

ED Follow-up Actions 4.10.17

#	What
1	Confirm in writing what Massachusetts's leaders described during the call held on April 6, 2017, in which the State indicated that it worked continuously with the Governor's office to ensure the Governor reviewed the final plan prior to submission to the Department.
2	<u>A.4.iii.a.1</u> Describe the long-term goals for improved academic achievement , as measured by proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.
3	<u>A.4.iii.a.2</u> and <u>Appendix A</u> Provide the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement in Appendix A.
4	<u>A.4.iii.a.3</u> Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for academic achievement take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps .
5	<u>A.4.iii.c.1</u> Describe the long-term goals for English learners for increases in the percentage of such students making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the State-determined timeline for such students to achieve English language proficiency; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.
6	<u>A.4.iii.c.2</u> and <u>Appendix A</u> Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency in Appendix A.
7	<u>A.4.v.b</u> Describe the weighting of each indicator in the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in ELP indicators each receive substantial weight individually and, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate
8	<u>A.4.viii.a</u> 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.
9	<u>A.4.viii.b</u> Describe the statewide exit criteria , established by the State, for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.
10	<u>H.1</u> Provide information on program objectives and outcomes for activities under Title V, Part B, Subpart 2 (rural education) , including how the SEA will use funds to help all students meet the challenging State academic standards

Revisions

Prompt 1

Confirm in writing what Massachusetts's leaders described during the call held on April 6, 2017, in which the State indicated that it worked continuously with the **Governor's office** to ensure the Governor reviewed the final plan prior to submission to the Department.

Text submitted 4.3.17

The Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth, appointed by Governor Baker, is an ex-officio member of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. Our agency reported to the Board on a frequent basis about the ESSA state plan development process. By virtue of his position on the Board, the Governor's appointee was involved throughout the process, from the inception of the state planning, through the public comment period, and to the ultimate finalization of the plan.

Date SEA provided the plan to the Governor: 3/8/2017

Revised text

The Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth, appointed by Governor Baker, is an ex-officio member of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. Our agency reported to the Board on a frequent basis about the ESSA state plan development process. By virtue of his position on the Board, the Governor's appointee was involved throughout the process, from the inception of the state planning, through the public comment period, and to the ultimate finalization of the plan. The Secretary and Commissioner met with Governor Baker on March 8, 2017, to discuss our consolidated state plan. Subsequent to that meeting, the Commissioner and Department staff continued to discuss details related to finalizing our state plan with the Secretary and his staff at the Executive Office of Education, who, in turn, continued consultation with the Governor and his staff. The final plan was presented to the Governor's office on March 31, and the Governor signed the plan on April 3, 2017. Since submitting our plan on April 3 we have continued to consult with the Secretary and his staff at the Executive Office of Education.

Date SEA provided the plan to the Governor: 3/8/2017

Prompt 2

A.4.iii.a.1 Describe the **long-term goals for improved academic achievement**, as measured by proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

Text submitted 4.3.17

Massachusetts will be administering a new statewide assessment in grades 3-8 in the 2016-17 school year. The new assessment, the Next-Generation MCAS, will build upon the successes of both the original MCAS and Massachusetts' two-year trial of the PARCC assessments. The Next-Generation MCAS will be scored on a scale that differs from both the original MCAS and PARCC. Because baseline data from the new assessments will not be available until the summer of 2017, it is not possible for Massachusetts to determine long-term goals for the state at this time. Once baseline data are available, Massachusetts plans to set ambitious long-term goals in accordance with the state plan requirements.

Revised text

Massachusetts will be administering a new statewide assessment in grades 3-8 in the 2016-17 school year. The new assessment, the Next-Generation MCAS, will build upon the successes of both the original MCAS and Massachusetts' two-year trial of the PARCC assessments. The Next-Generation MCAS will be scored on a scale that differs from both the

original MCAS and PARCC. Because baseline data from the new assessments will not be available until the summer of 2017, it is not possible for Massachusetts to determine final long-term goals for the state at this time. However, in the interim Massachusetts has set ambitious, long-term academic achievement goals for all students and all subgroups in English language arts, Mathematics and Science based on assessment results from the 2015-16 school year, and plans to apply the same methodology once Next-Generation MCAS results are available. The overall goal is consistent for all groups and subjects: reduce the proficiency gap by one-third over the next six years.

Group	Subject	2016 % Proficient or above	2017 Target	2018 Target	2019 Target	2020 Target	2021 Target	2022 Target
All students	ELA	71.7	73.3	74.8	76.4	77.9	79.5	81.0
Amer. Ind. or Alaska Nat.		61.9	64.0	66.1	68.2	70.3	72.4	74.5
Asian		83.0	83.9	84.9	85.8	86.7	87.7	88.6
Afr. Amer/Black		56.3	58.7	61.1	63.5	65.9	68.3	70.7
Hispanic/Latino		52.8	55.4	58.0	60.6	63.2	65.8	68.4
Multi-race, Non-Hisp./Lat.		72.2	73.7	75.3	76.8	78.3	79.8	81.4
Nat. Haw. or Pacif. Isl.		75.7	77.0	78.4	79.7	81.0	82.4	83.7
White		78.1	79.3	80.5	81.7	82.9	84.1	85.3
Econ. Disadvantaged		54.6	57.1	59.6	62.1	64.6	67.1	69.6
ELL and Former ELL		42.7	45.9	49.0	52.2	55.3	58.5	61.6
High needs		52.3	54.9	57.5	60.2	62.8	65.4	68.0
Students w/disabilities		37.6	41.0	44.5	47.9	51.3	54.8	58.2
All students	Math	64.1	66.1	68.0	70.0	72.0	74.0	75.9
Amer. Ind. or Alaska Nat.		52.6	55.2	57.8	60.4	63.0	65.6	68.2
Asian		83.4	84.3	85.2	86.1	87.1	88.0	88.9
Afr. Amer/Black		44.0	47.1	50.2	53.2	56.3	59.4	62.5
Hispanic/Latino		44.5	47.6	50.6	53.7	56.7	59.8	62.8
Multi-race, Non-Hisp./Lat.		64.3	66.3	68.2	70.2	72.2	74.1	76.1
Nat. Haw. or Pacif. Isl.		63.3	65.3	67.3	69.4	71.4	73.4	75.4
White		70.5	72.1	73.7	75.4	77.0	78.6	80.2
Econ. Disadvantaged		45.6	48.6	51.6	54.6	57.6	60.6	63.6
ELL and Former ELL		40.7	44.0	47.2	50.5	53.7	57.0	60.3
High needs		44.0	47.1	50.2	53.2	56.3	59.4	62.5
Students w/disabilities		30.0	33.9	37.7	41.6	45.4	49.3	53.1
All students	Science	54.7	57.2	59.7	62.2	64.7	67.2	69.6
Amer. Ind. or Alaska Nat.		42.4	45.6	48.7	51.9	55.1	58.2	61.4
Asian		70.0	71.7	73.3	75.0	76.6	78.3	79.9
Afr. Amer/Black		30.9	34.7	38.5	42.3	46.1	49.9	53.7
Hispanic/Latino		30.6	34.4	38.2	42.1	45.9	49.7	53.5
Multi-race, Non-Hisp./Lat.		55.7	58.1	60.6	63.0	65.4	67.9	70.3
Nat. Haw. or Pacif. Isl.		51.4	54.1	56.7	59.4	62.1	64.8	67.4
White		62.6	64.7	66.7	68.8	70.8	72.9	74.9
Econ. Disadvantaged		33.8	37.4	41.1	44.7	48.4	52.0	55.6
ELL and Former ELL		19.8	24.2	28.6	33.0	37.4	41.9	46.3
High needs		33.2	36.9	40.5	44.2	47.9	51.6	55.2
Students w/disabilities		26.5	30.5	34.6	38.6	42.7	46.7	50.8

Prompt 3

A.4.iii.a.2 and Appendix A Provide the **measurements of interim progress** toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement in Appendix A.

Text submitted 4.3.17

[None/blank]

Revised text

Interim targets toward meeting the long-term goal for academic achievement of reducing the proficiency gap by one-third over six years are included in the table above.

Prompt 4

A.4.iii.a.3 Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for academic achievement take into account the improvement necessary to make **significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps**.

Text submitted 4.3.17

[None/blank]

Revised text

The proposed long-term goal and associated interim measures are designed to have all students and all subgroups aspire to the same goal (reducing the proficiency gap by one-third). In setting such a goal, those groups that are furthest behind will be required to make the largest gains and, as a result, close statewide proficiency gaps. For example, in English language arts, the gap between the all students group (71.7 percent proficient) and those students in the economically disadvantaged subgroup (54.6 percent proficient) was 17.1 percentage points in the 2015-16 school year. If each group were to cut their proficiency gap by exactly one-third in six years, the resulting gap between the all students group (81.0 percent proficient) and the economically disadvantaged group (69.6 percent proficient) would then be 11.4 percentage points.

Prompt 5

A.4.iii.c.1 Describe the **long-term goals for English learners** for increases in the percentage of such students making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the State-determined timeline for such students to achieve English language proficiency; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

Text submitted 4.3.17

The WIDA ACCESS for ELLs test is in the midst of a transition from paper and pencil to online testing. This transition requires us to carefully study the adjusted standard setting results and scales to ensure that the changes support valid determinations of progress toward proficiency, and to determine the best approach to measuring progress. We will provide additional information at a later date.

Revised text

The WIDA ACCESS for ELLs test is in the midst of a transition from paper and pencil to online testing. This transition requires us to carefully study the adjusted standard setting results and scales to ensure that the changes support valid

determinations of progress toward proficiency, and to determine the best approach to measuring progress. Currently, we base growth-to-proficiency targets on the amount of growth needed by a student to reach English language proficiency (ACCESS Level 5) within six years in a Massachusetts school. When our ongoing transition is complete we will determine the appropriate number of years within which students will be expected to attain English language proficiency, up to the current six year basis, and the associated targets for making progress toward proficiency. We will provide additional information once this work has been completed. In the interim, Massachusetts is setting a long-term goal with interim targets based on the ACCESS for ELLs results from the 2015-16 school year. The goal will be to reduce the percentage of students that are not making sufficient progress towards English language proficiency by 50 percent over the next six years. The baseline and associated targets are detailed below.

Percent of Students Making Progress Toward English Proficiency							
Year	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
% Making Progress	61.8%	65.0%	68.2%	71.4%	74.6%	77.8%	81.0%

For the purposes of setting this long-term goal and interim targets, Massachusetts calculates **progress** toward English language proficiency based on the individual results of students who participated in two successive administrations of the ACCESS tests (i.e., the current and most recent year of administration), according to the following steps:

1. Set growth-to-proficiency targets for Massachusetts students, currently based on 2013 and 2014 historical data for students in the WIDA consortium, the student’s number of years in a U.S. school, and proficiency level on the prior year’s test.
2. Calculate and assign a Student Growth Percentile for ACCESS (SGPA), a number between 1-99, to each Massachusetts student who took ACCESS tests in two successive years, and compare the SGPA with the growth-to-proficiency target based on the prior year’s proficiency level and number of years the student has attended a U.S. school (Note: “Massachusetts school” is used as a proxy for attending a U.S. school).
3. If the student’s SGPA meets or exceeds the target listed in the table for a student at that proficiency level and with that many years in a Massachusetts school, then the student is on track toward attainment of English proficiency within the established number of years, and is considered to be “making progress.”

Prompt 6

A.4.iii.c.2 and Appendix A Provide the **measurements of interim progress** toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of **English learners** making progress in achieving English language proficiency in Appendix A.

Text submitted 4.3.17

[None/blank]

Revised text

The measurements of interim progress for English language learners toward English language proficiency are detailed in the table above.

Prompt 7

A.4.v.b Describe the **weighting of each indicator** in the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in ELP indicators each receive substantial weight individually and, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate

Text submitted 4.3.17

Massachusetts has not established specific weightings for the index methodology illustrated above because of we do not have results from the new assessment to create models and simulations. However, the core measures (Index E) will be given much greater weight than the additional measures (Index F) for purposes of determining an overall accountability index.

Text revised and submitted 5.10.17

The tables below outline Massachusetts' current thinking regarding the weighting of indicators in the proposed accountability system. The weights are similar to those used in the state's existing school percentile methodology, with adjustments made to fulfill ESSA's requirements related to English language proficiency for English learners (ELs) and the indicator(s) of school quality or student success.

It is important to note that Massachusetts intends to review, and if necessary, adjust the proposed weights once results from the Next-Generation MCAS tests are available. These results will serve as the primary basis for modeling and simulations for the combination of the indicators. We anticipate that once we have a complete data set and conduct analyses of the options for combining the indicators, we likely will amend our plan to reflect fine-tuning of the weights identified in this submission.

Nonetheless, Massachusetts is committing to two principles regarding any future adjustments to the weighting of indicators in the proposed accountability system: (1) the core indicators (academic achievement, student growth, graduation rates and EL progress towards English language proficiency) when taken together will be weighted substantially more than any one or combined indicators of school quality or student success; and (2) the weighting of indicators in the proposed system will be consistent with our current practice where academic achievement is the most heavily weighted indicator, including in the current normative identification of the lowest performing schools in the Commonwealth where academic achievement is weighted three times that of student growth.

These two principles, which are reflected in the current submission and will be reflected in future submissions, provide the U.S. Department of Education and peer reviewers with Massachusetts's core structure and design.

High school with measurable English learner group

Indicator	Measure(s)	Weighting
Academic Achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Grade 10 ELA, Math and Science: average scale score equated to Next-Generation ELA and Math MCAS scale	50%
Academic Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Mean student growth percentile (SGP)Measure of growth to standard (to be incorporated in the future)	20%
Graduation Rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Four-year cohort graduation rateFive-year cohort graduation rate plus percentage of students still enrolled in high schoolAnnual dropout rate	17.5%
Achieving English Language Proficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Student attainment of English language proficiencyProgress made by students towards attaining English language proficiency as measured by growth on the ACCESS for English language learners test	5%
School Quality or Student Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Chronic absenteeismSuccess in grade 9 coursesSuccessful completion of broad and challenging coursework	7.5%

High school without measurable English learner group

Indicator	Measure(s)	Weighting
Academic Achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade 10 ELA, Math and Science: average scale score equated to Next-Generation ELA and Math MCAS scale 	50%
Academic Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean student growth percentile (SGP) 	25%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measure of growth to standard (to be incorporated in the future) 	
Graduation Rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four-year cohort graduation rate 	17.5%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Five-year cohort graduation rate plus percentage of students still enrolled in high school 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual dropout rate 	
School Quality or Student Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chronic absenteeism 	7.5%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Success in grade 9 courses 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Successful completion of broad and challenging coursework 	

Non-high school with measurable English learner group

Indicator	Measure(s)	Weighting
Academic Achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grades 3-8 English language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics: average scale score 	60%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grades 5 and 8 Science: average scale score equated to Next-Generation ELA and Math MCAS scale 	
Academic Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean student growth percentile (SGP) 	25%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measure of growth to standard (to be incorporated in the future) 	
Achieving English Language Proficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student attainment of English language proficiency 	10%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress made by students towards attaining English language proficiency as measured by growth on the ACCESS for English language learners test 	
School Quality or Student Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chronic absenteeism 	5%

Non-high school without measurable English learner group

Indicator	Measure(s)	Weighting
Academic Achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grades 3-8 English language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics: average scale score. 	70%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grades 5 and 8 Science: average scale score equated to Next-Generation ELA and Math MCAS scale 	
Academic Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean student growth percentile (SGP) 	25%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measure of growth to standard (to be incorporated in the future) 	
School Quality or Student Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chronic absenteeism 	5%

Prompt 8

A.4.viii.a 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.

Text submitted 4.3.17

Massachusetts will identify the exit criteria for schools in need of comprehensive support prior to the first identification in fall 2018.

Revised text

Exit criteria for Comprehensive Support schools will align to Massachusetts state law and regulations governing district and school accountability and assistance (603 CMR 2.00). After three years, Comprehensive Support schools must meet student performance, growth, and gap closing targets in accordance with the revised accountability system described above. In addition, prior to removing a school from Comprehensive Support status, ESE will assess if the necessary capacity and conditions are in place at both the school and district levels to sustain improvement. Schools that do not demonstrate sufficient gains to meet the exit criteria at the end of their three-year turnaround term will either remain in Comprehensive Support status or can be considered for receivership as exercised by the Commissioner under state law. The Commissioner determines which route will have the greatest impact and opportunity for sustained change in the school and district. Comprehensive Support schools past their third year of turnaround will then be assessed annually against the exit criteria.

ESE requires that each school eligible for removal from Comprehensive Support status submit “exit assurances” to the Department for review. In this application, the district must identify the flexibilities that each school intends to sustain once removed from Comprehensive Support status and the mechanisms and/or funding sources that will be used to sustain each flexibility.

Prompt 9

A.4.viii.b Describe the **statewide exit criteria**, established by the State, for schools receiving additional **targeted support** under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

Text submitted 4.3.17

Massachusetts will identify the exit criteria for schools in need of targeted support prior to the first identification in fall 2018.

Revised text

As previously mentioned, Massachusetts is unable to fully specify some of the details of its proposed accountability system until all of the data are available for simulation and modeling. We anticipate that the exit criteria for targeted support schools will be similar to the current exit criteria for focus schools within our current accountability system. Those schools must meet a normative component of being above the 20th percentile within any group that led to the identification and a criterion referenced component of meeting the annual targets for the specified groups(s) in a given year to exit the status.

Prompt 10

H.1 Provide information on **program objectives and outcomes for activities under Title V, Part B, Subpart 2 (rural education)**, including how the SEA will use funds to help all students meet the challenging State academic standards

Text submitted 4.3.17

The objectives and expected outcomes for improved performance by students in rural and low-income schools will be established by applying the rules for setting performance and improvement targets under the Massachusetts school and district accountability and assistance system.

Background

The goal of Massachusetts' public education system for preschool through grade 12 is to prepare all students for success after high school. ESE has identified five primary strategies that support this goal:

- Strengthen standards, curriculum, instruction, and assessment
- Promote educator development
- Support social-emotional learning, health, and safety
- Turn around the lowest performing districts and schools
- Use technology and data to support student learning

The state's overarching goal and supporting strategies apply equally to students participating in Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS)-funded programs, which are designed to provide supplemental funding for rural districts to increase student achievement. In FY17, two districts in Massachusetts were eligible for RLIS funding.

Program objectives and outcomes

Funds received under the RLIS program must be used to support activities allowable under Title I, Part A, Title II, Part A, Title III, or Title IV, Part A, and may include parent involvement activities. Accordingly, RLIS-funded program objectives and measurable outcomes must be identified through district needs assessments and improvement plans, and must be aligned with recipient districts' objectives and expected outcomes for programs funded through Title I, Part A, Title II, Part A, Title III, and/or Title IV, Part A, including the expectations for academic achievement set out by the state's district and school accountability system. Overall academic achievement objectives and outcomes for Titles I-IV are described in Sections 4 through 6, and in the Long-Term Goals section of this Consolidated State Plan.

As part of the annual application for funding, districts are required to describe the specific program objectives and anticipated outcomes that they have identified to increase student achievement. Massachusetts provides direct technical assistance to recipient districts, and monitors both fund use and reported measures of program effectiveness.
