Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA

Module 5: Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) and Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) Schools

All states have developed or revised their state's accountability system in response to requirements in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). A state's accountability system includes multiple indicators, each of which illuminates a different facet of school performance or quality. States must identify all schools with one or more low-performing subgroups, based on performance across all indicators, for targeted support and improvement (TSI) based on consistently underperforming subgroups and additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI).

Results across accountability indicators drive school identification in various ways. **Module 2: State's System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation (AMD)** addresses how indicator results drive annual differentiation of schools through summative ratings or individual indicator results. This module addresses how indicator results drive the identification of TSI and ATSI schools.

States vary in their approach to identifying TSI schools based on consistently underperforming subgroups. TSI schools are generally identified based on consistent under-performance across multiple years and must be identified annually. There are some areas for state-level discretion with regard to identification of TSI schools; for example, states have flexibility in how they prioritize indicators. By weighting some indicators more than others or varying cut scores for identification, states may vary the types and number of schools identified for TSI. Please note that TSI exit criteria are determined by districts.

ATSI schools must be identified using the same methodology the state uses to identify the lowest-performing 5% of Title I schools for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI). However, a state can choose to identify these schools from among all schools or from among those schools identified as TSI. In addition, each state determines the criteria by which schools may *exit* ATSI status as long as those exit criteria ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success.

The overall approach to TSI and ATSI identification should reflect the state's theory of action and overall intended outcomes. To clarify the state's theory of action, see **Module 1: Theory of Action**.

This module includes three sets of self-reflection prompts that are intended to address the following concepts for the TSI and ATSI school-identification component within the larger state's accountability system. These three steps are not intended to be discrete; instead, they are intended to work together to help you answer questions in the next sections of this module.

Table 1. Overview of Module 5: TSI and ATSI Schools

Section	What is it?	Why is it important?	How should it be used?
Articulate the Rationale Behind the TSI and ATSI School Identification Methodologies	A description of why the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies are designed the way they are	It is important to develop a message that can be used for multiple audiences to describe the "what" and "why" behind TSI and ATSI identification to communicate effectively about school identification.	The **rationale** asks you to describe the expected policy objective, behavioral intent, and expected results associated with TSI and ATSI identification. This rationale can be used as a point of comparison for examining the results of school identification and will help you understand where the rationale may be misunderstood.
Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of the Rationale for Identifying TSI and ATSI Schools	A reflection on whether stakeholders understand the rationale behind the TSI and ATSI identification methodology that can help identify possible areas that may be misinterpreted or misunderstood by the public	Determining what assumptions or connections require more clarification can help minimize the public's misunderstanding and help prioritize resources to support communication efforts.	The **stakeholder perceptions** section asks you to think about your rationale as an outsider. To what degree will stakeholders understand this rationale? How public is its supporting documentation? How might people interpret, use, or misinterpret school identification? This may help you identify what areas may need additional explanation and determine whether additional communication is necessary.

Section	What is it?	Why is it important?	How should it be used?
Assess Confidence in Operations and Results of Identifying TSI and ATSI Schools	Based on your rationale and potential risk, an examination of your level of confidence that TSI and ATSI design decisions are sound and evidence supports your assumptions	Determining your overall confidence in the results and presentation of the TSI and ATSI methodology can help you determine where to collect evidence, make system revisions, or develop outreach materials.	The **confidence in operations and results** section will help you identify potential evidence that can help confirm TSI and ATSI identification rationale and design. The rationale can also be used as a point of comparison for design decisions, and the strength of rationale can be used to focus attention on key confidence claims.

Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA
Module 5: Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) and Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) Schools
Section 1. Articulate the Rationale Behind the TSI and ATSI School Identification Methodologies

Module 1: Theory of Action allows you to map the overall theory of action for the state's accountability system. Each component of the state's accountability system should then support the overall theory of action. To ensure the components are coherent with the larger vision of the state, each component of the system will have its own *component rationale,* or mini-theory of action describing how it is intended to function.

Consider the following questions regarding the component rationale for the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies. The questions below are intended to help you think about the high-level design associated with TSI and ATSI identification methodologies and how they align with policy, behavioral expectations, and accountability results. Later in this module, you will think about the risk associated with certain aspects and the level of confidence you have in the operationalization of the methodologies. These questions will be used a high-level point of comparison.

Table 2. Articulate the Rationale Behind the TSI and ATSI School Identification Methodologies

Articulate the Rationale Behind the TSI and ATSI Identification Methodologies	
Reflection Questions	*Notes*
Policy intent: Consistent with federal requirements, what policy objective(s) are you trying to achieve through the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies? How does this policy intent drive the larger theory of action policy intent supporting intended level of differentiation, school improvement, and public outreach? Examples may include the following: • Prioritizing the identification of large and persistent achievement gaps • Identification of a broad selection of schools to drive public awareness • Focused identification of schools to drive subgroup-specific support	

Reflection Questions	Notes
Policy mechanisms or levers: Based on your policy intent, how will different policy mechanisms capture and frame subgroup performance? Examples include thresholds of performance for indicators, indicator weightings, number of years of under-performance for purposes of TSI identification, other business rules triggering under-performance, etc.	
Behavioral intent: What behaviors are you trying to incentivize through the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies? These may include behaviors for policymakers, state staff, district leaders, principals, educators, and the public. That is, what do you expect people to do with this information?	
Expected results: For the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies, what data-based findings or trends do you expect to observe? These may include strong alignment between TSI and ATSI identification status and the following: • Results for particular indicators • Annual differentiation results/ratings • Goals under ESEA Section 1111(c)(4)(A) for subgroup performance These expectations provide additional comparisons to evaluate the technical characteristics of the indicators and overall results of TSI and ATSI identification methodologies.	

Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA
Module 5: Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) and Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) Schools
Section 2. Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of the Rationale for Identifying TSI and ATSI Schools

The overall objectives and design of an accountability system should be well understood. The greater the understanding, the less risk there is of accountability results being misinterpreted. After articulating or revisiting the rationale behind the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies in Section 1 of this module, SEA staff should examine the strength of the rationale behind TSI and ATSI methodologies to ensure they support state accountability objectives and are functioning as intended (the focus of Section 3 of this module). In addition, SEA staff should examine whether the public perceptions of the system promote its intended behaviors. Together, the technical soundness and public perceptions of the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies are likely to contribute to its success.

Use the reflection questions in the following table (Table 3) to consider whether the design and presentation of the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies and their rationale are (or are likely to be) understood by stakeholders.

Table 3. Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of the Rationale for Identifying TSI and ATSI Schools

Stakeholder Perceptions of the Rationale for Identifying TSI and ATSI Schools			
Perception Reflection	**Why is it important?**	**Reflection Questions**	**Notes**
Stakeholder Perceptions of the TSI and ATSI Identification Methodologies	Rationales help "connect the dots" of the state's accountability system. It is important that stakeholders and the public understand the rationale behind TSI and ATSI identification (as articulated in Section 1 of this module), which might include the mechanisms, connections, and assumptions that inform design decisions and evidence collection.	• Can you easily explain the rationale for how your state's TSI and ATSI identification methodologies support your policy objectives and statutory requirements?[1] • Can you identify policy levers embedded in the rationale that could compromise the attainment of policy intent? • Does the design of the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies (e.g., interaction between TSI and ATSI methodologies, indicator or composite index thresholds used to identify CSI schools, years of subgroup under-performance) support the intended level of differentiation among schools?	

---

[1] A state must annually identify any school with at least one consistently underperforming subgroup as TSI. A state may choose to identify ATSI schools as a subset of TSI schools or all schools statewide; regardless, ATSI schools have at least one subgroup performing within the range of CSI schools.

Perception Reflection	Why is it important?	Reflection Questions	Notes
Potential Misunderstanding of the TSI and ATSI Identification Methodologies	Public perceptions are important to increase buy-in for the system. Without considering public perceptions, advocacy groups may not understand how their concerns have been addressed, and stakeholders may not understand why thresholds for subgroup performance were designed.	• Which policy mechanisms or levers of the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies are most likely to receive public attention? Why? • What constituencies, stakeholders, or advocacy groups might question the rationale for the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies? What kinds of questions would they ask? • Are the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies coherent with local accountability policies or practices, and is this coherence communicated to the public?	

Based on the results of your previous reflections, consider the degree to which you believe the following regarding (a) communication and clarity of your rationale and (b) the risk of the public misunderstanding the rationale.

Table 4. Clarity and Risk of the TSI and ATSI School Identification Methodology

	No Clarification Needed	Clarification May Be Needed	Additional Clarification Needed	Notes
Communication and Clarity of Rationale	We have clearly stated the rationale behind TSI and ATSI identification methodologies, and the rationale reflects the overall objectives for the accountability and support system. These expectations are based on past experience or research and are readily available to the public.	We have stated the rationale behind TSI and ATSI identification methodologies, but the rationale may not clearly reflect the overall objectives for the accountability and support system. These expectations may have some support from previous experience or research. Some of this rationale is available to the public.	We have not clearly stated the rationale behind TSI and ATSI identification, or the rationale does not reflect the overall objectives for the accountability and support system. These expectations have not been supported with prior experience or research. Supporting materials are not available to the public.	

	Low	Moderate	High	Notes
Risk of Misunderstanding the Rationale	We have identified possible areas of TSI and ATSI identification methodologies that might be misunderstood by the public. Based on this examination, we have clarified aspects of the system and created clear documentation explaining the system.	We have examined what parts of TSI and ATSI identification methodologies might be misunderstood by the public but have not clarified them fully. Documentation may or may not be available specifically addressing areas of risk.	We have not examined TSI and ATSI identification methodologies for areas that could be misunderstood.	

For areas that need additional clarification or those that are high risk, you may need to prioritize future efforts. The potential next steps described below (Table 5) are important to consider as you review the confidence claims in the next section. If the rationale for the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies needs clarification or the risk for misunderstanding is high, what would you do next? For example, an undocumented rationale *may* increase the risk that TSI and ATSI identification is being misunderstood because of a lack of documentation, or it may be a result of incomplete or less-than-ideal assumptions. These considerations are intended to help prioritize next steps in supporting stakeholder perceptions of the state's accountability system.

Table 5. Potential Next Steps around Stakeholder Perceptions of the Rationale for Identifying TSI and ATSI Schools

Area of Exploration	Potential Next Steps	Notes
Communication and Clarity of Rationale	• Clarify the rationale behind your TSI and ATSI identification methodologies. Ensure it supports your overall theory of action and the policy objectives associated with your state's accountability system. • Clarify how you expect the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies to communicate school performance. Make clear how thresholds of performance for the TSI or ATSI designation communicate expectations for subgroups and how the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies support policy objectives. • Document how you have addressed the two bullet points above. Ensure this information is presented, formatted, and available in a way that it can be shared with the public and educators throughout the state.	

Area of Exploration	Potential Next Steps	Notes
Misunderstanding the Rationale	• Clarify what aspects of the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies are likely to receive the most public attention. Specify whether there are particular design decisions, indicators, or reports that might be controversial or difficult to understand. • Refine messages to make controversial or challenging aspects of the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies more accessible. Anticipate the types of questions (or engage in additional listening sessions) to highlight the most important issues to address. • Document how you have addressed the two bullet points above. Identify how responses from the public perceptions and TSI and ATSI identification methodologies rationale *Next Steps* can be compiled into a single set of resources.	

Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA
Module 5: Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) and Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) Schools
Section 3. Assess Confidence in the Operations and Results of Identifying TSI and ATSI Schools

As part of validating the theory of action behind the state's accountability system, it is important to consider whether the evidence generated by the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies upholds the underlying rationale. A state's accountability system can be thought of as a measurement instrument that helps the public understand the degree to which schools meet the state's educational objectives and priorities. Further, a state's accountability system and its results serve as a policy lever to incentivize actions that help achieve those same objectives and priorities.[2] To what degree is that happening? If states can identify sufficient evidence that upholds the assumptions associated with the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies, then an argument can be made that TSI and ATSI identification results are valid for identifying schools.

Respond to the following prompts to engage in the reflection around the operations and results of TSI and ATSI identification:

1. Read the claim, consideration, and potential sources of evidence.
2. Examine the specific evidence available in your state. Reflect on whether you believe you have collected enough evidence to be confident in the claim stated or whether there is a need for further examination.
3. Finally, respond to questions that pose whether you have (a) sufficiently explored the confidence claims below and (b) believe that you have collected enough evidence that these claims can be confirmed. Some questions may be based on opinion, whereas others will require an examination of data, supplemental analyses, or conversations with other SEA colleagues.

---

[2] See Accountability Identification Is Only the Beginning: Monitoring and Evaluating Accountability Results and Implementation from the Council of Chief State School Officers for more information. Note: The inclusion of links to resources and examples do not reflect their importance, nor is it intended to represent or be an endorsement by the Department of any views expressed, or materials provided. The U.S. Department of Education does not control or guarantee the accuracy, relevance, timeliness, or completeness of any outside information included in this document.

Table 6. Assess Confidence in the Operations and Results of Identifying TSI and ATSI Schools

Claim 1: Schools identified for TSI and ATSI align with the overall system theory of action.
Statutory requirements specify directly how states should identify schools that require the most support (i.e., CSI). States have some flexibility in how schools are identified for TSI or ATSI. For ATSI, this may include whether schools are identified from among all schools or from among TSI schools. For TSI, this may include how each threshold of performance compares to CSI performance. Regardless of the approach to TSI and ATSI identification (e.g., whether using a composite index or a series of decision rules), states should confirm that TSI and ATSI identification provides meaningful information and that identification methodologies align with the overall theory of action for accountability and improvement efforts. *For each consideration, review the key questions presented, and use the key evidence checks to help answer those questions.*
Consideration 1.1: Schools identified for TSI and ATSI are those with subgroups in greatest need and which require state and district support.
Assess Confidence in Operations and Results

Reflection Prompts	Notes
Key questions for the indicator: How is consistent subgroup under-performance defined for purposes of identifying TSI schools? What is the intended relationship and dynamic between CSI, TSI, and ATSI schools?	
Why is it important? TSI and ATSI identification can function independently or be based on sequential systems of identification. Each of these approaches have implications for the capacity of districts to support under-performing subgroups in schools, ensure alignment to support theory of action, and mitigate schools cascading from ATSI to CSI status. If schools do not meet ATSI exit criteria, the definition of subgroup under-performance should be evaluated and compared to the remaining claims of this module.	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
Key evidence checks: • Evaluate the definition of "consistently under-performing subgroups" for TSI identification, and determine its impact on the number of schools identified for TSI. Compare subgroups in identified schools to historical gains and projected improvement. • Determine how the methodology for identifying ATSI schools affects the number of schools identified for TSI and ATSI. Compare subgroups in identified schools to historical gains and projected improvement. • Determine whether ATSI identification is from among TSI-identified schools or if TSI and ATSI identification occur independently from among all schools.	

Potential next steps:
 	
 • For state systems, the identification of under-performing and lowest-performing subgroups in schools has implications on whether TSI schools cascade to ATSI schools or how ATSI schools cascade to CSI schools. High rates of identification or notification can result in an eventual increase in the number of CSI schools over time. Upon examining identification results, do the following:
 	
   – Compare results to the theory of action for accountability and support to determine the level of alignment.
 	
   – Revise the thresholds for consistently under-performing schools to better align with the theory of action.
 	
   – Revise indicator-specific thresholds for identification based on high-priority indicators and decision rules.
 	
   – Consider nesting ATSI schools as a subset of TSI schools to reflect signals of severity, if appropriate for the theory of action.
 	
 • If districts have capacity constraints based on identified schools, consider modifying identification methodologies to ensure that all identified schools receive a level of support consistent with the district and states theories of action or exploring alternative strategies to support identified schools using cross-agency funding strategies (e.g., Perkins Act or Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act funding).	

Consideration 1.2: TSI and ATSI identification status aligns with subgroups most in need of support.	
Assess Confidence in Operations and Results	
Reflection Prompts	**Notes**
Key questions for the indicator: What is the relationship between TSI and ATSI identification status and indicators reflecting the needed amount of support for subgroups?	
Why is it important? Schools identified for TSI and ATSI communicate a combination of under-performance for high-priority subgroups on key school outcomes and significant needs at either the school level, district level, or a combination of both. It is important to confirm that TSI and ATSI identification methodologies align with state performance expectations.	
Key evidence checks: • Compare the relationship between TSI/ATSI status to the gaps between subgroups and students on indicators for non-TSI and ATSI schools. Determine the size of gaps between TSI and ATSI schools and non-TSI/non-ATSI schools and the prevalence of unexpected gaps (e.g., identified schools have similar gaps to non-identified schools with similar proportions of specific subgroups of students). • Compare TSI and ATSI status to average per-pupil funding for the identified subgroups at the school level and across all schools.	

Reflection Prompts	Notes

Potential next steps:
 	
• Determine whether there are any misalignments (e.g., TSI and ATSI identification status does not align with lower needs-assessment ratings). If that is the case, consider the following:
  – Revise the TSI and ATSI identification methodologies to prioritize indicators that align with measures of the needs assessment.
  – Modify needs assessments to prioritize measures that align with indicators of TSI and ATSI identification.
 	
• When examining the gaps in identified and non-identified schools, consider prioritizing indicators of underperforming subgroup performance, such as ELP progress, or measures of subgroup performance not required by ESEA (e.g., gap scores).
 	
• Based on examinations of average per-pupil funding, if average rates are relatively high among non-TSI and ATSI schools, then consider the following:
  – Introduce indicators in the state's accountability system (including TSI and ATSI identification methodologies) that align with measures that correlate with school spending such as school climate or other conditions for learning.
  – Modify funding allocation formulas to better align with outcomes prioritized in TSI and ATSI identification methodologies.	

Claim 1 Reflection Prompts	**Claim 1 Response**
Reflecting on your notes above, consider your confidence in responding to the reflection prompts below.	
My state has sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand how our TSI and ATSI determinations align with our state objectives.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address the key questions and can confirm the TSI and ATSI determinations are functioning as intended.	Yes/No

Claim 2: TSI and ATSI identification results in meaningful exploration of and continuous improvement action taken in response to indicator performance for relevant subgroups.
TSI and ATSI identification is a signal indicating subgroups are significantly under-performing across all ESEA indicators. The ESEA statutory language also includes a strong focus on support, planning, and continuous improvement. It is important to evaluate and understand the degree to which TSI and ATSI identification supports the examination of accountability data, how those data are linked to capacity building and local data, and how this information can be used to drive changes in behavior.   *For each consideration, review the key questions presented, and use the key evidence checks to help answer those questions.*
Consideration 2.1: Systems and processes are in place that will enable adults to access and understand TSI and ATSI-specific accountability results.
Assess Confidence in Operations and Results

Reflection Prompts	Notes
Key questions for the indicator: Are technology systems established that will collect relevant data and deliver them to key stakeholders who enact improvements? Are protocols and processes established to ensure system intake and delivery of data? Are communication systems established to ensure meaningful and timely delivery and exploration of data?	
Why is it important? The quality and completeness of technology systems at the state, district, and school levels differ significantly. This may be especially true for schools identified for TSI or ATSI. Consider examining the degree to which systems, processes, and procedures are in place to support the meaningful exploration of data to support continuous improvement.	

Reflection Prompts	Notes

Key evidence checks:
 	
• Conduct a self-assessment of current practices that evaluates the degree to which district and school technology, systems and processes, and communications supports the meaningful exploration of and access to data. It is also important to consider how these needs may differ between TSI and ATSI schools and non-identified schools, especially with regard to how the state responds to support needs at the district or school levels.
 	
• For technology, consider the following:
  – Whether hardware and software systems are in place on the data intake side that can capture and report accountability data that focus attention on subgroup performance
  – Whether hardware and software systems are in place on the data consumer side that can present and manipulate data to meet the needs of end-users
  – Whether educators have been granted the proper authorizations to access data, given privacy considerations
  – Whether staff are in place with the capacity to modify and/or program software on an ongoing basis as needs are clarified
 	
• For protocols and processes, consider whether protocols have been identified for the intake of data from capture at the source level to input into state and district systems that are specific to TSI and ATSI school performance.
 	
• For communications, consider the following:
  – Whether data mapping has been documented and disseminated with appropriate messaging to technical status developing the data pipeline
  – Whether expectations and processes for using data have been documented and disseminated to educators	

Reflection Prompts	Notes

Potential next steps:
 	
• Convene working groups at the district or state levels to respond to results of self-evaluation.
 	
  – As needed, develop clear data maps that document the flow of data for all accountability indicators and additional reporting elements for state report cards disaggregated by subgroup.
 	
  – Develop plans to progressively phase-in more meaningful subgroup data as acquisition and development of hardware and software becomes feasible.
 	
  – Identify additional staff and resources needed to implement and maintain systems.
 	
• Conduct focus groups of educators regarding their current and prospective use of data.
 	
  – Examine protocols of communities of practice around data to determine what data points should be prioritized.
 	
  – Examine current procedures for accessing and generating data reports to ensure access.	

2.2: Stakeholders have the capacity to use the data to enact improvements.

Assess Confidence in Operations and Results

Reflection Prompts	Notes
Key questions for the indicator: What level of knowledge do key stakeholders have to access and capture subgroup data in a useful format? What level of data literacy do key stakeholders have to interpret subgroup data to identify root causes of problems and appropriate evidence-based practices to address them? What level of capacity do key stakeholders have to meaningfully implement evidence-based practices (EBPs) to impact subgroup outcomes?	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
Why is it important? It is likely that schools identified for TSI or ATSI will need support in building capacity around data awareness, literacy, and use to select relevant and effective interventions specific to subgroup needs. Putting in place systematic training and data collection can help states evaluate whether efforts to improve educator capacity are well designed and well targeted.	
Key evidence checks: • Convene working groups that include principals and department heads to discuss the training needs across the areas of data access, data literacy, and strategy implementation aligned to local needs. • Conduct formative examinations of educator knowledge at training events to support these three areas. • Collect artifacts of teachers and leaders during evaluation cycles that can serve as evidence of data literacy and reflect the capacity to use EBPs effectively.	
Potential next steps: • Develop and conduct professional development events and resources to support capacity building in the areas of data access, data literacy, and strategy implementation aligned to local needs. • Develop resources and training for locating and selecting EBPs. Examples of these resources are provided in **Module 7: State Support System for Identified Schools**. • Embed development of educator proficiency in these three areas into educator professional development systems.	

2.3 Designating schools as TSI and ATSI positively incentivizes stakeholder behavior in a way that outweighs potential unintended consequences.

Assess Confidence in Operations and Results

Reflection Prompts	Notes
Key questions for the indicator: What is the relationship between TSI/ATSI status and behavior of educators and staff at the school level? What is the relationship between TSI/ATSI status and district behaviors?	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
Why is it important? TSI and ATSI identification can be a pathway to help focus district and school efforts on relevant and impactful improvement strategies. It will be important to observe, monitor, and evaluate whether TSI and ATSI identification leads to positive changes in behavior and whether any unintended negative consequences emerge.	
Key evidence checks: • Evaluate the extent to which TSI and ATSI identification promotes positive behaviors that advance meaningful learning. These may include classroom and artifact observations, evaluating alignment of communities of practices, or interviewing and observing school leadership efforts. • Evaluate the extent to which TSI and ATSI identification promotes negative behaviors that lead to the potential of distorting indicator results. • Evaluate the extent to which TSI and ATSI identification promotes positive behaviors at the district level that facilitate systemic examinations of school needs to better align district support.	

Reflection Prompts	Notes

Potential next steps:
 	
• When evaluating whether TSI and ATSI identification promotes behaviors that advance meaningful learning, consider the following:
 	
  – Observe classrooms and artifacts to determine whether teachers adjust practices to respond to areas of improvement identified by accountability results.
 	
    ▪ Are they integrating the use of accountability results and classroom-level data into professional development and demonstrating how data drives instructional adjustments?
 	
    ▪ Is there an emphasis on profession development (e.g., emphasizing teaching standards around the integration of data into instructional adjustments)?
 	
  – Determine whether communities of practice utilize data that aligns with areas of improvement identified by accountability results. For example:
 	
    ▪ Are there updated protocols for communities of practice that integrate accountability results and related data?
 	
    ▪ How are local training and support efforts aligned to these protocols?
 	
  – Determine whether school leadership is communicating and supporting priorities that align with areas of improvement identified by accountability results. This may include the following:
 	
    ▪ Adjusting principal training (e.g., integrating capacity-building for supporting school improvement in response to accountability results)
 	
    ▪ Updating principal professional development systems (i.e., prioritize use of data and response to accountability results, including communication and support)	

Reflection Prompts	Notes

Potential next steps (continued):
 	
• When evaluating whether TSI and ATSI identification promotes negative behaviors, consider the following:
 	
   – Audit state tests to ensure there are no irregularities in procedures and/or results. To help prevent irregularities, consider providing intervention and support to teachers to help them integrate authentic adjustments to instruction.
 	
   – Analyze state results by depth of knowledge, complexity, or coverage of items to determine whether gains are meaningful (e.g., instructional practices focused on test-taking strategies might not meaningfully increase depth of knowledge). Consider providing intervention and support to teachers to help them integrate authentic adjustments to instruction.
 	
   – Survey teachers or conduct focus groups to measure perceptions around accountability, including buy-in and responses to accountability results focused on subgroup performance. Consider working with teachers to develop meaningful, realistic approaches to supporting changes in instruction or curricular use.
 	
   – Monitor teacher retention statistics to determine how accountability results might be influencing perceptions around quality of work and what can be done to improve perceptions.	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
Potential next steps (continued): • When evaluating whether TSI and ATSI identification promotes examinations of school needs and improved district support, consider the following: – Evaluate whether school improvement plans reflect accountability results (and, if applicable, the results of local needs assessments). This may require the following: ▪ Providing additional support around reviewing accountability results and conducting/using local needs assessments to drive school improvement plans ▪ Ensuring supports are in place for the identification and selection of EBPs based on subgroup needs and objectives – Review monitoring reports for implementation information and responses of district staff. Results of monitoring reports and response may require the following: ▪ Revisions to promote buy-in at the school-level regarding improvement activities identified in school improvement plans ▪ Revisions to ensure adequate training and resources are in place for successful implementation	
Claim 2 Reflection Prompts	**Claim 2 Response**
Reflecting on your notes above, consider your confidence in responding to the reflection prompts below.	
My state has sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand how stakeholders understand our TSI and ATSI determinations and improvement plans.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address the key questions and can confirm that stakeholder engagement around TSI and ATSI determinations is functioning as intended.	Yes/No

Claim 3: TSI identification and exit criteria reflect meaningful differentiation within and across school classifications.
States differ in their intended rates of identification, degree of differentiation, and prioritization of outcomes. It will be important to ensure that the state's system of AMD serves its intended purpose to differentiate performance, monitor progress, and reflect subgroup expectations based on the performance of the lowest-performing schools. *For each consideration, review the key questions presented and use the key evidence checks to help answer those questions.*
Consideration 3.1: The state's TSI and ATSI identification methodologies can meaningfully detect differences or changes for the lowest-performing subgroups.
Assess Confidence in Operations and Results

Reflection Prompts	Notes
Key questions for the indicator: Are TSI and ATSI and non-TSI and ATSI schools meaningfully differentiated from each other by their current-year performance? How does this differentiation on the state's system of AMD differ over time?	
Why is it important? States should be aware of the performance ranges for schools identified as TSI and ATSI. This can help inform needs assessments, data exploration, and support prioritization, especially when examining schools that are at risk of TSI or ATSI identification.	
Key evidence checks: • For schools identified for TSI and ATSI, compare the range of subgroup composite scores, subgroup dashboard profiles, order of decision rules, results on indicators, or identification-specific data to understand the range of performance for non-identified schools. • For schools identified for TSI and ATSI, examine, for subgroup data, the degree of differences in summative ratings or the range of performance on indicators to those schools at risk of being identified for TSI and ATSI (e.g., 6th–10th percentile subgroup schools). • Determine the relationship over time between TSI and ATSI identification status and subgroup performance (for both summative rating and non-summative rating systems) and summative ratings (in states with summative ratings only).	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
Potential next steps: • Within the set of schools identified for TSI and ATSI, it is helpful to understand the range of performance between the lower and upper bounds of identification. For subgroup data, examining the range of performance overall (for summative rating states) can help in disaggregating TSI and ATSI schools for differentiated support, informing how schools might be grouped for needs assessment, or identifying performance and progress trends overall or among subgroups. • Depending on the state's theory of action, the differences between TSI and ATSI and non-identified TSI and ATSI schools can vary. It will be important to understand differentiated subgroup performance between identified and non-identified schools and on what indicators. For example, TSI and ATSI high schools might have similar growth or achievement gap trends when compared to non-TSI and ATSI schools, but their starting points may be significantly different. Alternatively, TSI and ATSI schools may have very similar historical starting points but have very different improvement rates over time. These comparisons in performance may reflect minor or major differences in particular indicators. • For TSI and ATSI schools, understanding historical trend data can help qualify the magnitude of improvement and progress over time. This can also be used to help schools and districts contextualize performance improvements if they are significant but insufficient to result in meeting exit criteria (as discussed in the next Consideration).	
Consideration 3.2: Exit criteria are calibrated with a level of improvement considered meaningful for indicator scores for subgroups.	
Assess Confidence in Operations and Results	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
Key questions for the indicator: How reasonable are exit criteria when compared to typical changes over time? What triggers or supports are in place that impact ATSI schools cascading into CSI identification?	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
Why is it important? Exit criteria are a major factor in identification and support for TSI and ATSI schools. States determine the exit criteria for ATSI schools, while districts determine the exit criteria, if any, for TSI schools. Determining the reasonableness of exit criteria while still reflecting meaningful and rigorous progress is important to developing a credible state's accountability system that supports continuous improvement.	
Key evidence checks: • Ensure that the intent of exit criteria for ATSI schools is documented, clearly described, and available to schools and the public. • Determine the magnitude and volatility of performance for indicators and summative ratings (if applicable) over time and how those changes compare to the intent of exit criteria. How do expectations differ for different subgroups? • Based on trend, simulated, and updated performance data over time, compare TSI and ATSI subgroup performance to exit criteria to understand the degree to which schools may not exit ATSI status or that ATSI schools cascade into CSI status. • Identify key subgroup performance (e.g., English learners and students with disabilities), evaluate their historical gains, and determine whether ATSI exit criteria can reasonably be met with the use of current objectives or performance expectations. • Determine the degree to which the state's system of AMD and its indicators can reasonably detect subgroup under-performance, in light of overall under-performance.	

Reflection Prompts	Notes

Potential next steps:
 	
• Exit criteria should be framed in a meaningful and accessible way that communicates expectations for improvement against the state's objectives and state's accountability system's theory of action. It may be worth reframing or bolstering communications around the district-driven and support-oriented nature of TSI and ATSI identification and the value of meeting exit criteria for historically under-served student groups.
 	
• Evaluating the rigor versus the reasonableness of exit criteria using historical data, projections, and updated performance can help contextualize school improvement results across the range of ATSI identification. If performance expectations are dramatically unreasonable or reflect unattainable criteria, consider revising exit criteria by doing the following:
 	
  – Evaluating thresholds or cut scores at the indicator level required for exit to reflect meaningful progress
  – Evaluating the number of years of improvement required for exit ATSI status to support additional capacity-building efforts
  – Determining whether there are additional measures of progress for the state's accountability system that might impact the performance of specific subgroups that can be used to supplement changes in high-stakes accountability data to support interpretations
 	
• The use of gap indicators can be an important tool to focus all schools on subgroup progress. For under-performing schools, it may be difficult to detect TSI or ATSI schools because measures and ratings of overall school performance may be lower when compared to systems that do not include a gap indicator. Consider identifying schools that are at risk of TSI or ATSI identification to flag additional subgroup needs.	

Claim 3 Reflection Prompts	Claim 3 Response
Reflecting on your notes above, consider your confidence in responding to the reflection prompts below.	
My state has sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand how our TSI and ATSI exit criteria align with our state objectives.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address the key questions and can confirm the TSI and ATSI exit criteria are functioning as intended.	Yes/No