



Subgroups and Disaggregation within an Accountability System

Intended Outcome of Session: Participants will be able to construct an accountability system that disaggregates the required subgroups under ESSA and creates a system that includes all students and focuses on closing the achievement gap.

Alignment to CCSSO Principles and Roadmap

CCSSO	Main Point
<u>Accountability</u> Principle 2: Annual Determinations	Make annual accountability determinations for all public schools/districts based on clear goals to advance continuous improvement.
<u>Principle 4:</u> Disaggregation	Continue commitment to disaggregation of data – for reporting and accountability – and to closing achievement gaps in education opportunity and outcomes.
Opportunities and Considerations for State Leadership <i>Each state COULD...</i>	▪ Ensure each component of the accountability systems, including parts associated with subgroups, will achieve its intended purpose. ▪ Ensure the entire accountability system as a whole is coherent and fits the state’s values and theory of action, including by monitoring and making appropriate adjustments over time. ▪ Ensure meaningful accountability goals for performance and improvement for all public schools and subgroups, such as all students are on track to college and career readiness. ▪ Continue to disaggregate data for each measure in the state’s accountability system and for additional data for improvement – by at least the subgroups including race/ethnicity, economically disadvantages, students with disabilities, and English learners. In addition to the federally required subgroups, states may also use other subgroups (e.g., “super subgroups,” “lower-performing students”) as a basis for identifying schools for targeted assistance. ▪ Use disaggregated data in school accountability determinations/classifications and in determining consequences of supports and interventions, including schools with very low-performing subgroups, especially if the low-performing subgroup does not improve over time. ▪ Establish a minimum number for subgroup reporting and accountability that is valid (e.g., as inclusive as

	possible), appropriately protects student privacy, and is appropriately reliable given the state’s accountability system and other context (e.g., identified risks of under-/over-misidentification). ▪ Publicly report disaggregated data for all subgroups.
ESSA Requirements <i>Each state MUST...</i>	▪ Establish ambitious, state-defined long-term goals, including measurements of interim progress, on all required indicators, for all students and for identified subgroups (racial/ethnic, economic disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and English learners). ESSA § 1111(c)(4)(A). The state must identify the major racial/ethnic subgroups for school accountability. ESSA § 1005(c)(2). ▪ ESSA requires reporting of results disaggregated by additional subgroups of gender, foster children, homeless students, and students from military families. Also must report number and percentage of English Learners in district for five years of more without being reclassified as having attained proficiency in English. These subgroups must be reported but are not required to be incorporated in accountability. ESSA § 1177(c)(ii) ▪ ESSA requires that states annually measure and make accountability determinations overall for each school overall and for each federally specified accountability subgroup, generally starting in 2017-18. ESSA § 1111(c)(4)(B), (C). ▪ ESSA requires that each state/district annually report accountability data for each school overall and for each subgroup, as well as other data points. ESSA § 1111(h)(1)(C). ▪ ESSA requires that states set a statistically-sound uniform “minimum number” for subgroup data accountability, in consultation with key stakeholders. ESSA § 1111(c)(3)(A).
Elevating Equity	▪ Focus on inclusion of all students with additional emphasis on students who need the most help to improve academically. ▪ Establishing aspirational but attainable goals for all schools and subgroups, based on multiple measures provides an opportunity to focus on closing achievement gaps. ▪ Support LEAs in providing schools, subgroups, and students targeted and comprehensive supports and interventions. ▪ The focus on disaggregated data and subgroup accountability and public reporting is one of the strongest commitments to equity maintained in ESSA from NCLB. ▪ The focus on consultation with stakeholders can also be a mechanism for elevating equity in the process.
Resources/Examples	▪ Center for Assessment (draft, 6/16). <i>Including Subgroups in School Accountability: A Design decision resource.</i> ▪ Foundation for Excellence in Education. (Draft, 5/16). <i>A Model School Accountability System Under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).</i> (See especially pages 5-10 and 13 regarding subgroup accountability)
Issues and Questions to Consider	▪ What are the current status and educational needs of subgroups in the state? How is data collected to identify each of the reported subgroups? How will the state determine major racial/ethnic subgroups for schools accountability?

	▪ How will your state incorporate subgroup performance into annual school and subgroup accountability determinations required by ESSA? Will you do more than is required by ESSA in reporting, making annual determinations, or identifying/assigning consequences, e.g., include district or state goals/accountability? ▪ How will you decide how to specify the key decisions given to states by ESSA (e.g., defining “consistently underperforming,” “chronically underperforming,” and requirements to exit from targeted or comprehensive support and assistance)? ▪ How will you decide how to balance the various tensions in ESSA accountability, such as between subgroup inclusion, unreliability, and possible over/under-identification when establishing a minimum-n? What safeguards will you build in, and how will you know if they are working appropriately? ▪ Will the state disaggregate data by subgroups for indicator(s) of School Quality/Student Success (not required)? ▪ How will you operationalize the measurement of and goals for indicators (e.g., will Academic Progress indicator goals, e.g., growth, be normative or criterion, conditioned on variables such as prior achievement or anchored on an end target, vary for individual (students, subgroups, schools) or be the same)? How will measurements of interim progress be set (e.g., what should be the relationships between meeting Achievement and Progress goals)? ▪ How will you get evidence that your subgroup accountability does what it is intended to do and is not accompanying by undue negative consequences, especially that schools are being accurately classified in terms of (not) qualifying for high-stakes consequences, and that the supports and interventions are appropriate?
Next Steps	▪ Determine how the state’s accountability goals and theory of action, including subgroup accountability, are similar to and different from those the state developed under NCLB and/or ESEA Waivers. ▪ Determine if the state will apply for a waiver under 8401. States with rigorous, proven accountability systems in place may seek waivers of new accountability requirements that are inconsistent with their current approach to accountability and can demonstrate it will advance student achievement. ▪ Decide how the state will incorporate subgroup accountability, including the specific ESSA subgroup accountability requirements, into the state’s comprehensive accountability system, including supports and interventions. ▪ Use the CCSSO resources from this session to identify key specific decisions about subgroup accountability. Determine if the state needs additional support specific to the state’s plan and context. ▪ Review the draft ESSA Accountability regulations (issued 5/31/16 in Federal Register) and send in any comments before 7/28/16.