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Presentation outline

★ Overview of the Massachusetts ESSA plan
  ★ Key components
  ★ Stakeholder feedback

★ Proposed accountability plans for 2016-17 and 2017-18

★ Proposed turnaround and assistance activities
Norms & protocols

- Promote risk-taking by not assigning specific comments to individual members in meeting summaries & minutes
- Maintain confidentiality before, during, & after meetings
- Seek clarification & check understanding to avoid mistakenly attributing ideas to an individual or organization represented on the council
- Keep improvements in student learning at the core of the discussions. Students should drive the conversation
- Stay engaged in the issues
- Actively address implicit biases & instill cultural proficiency in discussions
- Encourage discussion from all voices of members. Be additive, not repetitive
- Let members know if pre-reading or other pre-meeting assignments require more than 30 minutes of preparation time
- Make it fun!
ESSA priorities

- **Equity and excellence** for all students, particularly for economically disadvantaged and other high need students
- High academic standards
- Accountability, support, and improvement
- Ensuring effective educators
- Supporting all students
- Academic assessments
Massachusetts’ goal is to prepare all students for success after high school by:

- Strengthening **standards, curriculum, instruction, and assessment**
- Promoting **educator development**
- Supporting **social-emotional learning, health, and safety**
- Turning around the **lowest performing districts and schools**
- Using **technology and data** to support teaching & learning
Promoting excellence

★ Using our state strategies to strengthen the quality of the instructional program students experience
  ★ Early grades literacy
  ★ Middle grades mathematics
  ★ Historically disadvantaged student groups
Grade 3 ELA, Grade 6 mathematics
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Grade 3 ELA, Grade 6 mathematics

- **G3 ELA - state**: 62%, 36%
- **G6 math - state**: 60%, 32%
- **G3 ELA - SWD**: 9%, 22%
- **G6 math - SWD**: 21%

Percent proficient or higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>G3 ELA - state</th>
<th>G6 math - state</th>
<th>G3 ELA - SWD</th>
<th>G6 math - SWD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promoting excellence: Examples

- Standards implementation and support
- Principal pipeline
- Effective feedback for educators
- Educator preparation
- Social-emotional skills
- School and district turnaround
- Consolidated grant application
Promoting equity

★ Access to effective educators
  ★ Student learning experiences

★ School-level expenditure reporting
  ★ Including personnel expenditures

★ Resource review in turnaround schools
## ESSA stakeholder feedback: 2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening</strong></td>
<td><strong>Modeling</strong></td>
<td><strong>Listening</strong></td>
<td><strong>Revising</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External stakeholders</td>
<td>Board of Elementary and Secondary Education</td>
<td>External stakeholders</td>
<td>External stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Elementary and Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder feedback

- 200+ stakeholder groups
- 5 public forums: 250+ attendees
- Almost 100 community meetings and presentations
- 1,500+ responses to our survey
- Broad range: educators, parents, students, advocacy groups
Public forums

11/14: Boston
11/21: Shrewsbury
11/29: Brockton
12/01: Holyoke
12/06: Salem
Forum feedback

★ Broad support for accountability metrics that:
   ★ Measure school climate
   ★ Ensure students participate in a high quality, well-rounded curriculum

★ Broad support for programs that:
   ★ Provide students with social/emotional/behavioral supports
   ★ Provide educators with skills to attend to students’ social/emotional/behavioral needs
Proposed changes to school and district accountability system
Accountability framework under ESSA

- Maintains NCLB’s annual testing requirements
- Requires states to incorporate a 95% assessment participation requirement into the accountability system
- Requires system of “annual meaningful differentiation” for all public schools
- Requires states to establish “ambitious state-designed long-term goals” & measures of interim progress, for all students and subgroups including a focus on gap closing
Accountability framework under ESSA

★ Requires states to include the following indicators in an accountability system
  ★ Academic achievement based on annual assessments in ELA, math and science
  ★ A measure of student growth or progress for elementary and middle schools.
  ★ Graduation rates for high schools
  ★ Progress in achieving English proficiency for English language learners
  ★ At least one measure of school quality or student success
Accountability framework under ESSA

- “Substantial weight” is required to be given to the achievement, progress, ELL proficiency and graduation rate indicators and taken together, they must be given “much greater weight” in the differentiation process than any measures of school quality or student success.

- Requires the identification of the lowest performing 5 percent of schools & high schools with graduation rates below 67%.

- Requires the identification of schools with low performing subgroups.
## Proposed indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for success</th>
<th>Proposed measure(s)</th>
<th>Grade span</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All students perform well against challenging grade-level expectations | - Next-generation MCAS results for English language arts, math, science  
- Student growth in ELA & math | All |
| All ELLs make progress towards English proficiency        | - ACCESS results                                                                   | All |
| All students graduate from high school                    | - 4-year cohort graduation rate  
- 5-year graduation plus still enrolled rate  
- Annual dropout rate | High school |
| All students attend school regularly                      | - Chronic absenteeism                                                              | All |
| All students experience a broad & challenging curriculum  | - Access to the arts  
- Access to a well-rounded curriculum  
- Passing all grade 9 courses  
- Access to advanced coursework | All  
High school  
High school  
High school |
| Schools support all students in attaining these goals     | - School climate survey (pilot in G5,8 and 10 in FY17)                              | All |
## Proposed indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Status for ALL students</th>
<th>Gap closing for HIGH NEEDS students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core measures</strong></td>
<td>1. ELA and math scaled score</td>
<td>1. ELA, math, and science gap reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Science performance index</td>
<td>2. ELA and math student growth percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ELA and math student growth percentile</td>
<td>3. ACCESS growth (English learners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. ACCESS progress (English learners)</td>
<td>4. Graduation and dropout rate gap reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Graduation and dropout rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional measures</strong></td>
<td>1. Chronic absenteeism</td>
<td>1. Improvement in chronic absenteeism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Grade 9 course passing</td>
<td>2. Improvement in grade 9 course passing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Advanced coursework</td>
<td>3. Improvement in access to advanced coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Access to the arts</td>
<td>4. Improvement in access to the arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Breadth of curriculum</td>
<td>5. Improvement in breadth of curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. School climate</td>
<td>6. Improvement in school climate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Proposed index methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Gap Closing for High Needs</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Measures</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Weighting between A and C to be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Measures</strong></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Weighting between B and D to be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL SCHOOL PERCENTILE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Weighting between E and F to be determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed accountability approach

- Measures aggregated into overall school performance index
- Index used as first step for classifying schools into performance levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Level</th>
<th>Example Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td>• School percentile 90-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>• School percentile 51-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>• School percentile 26-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level D</td>
<td>• School percentile 10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level E</td>
<td>• School percentile 6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Support or Underperforming</td>
<td>• School percentile 1-5 or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Current level four schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Receivership</td>
<td>• BESE Vote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed accountability approach

- Performance level designations do not depend solely on performance of other schools
  - Schools can move up in performance level by meeting or exceeding school and subgroup targets
  - Schools can move down in performance by having a low performing subgroup or not meeting participation requirements
- District performance levels based on all students in district, not individual schools
Identification of schools

- Identification needs to occur following the 2017-18 school year

- **Schools in need of Comprehensive Support**
  - Lowest performing 5% of schools
  - High schools with four-year graduation rate below 67%

- **Schools in need of Targeted Support**
  - Schools not identified for comprehensive support that have subgroups performing among the lowest in the state

- ESE will apply for flexibility to take school type into consideration for both categories
2016-17 accountability reporting

★ ESE is proposing to reset the baseline for grades 3-8 accountability in 2016-17
  ★ Assessment transition provides opportunity
  ★ Common assessment baseline for new accountability system
  ★ 2017 Next-Generation MCAS results reported with relative indicator
  ★ High school accountability would remain unchanged
  ★ Requires a regulatory change
2016-17 accountability reporting

- Schools not meeting participation requirements would be held in Level 3
- Any school meeting the participation requirements would be eligible
- All other Level 1-3 schools would not receive an accountability percentile or be leveled
- 2016-17 results would become new accountability baseline
- Current Level 4 or 5 schools that are not exiting would not be eligible
## Next steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>BESE meeting to present proposed model incorporating feedback received from the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Revise model based on feedback from BESE &amp; field 2016-17 reporting regulatory change to BESE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Final review of proposed model with BESE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Submit ESSA state plan to U.S. Department of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

★ What are your initial reactions to the proposed accountability system model and indicators?
★ What are your thoughts on the use of percentiles and criterion referenced measures for placement into accountability levels?
★ Should ESE explore the flexibility offered under ESSA to include in the students with disabilities subgroup those students who have transitioned off of IEPs within the last 2 years?
★ Should ESE explore the flexibility offered under ESSA to extend the number of years that former English learners are included in the ELL/Former ELL subgroup?
★ What are your thoughts on the proposed plans for 2016-17 accountability reporting?
School and district turnaround and assistance activities
ESSA evidence-based criteria

★ ESSA requires districts with comprehensive and targeted support and intervention schools to use strategies that are evidence-based
Turnaround practices

- Leadership, shared responsibility, and effective collaboration
- Intentional practices for improving instruction
- Student-specific supports and instruction to all students
- School climate and culture
SRG impact study

ELA Achievement Score Effect Sizes by Years After First SRG Receipt

Mathematics Achievement Score Effect Sizes by Years After First SRG Receipt

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .001$

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
SRG impact study

ELA Achievement Score Effect Sizes by English Language Learner (ELL) Status and Years After First SRG Receipt

Mathematics Achievement Score Effect Sizes by English Language Learner (ELL) Status and Years After First SRG Receipt

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .001$; + significance refers to the subgroup difference (subgroup – nonsubgroup)

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .001$; + significance refers to the subgroup difference (subgroup – nonsubgroup)
Framework for assistance

☆ All ESE turnaround assistance efforts by are structured around the turnaround practices
   ☆ Turnaround plans
   ☆ Monitoring
   ☆ Direct assistance
   ☆ Funding
   ☆ Professional development
Turnaround assistance under ESSA

- Rely on research that meets evidence-based criteria under ESSA
- We will continue to enhance our system of support aligned to the turnaround practices for comprehensive and targeted support and intervention schools
Questions?