Review of Accountability Measure: Chronic Absenteeism

Virginia Board of Education
Committee on School and Division Accountability

March 22, 2017
Philosophy of Accountability

Principles:

• Provides comprehensive picture of school quality

• Drives continuous improvement for all schools

• Builds on strengths and addresses gaps in current system

• Informs areas of technical assistance and school improvement resources
Philosophy of Accountability

Academic Outcomes

- Achievement on Assessments
- Graduation/School progress
- College and career readiness

Opportunities to Learn

- Student participation and engagement
- Access to resources
- Parent and teacher engagement

Adequate and Appropriate State Support
Mechanisms of Accountability

School Quality Profiles

- Public reporting function
- Features important indicators of school quality

Accreditation (State)

- Educational effectiveness function
- Measures reflects highest priorities
- Directs levels of support/intervention (school improvement)

Every Student Succeeds Act (Federal)

Standards of Quality

- Essential elements of schools function
- Ensures necessary resources are in place
Overview: Matrix-based system

School quality is measured through a process which is based on multiple measures and drives continuous improvement

• More than a single school quality indicator
• Schools assigned performance levels for each measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Quality Indicators</th>
<th>Performance Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator A</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criteria for Selecting Quality Accreditation Measures

- ✔ Research indicates metric is related to academic performance
- ✔ Standardized data collection procedures exist across schools and divisions
- ✔ Data for metric are reliable and valid
- ✔ Measure is modifiable through school-level policies and practices
- ✔ Measure meaningfully differentiates among schools based on progress of all students and student subgroups
- ✔ Measure does not unfairly impact one type/group of schools or students
- ✔ School-level measure is moderately to strongly correlated with school-level pass rates on state assessments
Process for Defining School Performance Benchmarks

Important questions:

• Does the benchmark reflect our objectives and expectations?
  • Aspirational goals versus continuous improvement

• What are the unintended consequences?

• How will we know if we are moving in the right direction?
Chronic Absenteeism: Indicator Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRAFT Criteria</th>
<th>Level 1 Exemplar</th>
<th>Level 2 Monitor</th>
<th>Level 3 Guide</th>
<th>Level 4 Intervene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School three-year average chronic absenteeism rate is 8% or less</td>
<td>School three-year average chronic absenteeism rate is between 8% and 15%</td>
<td>School three-year average chronic absenteeism rate is between 16% and 24%</td>
<td>School three-year average chronic absenteeism rate is 25% or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR School in Level 3 the prior year decreases chronic absenteeism rate by 2% or more</td>
<td>OR School in Level 4 the prior year decreases chronic absenteeism rate by 2% or more</td>
<td>OR School has stayed at criteria for Level 3 for more than 3 consecutive years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chronic Absenteeism: Follow-up Analysis

• At what percent of enrollment should students count toward the chronic absenteeism rate?

• How does the distribution of schools across the matrix change with a lower threshold for improvement?

• Where does Virginia rank nationally on chronic absenteeism?
Chronic Absenteeism: Student Enrollment Criteria

**Considerations:**
- Enrollment calculations are cumulative
- Alignment with federal accountability
  - *Every Student Succeeds Act:* “…in the case of a student who has not attended the same school…for at least half of a school year, the performance of such student on the indicators…may not be used in the system of meaningful differentiation…”
- Lower thresholds for enrollment capture more transient students in more schools
- Availability of effective interventions for transient students
## Chronic Absenteeism: Student Enrollment Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Enrollment Criteria</th>
<th>Level 1 Exemplar</th>
<th>Level 2 Monitor</th>
<th>Level 3 Guide</th>
<th>Level 4 Intervene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student is enrolled greater than 50% of the school year</strong></td>
<td>919 (50.33%)</td>
<td>705 (38.61%)</td>
<td>158 (8.65%)</td>
<td>44 (2.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student is enrolled greater than 30% of the school year</strong></td>
<td>836 (45.78%)</td>
<td>756 (41.40%)</td>
<td>187 (10.24%)</td>
<td>47 (2.57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student is enrolled greater than 10% of the school year</strong></td>
<td>723 (39.59%)</td>
<td>826 (45.24%)</td>
<td>222 (12.16%)</td>
<td>55 (3.01%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DRAFT/PROPOSED
Chronic Absenteeism: Improvement Criteria

• **Considerations:**
  - Setting a meaningfully significant benchmark for improvement ensures schools are not identified by chance
  - Chronic absenteeism rates vary widely from year to year
  - Benchmark for effective interventions is 10% decrease in chronic absenteeism per year
# Chronic Absenteeism: Improvement Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Improvement Criteria</th>
<th>Level 1 Exemplar</th>
<th>Level 2 Monitor</th>
<th>Level 3 Guide</th>
<th>Level 4 Intervene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 percent decrease</td>
<td>919 (50.33%)</td>
<td>705 (38.61%)</td>
<td>158 (8.65%)</td>
<td>44 (2.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 percent decrease</td>
<td>919 (50.33%)</td>
<td>727 (39.81%)</td>
<td>140 (7.67%)</td>
<td>40 (2.19%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chronic Absenteeism: National Perspective

Virginia ranks 24th out of 50 states on chronic absenteeism with a rate of 12.7%, compared to a national average of 14.1%.


Chronic Absenteeism: Stakeholder Feedback

Considerations for allowances:

• Students with chronic illnesses or medical needs that cannot be filled at the school
Accountability Matrix Benchmark Selection: Academic Achievement Indicator
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## High Level Recap: Building a Comprehensive Accountability System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplar: Model School</td>
<td>Monitor: School is performing at an acceptable rate</td>
<td>Guide: Division Corrective Action Plan</td>
<td>Intervene: State provides support for intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JANUARY

**Graduation/School Progress**
Graduation Indicator & Dropout Rate

### FEBRUARY

**Student Participation & Engagement**
Chronic Absenteeism Rate

### MARCH

**Achievement on Assessments**
Achievement
Student Growth
English Learner Progress

### APRIL

**Achievement on Assessments**
Achievement Gaps
**College & Career Readiness**
College & Career Readiness Index
Developing Achievement Indicators

**Achievement**
- Pass rate (with recovery) on state assessments for reading and writing
- Pass rate (with recovery) on state assessments for math
- Pass rate on state assessments for science

**Student Growth**
- Year-over-year gains in reading based on progress tables
- Year-over-year gains in math based on progress tables

**English Learner Progress**
- Year-over-year gains towards English proficiency based on ACCESS for ELLs assessment
Developing Achievement Indicators

• Goals:
  • Accurately reflect student achievement
  • Align important elements of achievement
  • Actionable at the school level
  • Transparent and succinct
Developing Achievement Indicators

- **Science pass rate**: accreditation pass rate and decrease in failure rate

- **Math combination rate**: combination of accreditation pass rate with recovery, student growth (Grade 3 through Algebra I) and decrease in failure rate

- **English reading and writing combination rate**: combination of accreditation pass rate with recovery, student growth (Grades 3 through 8), English Learner progress and decrease in failure rate

DRAFT/PROPOSED
# Achievement Indicator: Science Benchmark Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRAFT Criteria</th>
<th>Level 1 Exemplar</th>
<th>Level 2 Monitor</th>
<th>Level 3 Guide</th>
<th>Level 4 Intervene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current year or 3-year average pass rate is 93% or higher</td>
<td>Current year or 3-year average pass rate is between 70% and 93% <strong>OR</strong> School in Level 3 the prior year decreases failure rate by 10%</td>
<td>Current year or 3-year average pass rate is between 69% and 65% <strong>OR</strong> School in Level 4 the prior year decreases failure rate by 10%</td>
<td>Current year or 3-year average pass rate on state assessments is 65% or below <strong>OR</strong> School has stayed at criteria for Level 3 for more than 3 consecutive years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of Schools | 247 (14.29%) | 1,344 (77.78%) | 82 (4.75%) | 55 (3.18%) |

DRAFT/PROPOSED
Achievement Indicator: Math Benchmark Selection

Pass rate on state assessments:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Math combination rate} \\
\frac{8}{10} = 80\% \\
\end{array}
\]

Student growth:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PLUS} \\
\frac{2}{10} = 20\% \\
\end{array}
\]

Number of test takers

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PLUS} \\
\frac{10}{10} = 100\% \\
\end{array}
\]

DRAFT/PROPOSED
# Achievement Indicator: Math Benchmark Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRAFT Criteria</th>
<th>Level 1 Exemplar</th>
<th>Level 2 Monitor</th>
<th>Level 3 Guide</th>
<th>Level 4 Intervene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current year or 3-year average combination rate is 93% or higher</td>
<td><strong>OR</strong> School in Level 3 the prior year decreases failure rate by 10%</td>
<td><strong>OR</strong> School in Level 4 the prior year decreases failure rate by 10%</td>
<td><strong>OR</strong></td>
<td>School has stayed at criteria for Level 3 for more than 3 consecutive years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of Schools | 288 (16.13%) | 1,399 (78.33%) | 52 (2.91%) | 47 (2.63%) |

DRAFT/PROPOSED
## Comparison of Current and Proposed Rate Calculations for Math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Rate Criteria</th>
<th>State Average (2015-16)</th>
<th>Level 1 Exemplar</th>
<th>Level 2 Monitor</th>
<th>Level 3 Guide</th>
<th>Level 4 Intervene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Pass Rate</strong></td>
<td>82.87%</td>
<td>224 (12.54%)</td>
<td>1,401 (78.44%)</td>
<td>68 (3.81%)</td>
<td>93 (5.21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Combination Rate with Growth</strong></td>
<td>84.37%</td>
<td>288 (16.13%)</td>
<td>1,399 (78.33%)</td>
<td>52 (2.91%)</td>
<td>47 (2.63%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Achievement Indicator: English Reading and Writing

Pass rate on state assessments:

Student growth:

English Learner progress:

Number of test takers

8 / 10 = 80%

DRAFT/PROPOSED
### Achievement Indicator: English Reading and Writing (75%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRAFT Criteria</th>
<th>Level 1 Exemplar</th>
<th>Level 2 Monitor</th>
<th>Level 3 Guide</th>
<th>Level 4 Intervene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current year or 3-year average combination rate is 93% or higher</td>
<td>Current year or 3-year average combination rate is between 75% and 93%</td>
<td>Current year or 3-year average combination rate is between 74% and 65%</td>
<td>Current year or 3-year average combination rate is 65% or below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR School in Level 3 the prior year decreases failure rate by 10%</td>
<td>OR School in Level 4 the prior year decreases failure rate by 10%</td>
<td>OR School in Level 4 the prior year decreases failure rate by 10%</td>
<td>School has stayed at criteria for Level 3 for more than 3 consecutive years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>DRAFT/PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>264 (14.78%)</td>
<td>1,325 (74.19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 (8.96%)</td>
<td>37 (2.07%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Current and Proposed Rate Calculations for English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Rate Criteria</th>
<th>State Average (2015-16)</th>
<th>Level 1 Exemplar</th>
<th>Level 2 Monitor</th>
<th>Level 3 Guide</th>
<th>Level 4 Intervene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Pass Rate (75%)</strong></td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>191 (10.69%)</td>
<td>1,239 (69.37%)</td>
<td>253 (14.17%)</td>
<td>103 (5.77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Combination Rate with Growth and EL Progress</strong></td>
<td>84.43%</td>
<td>264 (14.78%)</td>
<td>1,325 (74.19%)</td>
<td>160 (8.96%)</td>
<td>37 (2.07%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Achievement Indicator:
## English Reading and Writing (70%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRAFT Criteria</th>
<th>Level 1 Exemplar</th>
<th>Level 2 Monitor</th>
<th>Level 3 Guide</th>
<th>Level 4 Intervene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current year or 3-year average combination rate is 93% or higher</td>
<td>Current year or 3-year average combination rate is between 70% and 93%</td>
<td>Current year or 3-year average combination rate is between 69% and 65%</td>
<td>Current year or 3-year average combination rate is 65% or below OR School in Level 3 the prior year decreases failure rate by 10% OR School in Level 4 the prior year decreases failure rate by 10% School has stayed at criteria for Level 3 for more than 3 consecutive years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Schools</td>
<td>264 (14.78%)</td>
<td>1,424 (79.73%)</td>
<td>61 (3.42%)</td>
<td>37 (2.07%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRAFT/PROPOSED**
# Benchmark Comparison for English Reading and Writing Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Benchmark</th>
<th>Level 1 Exemplar</th>
<th>Level 2 Monitor</th>
<th>Level 3 Guide</th>
<th>Level 4 Intervene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Combination Rate: 75% Benchmark</td>
<td>264 (14.78%)</td>
<td>1,325 (74.19%)</td>
<td>160 (8.96%)</td>
<td>37 (2.07%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Combination Rate: 70% Benchmark</td>
<td>264 (14.78%)</td>
<td>1,424 (79.73%)</td>
<td>61 (3.42%)</td>
<td>37 (2.07%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DRAFT/PROPOSED
Developing Achievement Indicators

• **Considerations:**
  • Combination rate gives equal weight to growth or progress among students who do not pass state assessments
  • Students are only counted once in the numerator (recovery is the exception)
  • Achievement metrics can be reported individually for increased transparency
Achievement Gaps Discussion

• **Considerations:**
  - Defining the gap – state benchmarks versus all students
  - Focus on size of gap or closing of gap, for all groups or certain groups
  - Measuring change over time when number of reporting groups vary across schools and from year-to-year

• **Methods under review:**
  - Average achievement gap across all reporting groups
  - Achievement gap among de-duplicated count of students with historically large gaps
  - Largest achievement gap among all reporting groups