



Arizona's ESSA Plan Revision Federal Accountability

Arizona's ESSA Plan...

- **Is the state's response to the Every Student Succeeds Act, the federal law that allows the U.S. Government to support both national and local education goals with grants and other resources.**
- **Describes how Arizona identifies schools for support and improvement.**
- **Outlines Arizona's system to make sure every student leaves twelfth grade ready for college and career.**
- **Reflects input from a variety of Arizona's education stakeholders.**
- **Was developed in 2016-2017 and received full federal approval in September 2017.**
- **Was amended to revise accountability components in 2019 - those modifications were approved January 2020**

Why Revise the Plan?

- **Superintendent Hoffman has laid out a vision of equity for all students to achieve their full potential.**
- **ADE has made key changes that are reflected in the revised plan:**
 - **Renewed focus on equity**
 - **Established an educator recruitment and retention team**
 - **Identified current initiatives supported through these federal programs**
- **It has been 4 years since Arizona began implementing the initial ESSA plan. Arizona has had an opportunity to reflect and adjust.**

Process for Revision-Completed Work

- **Program areas provided inventories of current work**
- **Program areas reviewed current ESSA plan**
 - **Made revisions where necessary**
 - **Included new work currently engaged in**
 - **Deleted incorrect or no longer applicable information**
 - **Modified Language for clarity**
 - **Applied equity lens to ensure equity was infused in all sections**
 - **Justified and provided rationale for all edits, additions, deletions**
- **Title I-D and Title IV piloted a process for stakeholder feedback and input with the federal programs Committee of Practitioners**
- **Conducted an internal feedback session for ADE specialists**
- **Throughout the process, ADE collaborated with the Region 15 Comprehensive Center at WestEd.**

Federal Accountability Section Overview

- **The plan is in DRAFT form – we need your feedback and input**
- **The following slides will highlight proposed key revisions and modifications in the federal accountability section of the plan**
- **The edits, additions, and deletions shared are proposed changes or modifications**



Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

4. Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d)):

Sections:

- i. Subgroups
- ii. N-Size
- iii. Establishment of Long-Term Goals
- iv. Indicators
- v. Annual Meaningful Differentiation
- vi. Identification of Schools
- vii. Annual Measurement of Achievement
- viii. Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement



US Department of Education: Plan Format

A series of specific prompts and/or questions to be answered are provided for each section.

Example:

- i. Subgroups (ESEA section 1111(c)(2)):
 - a. List each major racial and ethnic group the State includes as a subgroup of students, consistent with ESEA section 1111(c)(2)(B).
 - b. If applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English Learners) used in the Statewide accountability system.
 - c. Does the State intend to include in the English Learner subgroup the results of students previously identified as English Learners on the State assessments required under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) for purposes of State accountability (ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(B))?
 - d. If applicable, choose one of the following options for recently arrived English Learners in the State

ADE provides answers to each prompt or question.

Note: No changes were made to subsection i. Subgroups





ACCOUNTABILITY

ii. Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A))

- Federal accountability indicators have remained at an n-count of 20
 - Reworded to clearly differentiate between n-counts of 20 for the accountability indicators and the greater than 10 for public reporting (4(ii)(a))
- An updated table using 2018-2019 numbers to support the n-count of 20 for accountability indicators was provided
 - Previous table had included entity types (example: Head Starts) that were removed for more accuracy (4(ii)(c))

ii. Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A))

The table below is displaying how varying n-sizes could impact Arizona schools and the accountability system. This table shows how many schools could be included from accountability by subgroup depending on the n-size that is selected, as well as at the overall school level. As expected, the smaller the n-size, the more schools that would be included in accountability. The decision regarding n-size needs to be balanced with statistical validity and reliability.

Demographic	Total FAY Students	Total Schools	N10	N20	N25	N30
All	1,000,506	1,976	1,911	1,877	1,864	1,849
African American	49,380	1,976	1,076	759	650	541
American Indian	42,691	1,976	649	360	294	244
Hispanic/Latino	457,714	1,976	1,784	1,706	1,666	1,641
Asian	30,762	1,976	607	363	295	247
Hawaiian	3,752	1,976	67	11	5	4
White	384,232	1,976	1,637	1,468	1,420	1,371
Multi-Racial	33,658	1,976	1,039	660	512	393
English Learner	114,089	1,976	1,411	1,118	995	896
Economically Disadvantaged	471,457	1,976	1,600	1,554	1,535	1,517
Children with Disabilities	114,224	1,976	1,702	1,485	1,402	1,313



iii. Establishment of Long-Term Goals (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A))

Academic Achievement

- Reference to End of Course (EOC) assessments were removed and updated
 - Updated to reflect new test and grades tested (4(iii)(a)(1))
- Long-term goals and MIPs will need to be reevaluated as additional statewide data is received and when new assessments begin in the 2021-2022 school year.

iii. Establishment of Long-Term Goals (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A))

English Language Proficiency

- Chart was removed from the body of text and remains in Appendix C. (4(iii)(c)(1))
 - The chart was updated to include 2028 objectives
- The band wording included in the 2018-2019 update was removed as they were no longer applicable. They have been removed matching chart in Appendix C. (4(iii)(c)(2))

iii. Establishment of Long-Term Goals (ESEA section 111(c)(4)(A))

Chart As Shown in Appendix C:

Table I: Achieved and Projected Interim Progress for English Language Learners

	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Actual	FY2018 Actual	2018 Interim Obj.	2020* Actual	2020 Interim Obj.	2022 Interim Obj.	2024 Interim Obj.	2028 Interim Obj.
EL students that grew at least one level excluding kindergarten	42.30%	31.45%	33.20%	30%	29.00%	36%	42%	48%	52%
EL students that grew at least one level including kindergarten	45.45%	37.88%	38.94%	30%	33.93%	36%	42%	48%	52%
EL students that reclassified as Proficient excluding kindergarten	19.59%	9.63%	10.40%		10.65%	13%	16%	19%	22%
EL students that reclassified as Proficient including kindergarten	18.89%	10.61%	10.88%		11.07%	14%	17%	20%	23%
Weighted growth excluding kindergarten		34.48%	36.98%		31.55%	46%	52%	58%	64%
Weighted growth including kindergarten		46.60%	46.86%		40.10%	53%	59%	65%	73%

* In March of the 2019-2020 school year, all Arizona school campuses were closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Although instruction continued for Arizona students, some English Learner students may not have had the opportunity to take the English Proficiency (AZELLA) assessment.



iv. Indicators (ESEA 1111(c)(4)(B))

- Dropout was placed in the School Quality and Success area for the 9-12 models. (4(iv)(b))
 - Previously incorrectly placed in “other academic indicator”
- Links to technical manuals were embedded for additional reference. (4(iv)(c))
- Achieving English Language Proficiency table was reworded and improved to include more details on the calculation. (4(iv)(d))
- Clarification and calculation for Chronic Absenteeism and Dropout were added and improved. (4(iv)(e))

iv. Indicators (ESEA 1111(c)(4)(B))

- Achieving English Language Proficiency table was reworded and improved to include more details on the calculation. (4(iv)(d))

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	AZELLA Proficiency and Growth calculations	<p>Students included in the calculation have an EL need including recent arrivals and have a less than proficient ELP score.</p> <p>EL Proficiency: Schools earn points based on their reclassification percentage aggregated to a school level compared to the state's average.</p> <p>EL Growth: schools earn points based on their student's growth (change in performance levels) aggregated to a school level compared to the state's average change in performance levels the prior year.</p> <p>Schools with fewer than 20 FAY ELLs do not earn these points.</p>

iv. Indicators (ESEA 1111(c)(4)(B))

- Clarification and calculation for Chronic Absenteeism and Dropout were added and improved. (4(iv)(e))

Indicator	Measure(s)
School Quality or Student Success	<p data-bbox="545 508 1251 539"><u>School Quality and Success indicators for K-8 schools:</u></p> <ul data-bbox="545 568 2346 851" style="list-style-type: none"> • Chronic absenteeism: students absent for 10% or more of the year (18+ days). The calculation will not include documented chronically ill students. It will also not include kindergarten as they are not required to attend school by state law. <ul data-bbox="639 672 2346 851" style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The school’s chronic absenteeism percent will be calculated and subtracted from 100%. That percentage will be applied towards the available 5 or 10 points. ○ Example – School A has a 12 % Chronic Absenteeism rate. $100\% - 12\% = 88\%$ of available points in the model. A school eligible for 5 points will earn 4.4 points, a school eligible for 10 points will earn 8.8 points. <p data-bbox="545 879 1251 911"><u>School Quality and Success indicators for 9-12 schools:</u></p> <ul data-bbox="545 939 2346 1300" style="list-style-type: none"> • Drop-out: Dropouts are defined as students who are enrolled in school at any time during the school year but are not enrolled at the end of the school year and did not transfer, graduate, or die. Students withdrawn due to chronic illness are also excluded from the dropout rate calculation. When the dropout rate is calculated, year-end or exit codes are used to determine the percentage of students who are no longer enrolled in any Arizona public school prior to exiting as a graduate or completer. <ul data-bbox="639 1122 2346 1300" style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The school’s drop-out percent will be calculated and subtracted from 100%. That percentage will be applied towards the available 5 or 10 points. ○ Example – School A has a 5 % Drop-out rate. $100\% - 5\% = 95\%$ of available points in the model. A school eligible for 5 points will earn 4.75 points, a school eligible for 10 points will earn 9.5 points.

v. Annual Meaningful Differentiation (ESEA 1111(c)(4)(C))

- Wording was added to address ability to calculate all indicators for required subgroups (4(v)(a))
- Wording was added to include all charters in accountability system (4(v)(a))

“The Federal system creates a system of meaningful differentiation which includes all schools using one set of measures. The federal system will identify Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement schools as required by ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D).

All of the indicators use student level data; therefore, Arizona will be able to calculate each indicator by subgroup provided the subgroup has a sufficient n-count.

All charter schools in the state are included in accountability provided they meet the n-count.”

v. Annual Meaningful Differentiation (ESEA 1111(c)(4)(C))

Five Models
Weights clearly presented
(4(v)(b)&(c))

K-2 Schools

Proficiency 90%

EL (Achievement and growth) 10%

K-8 Schools

Proficiency 60%

Growth 20%

EL (Achievement and growth) 10%

Chronic Absenteeism 10%

9-12 Schools

Proficiency 60%

Graduation Rate 20%

EL (Achievement and growth) 10%

Drop-out 10%

Schools Serving a Combination to include Grade 12

Proficiency 60%

EL (Achievement and growth) 10%

Growth 15%

Chronic Absenteeism 5%

Graduation 5%

Drop-out 5%

Schools Serving a Combination NOT including Grading 12

Proficiency 60%

EL (Achievement and growth) 10%

Growth 20%

Chronic Absenteeism 5%

Drop-out 5%





SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT



vi. Identification of Schools (*ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)*)

General edits were made for clarity, grammar, word choice and internal alignment.

(vi) (a) Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools

Describe the State's methodology for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement

Clarify Specific Methodology for Calculating Lowest-performing 5%

Lowest Performing Schools are identified using the model and weighted indicators identified in section 4(v)(b) (*meaningful differentiation*). Each school receives a weighted average based off the model used to assess them for a Final Score. The five models are then grouped together: K-8 Schools, 9-12 Schools, Schools Serving a Combination to include Grade 12, Schools Serving a Combination NOT including Grade 12, and K-2 Schools. They are then standardized separately by their mean and standard deviation creating a Z score. All schools are then grouped back together. The funded Title 1 schools are then ranked based on their standardized Z scores. Based on this ranking a cut score for the bottom 5% is established.

(vi) (e) Targeted Support and Improvement

Describe the State’s methodology for annually identifying any school with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students, based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation, including the definition used by the State to determine consistent underperformance. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(iii))

Specifically define “*consistently underperforming*” subgroups of students

Any school with any subgroup in the bottom 2% on ATSI indicators during the prior three years of most current data will be identified as Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI).

Previous plan did not define “consistently underperforming”.

(vi) (f) Additional Targeted Support.

Describe the State's methodology, for identifying schools in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State's methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), including the year in which the State will first identify such schools and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. (*ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D)*)

Clarify Specific Methodology for Calculating Subgroups of Students Performing in Bottom 5%

- Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) is identified by calculating the same components as CSI (Proficiency, Growth, EL, etc.) but only for members of a particular subgroup.

A school's Final Points_{Subgroup} are calculated with the following formula:

$$Final\ Points_{Subgroup} = \frac{Total\ Points}{Eligible\ Points}$$

(vi)(g) Additional Statewide Categories of Schools

➤ Provide equity between Title 1 and Non-Title 1 ATSI schools

Added: Non-Title I ATSI schools not exiting after 4 years will be identified as Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools

➤ Moved to this section

All state designated “F” schools will be identified as Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools.

vii. Annual Measurement of Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii))

(vii) Describe how the State factors the requirement for 95 percent student participation in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system.

Clarify Specific Methodology

A participation rate of less than 95 percent on statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments is factored into the calculation of the proficiency indicator. If a school tested under 95% of their eligible students, then a penalty term is added to the denominator. The penalty term is equal to the number tests the school should have administered to have 95% tested.

Formula:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Proficiency \%} \\ &= \frac{\text{No. Proficient ELA Students} + \text{No. Proficient Math Students}}{(\text{\# Students Tested in ELA} + \text{\# Students Tested in Math}) + 2 * \text{Students needed for 95\% tested}} \\ & * 100 \end{aligned}$$

(viii)(a) Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools

Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, including the number of years (not to exceed four) over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

Added Exit Criteria for “F” Schools

A minimum of two consecutive years above “F” letter grade.

We Need Your Input

- Survey Link: [ESSA Plan Title I, Part A \(Accountability\)](#)
 - The first round of feedback will be collected through April 30, 2021
- Access www.azed.gov/essa for:
 - Overview webinar
 - Individual program webinars
 - Survey links for feedback
 - FAQs
- Questions
 - Accountability Formulas and Calculations: Achieve@azed.gov
 - School Support & Improvement: SchoolImprovementInbox@azed.gov