

Overview of Wisconsin's NCLB Waiver

ACCOUNTABILITY

MOVING FORWARD THE WISCONSIN WAY



ESEA WAIVER REQUIREMENTS

USED is offering states the opportunity to waive certain ESEA/NCLB provisions. Waiver proposals must address four principles:

1. College- and career-ready expectations for all students
2. State-developed differentiated recognition, accountability, and support
3. Supporting effective instruction and leadership
4. Reducing duplication and unnecessary burden

PROCESS

Design Team

- DPI engaged stakeholders and elected leaders via the accountability design team Aug-December.

Public Draft Released

- DPI posted a draft proposal on January 23 to elicit feedback.

Comment Period

- The two week public comment period/survey ended February 3rd.
- DPI refined the proposal based on feedback.

Federal Submission

- Proposal submitted to USED on February 22, 2012.

THE DISCLAIMER

- Wisconsin's waiver represents a comprehensive, statewide accountability system and education plan.
- However, components of the proposal represent a work in progress.
- DPI will continue to refine Wisconsin's proposal in coming months in consultation with USED and our technical advisors.

Expanding upon Every Child a Graduate to focus on increasing expectations that ensure Wisconsin graduates are prepared for success in college and career, DPI is raising standards and making changes to assessment and graduation requirements.

COLLEGE AND CAREER READY EXPECTATIONS **FOR ALL STUDENTS**

STANDARDS & ASSESSMENTS

- Full instructional implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and the alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities, the Common Core Essential Elements (CCEE), in 2014-15.
- Proficiency will be measured by new assessments:
 - WKCE → Smarter Balanced (2014-15)
 - WAA-SwD → Dynamic Learning Maps (2014-15)
 - ACCESS → ASSETS (2015-16)
- New assessments and Common Core instructional resources will incorporate Universal Design for Learning principles.

ASSESSMENT ROLL-OUT

- The Smarter Balanced assessment and Dynamic Learning Maps assessment are being designed similarly. Both assessments will:
 - Move from Fall to Spring administrations
 - Be administered in grades 3-8 and 11
 - Take advantage of technology as much as possible, and administered online
 - Include end-of-year summative components as well as additional resources to benchmark student progress throughout the year
 - Be piloted in 2013-14
 - Be required in 2014-15
 - Be used in accountability calculations in 2014-15

ASSESSMENT ROLL-OUT

Year	Assessment	Scale used for accountability
2011-12	WKCE	Final year for current WKCE performance levels; begin field testing of cut scores based on NAEP
2012-13	WKCE	Use cut scores based on NAEP on WKCE student reports, and for school and district accountability report cards
2013-14	WKCE	Continue using cut scores based on NAEP for WKCE and accountability report cards
	Smarter Assessment Field Test Dynamic Learning Maps Field Test	Field test Smarter and Dynamic Learning Maps assessments and define performance cut scores to be used across <u>all</u> participating states
2014-15	Smarter Assessment System Dynamic Learning Maps	Fully implement Smarter and Dynamic Learning Maps assessment Smarter with consortia-defined performance cut scores

INTERIM STEPS

- **More rigorous standards** include calculating WKCE cut scores based on the NAEP scale (2012-13)
- **Increased graduation requirements** will be raised at the state level to include a minimum of:
 - 3 years of mathematics
 - 3 years of science, engineering or technology
 - 6.5 elective credits
- **Meaningful assessments**, a renewed focus on college and career readiness includes a 2013-15 budget request to support the full EXPLORE-PLAN-ACT + WorkKeys package (ACT).

With the goal of developing a statewide accountability system that promotes and supports school improvement across the state, DPI worked with the school accountability design team, other stakeholders, and our Technical Advisory Committee to establish accountability measures that 1) are fair; 2) raise expectations; and 3) provide meaningful measures to inform differentiated recognitions, intervention, and support.

STATE-DEVELOPED DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SUPPORT

STATEWIDE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

- Wisconsin's accountability system will include all schools receiving public funds, including:
 - ❖ Title I and non-Title I schools
 - ❖ District, non-district, and non-instrumentality charter schools
 - ❖ Private schools participating in the state Parental Choice Programs
- Full implementation of this unified accountability system beyond Title I schools is pending state legislative changes and funding.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDEX

- A comprehensive accountability index will replace the current AYP pass-fail system. The index uses multiple measures and classifies schools along a continuum of performance (2012-13).
- Schools will be held accountable according to the four priority areas (sub-scales) identified by the Accountability Design Team:
 - ❖ **Student Achievement**
 - ❖ **Student Growth**
 - ❖ **Closing Gaps**
 - ❖ **On-track to Graduation/Postsecondary Readiness**
- The overall accountability score will be a combination of the four sub-scale scores and placed on an index (0-100). Both Priority Area scores and overall accountability scores will be reported to enhance transparency and differentiation.
- DPI is working with our Technical Advisory Committee and will field test the index system (2011-12).

ACCOUNTABILITY RATINGS

- A standard setting process—overseen by DPI’s Technical Advisory Committee—will determine how each of the four priority areas are weighted and combined into the overall accountability score.
- The score will place schools into one of six ratings:
 1. *Significantly Exceeding Expectations*
 2. *Exceeding Expectations*
 3. *Meeting Expectations*
 4. *Meeting Some Expectations*
 5. *Meeting Few Expectations*
 6. *Persistently Failing to Meet Expectations*

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

- The accountability expectations are for schools to be *Meeting Expectations* or above. Additionally, schools will be held accountable for three specific performance expectations:
 - ✓ **Test Participation** rate is to be no lower than 95%
 - ✓ **Absenteeism** rate is to be no higher than 13%
 - ✓ **Dropout** rate is to be no higher than 6%
- If a school does not meet one of these additional three performance expectations, they will receive a red flag for that area. Any red flag results in the school—regardless of their accountability score—being in the bottom three rating categories (i.e., schools with flags cannot be given a rating of *Meeting Expectations* or above).

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

- DPI will set differentiated expectations (Annual Measurable Objectives/AMOs) based on each school's overall performance on the index. However, the AMOs for test participation, absenteeism and dropout rates will remain the same across the state (95%, 13%, and 6%).
- Schools further behind will have more aggressive AMOs, requiring all schools to be *Meeting Expectations* within four years, regardless of their starting point in 2012-13.
- A school cannot be in the top three rating categories if it has missed its AMO or has any red flags. A school scoring low in any of the four priority areas cannot be in the *Significantly Exceeding Expectations* category.

REPORT CARDS

- New school and district report cards will be developed over the coming year in consultation with our Technical Advisory Committee, school and district staff, and other stakeholders.
- Report cards based on the accountability index will be publicly reported beginning in summer **2013**.
- Report cards will replace the school and district performance reports, allowing these reporting requirements to be met without the need for districts to create separate reports.
- Report cards will be available in WISEdash, a single reporting system that will include pre-defined and user-defined reports such as student growth percentiles, enrollment, postsecondary enrollment, etc.

DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

- District accountability based on the aggregate of all district students at the elementary, middle and high school levels will continue. An accountability index score will be calculated for each level.
- The district AMO is to meet or exceed expectations at all three levels—elementary, middle and high school—and to have no schools in the *Persistently Failing to Meet Expectations* category.
 - + If the aggregate scores for the district fail to meet expectations at all three levels, the district will miss the AMO. Additionally, districts that have any schools in the *Persistently Failing to Meet Expectations* category will receive a red flag and miss the AMO.
- For districts missing the AMO at all three levels —elementary, middle and high school—the state superintendent may require that a district-level diagnostic review be completed to evaluate critical systems and structures within the central office (e.g. human resources, curriculum and instruction, finance, and leadership).

Subgroups, Multiple Measures and Scoring

A CLOSER LOOK AT THE DATA

SUBGROUP ACCOUNTABILITY

- A cell size of 20 will be used for all accountability calculations, a change from 40. Reducing the cell size permits us to identify subgroups that may be struggling but would not be reported under larger cell size rules.
- A combined subgroup will be used when each of the binary subgroups (ELL, SWD, economically disadvantaged) do not meet cell size, in recognition of the need to closely monitor the performance of these traditionally high needs student groups.
- The accountability index is designed to emphasize the performance of every subgroup. The four subscales of the priority areas prevent small subgroup performances from being masked.

PRIORITY AREAS

- **Achievement**

- Reading proficiency
- Mathematics proficiency

- **Growth**

- A move-up indicator is applied in this system, using Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs), which prioritizes growth for all students
- Schools are granted points for students that grow within and between proficiency levels; and students who maintain proficiency
- All growth is rewarded but more growth expected for those further behind

PRIORITY AREAS

- **Gap Closing**

- Looks at gaps in attainment (reading + math), graduation rates, and growth rates
- Calculation is to compare each subgroup to the highest attaining subgroup in the same category (racial subgroups, binary subgroups)

PRIORITY AREAS

- **On-track to Graduation (K-8)**
 - Attendance rate
 - 3rd grade reading
 - 8th grade mathematics performance
 - Intentional “double counting” as these measures are key to successful transitions
 - As more indicators become available, they will be added to this priority area

PRIORITY AREAS

- **Postsecondary Readiness (9-12)**

- Attendance
- Graduation rates
- ACT Participation and Performance

- **Potential Future Indicators**

- Postsecondary Enrollment
- Course and co-curricular activity offerings
- Performance on other assessments (science, social studies, military assessment, industry certification)

ACCOUNTABILITY SCORING

- The methodology for how each category is weighted and combined into an overall accountability score will be determined through a standard setting process overseen by DPI's Technical Advisory Committee.
- The methodology for how accountability scores fall into the six rating categories will be determined through a standard setting process overseen by DPI's Technical Advisory Committee.

IDENTIFICATION & SUPPORT

IDENTIFICATION

- **Annual:** Accountability calculations will be run annually, and schools placed on a continuum of six categories based on their results.
- **Cohort:** In addition to annual determinations, the lowest performing schools (*priority*) and schools with the largest gap or low performing subgroups (*focus*) will be identified every three years and have state required interventions.
 - This replaces the current annual designation of Schools Identified for Improvement under NCLB
 - Currently only Title I funds available to support Title I schools

REWARD SCHOOLS

- **Schools of Recognition**

- Continue current schools of recognition program for Title I schools in top quartile of poverty
- Add a new recognition program for all schools identified as *Significantly Exceeding Expectations* on the annual report card
- Add recognition for all schools making significant progress

PRIORITY SCHOOLS

- **All schools** are subject to identification.
 - Funding only for Title I schools currently
 - Schools must contract to conduct diagnostic review. Reform plan based on diagnostic review.
 - Schools must partner with a state-approved turnaround partner to improve learning/support in reading and mathematics.
 - Closure is also an option for priority schools.

- **Charter schools and schools participating in Parental Choice Programs** must implement similar requirements as traditional public schools.

FOCUS SCHOOLS

- Identified based on large gaps or low subgroup performance in one (or more) of three categories:
 - Reading achievement
 - Mathematics achievement
 - Graduation rates
- All schools subject to identification (\$ only for Title I)
- Develop a reform plan based on an online self-assessment to implement Response to Intervention, working closely with WI's Rtl Center
- Ongoing monitoring at state level

DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

- Districts will be identified for improvement in two ways:
 - if the aggregate scores for elementary, middle and high school levels fail to meet expectations at all three levels, or
 - if the district has any schools rated as *Persistently Failing to Meet Expectations*
- DPI may require a contracted expert to complete a diagnostic review at the LEA level to evaluate human resources, curriculum and instruction, finance, allocation of resources, leadership.
- Based on diagnostic review the State Superintendent may direct reform at the LEA level. Districts would work closely the district assigned turnaround expert in implementing the required reforms.

SCHOOLS NOT MEETING EXPECTATIONS

- If a **priority school** fails to make adequate progress after 3 years, the state superintendent may intervene.
 - + His/her work could include, but is not limited to, directing the school board to open the school under a contract with a successful management organization.
- If a **focus school** fails to make adequate progress after 3 years, the state superintendent may direct specific actions take place targeted to the school's lowest performing subgroups.
 - + This may include, but is not limited to, required PD, curriculum, and a more intensive partnership with the WI Rtl Center.

STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF SUPPORT

- A Statewide System of Support will be developed for all schools, not just Title I.
- Resources will be available online and via the Rtl Center and CESAs.
- Districts will be the entry point for school improvement and district reform.

The primary purpose of the Wisconsin Framework for Educator Effectiveness is to support a system of continuous improvement of educator practice—from pre-service through service—that leads to improved student learning. The system established by the Educator Effectiveness Design Team was designed to evaluate teachers and principals through a fair, valid, and reliable process using multiple measures across two main areas: educator practice and student outcomes.

SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION AND LEADERSHIP

EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS

- The purpose of the Educator Effectiveness system is to support a system of continuous improvement of educator practice that leads to improved student learning.
- All educators will be included in the evaluation system.
- Both principal and teacher evaluations will include multiple measures of educator practice and student outcomes.
 - 50% educator practice
 - 50% student outcomes
- The system will include formative and summative elements, linked to the educator's professional development plan (PDP)
- Individual educator ratings are confidential and will not be publicly reported.
- The system will be piloted and implemented over the next two years, and fully implemented in the state by **2014-15**.

DPI is aligning a variety of efforts to reduce duplication and unnecessary burden on districts. Our methods of collecting district data are changing as result of the transition to a statewide student information system (SSIS); and our methods of making data available directly to districts as well as to the public, will be localized and made more timely through the SSIS and a new reporting system called the Wisconsin Information System for Education dashboard (WISEdash).

REDUCING DUPLICATION AND UNNECESSARY BURDEN

DATA SYSTEMS & EFFICIENCIES

- Districts will begin transitioning to a statewide student information system (SSIS) vendor in **2012-13**.
 - + There is a five-year implementation timeline for this system, which will reduce duplication of reporting efforts, increase timeliness of access to reported data, and allow districts more time to focus on using data to inform important educational decisions
- WISEdash – a single reporting system that will include accountability reporting
 - + WISEdash will also include reports on student growth percentiles, enrollment, postsecondary enrollment, and literacy.
 - + WISEdash will be released initially in secure format only (i.e., for authorized district personnel to use via a login).
 - + Eventually WISEdash will replace DPI's current public data reporting systems.

THANK YOU

For more information, please visit:
<http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/esea>