



engage^{ny}

Our Students. Their Moment.

Development of the New York State Every Student Succeeds Act Plan

Presented to Board Of Regents
January 9, 2017

Work Thus Far

- ✓ Engaged in extensive research to understand the law and the opportunities it provides, including, but not limited to meetings with:
 - United States Department of Education (USDE)
 - Brustein & Manasevit – a law firm recognized for its federal education regulatory and legislative practice
 - Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), which has provided access to many national experts including:
 - Linda Darling Hammond, Learning Policy Institute
 - Brian Gong, Center for Assessment
 - Kenji Hakuta, Stanford University
 - Delia Pompa, Migration Policy Institute
 - Gene Wilhoit, National Center for Innovation in Education
 - Susie Saavedra, National Urban League

- ✓ In the past three months, the Board of Regents has engaged in discussions with national educational experts regarding ESSA:
 - ✓ Linda Darling Hammond, Learning Policy Institute
 - ✓ Scott F. Marion, National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment
 - ✓ Michael Cohen, Achieve

- ✓ Met approximately ten times with Title I Committee of Practitioners to discuss ESSA.

- ✓ Established an ESSA Think Tank with representatives from over 100 organizations. The Think Tank has met at least monthly since June.
 - Work Groups have met twice a month: Supporting All Students, Supporting English Language Learners, Supporting Excellent Educators, Challenging Academic Standards and Assessments, Accountability Methodologies and Measurements, and Supports and Improvement for Schools

Work Thus Far

- ✓ Developed draft Characteristics of Highly Effective Schools and Guiding Principles for development of the ESSA state plan.
 - Surveyed Think Tank, COPs and the field for feedback on these documents.
- ✓ Drafted High Concept Ideas, which were presented at Regional State Plan Development Meetings during November and December. (Handout)
 - Participant feedback on the High Concept Ideas was gathered through meeting discussion and a survey.

Organization of High Concept Idea

The High Concept Ideas are organized in accordance with USDE's draft ESSA State Application Plan Template and ESSA Think Tank Workgroups:

- Supporting All Students (November)
- Challenging Academic Standards and Assessments (December)
- Supports for Improving Schools (January-handout)
- Accountability Measurements and Methodologies
- Supporting Excellent Educators
- Supporting English Language Learners

Full Board Presentations

Monday:

- Presentation of High Concept Ideas regarding providing supports and interventions in low-performing schools.
- Plan to seek feedback from the field on potential measures of school quality and student success.

Tuesday:

- Linda Darling-Hammond, Learning Policy Institute

Supports and Interventions in Low-Performing Schools

- It is important that the first step for all schools identified as low performing is a comprehensive needs assessment to identify root causes and ultimately drive the school's improvement plan. This is required in ESSA.
- Schools will need some flexibility to address school-specific barriers.
- NYSED can best promote teaching and learning through a system that focuses on technical assistance and support rather than monitoring and evaluation.

Supports and Interventions in Low-Performing Schools – High Concept Ideas

High Concept Idea #33: To ensure that school improvement plans are tailored to the identified needs of schools, we will require low-performing schools to complete a diagnostic needs assessment that looks at whole school practices and use the results as the basis for school improvement plans.

- ESSA requires that schools receive a diagnostic needs assessment upon identification.
- This needs assessment will identify root causes that will subsequently be addressed in the plans schools develop.
- The “prescription” – what to do next – should not be pre-determined, but should come after the diagnosis.

Supports and Interventions in Low-Performing Schools – High Concept Ideas

High Concept Idea #34: To ensure that plans are driving improvement, schools identified as low-performing will receive an annual review and develop annual plans.

- This High Concept Idea is intended to ensure that practices are examined often and that the plan driving improvement is a working document that can be responsive to needs that emerge.
- The annual review will not repeat the diagnostic review process, but will rather focus on the degree to which the plan that has been developed is being successfully implemented and whether either the elements of the plan or the strategies for implementation need revision.

Supports and Interventions in Low-Performing Schools – High Concept Ideas

New School Identification:

- **COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT AND INTERVENTION SCHOOLS** - Schools in the Bottom 5% of schools or schools with graduation rates below 67%. Similar to the current Priority Schools. ESSA requires that the Department have primary oversight of these school's improvement efforts.
- **TARGETED SUPPORT AND INTERVENTION SCHOOLS** - Schools identified because of low subgroup performance. Similar to current Focus Schools. ESSA envisions districts having primary responsibility for oversight of these schools' improvement efforts.

Supports and Interventions in Low-Performing Schools – High Concept Ideas

High Concept Idea #35: To ensure that schools identified as Comprehensive are able to address the specific areas that are contributing to their identification status, Comprehensive schools will have some flexibility in the school reform model they pursue.

- Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools need sufficient flexibility to tailor their plans to their circumstances. The diagnostic needs assessment should inform the path chosen.
- The current school reform models would remain options for schools:
 - Transformation Model
 - Turnaround Model
 - Innovative Framework Model
 - Early Learning Intervention Model
 - Evidence-based Model
 - Restart Model
 - Whole School Reform

Supports and Interventions in Low-Performing Schools – High Concept Ideas

High Concept Idea #36: To ensure that schools and districts identified as low performing have the flexibility to address their specific needs, we will not pursue the Direct Service Set Asides option contained in ESSA.

- ESSA already requires that states set aside seven percent of their Title I funding to support school improvement efforts. 95% of these funds must be provided as grants to districts.
- ESSA allows the option for states to set aside an additional three percent of the statewide Title I allocation. If the Set-Aside option was pursued, 7 percent would be directed toward school improvement, 3 percent would be set aside for direct services, and the remaining 90 percent would be distributed to districts as “unrestricted” Title I funds.
- The 3 percent set-aside would be offered as grants to districts serving the highest percentages of comprehensive or targeted support and improvement schools.
- Funds must be used for direct student services offered by the district or by providers.
- District representatives on the ESSA Think Tank, including those representing districts that would likely receive direct service funding, strongly oppose the set-aside. Districts without identified schools would see a three percent reduction in their Title I allocation. Districts with identified schools believe the constraints on how Direct Service funds may be used outweigh the benefit of the additional funds that would be provided to the district.

Supports and Interventions in Low-Performing Schools – High Concept Ideas

Issue Needing Further Refinement: Public School Choice

Under ESSA, public school choice is no longer required to be provided to students who attend identified Title I schools.

If districts do offer public school choice, they may use Title I funds only for transportation of students from Title I schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement, not for those identified for Targeted Support and Improvement. In addition, no more than 5% of a district's Title I allocation may be used to support Public School Choice.

Currently, Commissioner's Regulations require that Public School Choice be offered to any student in an identified Title I Priority or Focus School.

The Regents must decide whether to continue to mandate public school choice in identified schools or whether to allow each district with identified schools to decide whether to offer choice.

The ESSA workgroup tasked with this issue recommends that the public school choice mandate be sunset.

Soliciting feedback from the field on this issue will be part of the Department's next round of public engagement.

Supports and Interventions in Low-Performing Schools – High Concept Ideas

Additional High Concept Idea Still Under Development:

- Under ESSA, states must ensure that districts are providing sufficient resources to schools to implement their school improvement plans and to ensure that there are not resource inequities between identified schools and schools in good standing at the district level.
- The ESSA Think Tank workgroup has proposed that the state collect and analyze data on fiscal resources and human resources in districts with identified schools, though it has yet to agree on a recommendation regarding how this will be operationalized.

Indicators of School Quality and/or Student Success

Indicators of School Quality and/or Student Success:

- May vary by each grade span;
- Must meaningfully differentiate among schools and be valid, reliable, comparable, and available for schools statewide; and,
- Must be calculated in the same way for all schools across the state and be able to be disaggregated for each subgroup of students.

Examples include, but are not limited to: measures of student access to and completion of advanced coursework; postsecondary readiness; school climate and safety; student engagement; and teacher engagement.

Indicators of School Quality and/or Student Success

- ESSA requires states to develop accountability systems for differentiating public school performance using the following measures:
 - The proficiency rates of students in reading/language arts and mathematics;
 - For elementary and middle schools, a measure of student growth or another valid and reliable statewide academic indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance;
 - For high schools, four-year graduation rates, and at the state’s discretion extended-year graduation rates;
 - The progress that English language learners make towards acquisition of English proficiency; and
 - **At least one additional indicator of School Quality or Student Success.**

Proposal for Public Engagement on Possible Indicators

- The Department proposes to survey the field's response to a list of possible indicators of School Quality and/or Student Success. (Handout)
- The survey would be sent out to the field the week of January 16th, and the public would have three weeks to respond.
- ESSA Think Tank Members will also be asked to distribute the survey to their constituents and encourage them to participate in the survey.

Development of Survey

The indicators included in the survey were compiled based upon:

- A review of nationally researched educational organization policy papers on metrics for measuring school quality;
- A review of researched metrics used in other states;
- Discussions with and surveys completed by the Accountability Measurements and Methodologies work group of the ESSA Think Tank, the ESSA Think Tank, and members of the Board of Regents.

The indicators are divided into two sections within the survey:

- Indicators ready for use beginning with 2017-18 school year data
- Indicators not ready for use beginning with 2017-18 data, but which could be considered for incorporation in future accountability determinations.

List of Proposed Indicators – Ready for 2017-18 SY

Possible Student Success and School Quality indicators that are based on information that NYSED already collects or could have ready for use beginning with the 2017-18 school year results:

- Chronic Absenteeism
- Promotion Rates
- High School Credit Accumulation*
- High School Success Index
- School Safety
- Student access to highly qualified teachers
- Student completion of required credits by year to determine “on track” status*
- Student enrollment in and successful completion of dual-credit coursework*
- Student participation in Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), and honors courses*
- Student Attendance
- Student participation in and successful completion of Career and Technical Education (CTE) courses*
- Student participation in and performance on college entrance and/or college placement exams*
- Student successful completion of required courses for graduation*
- Student Suspension Rate (Out of School)
- Success on Regents Exams
- Teacher Attendance
- Teacher Certification/Effectiveness

* The department is in the process of developing the reporting structures for these items that would be sufficiently robust to allow their use as measures of school quality and student success.

List of Proposed Indicators – To be incorporated over time

Possible Student Success and School Quality indicators that the Department believes will not be available for implementation using 2017-18 school year results, but that the Department may be able develop for future implementation:

- Career Readiness
- Opportunity to Learn Standards (e.g., class sizes; guidance counselors; many other possibilities)
- Parent and Community Engagement
- Post-Graduation Outcomes
- Postsecondary enrollment rates
- Postsecondary persistence rates
- Student access to engaging coursework (e.g., project-based learning, wide selection of offerings)
- Student access to high quality materials
- Student access to safe and clean facilities
- Student attainment of certificates and/or licenses
- School Climate Surveys
- Student, staff, and/or parent surveys
- Teacher access to professional learning opportunities that support effective teaching strategies.
- Teacher access to a variety of professional learning activities that meet teacher needs in various stages of development.
- Teacher Turnover

Survey Sample

2. Chronic Absenteeism

Definition: In New York State, chronic absenteeism for a student is defined as missing 10% or more (excused and unexcused) of the days that the student has been enrolled and school has been in session.

Measured by: Calculating the percentage of students annually who meet the definition of being chronically absent within a school.

- a. Strongly Support
- b. Support
- c. Neutral
- d. Disagree
- e. Strongly Disagree
- f. I am not familiar with this idea, and therefore I do not wish to provide a response.
- g. Other

- ❖ Respondents will have access to mini-webinars that explain and provide background on each indicator.

Proposed Survey Timeline

Activity	Timeline
Upon Regents approval, the survey will be issued to the field.	Week of January 16, 2017
Survey will be open for responses.	Through February 8, 2017
Update to Board of Regents on Survey Responses	February 13-14, 2017
Public Meetings	Late February/March 2017
Recommendations to Board of Regents on Indicators of School Quality and Student Success	March 13-14, 2017

Full Board Presentations

Monday:

- Presentation of High Concept Ideas regarding providing supports and interventions in low-performing schools.
- Plan to seek feedback from the field on potential measures of school quality and student success.

Tuesday:

- Linda Darling-Hammond, Learning Policy Institute