

**Virginia Department of Education
VAFEPA Roundtable
October 12, 2016
9 a.m. – Noon**

AGENDA

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| 9:00 - 9:40 a.m. | Welcome, Introductions, Overview of ESSA |
| 9:45 - 10:30 a.m. | Accountability Breakout Discussions |
| | I. English Learners - Entrance and Exit Criteria |
| | II. ESSA Accountability Indicators |
| | III. Teacher Effectiveness Definition |
| 10:30 - 10:45 a.m. | Break |
| 10:45 – 11:30 a.m. | Repeated Session |
| 11:30 - Noon | Report Out and Conclusion |

**Virginia Department of Education
VAFEPA Roundtable
ESSA Stakeholder Input ~ Meeting Notes
October 12, 2016**

Entrance and Exit Criteria for English Learners

ESSA requires states to establish and implement standardized statewide entrance and exit procedures for ELs, including a requirement that all students who may be ELs are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the state. The proposed regulations clarify that states should develop uniform criteria that are applied statewide.

How does your division identify ELs? What parts of the process work best, and what parts present challenges? What uniform criteria would you like to see considered in the identification (entrance) of ELs?

ESSA requires states to provide for the inclusion of ELs in state assessments by providing appropriate accommodations on assessments, including, “to the extent practicable, assessments in the language and form most likely to yield accurate data” on student performance, until ELs have achieved English language proficiency. What are potential benefits and drawbacks to providing assessments for ELs in their native language?

Additional comments

Name _____

Organization or School Division _____

**Virginia Department of Education
VAFEPA Roundtable
ESSA Stakeholder Input ~ Meeting Notes
October 12, 2016**

Accountability Indicators

ESSA requires states to establish accountability systems that include five types of indicators: academic achievement; academic progress (for elementary and middle schools); graduation rate (for high schools); progress in English Learners gaining proficiency; and school quality. States determine how indicators will be weighted, provided that English/language arts and mathematics are weighted equally; and provided that the academic indicators carry much more weight than the indicator of school quality.

Consider the list of academic indicators below. Which indicators should carry the greatest weight, and why? Alternately, should each indicator carry equal weight?

- Pass rates on SOL tests for reading and mathematics for all students and all reporting groups
- Student academic growth (elementary and middle schools)
- The progress of English Learners towards English language proficiency
- High school graduation rate

Consider the list of school quality indicators below. Which of these should be considered for inclusion in Virginia's accountability system, and why? NOTE: The school quality indicator must be disaggregated by reporting group, and must result in meaningful differentiation between schools.

- College and career readiness
- Student attendance rate
- Percentage of students who are absent 10% or more of the school year
- Student discipline rate
- Teacher qualifications
- School climate and safety

To establish long term goals and interim measures of progress for the EL progress towards proficiency indicator, states are permitted to consider a number of factors. In addition to a student's entry level proficiency in English, which of the factors below should be considered when establishing targets for this indicator, and why? Which factors should not be considered?

- Time in language instruction educational programs
- Grade level
- Age
- Native language proficiency level
- Limited or interrupted formal education, if any

Additional Comments

Name _____

Organization or School Division _____

**Virginia Department of Education
VAFEPA Roundtable
ESSA Stakeholder Input ~ Meeting Notes
October 12, 2016**

Teacher Effectiveness Definition

Proposed regulations in ESSA require states and school divisions to define “ineffective teacher” or provide guidelines that enable the reporting on the percentages of low-income and minority students taught by **ineffective** teachers in Title I schools, compared with non-low-income and non-minority students in schools not receiving Title I funds.

The following states have posted draft definitions for “Ineffective Teacher”:

Arizona - An “ineffective teacher” is one who consistently fails to meet expectations and requires a change in performance due to minimal competency with adopted professional standards. Students with an ineffective teacher generally make unacceptable levels of academic progress.

Illinois (draft) - A teacher who has received an “unsatisfactory” rating in his/her most recent performance evaluation rating or a teacher who has received a “needs improvement” on an evaluation and in a subsequent evaluation has received an “unsatisfactory” or “needs improvement.”

Pennsylvania (draft) - Ineffective teachers are not properly credentialed (have not completed an approved teacher certification program), and are incompetent in subject matter and instructional practice for the core content area(s) they teach. These teachers fail to demonstrate proficiency in one or more of the four Danielson Framework domains (or an approved alternate measure). An ineffective teacher is one who has failed to improve after they are given an improvement plan and appropriate supports.

What are the pros and cons to each of these definitions? Which definition do you think might be appropriate for Virginia to consider? What do you suggest would be an appropriate definition of “ineffective teacher” for Virginia? Consider implications for data collection and public reporting locally and at the state level.

Teacher Preparation

ESSA permits states to use Title II, Part A, state set-aside funds for a number of purposes, including reforming teacher preparation program standards and approval processes to ensure that teachers have the necessary skills to help students meet challenging state standards. (Section 2101(c)(4)(B)(i))

- In what areas do you feel teachers are most prepared during pre-service programs to address the learning needs of students, including: low-income students; lowest-achieving students; English learners; children with disabilities; children and youth in foster care; migratory children; homeless children and youths; neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children; immigrant children and youth; students in LEAs eligible for grants under the Rural and Low-income Schools Program; American Indian and Alaska Native students, students with low literacy levels; and students who are gifted and talented?
- In what areas do you feel teachers are least prepared during pre-service programs surrounding the student reporting groups listed above?
- What would you like to see emphasized in pre-service programs to better prepare teachers to address the needs of the student reporting groups listed above?

Additional Comments

Name _____

School Division or Organization _____