

# Preliminary ESSA Progress to Exit Report for CSI and ATSI Schools 2018-19 School Year

This report contains ESSA identification results for schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Additional Targeted Support after the 2017-18 school year. The report further describes the criteria to exit from those identifications, and shows how this school has progressed toward fulfilling applicable exit criteria. All identifications and scores contained in this report that pertain to the ESSA accountability system are considered preliminary. We ask that you not publicly share the information from this report until the public release, which is expected in spring of 2020.

## Example District - Example Elementary

### Your School's ESSA Identification Status:

#### Additional Targeted Support

Identification year/cohort: 2018-19

School Received Title I funds in 2018-19 school year: Yes

#### Exit Status: Not Exit Eligible

No CSI or ATSI schools are eligible to exit based upon 2018-19 ESSA accountability. This is because exit calculations require two years of data. This school's first opportunity to exit will be based upon 2019-20 ESSA accountability results.

#### Exit Criteria for ESSA Identifications

Wisconsin's approved ESSA Plan ([click here](#)) describes how a school identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) or Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) under Wisconsin's ESSA accountability system is eligible to exit its identified status. The plan lists three general criteria that an identified school must meet in order to exit these identifications:

1. Exceed initial and current identification thresholds;
2. Make sustained and sustainable improvement toward the long-term goals; and

3. Demonstrate evidence of systems, structures and/or procedures that ensure sustained and sustainable high-quality improvement planning and practices are in place.

Below you will find further information about each of the exit criterion, including progress data for your school.

### Criterion 1: Exceed Initial and Current Identification Thresholds

In order not to be eligible for re-identification, the all-students summary score in a CSI-Lowest Performance school or the summary score(s) for applicable student group(s) in an ATSI school must be above both the threshold for identification from the school year when the school was identified and the threshold in the current year.

This table provides summary scores for your school and for student groups in your school. It also lists applicable identification thresholds.

Student Group	Summary Score	Applicable Thresholds			
	Current	CSI-ID Year	CSI-Current	ATSI - ID Year	ATSI - Current
Black	7	NA	NA	6.4	6.7

### Criterion 2: Progress toward Long-Term Goals

A CSI-Lowest Performance school or an ATSI school may demonstrate progress toward long-term goals in one of two ways: 1) the school’s average points-based proficiency rates exceed the initial performance when the school was identified in both of the most recent two years for which enough data are available; OR 2) the points-based proficiency rates show improvement over two most recent growth intervals.

These criteria are applied separately for each of the long-term goals in Wisconsin’s ESSA plan. Information about your school’s progress over time is below.

#### Academic Achievement Long-Term Goal

Wisconsin measures progress toward the long-term goal for achievement using a points-based proficiency rate. A points-based proficiency rate awards points for student performance as follows:

Performance Level	Points
Advanced	1.5
Proficient	1.0
Basic	0.5
Below Basic	0.0

The tables below provide detailed information about student performance on the Forward Exam, ACT with Writing, and Dynamic Learning Maps assessments. Specifically, they show the points-based proficiency rates for any identified student groups.

**ELA Points-Based Proficiency Rates**

Student Group	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	Progress 1	Progress 2
Black	29.3	18.1	TBD	No	TBD

**Mathematics Points-Based Proficiency Rates**

Student Group	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	Progress 1	Progress 2
Black	23.9	29.3	TBD	Yes	TBD

**Graduation Long-Term Goal**

Wisconsin measures progress toward the graduation long-term goal using an average of the 4-year and 7-year graduation rates. The tables below show the average graduation rates for any identified student groups.

Student Group	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Progress 1	Progress 2
Black	NA	NA	TBD	NA	TBD

**On-Track to English Language Proficiency Long-Term Goal**

Wisconsin measures progress toward the long-term goal for students to be on-track to English language proficiency (ELP) using English Language Proficiency data from the ACCESS For ELLs exam. Wisconsin’s ESSA plan describes the number of years a student should take to exit English learner services based on the grade in which an English learner first took the ACCESS exam and their entering ELP level. During interim years DPI calculates the rate of progress ELs make toward the goal of exiting “on time.” The tables below show the rate of students who are On-Track to Proficiency based on their interim progress toward exiting in the goal year. Note that data will only appear for ATSI English learner groups or for CSI All-Students groups with at least 20 ELs who took an ACCESS exam in the current year as well as 20 in at least the most recent prior year.

Student Group	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	Progress 1	Progress 2
Black	NA	NA	TBD	NA	TBD

A CSI-Low Graduation Rate school demonstrates progress if its average graduation rate exceeds the initial performance for which the school was identified in both of the most recent two years for which enough data is available OR the two most recent intervals both show improvement. Note that criterion 2 for this identification is only applied to the graduation long-term goal: averaged 4- and 7-year graduation rate.

**Criterion 3: Evidence of Systems That Support Continuous Improvement**

*This section will be updated before the end of the school year.*

In order to satisfy Criterion 3, the school must demonstrate evidence of systems, structures and/or procedures that ensure sustained and sustainable high quality improvement planning and practices are in place.

Evidence for this criterion will be measured using the criteria in the Continuous Improvement Process Criteria ([click here](#)) and Rubric, and will be collected either through DPI monitoring for CSI schools, or through review of information provided to DPI through end-of-year reporting by the district for CSI and ATSI schools. Specifically, evidence should demonstrate an effective system:

- that includes implementation teams reflecting diverse stakeholders and roles (R3, R4 & P6 in Continuous Improvement Process Criteria and Rubric);
- that supports educators' use of an evidence-based improvement strategy that is aligned with identified needs and positively impacts student learning (P4 & P5 in Continuous Improvement Process Criteria and Rubric); and
- that can be replicated for new initiatives (A1 & A2 in Continuous Improvement Process Criteria and Rubric).

Additionally, monitoring and review of end-of-year reporting will check that effective implementation of continuous improvement process structures are in place, are monitored, and are sustainable. This means that

- the team implements the plan with fidelity, which includes *collection of practice and student outcome data* (D2, D3 & D4 in Continuous Improvement Process Criteria and Rubric); and
- the team uses a system to document implementation which includes *regular review of educator practice and student outcome data*, revision of action steps, and planning for sustainability and further use or scaling up of the evidence-based improvement strategy. (R7, S1 & S2 in Continuous Improvement Process Criteria and Rubric).