



COLORADO

Department of Education

ESSA Accountability: Identification and Exiting of Schools for Improvement and Support

Stakeholder Survey Results,
ESSA Hub Input, Final Regulations, and
Current Recommendations

January 4, 2017

Respondent Demographics

Question 1: What is your role?

Role	Percent	Count
Parent	10.0%	7
<i>Educator</i>	<i>90.0%</i>	<i>63</i>
Member of the Public	17.1%	12
Hub Committee Member	4.3%	3

Note. Percentages exceed 100% as some respondents indicated multiple roles.

Question 2: Where are you from?

Location	Percent	Count
<i>Rural Areas</i>	<i>36.2%</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Suburban Areas</i>	<i>36.2%</i>	<i>25</i>
Urban Areas	27.5%	19

Structure of Remaining Slides

- **On the remainder of the slides**
 - Green font represents preliminary input from the Hub and the number of Hub members that preliminarily supported each item
 - Red font represents impact of final Accountability Regulations on options being considered
 - “Recommendation” slides represent the recommendation being made at this time by the small group working on this decision point and will be put forth to the Hub and State Board of Education as recommendations after the remainder of the AWG has reviewed and agrees with the recommendation

Comprehensive: Lowest 5%

Question 3: What criteria should Colorado use to identify schools as the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools for comprehensive support and improvement?

Options	Percent	Count
<i>Rank schools based on the total percentage points earned on the School Performance Frameworks (SPF) and identify the lowest 5% of Title I schools. (Spoke Recommendation) (currently estimated at 35 schools using current data - number will change by the time of implementation).</i>	68.1%	47 Hub: 10 out of 16
Use the lowest rating possible on the SPF (Turnaround Plan Type) to identify schools for this category. (currently estimated at 37 schools using current data - number will change by the time of implementation; will not necessarily result in 5% of schools in some years).	27.5%	19 Hub: 3 out of 16
Other (please specify)	4.4%	3
Total responses		69

“Other” replies on next page

Comprehensive: Lowest 5%

Question 3: What criteria should Colorado use to identify schools as the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools for comprehensive support and improvement?

“Other” replies:

- One thing to note is that while CDE takes up the issue of identification and exit criteria for schools in need of improvement, it does not discuss intervention. This is not unique to Colorado—the AFT has found that many states are taking more time to develop recommendations on improvement and intervention strategies. But this is where one of the real opportunities is to move away from the sanction-based accountability of the NCLB-era, to a support-and-improve system. -The state is recommending using the total percentage of points earned on the Colorado School Performance Frameworks (SPF) to rank schools, and that schools be identified each year, rather than every three years. AFT-CO does not recommend ranking schools or giving them letter grades, as this can unfairly hurt schools and students. It is more helpful to provide a data dashboard that shows where schools are doing well and where they need help. Much like the dashboard of a car, there are multiple indicators that let you know the status of your vehicle. This is much more useful than simply knowing the car will or won't run.
- Do not identify by %, in a standards based system what happens when all schools meet the 'expected minimum standard?'
- Use a criterion based tool that theoretically allows all schools to meet the expectation.

Recommendation

- **After reviewing the results of the survey and input from the Hub, the first option is being recommended:**
 - *Rank schools based on the total percentage points earned on the School Performance Framework (SPF) and identify the lowest 5% of Title I schools.*

Comprehensive: Lowest 5%

Question 6: How many years of data should be used to identify each category of comprehensive (Lowest 5%)?

Options	Percent	Count
One preceding year	9.0%	6
<i>Three preceding years</i>	89.6%	60
Other (specify)	1.5%	1
Total Responses		67

Allowed in Final Regs

Other:

- Use both with 50% of points from each
- Use four preceding years to capture a student's high school experience

Recommendation

- After reviewing the results of the survey and input from the Hub, the second option is being recommended:
 - *Use three years of preceding data.*

Comprehensive: Lowest 5%

Question 7: How often should schools be identified for comprehensive support and improvement for each of the school categories (Lowest 5%)?

Options	Percent	Count	
<i>Every year</i>	<i>63.8%</i>	<i>44</i>	Hub: 10 out of 16
Every three years	33.3%	23	Hub: 3 out of 16
Other (specify)	2.9%	2	
Total Responses		69	

Other:

- Every 5 years
- Every 2 years

Recommendation

- After reviewing the results of the survey and input from the Hub, the first option is being recommended:
 - *Identify schools annually.*

Comprehensive: Lowest 5%

Question 8: Once a school has been identified for comprehensive support and improvement for each of the school categories (Lowest 5%), how long should the identification last?

Options	Percent	Count
One year	20.3%	14
<i>Three years</i>	<i>76.8%</i>	<i>53</i>
Other (specify)	2.9%	2
Total Responses		69

Other:

- Until significant improvement is realized

Recommendation

- After reviewing the results of the survey and input from the Hub, the second option is being recommended:
 - *Identification of schools should last for three years.*

Comprehensive: High Schools with Low Grad Rate

Question 4: What data should Colorado use for identifying low graduation rate?

Options	Percent	Count
<i>4-year plus extended year graduation rate (Spoke Recommendation) (based on current data, estimated to range between 50 to 90 high schools being identified)</i>	79.4%	54
	Hub: 11 out of 16	
4-year graduation rate only (based on current data, estimated to range between 80 to 140 high schools being identified)	16.2%	11
	Hub: 0 out of 16	
Other (please specify)	4.4%	3
Total responses		68

Other:

- 4 year, extended year, and alternative programs including GEDs, and vocational programs
- For this small rural school district, there appears to now be a penalty for taking the risk of allowing out of district dropouts to enter our school to try again at graduating. Years ago, I previously wrote in my improvement plan that of that particular at-risk group, our goal was to get at least 50% to graduate. While we are far more successful than that, of the students that do not graduate, this "previously dropped-out group" is a significant factor.
- 4-year plus extended year graduation rate with the option to use completion rate (Diploma + GED Completers)

Recommendation

- After reviewing the results of the survey and input from the Hub, the first option is being recommended:
 - *Use 4-year plus extended year graduation rate for identification of high schools with low graduation rates.*

Comprehensive: HS with Low Grad Rate

Question 6: How many years of data should be used to identify each category of comprehensive (High Schools with Low Grad Rate)?

Options	Percent	Count
One preceding year	6.0%	4
<i>Three preceding years</i>	92.5%	62
Other (specify)	1.5%	1
Total Responses		67

Allowed in Final Regs

Other:

- Use both with 50% of points from each
- Use four preceding years to capture a student's high school experience

Recommendation

- After reviewing the results of the survey and input from the Hub, the second option is being recommended:
 - *Use three years of preceding data.*

Comprehensive: HS with Low Grad Rate

Question 7: How often should schools be identified for comprehensive support and improvement for each of the school categories (HS with Low Grad Rate)?

Options	Percent	Count
<i>Every year</i>	62.3%	43
Every three years	34.8%	24
Other (specify)	2.9%	2
Total Responses		69

Hub: 7 out of 16

Hub: 5 out of 16

Other:

- Every 5 years
- Every 2 years

Recommendation

- After reviewing the results of the survey and input from the Hub, the first option is being recommended:
 - *Identify schools annually.*

Comprehensive: HS with Low Grad Rate

Question 8: Once a school has been identified for comprehensive support and improvement for each of the school categories (HS with Low Grad Rate), how long should the identification last?

Options	Percent	Count
One year	20.3%	14
<i>Three years</i>	<i>76.8%</i>	<i>53</i>
Other (specify)	2.9%	2
Total Responses		69

Other:

- Until significant improvement is realized

Recommendation

- After reviewing the results of the survey and input from the Hub, the second option is being recommended:
 - *Identification of schools should last for three years.*

Comprehensive: Additional Targeted

Question 5: A school with at least one low performing group of students that has been identified for additional targeted support should be allowed to improve performance for ____ number of years before it is re-identified for comprehensive support and improvement.

Options	Percent	Count
One	2.9%	2
Two	8.8%	6
Three	70.6%	48
Four	16.2%	11
Other (specify)	1.5%	1
Total Responses		68

Comments: Use 2 years, then re-assess. If indicators show reasonable improvement then add 2 more years (4 total)

Recommendation

- After reviewing the results of the survey and input from the Hub, the third option is being recommended, with a plan to revisit this decision as we collect more data on the performance of schools that are identified for and receive additional targeted support (the State will need time to define reasonable improvement based on data collected moving forward):
 - *Identification of schools should last for three years.*

Comprehensive: Additional Targeted

Question 6: How many years of data should be used to identify each category of comprehensive (Additional Targeted)?

Options	Percent	Count
One preceding year	10.5%	7
<i>Three preceding years</i>	86.6%	58
Other (specify)	3.0%	2
Total Responses		67

Allowed in Final Regs

Other:

- Use both with 50% of points from each
- Use four preceding years to capture a student's high school experience

Recommendation

- After reviewing the results of the survey and input from the Hub, the second option is being recommended:
 - *Use three years of preceding data.*

Comprehensive: Additional Targeted

Question 7: How often should schools be identified for comprehensive support and improvement for each of the school categories (Additional Targeted)?

Options	Percent	Count
<i>Every year</i>	<i>66.7%</i>	<i>46</i>
Every three years	30.4%	21
Other (specify)	2.9%	2
Total Responses		69

Other:

- Every 5 years
- Every 2 years

Recommendation

- After reviewing the results of the survey and input from the Hub, the first option is being recommended:
 - *Identify schools annually.*

Comprehensive: Additional Targeted

Question 8: Once a school has been identified for comprehensive support and improvement for each of the school categories (Additional Targeted), how long should the identification last?

Options	Percent	Count
One year	21.7%	15
<i>Three years</i>	<i>75.4%</i>	<i>52</i>
Other (specify)	2.9%	2
Total Responses		69

Other:

- Until significant improvement is realized

Recommendation

- After reviewing the results of the survey and input from the Hub, the second option is being recommended:
 - *Identification of schools should last three years.*

Comprehensive: Exit Criteria

Question 9: 'A school should exit comprehensive status when that school no longer meets the identification criteria.'

Agreement	Percent	Count
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Disagree	0.0%	0
Undecided	4.4%	3
Agree	53.6%	37
Strongly Agree	42.0%	29
Overall (Agree/SA)	95.6%	66 out of 69

Hub: 5 out of 16

Recommendation

- After reviewing the results of the survey and input from the Hub, the exit criteria being recommended is:
 - *School no longer meets the criteria that resulted in the school being identified for support and improvement.*

Targeted



Final Regulations

- **Have to identify two categories of Targeted:**
 - Consistently underperforming (starting in 2019-2010, annually)
 - Any school that has one or more consistently underperforming subgroups of students
 - Low-performing subgroup (starting in 2018-2019, once every 3 years)
 - “Any school that is not identified under paragraph (a) [*comprehensive*] of this section in which one or more subgroups of students is performing, using the State’s methodology for identifying the lowest-performing schools under paragraph (a)(1) [*comprehensive, lowest 5%*] of this section, at or below the performance of all students in any school identified under paragraph (a)(1) of this section.”

Final Regulations

■ Identification of Targeted:

- Based on all indicators
- Weighted as prescribed (e.g., English Language Progress Indicator has to be weighted the same as achievement and growth)
- “A subgroup of students that is not meeting at least one of the State’s measurements of interim progress or is not on track to meet at least one of the State-designed long-term goals under §200.12 or is performing below a State-determined threshold on an indicator for which the State is not required to establish a long-term goal under §200.12; or another State-determined definition.”

Targeted: Indicators Used in Identification

Question 10: How should accountability indicators be used in the analyses for identifying schools for targeted support and improvement (by definition, these are schools that have at least one student group that is consistently underperforming) on all indicators in the accountability system?

Options	Percent	Count
Use all possible indicators (only include schools when they have large enough group(s) of students on all indicators; exclude from analyses any school that does not have a large enough group(s) of students on any indicator(s)) ~ would result in fewest schools being identified (currently estimated at less than 75 schools using one year of data).	33.3%	22
Use all available indicators (only include schools in analyses if they have a large enough group of students on at least one indicator and only use indicators for which the school has a large enough student group(s)) ~ would result in most schools being identified (currently estimated at over 650 schools using one year of data).	4.6%	3
Use a minimum of 3 indicators (only include schools when the school has a large enough group of students on at least 3 indicators for that student group) (Spoke Recommendation) ~ would result in a mid-range of schools being identified (currently estimated between 100 to 200 schools using one year of data).	62.1%	41
Total responses		69

Hub: 0 out of 16

Hub: 0 out of 16

Hub: 3 out of 16

Required in Final Regulations: ELP has to be weighted the same as achievement and growth (and grad rate). Does not address if too few students have data for that indicator.



Options

- **After reviewing the results of the survey, input from the Hub, and the final ESSA Accountability Regulations, the first and third options are being put forth for decision, along with pros and cons for each option:**
 - *Use all possible indicators (only include schools when they have large enough group(s) of students on all indicators; exclude from analyses any school that does not have a large enough group(s) of students on any indicator(s)).*
 - *Use a minimum of 3 indicators (only include schools when the school has a large enough group of students on at least 3 indicators for that student group).*

Targeted: Years of Data Used in Identification

Question 11: How many years of data should be used to identify schools for targeted support and improvement (identified as any school with at least one consistently underperforming student group)?

Options	Percent	Count
One preceding year	10.3%	7
<i>Three preceding years</i>	83.8%	57
Other (specify)	5.9%	4
Total Responses		68

Hub: 8 out of 16

Other:

- Use both with 50% of points from each
- Use two years of data
- Worst of either: single year or average of 3 years
- Use at least four years of data

Required in Final Regulations: No more than two years of data, unless the state can demonstrate a longer period will better support low-performing student groups

Recommendation

- After reviewing the results of the survey and input from the Hub, the second option is being recommended:
 - *Use three years of preceding data.*
 - *Because the final regulations require use of no more than 2 years of data, unless the state can demonstrate a need to use more years of data, the State Plan will need to include the number of schools that would not be included in analyses if only two years of data is used.*

ELP Indicator Issue

Question 12: What suggestions or ideas do you have for addressing the concern that there is one additional indicator for English learners, which is not required for any other student groups?

- A total of 19 open-ended responses were received.
- The responses were reviewed to identify overall themes and significant notes of consideration.
 - The obtained feedback was grouped into three categories:
 - Group 1: **Suggestions for Use**
 - Group 2: **Additional Indicator is Necessary/Appropriate**
 - Group 3: **Additional Indicator is Inappropriate**
 - Group 4: **Request for Info and/or Pertains to Another Topic**
 - Comments are provided on the following slides.

Hub: No comments

Group 1: Suggestions for Use

- What are the impacts on schools and districts to collect this data for English learners. I think the idea of using this as a separate indicators and a check point for schools might be a good option. If not consider how this could be weighted.
- I like the lowering of the weighting of language proficiency so that it has minimal impact but also still keeps the data and holds schools accountable. I'm thinking it should have 20% the impact of the other measures...but someone should play with the numbers to see how many schools it would impact the rating of and what is a reasonable percentage.
- Include other subgroups that should be measured and addressed: gifted and talented
- Perhaps the English learner category could be substituted for another indicator.
- Create a tiered system for schools with high poverty plus high ELL and above average SPED and mobile populations.
- I always have concerns when a group singled out from others however, if the issues unique to a group is addressed appropriately and improvements are realized, through individualized teaching learning, it would seem justify the need have the additional indicator. This doesn't mean putting students in special ed classes but rather targeting their issues and assigning a qualified teacher or staff professional to work with students.

Group 2: Additional Indicator is Necessary/Appropriate

- English learners have additional educational needs beyond other subgroups, so it seems appropriate that schools should be held accountable for servicing these additional needs. In other words, I am unconcerned about having an additional indicator for English learners. Yes, it's harder to meet these students' needs, but that doesn't decrease the imperative to meet them.
- EL students have historically underperformed so need to have more scrutiny to ensure they are being supported. EL students are very typically disenfranchised so having another measure signals that ALL teachers should be held accountable for their inclusion and progress, not just the ESL teacher. I do not feel the extra measure is a problem... in fact I think it ensures equal access for all students.
- I think this additional indicator is important. I support its inclusion.

Group 3: Additional Indicator is Inappropriate

- I strongly agree with this concern. The redundancy for one specific student group is not worthy of being counted twice. If required by federal statute, then the weight of the two indicators should be modified to have the impact of a single indicator.
- It is discriminatory and should not be used. The current accountability system is seriously flawed with discrimination.

Group 4: Request for Info and/or Pertains to Another Topic

- As the committee works through the recommendations, the number of schools that would fall into needing improvement must be considered. If the metrics are constructed in such a way that we have a larger number of schools needing resources, there will not be enough resources to go around to help these schools (e.g., because of TABOR, CDE will be hard pressed to offer much support to those schools identified as needing help). In addition, It is hoped that CDE will use the method of identifying schools needing additional support as a way to help schools and NOT punish them for under performance.
- The proposed list of options are all valid. I would like to see a pro/con list of how each option impacts districts based on if they are rural, urban or suburban.
- The proposed options to date seem like they are all worth exploring and we would like to see a pros and cons list for each proposed item. This feedback is being provided by the PEA ESSA team.
- The proposed options presented seem worthy of further exploration and a pros and cons list would be helpful.
- My biggest concern is that students on IEPs are considered an underperforming group when compared to all Colorado students. This should, by definition, be true in all schools and districts. If these students were not underperforming, they would not be on an IEP in the first place. Any school of 700 students could easily be placed on targeted support because of the academic progress of 16 students on IEPs. The other concern is that the state does not see magnitude of the stigma that these labels place on the school and community. Schools with the label of 'priority improvement' or 'turnaround' result in the more wealthy and higher performing students leaving, which perpetuates the cycle. Teachers are disheartened and parents take it as a given the school is bad, regardless of the efforts made or the resources available for improvement. My district had a 'Title I focus school' that suffered with this label for three years despite achieving performance after the first year. All schools and districts should be able to exit the debilitating stigma of the label as soon as possible and given a grace period to build the school back up before being thrust back down again.
- General educators, special educators and parents need information and training about English language development timelines (silent receptive stage on through fluency) and supports differ along the way. English as a second language teachers should be highly qualified, and the students should receive the recommended minimums of daily service time, English should be taught explicitly (using first language as modality when possible) and not just absorbed in context, or their students should not be tested/ test results should not be considered as reliable as they could be. Consider extending any timeline (i.e. 3 years for English speaking students, double that for students learning English, triple that if they have additional needs).
- Once a school is identified as needing additional support, that support should last 3 years, even if the school improves enough to be removed from the comprehensive or targeted lists. It will take more than one year to make systemic improvements within the school.
- my newsletter on the need to keep in mind what we agreed to in SB 163 - which is still current law <http://anotherviewphj.blogspot.com/2016/11/av154-public-education-in-colorado.html>.

Status of the Additional Indicator for EL Student Group

- **After reviewing the results of the survey and input from the Hub, the Accountability Spoke is collecting additional stakeholder input and developing options based on that input.**
 - Considerations: The Regulations prescribe weighting of indicators when a school does not have enough students for the English Language Proficiency (ELP) indicator. However, the regulations do not address Colorado’s concern that the ELP indicator alone could prevent a school from being identified when the school does not meet expectations on content indicators for English Learners but does meet expectations on the ELP indicator
 - Question being discussed and further considered:
 - What is the most fair and equitable way to use “all indicators”, given that the EL student group will always have one additional indicator?

Potential Options

- **The following options are being considered and vetted with stakeholders:**
 - Use all required indicators (ELA & math achievement and growth, grad rate, other indicator, and ELP) and weight them similarly
 - Use a two step process:
 - Option 1
 1. Use all indicators, except for ELP indicator, for all student groups
 2. For the EL group, include the ELP indicator as an additional check
 - a. Not meeting expectations on ELP indicator requires that indicator to be addressed in the school's improvement plan
 - b. Meeting expectations on ELP indicator would not prevent school from being identified, but the school would not have to address ELP performance in its plan
 - Option 2
 1. Conduct analyses separately for ELP and other indicators (ELA & math achievement and growth, grad rate, other indicator)
 2. Schools can be identified for content performance (all indicators except ELP) of student groups and/or for the linguistic performance of English Learners (ELP indicator)

- **Other options?**

Next Steps

- **Additional input is being collected from:**
 - Other states and national organizations to see what options are being considered by other states
 - Constituents and colleagues of the Spoke Members working on this decision point
 - EL experts and stakeholders
- **Options will be revised and updated based on the input collected, before options and/or recommendations are prepared on this component of the school identification decision point.**

Contact Information

- For questions or to provide input contact
 - Nazanin Mohajeri-Nelson
 - Mohajeri-nelson_n@cde.state.co.us
 - (303) 866-6205