



COLORADO

Department of Education

**ESSA Accountability Work Group
Decision Point:
Long-Term Goals and Interim
Targets**

Decision Point

- How will Colorado measure interim progress and progress towards long-term goals?

A. Academic Achievement.

- Description.** Describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for academic achievement.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Sample Grade-level Table

	Reading/ Language Arts	Reading/ Language Arts	Mathematics	Mathematics
Subgroups	Starting Point (Year)	Long Term Goal (Year)	Starting Point (Year)	Long Term Goal (Year)
All students				
Economically disadvantaged students				
Children with disabilities				
English learners				
African American				
American Indian or Alaska Native				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander				
Hispanic or Latino				
White				



Decision Point, Cont.

B. Graduation Rate.

- i. **Description.** Describe how the SEA established its ambitious long terms goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and, if applicable, the extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. Add additional tables as necessary.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate		
Subgroup	Starting Point (Year)	Long Term Goal (Year)
All students		
Economically disadvantaged students		
Children with disabilities		
English learners		
African American		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander		
Hispanic or Latino		
White		

- ii. If the State has an extended-year rate or rates, indicate the length of the cohort (*i.e.*, 5-year, 6-year, 7-year):

[Click here to enter text.](#)

<INSERT #>-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate		
Subgroup	Starting Point (Year)	Long Term Goal (Year)
All students		
Economically disadvantaged students		
Children with disabilities		
English learners		
African American		
American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander		
Hispanic or Latino		
White		

Requirements

- **Federal Statute (ESSA)**
 - Ambitious long-term goals which include measurements of interim progress
 - Same timeline for all students and disaggregated groups
 - Takes into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps

Additional information – Long-term goals materials from 9/21:
www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/accountabilityworkgroup



Starting Point: What We've Heard

- Consider raising expectations
- Consider what other states are doing
- Consider goals aligned to adequate growth percentiles (AGP)
- Consider including growth goals

Options Regarding Achievement Goals



Recommended Option

Set targets based on mean scale scores

Pros	Cons	Considerations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Aligned with current Performance Frameworks• Takes incremental performance of all students into consideration, regardless of where they fall within the full range of scale scores• Encourages educator conversations around instructional improvement to focus on every student	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does not show how many students are meeting assessment expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does not encourage systems to target “bubble” students, on the verge of making “proficient”• Protects PII and can be publicly reported without data suppression

Not Recommended

- **Targets based on the percentage of students in specific performance level categories**
 - Shows how many students are meeting assessment expectations, but doesn't take performance of all students into consideration (e.g., students close to the cut-point are not differentiated from students far below/above the cut-point)
 - Doesn't align with current accountability practices
 - Requires stringent data suppression around public reporting to ensure personally identifiable information (PII) is protected

Options Regarding Graduation Goals



Recommended Option

Establish long-term goals taking into consideration the **four-year, and extended-year, adjusted cohort graduation rates**

Pros	Cons	Considerations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Considers factors such as concurrent enrollment• Considers students who are in 5-year programs (e.g., ASCENT)• Considers students with disabilities who may take longer than 4 years to graduate• Acknowledges and honors success of every student		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Doesn't recognize alternative completion pathways; relies solely on graduation diploma

Not Recommended

- Establish long-term goals based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate only (exclude extended-year graduation rate)
 - Does not address stakeholder concerns
 - Does not accommodate a variety of factors that may lead to extended enrollment, such as ASCENT programs and concurrent enrollment

Options Regarding Long-Term Goals



Recommended Option

Establish long-term goals based on cut-scores informed by historical data (e.g., percentile ranks)

Pros	Cons	Considerations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Still ambitious but more likely to be attainable• Aligned with current Performance Frameworks• Based on Colorado data• Allows meaningful differentiation among schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does not allow comparisons beyond Colorado• Does not compare students to a theoretical criterion, but to a normed baseline year and to each other, within and across disaggregated groups, schools, and districts• Dependent on baseline performance, there are risks that bar could be set too low/high	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Should normative system be applied to all indicators? Would require a change in the growth calculations• Can't baseline every year; creates moving target• May not encourage highest performing schools/districts to grow or reward them for growth

Not Recommended

- **Goals based on theoretical criteria (e.g., a specific percentage of students should be able to meet PARCC achievement objectives, all students should graduate in 4 years)**
 - Establishes very ambitious targets directly aligned to state assessment expectations, and communicates a sense of urgency around student improvement
 - Goals may not be attainable (unrealistically high), however, and this approach may be seen as unfair or even punitive by the field, and may result in an accountability system that does not meaningfully differentiate among schools
 - Not aligned to current Performance Frameworks

Options Regarding Timeline



Options Regarding Timeline

Options	Pros	Cons	Considerations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Minimum of 5 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none">5 years – minimum amount of time to make systemic change	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Can just wait until the system changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Change in assessments5 -10 years – too long for any individual student
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Maximum of 10 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none">10 years – holds systems accountable to making change		

Options Regarding Interim Measures



Option 1

Establish same interim targets for all students and all disaggregated groups

Pros	Cons	Considerations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Easier to communicate to public and for public to understand	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Doesn't take into consideration that some disaggregated groups, schools, and districts are starting at a lower point	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Doesn't take into consideration the research around systemic change

Option 2

Establish different interim targets based on starting point of disaggregated groups (with the same long-term goal)

Pros	Cons	Considerations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Interim goals that take starting point into consideration may be more feasible for traditionally low-performing disaggregated groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• More difficult to communicate to the public and for the public to understand• Disaggregated groups are held to different targets each year (except for the final long-term goal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assumes that change is linear—not necessarily the case• Low-performing disaggregated groups will have to make more progress each year than their higher-performing counterparts

Options Regarding Frequency of Interim Targets



Option 1

Raise interim targets every year

Pros	Cons	Considerations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Communicates a sense of urgency	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Requires more resources to implementComplicates communication because targets change so often	

Option 2

Raise interim targets every 2 (or 3) years

Pros	Cons	Considerations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simplifies communication because targets don't change so often	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Every 3 years might be too infrequent	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Depends on the timelines (e.g., 5 years, 7 years, etc.)

Input Needed

- Please use this link to respond to the following questions:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/JM28XFR>

- 1. What is your role? (Parent, educator, public, hub member)
- 2. Where are you from? (rural, urban, or suburban setting)
- 3. In the case of multiple options, please indicate your preferred option.
- 4. In the case of single recommendations, please indicate whether you recommend the proposed option (1=do not recommend, 5=strongly recommend)
- 5. Optional, provide any rationale or considerations for your responses.