ESSA, AQuESTT, and the Nebraska Education Vision
Objectives

- Provide a high-level overview of ESSA plan
- Go in-depth on accountability indicators, calculations, and what information shows us
- Discuss designation process (Priority Schools, TSI, CSI)
- Share our vision and beliefs about school improvement
- Answer questions, share resources, and take feedback
Mission: To lead and support the preparation of all Nebraskans for learning, earning, and living.
Every Student Succeeds Act

- Bipartisan federal education bill passed in 2015
- Focused on ensuring a quality education for all students regardless of race, zip code, language proficiency, or disability
- Each state must submit a plan for approval
- How is ESSA different from NCLB?
  - Provides increased state autonomy
  - No Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)
  - Requires a “5th indicator” in accountability systems to measure school quality
  - Inclusion of English learner proficiency in accountability
  - Ends School Improvement Grant (SIG) -- combines with “Accountability” funds
Context: Nebraska’s ESSA Plan

• Single system of accountability
• Blend ESSA with AQuESTT and State Board’s Strategic Vision and Direction
• Focus federal funds to support:
  • Struggling schools
  • Historically underserved students
  • Recruitment and development of highly-effective educators
• Approved by State Board of Education in September 2017
• Submitted to USDE on September 18, 2017
• Approved by USDE June 5, 2018
Context: Nebraska’s ESSA Plan

• New Indicators
  – Chronic absenteeism
  – Science
  – Progress toward English Language Proficiency

• Designation of Schools
  – Comprehensive Support and Improvement
  – Targeted Support and Improvement
Recommendations from AQuEStT Revision Team

- One accountability system
- Rating not ranking
- Moving forward with Minnesota-based designation system
- Growth needs to be weighted more
- We know AQuEStT complex, BUT we need to communicate it simply to audiences
- Combine 4-year and 7-year graduation rate
- Develop a system based more on the tenets of AQuEStT
- Keep “full academic year” requirement
  - Elevate district accountability
  - Communicate reporting
- Progress towards English language proficiency - Stamp of approval?
- Chronic absenteeism shouldn’t carry much weight
Classification to Designation

One system, two steps.

Step 1: Classification

- Excellent
- Great
- Good
- Needs Improvement

Step 2: Support

Classification - Rating schools

- Designation - Supporting schools
  - Priority schools - three schools, supported by state funding
  - Comprehensive Support & Improvement (CSI)
  - Targeted Support & Improvement (TSI)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-level Policy Decisions</th>
<th>Business Rule Development</th>
<th>Modeling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophically what are we trying to achieve with indicators?</td>
<td>What are the technical decisions that need to be made?</td>
<td>How does this work in reality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do we want the system to combine?</td>
<td>What are considerations for special circumstances?</td>
<td>Is the system fair?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many schools can we support?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does it pass the “sniff test?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Classification: AQuESTT 2.0

- Oriented by tenet
- Creates framework by which additional indicators could be added
- Ties accountability with framework of support
- Moves AQuESTT beyond test scores
### Elementary and Middle Schools

**Proficiency Status (4.3.2.1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Partnerships (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions (0, -1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Opportunities &amp; Access (+1.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Career Readiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment (+1.0, -1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Chronic Absenteeism**: 50%
- **Progress towards English language proficiency**: 50%
- **Individual Score Growth**: 40%
- **Score Improvement**: 30%
- **Non-Proficiency Reduction**: 15%
- **Science Proficiency Status**: 5%
- **Science Score Improvement**: 10%

**EBA (+1, 0)**

**Final Classification -- Max 4 (Excellent)**

### High Schools

**STATUS (4, 3, 2, 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Partnerships (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions (0, -1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Opportunities &amp; Access (+1.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Career Readiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment (+1.0, -1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **4 Year Graduation**: 51%
- **Chronic Absenteeism**: 50%
- **Progress towards English language proficiency**: 50%
- **Score Improvement**: 50%
- **Non-Proficiency Reduction**: 35%
- **Science Proficiency Status**: 5%
- **Science Score Improvement**: 10%

**EBA (+1, 0)**

**Final Classification -- Max 4 (Excellent)**
AQuESTT Indicators

- **Definition:** “...measure of gain in student achievement or element perceived to influence those gains. Provide parents and communities with richer picture of school performance.” ~CCSSO, 2017

- **Handout**
  - High-level overview of indicator
  - How it’s calculated (high-level)
  - What the indicator tells us

- **Take 5 minutes to read over the document. Discuss with a neighbor the following questions:**
  - What questions do you have?
  - What makes sense?
  - What doesn’t make sense?
  - What are we forgetting?
### Additional Indicators

**What could/should be included in an accountability system?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Partnerships</th>
<th>Transitions</th>
<th>Educational Opportunities &amp; Access</th>
<th>College and Career Readiness</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Educator Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate survey</td>
<td>3rd Grade on Track</td>
<td>Access to advance coursework</td>
<td>ASVAB</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>Teacher absenteeism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten readiness</td>
<td>Early childhood</td>
<td>Early childhood</td>
<td>21 on ACT</td>
<td>Science Improvement (2021)</td>
<td>Teacher evaluation system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade on track</td>
<td>Expanded learning</td>
<td>College matriculation</td>
<td>Industry certification</td>
<td>PACT to ACT Growth</td>
<td>Teacher survey participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade on track (Early Warning)</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Subgroup performance</td>
<td>Internship/Apprenticeship</td>
<td>Percent classes with endorsed staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT of 21</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Disc/Susp &amp; Exp</td>
<td>AP/IB/Dual credit</td>
<td>EC Step up to Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College matriculation</td>
<td>Subgroup performance</td>
<td>Interests and Opportunities survey (Louisiana)</td>
<td>Concentration completion</td>
<td>Programs of Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beyond the Core - Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAL success and movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Designation: Levels of Support

CSI
• Lowest 5% of Title I schools
• High schools with grad rates below 67%
• Consistently low-performing subgroups

TSI
• Consistently low-performing subgroups.

*Beginning in 2019, any school with consistently low-performing subgroup may not be classified as Excellent

Priority Schools
• Schools most needing support to improve
Classification and Designation

- Consensus around keeping system relatively the same – **No ranking of schools**
- Challenge: Identifying schools for improvement and supports

How do we determine schools most needing improvement from this group? Using all indicators?
Designation

How we propose designating schools for support

Comprehensive Support and Improvement
Targeted Support and Improvement
Additional Targeted Support and Improvement
Developed in 2014-15, AQuESTT is a classification system and a broader system of school improvement.

Classification + Framework for Improvement = AQuESTT
Supporting Schools - Championing Equity

- Why do we care?
  - Historically - We had to label school
  - Today/Future - Designations and data support school improvement

- Our core beliefs:
  - All schools can improve
  - Focus on equity
  - AQuESTT is the framework for improving

- Equity handouts
  - [https://greatlakesequity.org/resources](https://greatlakesequity.org/resources)
  - [goo.gl/2ULUSk](https://goo.gl/2ULUSk)
Support for Improvement Funds

- No more School Improvement Grants
- No more “Accountability” funds
- Combines resources for Improvement - 7 percent set aside

- ~$5 million
- Competitive grant process
Comprehensive Needs Assessment

- Being developed in partnership with ESUs, REL, NDE
- Use data to identify needs and gaps
- Should be informed by other sources of information
  - EBA
  - AdvancED review
  - Student surveys
- Outlines minimum expectations from the state
  - Ex. Aligned curriculum
- Begins process of root cause analysis
Improvement Plan

- Informed by all indicators
- Be developed after stakeholder engagement (teachers, parents, school leaders).
- Include evidence-based interventions
- Be based on school-level needs assessment
- Identify resource inequities
- Must be approved by the school, LEA, and SEA
- Periodically reviewed by State

ESSA Section 1111 (d)(1)(B)
Application

- Schools demonstrating the greatest need will receive funds first
- Criteria for school improvement will align with tenets of AQuESTT
- Application will include community/educational partners
  - ESUs
  - Non-profits
- Monitored by NDE Title I staff
- MUST include evidence based interventions
Accountability = Continuous Improvement

Trends from EBA
- Needs Improvement Schools - Requesting support with partnerships for community groups
- Supporting digital learning opportunities
- Technology to support teaching and learning
- Support and manage learning of all students

AdvancED eleot Averages (16-17)
- **Equitable Learning**
  - Differentiated learning opportunities
  - Equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources, technology and support
  - Ongoing opportunities to learn about their own and other’s backgrounds/cultures/differences
- **High Expectations**
  - Is provided exemplars of high quality work
  - Knows and strives to meet high expectations established by the teacher
- **Digital Learning**
  - Uses digital tools/technology to gather, evaluate, and/or use information for learning
  - Uses digital tools/technology to communicate and work collaboratively for learning
Resources

USDoe Guidance on Evidence
Math and ELA Resources - Evidence Based
Chronic Absenteeism Information
www.AQuESTT.com
Next Steps

Communication

• ESSA & Accountability webinars
• Roadshow
• Focus groups
• Administrator Days

Technical Development / Models

• Operationalizing recommendations
• Create models; seek feedback
• Independent, expert review
• Revision
Questions/Concerns