



Proposed Delaware School Success Framework (DSSF)

Policy and Practice Conference

June 24, 2015



Delaware
Department of Education

Who Are We?

- Jeff Klein – Coordinator of Research, Development, and Evaluation, Appoquinimink School District
- Gerri Marshal – Supervisor, Research and Evaluation, Red Clay Consolidated School District
- Ryan Reyna – Director of the Office of Accountability and Data Management, Delaware Department of Education

Overview of Accountability System in DE

Based on feedback from stakeholder groups, USDOE, and best practices used in other regions, we recognize that:

- AYP provides a very limited picture of school performance, so any new system should reflect multiple measures of performance
- Stakeholders use an accountability system for very different purposes and we need to be sensitive to all of these
- No accountability system will be perfect, nor will any system be 100% reflective of individual schools

We are aiming to have as strong and comprehensive of an accountability system as possible, utilizing stakeholder feedback, federal requirements, and best practices.

Feedback to Date

- We have solicited feedback this system from multiple groups, and will continue to do so throughout the Fall, including:
 - State Board of Education (multiple meetings)
 - Legislators (information sessions, information sheets)
 - Chiefs (meetings and updates)
 - DESS (meeting)
 - Statewide survey (6,500 responses)
 - Focus Groups (ongoing; includes teachers, parents, higher education, district staff, business community, etc.)
- The Accountability Framework Working Group (AFWG) has been the representative body advising on the development of the new system (includes superintendents, district administrators, PTA, DSEA, and SBE)
 - Districts with representation on AFWG at some point, to date: Indian River, Red Clay, Capital, Appoquinimink, NCCVT, Caesar Rodney, Polytech, Woodbridge, Delmar, Brandywine, and Lake Forest.

DSSF: Whole System Overview

Part A	Part B
Proficiency in ELA, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies (adjusted for participation)	Surveys – Student, Parent and Teacher
Growth in ELA and Math	Postsecondary Outcomes
Attendance (ES/MS only)	School-driven Narrative Report (i.e., programs, sports, civic engagement)
On Track in 9 th grade (HS only)	Social-emotional Learning
4-, 5- and 6-year Graduation Rate (HS only)	
Growth to Proficiency in ELA and Math (ES/MS only)	
College and Career Preparation (HS Only)	

***Note:** Part A metrics are those that were submitted to USDOE as part of our ESEA submission. These will be used to determine performance of schools. Part B metrics are Delaware-specific and Delaware-driven. They will be metrics transparently reported on the school framework, but will not be used to determine a performance level.*

DSSF: Part A (Performance)

Current Federal Accountability - Adequate Yearly Progress	Proposed Federal Accountability – Part A of DE School Success Framework (DSSF)
Proficiency in ELA and Math	1A-D) Proficiency in ELA, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies adjusted for Participation rate
Growth in ELA and Math	2A-B) Growth in ELA and Math
Attendance (ES/MS only)	3A) Attendance (ES/MS only)
4-year Graduation Rate (HS only)	3B) On Track in 9 th grade (HS only)
	3C-E) 4-, 5- and 6-year Graduation Rate (HS only)
	4A-B) Growth to Proficiency in ELA and Math (ES/MS only)
	4C) College and Career Preparation

After the release of the 2014-15 data, the DDOE and the AFWG will work together through Fall 2015 to analyze the data and make final recommendations on metric weighting and targets to the Secretary

DSSF: Part B (Non-rated)

Data publicized on redesigned school report card

1. Surveys – Student, Parent and Teacher
2. Postsecondary outcomes
3. Narrative report (i.e., programs, sports, civic engagement)
4. Social-emotional learning
5. Other Ideas/Suggestions (please share during Focus Group!)

Proposed Weights - HS

These are proposed weights for the DSSF. Once data 2014-15 testing data is received, we will verify that these are the final weights within the system.

HIGH SCHOOL - Area/Measures	Weight
<i>Academic Achievement</i>	25%
Proficiency ELA adjusted for Participation	7.5%
Proficiency Math adjusted for Participation	7.5%
Proficiency Science adjusted for Participation	5%
Proficiency Social Studies adjusted for Participation	5%
<i>Growth</i>	45%
Growth in ELA	22.5%
Growth in Math	22.5%
<i>On Track to Graduation</i>	20%
On Track in 9 th Grade	5%
4-year Cohort Graduation Rate	10%
5-year Cohort Graduation Rate	3%
6-year Cohort Graduation Rate	2%
<i>College and Career Preparation</i> (successful participation in a college or career experience in high school)	10%
CCR Success in High School	10%
Total	100%

Proposed Weights – ES and MS

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL - Area/Measures	Weight
<i>Academic Achievement</i>	30%
Proficiency ELA adjusted for Participation	10%
Proficiency Math adjusted for Participation	10%
Proficiency Science adjusted for Participation	5%
Proficiency Social Studies adjusted for Participation	5%
<i>Growth</i>	40%
Growth in ELA	20%
Growth in Math	20%
<i>On Track to Graduation</i>	10%
Average Daily Attendance	10%
<i>College and Career Preparation</i>	20%
Growth to Proficiency in ELA	10%
Growth to Proficiency in Math	10%
Total	100%

Deep Dive: Part A Metrics

Academic Achievement

1. Proficiency on Smarter Balanced in ELA adjusted for Participation
2. Proficiency on Smarter Balanced in Mathematics adjusted for Participation
3. Proficiency on DCAS in Science adjusted for Participation
4. Proficiency on DCAS in Social Studies per the 5-year Assessment Plan adjusted for Participation

Deep Dive: Part A Metrics

Growth

1. Growth in ELA
2. Growth in Mathematics

Model

- Retrospective analysis of growth
- Controls for
 - Multiple prior assessments
- Incorporates a weighted average over 3 years

Deep Dive: Part A Metrics

On Track to Graduation

1. Average Daily Attendance (ES/MS)
2. On Track in 9th Grade (HS)
3. Four year Cohort Graduation Rate (HS)
4. Five year Cohort Graduation Rate (HS)
5. Six year Cohort Graduation Rate (HS)

Deep Dive: Part A Metrics

College and Career Readiness

1. Growth to Proficiency in ELA (ES/MS)
2. Growth to Proficiency in Mathematics (ES/MS)
3. College and Career Preparation (HS)
 - 3+ on both Smarter ELA and Mathematics
 - 1550+ on SAT (or equivalent on the new SAT)
 - 3+ on AP (excluding AP Seminar)
 - 4+ on IB
 - B or higher grade in a Department approved non-elective course in the state course transfer matrix
 - Technical skills attainment with a 6+ (combined) on Smarter ELA and Mathematics
 - Technical skills attainment with completion of a co-op job training opportunity

Accountable Subgroups

- State performance targets will be set for each of the following groups:
 - All
 - Special Education
 - English Language Learners
 - Low-income
 - Race/ethnicity
- Participation rate will be determined for each group and rates below 95% will affect overall school rating

Achievement Gap Conversation

- Proposal to move to use of *Student Gap Group* for accountability purposes
 - Proficiency in ELA/Math
 - Graduation Rate - 4-year only
- Student Gap Group: aggregate, unduplicated count of students that are in groups that have historically had achievement gaps
 - Ethnicity/Race (African American, Hispanic, Native American)
 - Special Education
 - Economically Disadvantaged (Direct Certification) and
 - English Language Learners
- Establish targets to close Student Gap Group achievement gap
- Benefits of this approach
 - Increases number of schools held accountable for achievement gaps
 - Provides a single achievement gap goal (rather than more than 10 for some schools)
 - No students are “double counted”
- DDOE committed to continue producing individual subgroup targets (AMOs) and reporting annually on that performance
- Run tests in Fall 2016 to ensure
 - No school receives highest rating if significant gaps persist
 - Not creating perverse incentives

Accountability Summary

Issue	Current ESEA Flexibility	ESEA Flexibility Proposal
School ratings	Met/Did not meet AYP	Multiple level rating system - TBD (with one year ratings “pause”)
Scoring	Binary	Across performance spectrum
Targets	Established in 2012 ESEA Flexibility application	Set in Fall 2015 after review of Smarter assessment data
Measures	Limited	Multiple
Subgroups	Individual targets (AMOs) for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students • American Indian/Alaska Native • African American • Hawaiian/Pacific Islander • Hispanic • White • Multiracial • English Learner • Students with Disabilities • Economically Disadvantaged (Direct Certification) 	Student Gap Group for accountability Maintain AMOs and report performance for all subgroups
Participation	95% or Did not meet AYP	95% – reduction in rating

Timeline Moving Forward

- **May and June (2015):**
 - Solicit ongoing feedback on the school performance report
- **July and August (2015):**
 - Develop the school performance report
- **September (2015):**
 - Run reports with Smarter data and finalize weighting system
- **October (2015):**
 - Districts and schools receive individual reports (no accountability)
 - Solicit any additional feedback on the report cards from Chiefs and Focus Groups
- **November and December (2015):**
 - Begin development of the online system
 - Solicit feedback on the online system
- **January – March (2016):**
 - Develop the online system
- **April – June (2016):**
 - Beta test and solicit additional feedback on the online system (projected “go-live” date is Summer 2016)
 - School-wide surveys distributed

Additional Questions?

Contact Us:

- Jeff jeff.klein@appo.k12.de.us
- Gerri gerri.marshall@redclay.k12.de.us
- Ryan ryan.reyna@doe.k12.de.us