

## Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA

### Modules 3A–3E: Indicators

Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA), a state’s accountability system must include a minimum number and type of *indicators*, which are the data and information used to measure school performance based on state priorities. The ESEA requires that a state establish five indicators. A school’s performance is rated based on four of these indicators, depending on whether the school is an elementary or middle school or a high school. One of the indicators applies only to schools that are not high schools, and another applies only to high schools. These modules focus on the specific indicators that make up the state’s system of annual meaningful differentiation (AMD):

- A. **Academic achievement indicator**, as measured by proficiency on the annual statewide reading or language arts and mathematics assessments and at the state’s discretion, for each public high school in the state, student growth, as measured by such annual assessments.
- B. **Other academic indicator** for elementary and middle schools that are not high schools that is either a measure of student growth or another valid and reliable statewide measure that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance
- C. **Graduation rate indicator**, as measured by the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR) for high schools and, at a state’s discretion, may include one or more extended-year ACGRs.
- D. **Progress in achieving English-language proficiency (ELP) indicator**, as defined by the state and measured by the state’s statewide ELP assessment.
- E. At least one **school quality or student success (SQSS) indicator** that meaningfully differentiates between schools and is valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide

In **Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD**, you responded to a set of three self-reflection prompts to help describe why decisions were made and how indicators interact within the state’s system of AMD. For each of the following modules (**Modules 3A–3E**), you are invited to take a closer examination of individual indicators by category. You will be asked to specify the following for each indicator in an abbreviated manner (see Table 1 below):

*This module is part of the Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under the ESEA tool, which is designed to help state educational agency (SEA) staff reflect on how the state’s accountability system achieves its intended purposes and build confidence in the state’s accountability system design decisions and implementation activities.*

*Thank you to Juan D’Brot from the National Center for Assessment, Kerstin LeFloch from American Institutes for Research, and David English formerly with American Institutes for Research for their support and contributions to this resource.*

**Table 1. Overview of Modules 3A-3E: Indicators**

Section	What is it?	Why is it important?
Section 1. Articulate the Rationale Behind the Indicator	The opportunity to clearly and concisely describe why the indicator is designed the way it is	To develop a message that can be used for multiple audiences to describe the “what,” “why,” and “how” behind a given indicator
Section 2. Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of the Indicator Rationale	A reflection on whether stakeholders understand the rationale behind the indicator, helping to identify possible areas that may be misinterpreted or misunderstood by the public	Determining what assumptions or design decisions might require more explanation can help minimize the public’s misunderstanding and help prioritize resources to support communication efforts.
Section 3. Assess Confidence in Operations and Results of the Indicator	Based on your state’s rationale and potential risk, the opportunity to examine your state’s level of confidence that design decisions are sound and evidence supports your state’s assumptions for a specific indicator	Determining your state’s confidence in the results and presentation of a specific indicator can help you build confidence across the indicators and help clarify where additional evidence, revisions, or outreach materials can be useful.

## Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA

### Module 3A: Academic Achievement Indicator

Academic achievement is one of the main drivers for assessing school performance under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The academic achievement indicator required under the ESEA measures proficiency on the required annual assessments in ELA and mathematics and can also be referred to as a status, attainment, or point-in-time indicator. Prior to the recent reauthorization of ESEA, academic achievement was typically reported as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient level or higher. Although states are required to report percent proficient, ESEA allows some flexibility in how proficiency is used in state systems of AMD.

This optional module provides an opportunity for a state to further examine its academic achievement indicator.

This module includes three sets of self-reflection prompts that are intended to address the following concepts for the academic achievement indicator within the broader state’s accountability system. These three sets of prompts are not intended to be discrete; instead, they are intended to work together to help your state answer questions in the next sections of this module.

**Table 1. Overview of Module 3A: Academic Achievement Indicator**

Section	What is it?	Why is it important?
Section 1. Articulate the Rationale behind the Academic Achievement Indicator	The opportunity to clearly and concisely describe why the indicator is designed the way it is	To develop a message that can be used for multiple audiences to describe the “what,” “why,” and “how” behind a given indicator.
Section 2. Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of the Academic Achievement Indicator Rationale	A reflection on whether stakeholders understand the rationale behind the indicator, helping to identify possible areas that may be misinterpreted or misunderstood by the public	Determining what assumptions or design decisions might require more explanation can help minimize the public’s misunderstanding and help prioritize resources to support communication efforts.
Section 2. Assess Confidence in Operations and Results of the Academic Achievement Indicator	Based on your state’s rationale and potential risk, the opportunity to examine your state’s level of confidence that design decisions are sound and evidence supports your state’s assumptions for a specific indicator	Determining your state’s confidence in the results and presentation of a specific indicator can help you build confidence across the indicators and help clarify where additional evidence, revisions, or outreach materials can be useful.

## Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA

### Module 3A: Academic Achievement Indicator

#### Section 1. Articulating the Rationale Behind the Academic Achievement Indicator

Consider the following questions regarding the rationale behind how the academic achievement indicator was designed.

**Table 2. Articulate the Rationale Behind the Academic Achievement Indicator**

Articulate the Rationale Behind the Academic Achievement Indicator	
<i>Reflection Questions</i>	<i>Notes</i>
<b>Specific policy objective for the academic achievement indicator:</b> What policy objective does the academic achievement indicator serve? This can be very general and may include ideas about college- or career-readiness expectations, performance over time, or links to other postsecondary data.	
<b>Policy mechanisms or levers:</b> How does the measurement and communication of this indicator support policy objectives? How is your state reducing barriers to use and interpretation of this indicator? Do people understand it? Does it seem important and relevant? Is it easy to use?	
<b>Behavioral intent:</b> What behaviors is your state trying to incentivize through the way in which the academic achievement indicator is operationalized? Are you trying to focus people’s attention on a specific aspect of school performance? Are you highlighting students near and above proficiency? Are you focusing on high grade-level expectations?	
<b>Processes to support indicator:</b> What measures is your state using to calculate the academic achievement indicator? Are there any challenges with calculating, including, or aggregating these measures for the indicator?	

Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA

Module 3A: Academic Achievement Indicator

Section 2. Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of the Academic Achievement Indicator Rationale

In Section 2 of the **Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD**, you were asked to reflect on how well stakeholders perceive and understand how the indicators in the state’s system of AMD interact. You may use these previous reflections and prompts to inform your state’s reflections on how well stakeholders perceive and understand the academic achievement indicator. Review your state’s responses to those questions to prioritize what next steps may be needed in light of your state’s responses to the operations and results questions for the academic achievement indicator.

Table 3. Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of the Academic Achievement Indicator Rationale

Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of the Academic Achievement Indicator Rationale	
Notes	Next Steps

## Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA

### Module 3A: Academic Achievement Indicator

#### Section 3. Confidence in the Operations and Results of the Academic Achievement Indicator

The following self-reflection prompts provide states with the opportunity to consider how the academic achievement is designed, operationalized, and implemented. Please consider your state's responses to **Module 1: Theory of Action**, **Module 2: State's System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation (AMD)**, and **Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State's System of AMD** to inform responses to the following prompts.

Respond to the following prompts to engage in the reflection around the way in which the academic achievement indicator functions:

1. Read the claim, consideration, and potential sources of evidence, then examine the specific evidence available in your state.
2. 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 (a) have 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 members of your SEA.

**Table 4. Confidence in the Operations and Results of the Academic Achievement Indicator**

<b>Claim 1: The academic achievement indicator aligns with the state's overall system theory of action and its policy objectives.</b>	
There are several concepts to consider as you examine the design decisions behind the academic achievement indicator, which might include your state's overall policy objectives, how well the indicator represents performance to grade-level standards, and whether the indicator adheres to the general statutory requirements set forth in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).	
<b>Consideration 1.1: The academic achievement helps to achieve our policy objectives for the state's accountability system.</b>	
<b>Reflection Prompts</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> What type of construct is the academic achievement indicator intended to represent?	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Why is it important?</b> The academic achievement indicator communicates student performance against grade-level expectations across all school levels (including high schools). However, flexibility in the design and operationalization of the academic achievement indicator under ESEA will require a state to consider its intended purpose and the use of this indicator to ensure the indicator meets the state’s policy objectives and aligns with the state’s accountability system’s theory of action.	
<b>Key evidence checks:</b> Determine the type of information the academic achievement indicator is intended to represent. Consider whether this information supports your state’s overall theory of action by focusing on the levels of proficiency, a performance index, or another model to academic achievement as measured by proficiency.	
<b>Potential next steps:</b> The academic achievement indicator may be a very simple or more complex indicator. Depending on the design of the indicator, ensure that the public is aware of how this indicator serves the state’s theory of action and why a focus on proficiency is important to the state’s educational objectives.	
<b>Consideration 1.2:</b> The academic achievement fairly represents the construct as intended.	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent do the measures that comprise the academic achievement (i.e., proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments) represent the construct fairly and without bias?	
<b>Why is it important?</b> Because the academic achievement indicator has a tight focus on school performance in accountability, it is important to determine its design is a fair representation of this construct. The statewide summative assessments required under ESEA Title I are subject to rigorous peer review, which provides substantial evidence of the technical adequacy (i.e., reliability, fairness, and validity) of the measure.	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key evidence checks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine whether schools and districts have an equal opportunity to demonstrate progress (e.g., schools with untested grades, high schools, or very small schools).</li> <li>Identify any potential sources of bias in how data are transformed.</li> </ul>	
<b>Potential next steps:</b> Because the academic achievement indicator is based on statewide assessment that undergo a peer review process, peer review outcomes will identify issues that are associated with validity, reliability, and fairness.	
Claim 1 Reflection Prompts	Claim 1 Response
We have sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand whether the academic achievement indicator aligns with the overall system theory of action and its policy objectives.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address key questions and can confirm the considerations associated with Claim 1 aligns with the overall system theory of action and its policy objectives.	Yes/No

### Claim 2: The academic achievement indicator supports valid and reliable results.

Earlier in **Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State's System of AMD**, you were asked to consider how the weighing of indicators or the order of decision rules affected the differentiation of schools. In this module, we will more deeply examine how well the academic achievement indicator (and its individual measures) support valid and reliable ratings.

*For this claim, consider the following statements, and explore the key questions and evidence suggested.*

**Consideration 2.1:** The measures that comprise the academic achievement indicator can be compared and differentiated appropriately.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> Can the measures (i.e., proficiency on the statewide mathematics assessment and proficiency on the statewide reading assessment) that comprise the academic achievement indicator able to be appropriately compared and combined as a single indicator (as required by assessment peer review)?	



Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> One of the primary uses of indicators is to contribute to an overall state’s system of AMD that differentiates schools in a meaningful way. The characteristics of the indicators have an impact on how the overall system operates. Similarly, the characteristics of measures play a role in how indicators influence the overall state’s system of AMD. It is important to consider how multiple measures are compared and combined as part of the academic achievement indicator.</p>	
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is common to combine measures of mathematics and reading/Language Arts as part of the academic achievement indicator. To support interpretations associated with the indicator, it is important to identify outliers in any of the measures and determine what affect they have on the interpretations before or after transformations, if applicable (e.g., creating an achievement index).</li> <li>• Determine the differences across the assessments used for the academic achievement measures. This may include examining measures of central tendency, shape, skew, and standard deviation among measures that comprise the academic achievement indicator.</li> <li>• Determine whether it is appropriate to standardize or otherwise transform data to support more direct comparisons across measures (e.g., creating an achievement index).</li> </ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When combining measures to create an indicator, outliers can affect interpretations of measures by influencing standardization techniques, comparisons of range, or comparisons of averages. However, outliers can also reflect very high-performing or under-performing schools that should be recognized. Because of the restrictions to what measures can be used for the academic achievement indicator, it will be important to understand how various measures may affect the interpretation of the indicator and how this interpretation affects the overall differentiation of schools.</li> <li>Differences in data characteristics, especially when using an achievement index, are important to consider. If data are standardized in any way (e.g., indexes based on scale scores or thetas), it will be important to determine whether there are any restrictions in available data points or if strong modal or multi-modal characteristics emerge. If combined data are reflecting data characteristics that are difficult to interpret, consider adjusting methods to make data more interpretable or usable. Note that standardizing or transforming data that are typically interpreted as percent-proficient can make interpretations more challenging, especially for the public. Excessive transformations can make data less actionable and should be considered in conjunction with reporting design.</li> </ul>	
<b>Consideration 2.2:</b> The academic achievement indicator itself contributes as intended in the state’s system of AMD.	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent is the academic achievement indicator differentiating schools in the state’s system of AMD as intended?</p>	
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> Other, more global factors should also be considered when evaluating how indicators contribute to the overall state’s system of AMD. The degree of differentiation within and across the indicator is important to consider and should be evaluated.</p>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine the degree to which different measures within the academic achievement indicator contribute to the overall academic achievement indicator result.</li> <li>• Determine how well the indicator meaningfully differentiates schools based on changes in measure results (i.e., the degree to which the measure is malleable).</li> <li>• Determine the relative contribution the academic achievement has on the overall state’s system of AMD and whether this level of contribution is intended.</li> </ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similar to evaluations of the state’s system of AMD earlier in <b>Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation (AMD)</b>, it is important to understand how each measure contributes to the overall result of the academic achievement indicator. Understanding whether mathematics or reading or language arts proficiency rates exhibit more influence on the academic achievement indicator can help explain how improvement in one content area or another can impact school classifications. The relative influence should be compared to the overall theory of action and rationale behind the academic achievement indicator to determine how to best communicate this influence to the public.</li> <li>• Evaluating whether measures support annual meaningful differentiation is more than determining how much measures contribute to the indicator result. It is also important to understand whether results for the measures lead to changes in overall school performance. Academic performance, especially proficiency rates, may change somewhat slowly. It may be important to communicate how the rest of the state’s system of AMD is intended to capture progress toward improving academic performance (e.g., through the other academic indicator or the SQSS indicator).</li> <li>• The relative contribution of the academic achievement indicator when compared to the other indicators in the system was addressed in <b>Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD</b>. In light of the deeper examination of measures and the academic achievement indicator, itself, results from <b>Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD</b> should be revisited to ensure the academic achievement indicator is influencing the state’s system of AMD as intended.</li> </ul>	

Claim 2 Reflection Prompts	Claim 2 Response
We have sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand whether the academic achievement indicator supports valid and reliable school accountability results.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address key questions and can confirm that the considerations associated with Claim 2 support valid and reliable school accountability results.	Yes/No

Claim 3: Data on school performance on the academic achievement indicator provide actionable information for improving instruction.	
<p>The utility and use of data from state’s accountability systems goes beyond evaluating the design and operations of the system. It is important to also consider how stakeholders, educators, and the community intend to use the data. This includes both accountability and related non-accountability data. Although additional data may not directly be part of the state’s accountability system, it is important to think about how other coherent lagging<sup>1</sup> and leading<sup>2</sup> indicators connect to accountability data and the degree to which we should support reporting, provide access (where possible), or raise questions related to those data.</p> <p><i>For this claim, consider the following statements, and explore the key questions and evidence suggested.</i></p>	
Consideration 3.1: Achievement data are useful to the consumers of the state’s accountability system because they represent important signals of school performance.	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are the measures associated with the academic achievement indicator perceived as important signals of school performance?	

<sup>1</sup> Other lagging indicators: These are the data elements that are closely related outcome data, may or may not be appropriate or ready for high-stakes use. These might also include data that are not interpretable until the end of a quarter, semester, trimester, or school year.

<sup>2</sup> Leading indicators: These are the data elements that inform progress against lagging and accountability indicators. They may not be collected at the state level but are important to identify. These may also include more real-time, process-oriented data that reflect day-to-day, week-by-week, or periodic decisions and activities.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> Accountability indicators and reporting are often at risk of being relegated to information that serves a punitive or labeling purpose. It is important to help consumers of the state’s accountability system understand that data reflect important markers of school quality and can be used to set future performance targets linked to more real-time data. Although proficiency is often a referenced data point, classroom educators and principals may feel like it is insufficiently sensitive to reflect changes to instructional practice or curriculum implementation.</p>	
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine whether there is specific-enough framing around the importance, role, and intended use of results for this indicator. If there are guiding principles around how the academic achievement indicator was designed, are they readily available to the public and part of communication strategies.</li> <li>• Identify how the data for the academic achievement indicator should be used for planning and how data should be used to determine future performance targets.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b> Performance on the academic achievement indicator (i.e., proficiency rates) will likely receive a large degree of attention as a high-stakes outcome in accountability. However, it is important to frame how data from the academic achievement indicator reflects and supports the high-level objectives of the educational system and the state’s accountability system’s theory of action. Supplementing or highlight communications, documentation, or access to resources that describe how the academic achievement indicator reflects point-in-time performance through information that is intended to confirm what educators already know about students at the end of the year. Instead of relying on achievement as an informational tool for any particular student, it may be more appropriate to frame it as an information tool for system progress against standards or to help evaluate the implementation of instructional approaches at the school or district level.</p>	

**Consideration 3.2:** Primary users can understand the data reported and results of the academic achievement indicator.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are the data underlying the academic achievement indicator and (and the measures within the indicator) understandable, interpretable, and informative?	
<b>Why is it important?</b> Performance framed as proficiency is a familiar, but potentially misunderstood piece of information. It is important to ensure educators and instructional leaders understand the aggregate and retrospective nature of proficiency and how locally selected and developed assessments can be used to supplement required summative performance data. Further, any transformations (e.g., an achievement index or weighted scores) should be communicated in meaningful and transparent ways.	
<b>Key evidence checks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Examine results for the academic achievement indicator across the state and over time to determine what cut scores, thresholds, or flags within results for the indicator reflect meaningful progress or performance and how these compare to proficiency cuts, if relevant. Determine whether these qualifiers are available to the public and primary consumers of accountability data.</li><li>• Identify the potential stakeholder groups that would be considered the primary actors who use the data. Consider how each of these stakeholders should be interacting with achievement data, and determine whether the information provided is sufficient to support understanding and use. For example, district leaders may need a blend of both state accountability and related district or school data, whereas school leaders may need reports that highlight school-level data with references to why they are relevant to improving accountability-based data.</li><li>• For each of the identified stakeholder groups and users of the state’s accountability system, determine whether there are unique or common data displays, visualizations, or reporting strategies that are useful to examining, interpreting, and acting upon achievement data.</li></ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depending on the presentation of the academic achievement indicator or the way in which it is transformed, it may be important to scaffold access and interpretation of achievement data. If data are transformed, consider developing meaningful cut scores for the academic achievement indicator or its composite indices to help people understand the meaning of performance or progress.</li> <li>Developing meaningful reports and resources is an iterative and resource-intensive process. Depending on the key stakeholders identified, consider reframing, repackaging, or creating additional resources that are targeted to high leverage groups that use accountability data (e.g., district leaders, principles, or school improvement teams) that connect the state summative assessment to other localized sample data (e.g., course grades, engagement measures, progress monitoring data).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Consideration 3.3:</b> Primary users understand how achievement accountability data can be supplemented with other meaningful data to inform continuous improvement practices.</p>	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are results from the academic achievement indicator linked with coherent lagging and leading indicators to support continuous improvement?</p>	



Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> A risk associated with the use of proficiency rates on the statewide summative assessment is that they can be perceived as less relevant by educators and educational leaders than other locally developed assessment data. It is important to help practitioners and educators understand the links between instructional decisions, professional development selection, program implementation, progress indicators, and outcome indicators (both for and beyond high-stakes accountability) and how high-stakes assessment data are a reflection or confirmation of what they already know. In other words, consider what resources or support structures can be put in place not only to help users of the state’s accountability know what to improve but also how they might drive improvement using other local academic performance data.</p>	
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify related outcome data or lagging indicators that can help inform academic progress at the statewide, regionally, or at the district and school levels.</li> <li>• Identify leading indicators and process data that are linked to improvements on the statewide summative assessment based on evidence or research (e.g., indicators of engagement, course access, core course grades, credit acquisition, rates of chronic absenteeism).</li> <li>• Using evidence, determine the links among accountability and other lagging, leading, and process indicators to help consumers draw connections between coherent data. Differentiate these connections by grade span, content area, and outcome type if relevant.</li> <li>• Determine how these different types of information result in different actions for SEA staff, regional staff, district leaders, school principals, and school leadership teams.</li> </ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A state’s theory of action should provide a rationale for each indicator selected for inclusion in the system. This rationale should clarify the actions and initiatives the state believes will be incentivized through the inclusion of the indicator and how those actions will serve to improve performance. The state should articulate the range of actions it believes will move the needle on achievement based on any statewide, systematic, regional, or districtwide initiatives or interventions (e.g., endorsed evidence-based strategies, tiered intervention approaches, curriculum and instruction initiatives).</li> <li>• Connecting evidence across time (i.e., process, leading, and lagging data) can be challenging when users of the state’s accountability system are not aware of all the available data. Consider helping users understand the connection of accountability and related data to process-oriented data that may be associated with program decisions at the school or district level (e.g., intervention selection, curricular programs, progress monitoring, or use of district-developed assessment to refine classroom assessment practices).</li> <li>• In conjunction with state and district school improvement teams, consider embedding examinations of coherent data connections that are differentiated by grade span and data type (e.g., academic data, access to opportunity data, engagement data, course-related data) into school improvement planning processes, data reviews, or district-led school improvement plan reviews, in addition, for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, to the data from the needs assessment on which such schools are required base their support and improvement plans.</li> <li>• Engage in listening or feedback sessions to crowdsource additional ideas or strategies. Consider embedding these into state-supported resources to help engage in systematic capacity-building efforts.</li> </ul>	

Claim 3 Reflection Prompts	Claim 3 Response
We have sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand how data from the academic achievement indicator should be used and how it informs continuous improvement.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address key questions and can confirm the considerations associated with Claim 3.	Yes/No

**Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA**  
**Module 3B: Other Academic Indicator**

Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA), a state’s accountability system must include a valid and reliable “other academic indicator” for elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools beyond the academic achievement indicator. The law requires the other academic indicator include either a measure of student growth or another valid and reliable statewide academic indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation. While challenges exist with these other academic indicators, ranging from accuracy and precision to understandability and access, the familiarity and usefulness of other academic indicators currently used in states may be an important factor in selecting appropriate measures for this category of indicator.

The choice of a particular student growth measure or other measure for the other academic indicator should be based on the objectives stated in the state’s theory of action. Given the potential differences in how these measures can be applied to the state’s system of AMD, it is important that practitioners consider how student growth or other measures serve both the policy and technical objectives of the system, including whether these measures:

- Reflect progress as intended by the selected measures.
- Are robust regarding equity issues, so that they are not unduly influenced by the composition of the students within a school or district.

This optional module includes three sets of self-reflection prompts that are intended to address the following concepts for the other academic indicator. These three sets of prompts 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 3B: Other Academic Indicator**

Section	What is it?	Why is it important?
Section 1. Articulate the Rationale Behind the Other Academic Indicator	The opportunity to clearly and concisely describe why the indicator is designed the way it is	To develop a message that can be used for multiple audiences to describe the “what,” “why,” and “how” behind a given indicator.

Section	What is it?	Why is it important?
Section 2. Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of Other Academic Indicator Rationale	A reflection on whether stakeholders understand the rationale behind the indicator helps identify possible areas that may be misinterpreted or misunderstood by the public	Determining what assumptions or design decisions might require more explanation can help minimize any public misunderstanding and help prioritize resources to support communication efforts.
Section 2. Assess Confidence in Operations and Results of the Other Academic Indicator	Based on your state's rationale and potential risk, the opportunity to examine your state's level of confidence that design decisions are sound and evidence supports your state's assumptions for a specific indicator	Determining your state's confidence in the results and presentation of a specific indicator can help you build confidence across the indicators and help clarify where additional evidence, revisions, or outreach materials can be useful.

## Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA

### Module 3B: Other Academic Indicator

#### Section 1. Articulating the Rationale Behind the Other Academic Indicator

Consider the following questions regarding the rationale behind how the other academic indicator was designed.

**Table 2. Articulate the Rationale Behind the Other Academic Indicator**

Articulate the Rationale Behind the Other Academic Indicator	
<i>Reflection Questions</i>	<i>Notes</i>
<b>Specific policy objective for the other academic indicator:</b> What policy objective does the other academic indicator serve? This will be based in large part on the way the indicator is calculated. This may also be based on whether certain data are intended to balance the status focus of achievement.	
<b>Policy mechanisms or levers:</b> What measures is your state using to calculate the other academic indicator? Are there any challenges with calculating, including, or aggregating measures for the indicator? How is your state helping people understand how to interpret and use data from this indicator?	
<b>Behavioral intent:</b> What behaviors is your state trying to incentivize through the way in which the other academic indicator is operationalized? Are you trying to focus people’s attention on a specific aspect of school performance? How will this be communicated to the public, parents, educators, and community?	
<b>Expected results:</b> For the other academic indicator, what data-based findings or trends do you expect to observe? This may include trend data, challenges associated with changes in programs or policies, or how this indicator is expected to influence the overall state’s system of AMD.	

Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA

Module 3B: Other Academic Indicator

Section 2. Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of the Other Academic Indicator Rationale

In Section 2 of the **Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD**, you were asked to reflect on how well stakeholders perceive and understand how the indicators in the state’s system of AMD interact. You may use these previous reflections and prompts to inform your state’s reflections on how well stakeholders perceive and understand the other academic indicator. Review your state’s responses to those questions to prioritize what next steps may be needed in light of your state’s responses to the operations and results questions for the other academic indicator.

Table 3. Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of the Other Academic Indicator Rationale

Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of the Other Academic Indicator Rationale	
Notes	Next Steps

## Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA

### Module 3B: Other Academic Indicator

#### Section 3. Considering Confidence in the Operations and Results of the Other Academic Indicator

The following reflection prompts provide states with the opportunity to consider how the other academic indicator is designed, operationalized, and implemented. Please consider your state's responses to **Module 1: Theory of Action**, **Module 2: State's System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation (AMD)**, and **Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State's System of AMD** to inform responses to the following prompts.

Respond to the following prompts to engage in the reflection around the way in which the other academic indicator functions:

1. Read the claim, consideration, and potential sources of evidence, then examine the specific evidence available in your state.
2. 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 (a) have 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 members of your SEA.

**Table 4. Confidence in the Operations and Results of the Other Academic Indicator**

Claim 1: The other academic indicator aligns with the overall system theory of action and its policy objectives.	
There are several ideas to consider when examining the design decisions behind the other academic indicator for elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools. These concepts might include overall policy objectives, how well the other academic indicator relates to academic progress, and whether relevant design decisions adhere to the statutory requirements set forth in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA). <i>For this claim, consider the following statements, and explore the key questions and evidence suggested.</i>	
Consideration 1.1: The other academic indicator helps to achieve our policy objectives for the state's accountability system.	
Assess Confidence in Operations and Results	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> What type of construct is the other academic indicator intended to represent?	



Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> The other academic indicator provides states with an opportunity to expand conceptualizations of academic performance. This flexibility requires states to consider intended purpose and use of this indicator to ensure it meets policy objectives and aligns with the state’s accountability system’s theory of action. Please note that states were required to use other academic indicators prior to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) (i.e., under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)); likewise, states were permitted to consider growth in making accountability determinations through the ESEA Flexibility initiative.</p>	
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b> Determine the type of information the other academic indicator is intended to represent. Consider whether this information supports your state’s overall theory of action by focusing on student progress, additional academic areas, or achievement gaps between particular student groups.</p>	
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b> The other academic indicator will vary in its complexity but should supplement the academic achievement indicator and support the state’s educational vision. Depending on how this indicator is designed, ensure that the public is aware of how this indicator serves the state’s theory of action and how a focus on student growth, additional content areas, or closing achievement gaps, for example, facilitates progress toward the state’s educational objectives.</p>	
<p><b>Consideration 1.2:</b> The other academic indicator fairly represents the construct as intended.</p>	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent do the measures that comprise the other academic indicator represent the construct fairly and without bias?</p>	
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> Like the academic achievement indicator, the other academic indicator will have a tight focus on school academic performance in accountability. As a result, it will possibly be a test-based indicator based on the statewide summative assessments.</p>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key evidence checks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine whether schools have an equal opportunity to demonstrate progress.</li> <li>Identify any potential sources of bias in how data are transformed.</li> </ul>	
<b>Potential next steps:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If any other source of data is used for this indicator besides summative assessment data, it will be important to ensure that these measures are fair; can be compared without concerns over quality; are free from bias; and are accessible to students regardless of their age, race/ethnicity, level of English proficiency, disability status, or gender.</li> </ul>	
Claim 1 Reflection Prompts	Claim 1 Response
We have sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand whether the other academic indicator aligns with the overall system theory of action and its policy objectives.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address key questions and can confirm the other academic indicator aligns with the overall system theory of action and its policy objectives.	Yes/No

### Claim 2: The other academic indicator supports valid and reliable school results.

In **Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation (AMD)**, you were asked to consider how the weighting of indicators or the order of decision rules affected the differentiation of schools. In this module, we will more deeply examine how well the other academic indicator for elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools and its composite measures (if applicable) support valid and reliable results.

*For this claim, consider the following statements, and explore the key questions and evidence suggested.*

#### Consideration 2.1: The other academic indicator demonstrates sufficient internal technical quality.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> Do the measures that comprise the other academic indicator demonstrate sufficient internal consistency and reliability related to differentiation?	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> The measures that comprise the other academic indicator will possibly be a test-based measure; The next section will address the impact of any transformations associated with the other academic indicator measures. If the other academic indicator is not based on statewide summative assessments, it is important to ensure that concepts like consistency and reliability are addressed.</p>	
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine the degree to which there is sufficient consistency in the measures used for the other academic indicator.</li> <li>• Determine the whether the level of precision is sufficient for each measure’s application as a tool to differentiate schools.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistency is an important factor to consider because a state’s accountability system relies on the ability of indicators and measures to detect changes over time. If there is a high amount of volatility in a measure across repeated test administrations or other data collections, it can be difficult to determine whether the volatility is due to measure idiosyncrasies, sampling issues, or changes in the construct of interest. The reasons behind volatility (i.e., a lack of consistency) should be identified and addressed. If high volatility/low consistency is a function of factors that affect the interpretation of school performance, it may be necessary to revise the measures that make up the other academic indicator or identify ways to systematize documentation and collection of data to improve consistency.</li> <li>• Measures may differ in the level of precision afforded. Measures that are reduced to a yes/no (e.g., pass/fail) criterion may be less precise than those that provide a range of performance. Evaluating an appropriate level of precision is dependent on the intended interpretations from the measure. This evaluation should be used in conjunction with empirical examinations of differentiation, which are described in the next consideration, to determine whether measurement approaches should be revised or additional measures should be included.</li> </ul>	

**Consideration 2.2:** The measures that comprise the other academic indicator can be compared and differentiate appropriately.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are the measures that comprise the other academic indicator able to be compared and combined as a single indicator?	
<b>Why is it important?</b> One of the primary uses of indicators is to contribute to an overall state’s system of AMD that differentiates schools in a meaningful way. The characteristics of the indicators have an impact on how the overall system operates. Similarly, the characteristics of measures play a role in how indicators influence the overall state’s system of AMD. It is important to consider how multiple measures are compared and combined as part of the other academic indicator.	
<b>Key evidence checks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It is common to combine measures across content areas for measuring student growth and achievement gaps (e.g., reading or language arts and mathematics) or additional areas of content performance (e.g., science and social studies) as part of the other academic indicator for elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools. To support interpretations associated with the indicator, it is important to identify outliers in any of the measures and determine what effect they have on the interpretations before or after transformations, if applicable (e.g., creating an index or reports for the other academic indicator).</li><li>• Determine the differences in data. This may include examining measures of central tendency, shape, skew, and standard deviation among measures that comprise the other academic indicator.</li><li>• Determine whether it is appropriate to standardize or otherwise transform data to support more direct comparisons across measures (e.g., creating a growth index, transition table, or achievement gap).</li></ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When combining measures to create an indicator, outliers can affect interpretations of measures by influencing standardization techniques, comparisons of range, or comparisons of averages. However, outliers can also reflect very high performing or underperforming schools that should be recognized in system development. Because of the types of measures that are typically used for the other academic indicator, it will be important to understand how trends in performance or progress data may affect the interpretation of the indicator and how it affects the overall differentiation of schools.</li> <li>• Differences in data characteristics for measures of student growth or achievement gaps are important to consider. If data are standardized in any way (e.g., indexes based on scale scores or thetas), it will be important to determine whether there are any restrictions in available data points or if strong modal or multi-modal characteristics emerge. If combined data are reflecting data characteristics that are difficult to interpret, consider adjusting methods to make data more interpretable or usable. Note that standardizing or transforming data that are typically interpreted as percent proficient can make interpretations more challenging, especially for the public. Excessive transformations can make data less actionable and should be considered in conjunction with reporting design.</li> <li>• If using a measure of achievement gaps, consider the impact of performance cuts on the statewide standardized assessment can have on the comparison of performance between referent and comparison groups. A small shift in performance cuts can have drastic implications on the size of a gap. Consider examining differences between proficiency-rate gaps, scale-score gaps, growth gaps, area under the curve between groups, or these same metrics to a criterion-referenced target to examine how different metrics can yield very different interpretations for performance comparisons. These evaluation tactics can help determine what achievement gap closing metric is most appropriate for the state's policy and educational objectives.</li> </ul>	

**Consideration 2.3:** The other academic indicator itself is comparable with and contributes as intended in the state’s system of AMD.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are the measures in the other academic indicator differentiating schools in the state’s system of AMD as intended?	
<b>Why is it important?</b> Other, more global factors should also be considered when evaluating how indicators contribute to the overall state’s system of AMD. The degree of differentiation within and across the indicator is important to consider in general and is required by statute.	
<b>Key evidence checks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Determine the degree to which different measures within the other academic indicator contribute to results for the overall indicator.</li><li>• Determine how well the indicator meaningfully differentiates schools based on changes in results on the measure (i.e., the degree to which the measure is malleable).</li><li>• Determine the relative contribution the other academic indicator has on the overall state’s system of AMD and whether this level of contribution is intended.</li></ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similar to evaluations of the state’s system of AMD in <b>Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD</b>, it is important to understand how each measure contributes to the overall other academic indicator rating. Understanding whether student growth, achievement gaps, or other academic measures exhibit more influence on the other academic indicator can help explain how improvement in a content area can impact school results. The relative influence should be compared to the overall theory of action and rationale behind the other academic indicator to determine how to best communicate this influence to the public. In addition, it is important to consider how constricted aggregates of progress or performance within the indicator may influence contribution to the overall indicator and how they should be interpreted (e.g., if student growth in mathematics is more volatile than reading or language arts growth, achievement gaps in mathematics are less pronounced than reading or language arts because mathematics scores are generally lower).</li> <li>• Evaluating whether measures support meaningful differentiation is more than determining how much measures contribute to the indicator result. It is also important to understand whether changes in the measures lead to changes in overall indicator performance. Academic proficiency rates or progress against a transition table, may change somewhat slowly. It may be important to communicate what conditions may be reflected in this indicator of the state’s system of AMD. For example, progress on a transition table may have jumps and pauses due to the nature of student progress on scale scores on an assessment, norm-referenced growth (e.g., student growth percentiles or value-added modeling) may reflect more restricted ranges in aggregate than percent proficiency, or changes in other content areas may be slower/faster depending on the way in which assessments for science and social studies are designed.</li> </ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps (continued):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The relative contribution of the other academic indicator when compared to the other indicators in the system was addressed in <b>Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD</b>. In light of the deeper examination of measures and the other academic indicator itself, results from <b>Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD</b> should be revisited to ensure the other academic indicator is influencing the state’s system of AMD as intended. For example, certain student growth approaches are much less influential than proficiency because of their restricted aggregate ranges (despite their increased volatility year-over-year at the student level) and may require adjustments to policy or empirical weights in the state’s system of AMD.</li> </ul>	
Claim 2 Reflection Prompts	Claim 2 Response
We have sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand whether the other academic indicator supports valid and reliable school results.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address key questions and can confirm the other academic indicator supports valid and reliable school results.	Yes/No



**Claim 3: We have conceptualized how data from the other academic indicator should be used and how they support continuous improvement.**

The utility and use of data from a state’s accountability system goes beyond evaluating the design and operations of the system. It is important to also consider how stakeholders, educators, and the community intend to use the data. This includes both accountability and related non-accountability data. Although additional data may not directly be part of the state’s accountability system, it is important to think about how other coherent lagging<sup>3</sup> and leading<sup>4</sup> indicators connect to accountability data and the degree to which a state should support reporting, provide access (where possible), or raise questions related to those data.

*For this claim, consider the following statements, and explore the key questions and evidence suggested.*

**Consideration 3.1:** Other academic indicator data are useful to the consumers of the state’s accountability system because they represent important signals of school performance.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are the measures associated with the other academic indicator perceived as important and useful?	
<b>Why is it important?</b> Accountability indicators and reporting are often at risk of being relegated to information that serves a punitive or labeling purpose. It is important to help consumers of the state’s accountability system understand that data reflect important markers of school quality and can be used to set future performance targets linked to more real-time data. Although academic growth and achievement gaps are often referenced as data points, classroom educators and principals may feel that they are insufficiently sensitive to reflect changes to instructional practice or curriculum implementation. Academic growth may be perceived as a more sensitive measure of school progress but should also be communicated as a reflection of a point-in-time measure that is intended to better highlight progress toward grade-level expectations.	

<sup>3</sup> Lagging indicators: These are the data elements that are closely related outcome data; they may or may not be appropriate or ready for high-stakes use. These might also include data that are not interpretable until the end of a quarter, semester, trimester, or school year.

<sup>4</sup> Leading indicators: These are the data elements that inform progress against lagging and accountability indicators. They may not be collected at the state level but are important to identify. These data elements also might include more real-time, process-oriented data that reflect day-to-day, week-by-week, or periodic decisions and activities.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine whether there is specific-enough framing around the importance, role, and intended uses of data in this indicator. If there are guiding principles around why the other academic indicator was designed, ensure they are readily available to the public and part of communication strategies.</li> <li>Identify how the data for the other academic indicator should be used for planning and how data should be used to determine future performance targets.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b> Progress and performance measures (e.g., growth or gap) will likely receive a large degree of attention as a high-stakes outcome in accountability. However, it is important to frame how data from the other academic indicator reflects and supports the high-level objectives of the educational system and the state’s accountability system’s theory of action. Consider supplementing or highlighting communications, documentation, or access to resources that describe how the other academic indicator reflects a reconceptualization of point-in-time performance through information that is intended to confirm what educators already know about students at the end of the year. Instead of relying on growth or other performance data as an informational tool for any particular student, it may be more appropriate to frame it as an information tool for system progress against standards or to help evaluate the implementation of instructional approaches at the school level.</p>	
<p><b>Consideration 3.2:</b> Primary users are able to interpret data reported through the other academic indicator.</p>	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are other academic indicator and measure data understandable, interpretable, and informative?</p>	
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> It is important to ensure educators and instructional leaders understand how the other academic indicator and its measures relate to other indicators and performance results and how this indicator reflects state or local priorities.</p>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examine results for the other academic indicator across the state and over time to determine what cut scores, thresholds, or flags within the indicator reflect meaningful progress or performance and how these compare to proficiency cuts, growth observations, or expected growth targets, where relevant. Determine whether these qualifiers are available to the public and primary consumers of accountability data.</li> <li>• Identify the potential stakeholder groups that would be considered the primary actors who use the data. Consider how each of these stakeholders should be interacting with other academic indicator data and determine whether the information provided is sufficient to support understanding and use. For example, district leaders may need a blend of both state accountability and related school data, whereas school leaders may need reports that highlight school-level data with references to why they are relevant to improving accountability-based data.</li> <li>• For each of the identified stakeholder groups and users of the state’s accountability system, determine whether there are unique or common data displays, visualizations, or reporting strategies that are useful to examining, interpreting, and acting upon indicator data such as achievement, growth, or gap data.</li> </ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depending on the presentation of the other academic indicator or the way in which it is transformed, it may be important to scaffold access and interpretation of achievement, growth, or gap data, if relevant. If data are transformed, make sure you have developed meaningful cut scores for the other academic indicator or its composite indices to help people understand the meaning of performance, progress, or gaps.</li> <li>Developing meaningful reports and resources is an iterative and resource-intensive process. Depending on the key stakeholders identified, consider reframing, repackaging, or creating additional resources that are targeted to high-leverage groups that use accountability data (e.g., district leaders, principals, or school improvement teams) that connect the state summative assessment (if applicable) to other localized sample data (e.g., course grades, engagement measures, progress monitoring data).</li> </ul>	
<b>Consideration 3.3:</b> Primary users understand how data from the other academic indicator are connected to other coherent and meaningful data to inform continuous improvement practices.	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are achievement, growth, or gap accountability data (if relevant) linked with coherent lagging and leading indicators to support continuous improvement?</p>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> A risk associated with the statewide summative assessment is that it can be perceived as less relevant by educators and educational leaders than other locally administered or developed assessments data. This is sometimes remedied by using growth data, but even this may be seen as multiple point-in-time data. It is important to help practitioners and educators understand the links between instructional decisions, professional development selection, program implementation, progress indicators, and outcome indicators (both for and beyond high-stakes accountability) and how high-stakes assessment data are a reflection or confirmation of what they already know. In other words, consider what resources or support structures can be put in place to not only to help users of the state’s accountability know what to improve, but also how they might drive improvement using other local academic performance, growth, or gap data.</p>	
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify related outcome data or lagging indicators that can help inform improvement on the other academic indicator that may be available statewide, regionally, or at the district and school levels.</li> <li>• Identify leading indicators and process data that are linked to improvements on the statewide summative assessment based on evidence or research (e.g., indicators of engagement, advanced course access, core course grades, credit acquisition, rates of chronic absenteeism).</li> <li>• Using evidence, determine the links among accountability and other lagging, leading, and process indicators to help consumers draw connections between coherent data. Differentiate these connections by grade span, content area, and outcome type if relevant.</li> <li>• Determine how these different types of information result in different actions for SEA staff, regional staff, district leaders, school principals, and school leadership teams.</li> </ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A state’s theory of action should provide a rationale for each indicator selected for inclusion in the system. This rationale should clarify the actions and initiatives the state believes will be incentivized through the inclusion of the indicator and how those actions will serve to improve performance. States should articulate the range of actions they believe will lead to improved academic achievement based on any statewide, systematic, regional, or districtwide initiatives or interventions (e.g., endorsed evidence-based strategies, tiered intervention approaches, curriculum and instruction initiatives).</li> <li>• Connecting evidence across time (i.e., process, leading, and lagging data) can be challenging when users of the state’s accountability system are not aware of all the available data. Consider helping users understand the connection of accountability and related data to process-oriented data that may be associated with program decisions at the school or district level (e.g., intervention selection, curricular programs, progress monitoring, or use of district-developed assessment to refine classroom assessment practices).</li> <li>• In conjunction with state and district school-improvement teams, consider embedding examinations of coherent data connections that are differentiated by grade span and data type (e.g., academic achievement data, access to opportunity-to-learn data, student and teacher engagement data, course-related data) into school improvement planning processes, data reviews, or district or school-led school improvement and support plan reviews.</li> <li>• Engage in listening or feedback sessions to crowd-source additional ideas or strategies. Consider embedding these into state-supported resources to help engage in systematic capacity-building efforts.</li> </ul>	

Claim 3 Reflection Prompts	Claim 3 Response
We have sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand how data from the other academic indicator should be used and how it informs continuous improvement.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address key questions and can confirm we have conceptualized how data from the other academic indicator should be used and how it supports continuous improvement.	Yes/No

**Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA**  
**Module 3C: Graduation Rate Indicator**

States have some flexibility in how they operationalize the graduation rate indicator for their state accountability systems under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA), but all states must use the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR), and may also use, at their discretion, one or more extended-year ACGRs as the measures for the indicator. The ACGR is calculated as the percent of students in a ninth-grade cohort that graduate with a regular high school diploma in a specified number of years or less (i.e., four-year or, at a state’s discretion, one or more extended years) consistent with the definition of the four and extended year ACGR in ESEA section 8101(25). School graduation rates must be part of the state’s accountability system for high schools that is used for identifying schools for CSI schools (i.e., the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools), TSI schools, and ATSI schools. States must separately identify any school that graduates fewer than 67 percent of its students as CSI.

This optional module provides an opportunity for states to further examine their graduation rate indicator.

This module includes three sets of self-reflection prompts that are intended to address the following concepts for the graduation rate indicator within the broader state’s accountability system. These three sets of prompts are not intended to be discrete; instead, they are intended to work together to help your state answer questions in the next sections of this module.

**Table 1. Overview of Module 3C: Graduation Rate Indicator**

Section	What is it?	Why is it important?
Section 1. Articulate the Rationale Behind the Graduation Rate Indicator	The opportunity to clearly and concisely describe why the indicator is designed the way it is	To develop a message that can be used for multiple audiences to describe the “what,” “why,” and “how” behind a given indicator.
Section 2. Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of the Graduation Rate Indicator Rationale	A reflection on whether stakeholders understand the rationale behind the indicator helps identify possible areas that may be misinterpreted or misunderstood by the public	Determining what assumptions or design decisions might require more explanation can help minimize the public’s misunderstanding and help prioritize resources to support communication efforts.



Section	What is it?	Why is it important?
Section 2. Assess Confidence in Operations and Results of the Graduation Rate Indicator	Based on your state’s rationale and potential risk, the opportunity to examine your state’s level of confidence that design decisions are sound and evidence supports your state’s assumptions for a specific indicator	Determining your state’s confidence in the results and presentation of a specific indicator can help your state build confidence across the indicators and help clarify where additional evidence, revisions, or outreach materials can be useful.

## Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA

### Module 3C: Graduation Rate Indicator

#### Section 1. Articulating the Rationale Behind the Graduation Rate Indicator

Consider the following questions regarding the rationale behind how the graduation rate indicator was designed.

**Table 2. Articulate the Rationale Behind the Graduation Rate Indicator**

Articulate the Rationale behind the Graduation Rate Indicator	
<i>Reflection Questions</i>	<i>Notes</i>
<b>Specific policy objective for the Graduation Rate Indicator:</b> What policy objective does the graduation rate indicator serve? This will be based in large part on the way the indicator is calculated and whether one or more extended year ACGRs are included.	
<b>Policy mechanisms or levers:</b> How does the selection if applicable, of any extended year ACGRs in addition to the four-year rate support policy objectives? How is your state reducing barriers to using and interpreting this indicator? Are there any challenges with calculating, including, or aggregating these measures for the indicator?	
<b>Behavioral intent:</b> What behaviors is your state trying to incentivize through the way in which the graduation rate indicator is operationalized? Are you trying to focus people’s attention on graduating in four years, or on a different timeline? Why might that be? How will this be communicated to the public, parents, educators, and community?	
<b>Expected results:</b> For the graduation rate indicator, what data-based findings or trends do you expect to observe? This may include trend data, challenges associated with changes in programs or policies, or how this indicator is expected to influence the overall state’s system of AMD.	

**Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA**  
**Module 3C: Graduation Rate Indicator**  
**Section 2. Stakeholder Perceptions: Graduation Rate Indicator**

In Section 2 of the **Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State's System of AMD**, you were asked to reflect on how well stakeholders perceive and understand how the indicators in the state's system of AMD interact. You may use these previous reflections and prompts to inform your state's reflections on how well stakeholders perceive and understand the graduation rate indicator. Review your state's responses to those questions to prioritize what next steps may be needed in light of your state's responses to the operations and results questions for the graduation rate indicator.

**Table 3. Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of the Graduation Rate Indicator Rationale**

Review Stakeholder Perceptions Reflections	
Notes	Next Steps

## Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA

### Module 3C: Graduation Rate Indicator

#### Section 3. Confidence in the Operations and Results of the Graduation Rate Indicator

The following self-reflection prompts provide states with the opportunity to consider how the graduation rate indicator is designed, operationalized, and implemented. Please consider your state’s responses to **Module 1: Theory of Action**, **Module 2: State’s System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation (AMD)**, and **Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD** to inform responses to the following prompts.

Respond to the following prompts to engage in the reflection around the way in which the graduation rate indicator functions:

1. Read the claim, consideration, and potential sources of evidence, then examine the specific evidence available in your state.
2. 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 (a) have 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 members of your SEA.

**Table 4. Confidence in the Operations and Results of the Graduation Rate Indicator**

<b>Claim 1: The graduation rate indicator aligns with the overall system theory of action and its policy objectives.</b>	
There are several ideas we should consider as we examine the design decisions behind the graduation rate indicator. These concepts might include the state’s overall policy objectives, how well it represents achievement of grade-level academic content standards, and whether it adheres to the general statutory requirements set forth in the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).	
<i>For this claim, consider the following statements, and explore the key questions and evidence suggested.</i>	
<b>Consideration 1.1: The graduation rate indicator helps to achieve our policy objectives for the state’s accountability system.</b>	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> What type of construct is the graduation rate indicator intended to represent, given how the state calculates the indicator?	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Why is it important?</b> The graduation rate allows the state to communicate different value statements around ensuring students have met K–12 expectations under different time frames using four-year and extended year adjusted cohort graduation rates (ACGR)s.	
<b>Key evidence checks:</b> Determine the value principles and communication supports that are aligned with your state’s conceptualization of the graduation rate indicator. Consider whether the way in which you are reporting, describing, and communicating about this measure supports your state’s overall theory of action.	
<b>Potential next steps:</b> The graduation rate indicator uses the ACGR and is likely familiar to educators but may require additional communication to the public. If your state has defined its graduation rate indicator as something other than simply the four-year ACGR (e.g., including an extended year rate), determine how the design of the indicator serves the state’s theory of action.	
Claim 1 Reflection Prompts	Claim 1 Response
We have sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand whether the graduation rate indicator aligns with the overall system theory of action and its policy objectives.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address key questions and can confirm the graduation rate indicator aligns with the overall system theory of action and its policy objectives.	Yes/No

### Claim 2: The graduation rate indicator supports valid and reliable school results.

In **Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD**, you were asked to consider how the weighing of indicators or the order of decision rules affected the differentiation of schools. In this module, we will more deeply examine how well the graduation rate indicator supports valid and reliable results.

*For this claim, consider the following statements, and explore the key questions and evidence suggested.*

**Consideration 2.1:** The measures that comprise the graduation rate indicator can be compared and differentiated appropriately.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are the measures that comprise the graduation rate indicator (i.e., the four-year and, at the State's discretion, one or more extended-year ACGRs) able to be compared and combined as a single indicator?	
<b>Why is it important?</b> One of the primary uses of indicators is to contribute to an overall state's system of AMD that differentiates schools in a meaningful way. The characteristics of the indicators have an impact on how the overall system operates. Similarly, the characteristics of measures play a role in how indicators influence the overall state's system of AMD. Consider how multiple measures are compared and combined as part of the graduation rate indicator (i.e., how to combine four-year and extended-year ACGRs). Some states use one or more extended-year ACGRs in addition to the four-year ACGR. When using multiple rates, it is important to determine whether the indicator reflects a state's preference to match based on year of entry (i.e., if four-year and extended-year ACGRs are based on the year in which students enter 9 <sup>th</sup> grade, making the ACGRs directly comparable) or year of exit (i.e., if four-year and extended-year ACGRs are reporting in the same year, which requires the use of different 9 <sup>th</sup> grade cohorts, making these less comparable).	
<b>Key evidence checks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identify data characteristics, outliers, and trends in any of the ACGRs and determine how to interpret the different time frames and rates.</li><li>• Consider how different ACGRs were combined and determine whether these design decisions support the state's theory of action (e.g., weighting the four-year ACGR more heavily than extended-year ACGRs or weighting four-year and extended-year ACGRs equally).</li></ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depending on how states combine four-year and extended AGCRs, data characteristics, outliers, and trends will need to be interpreted differently. Ensure that educators and the public understand how different ACGRs are being used and how to best interpret results and compare those interpretations.</li> <li>When combining measures to create an indicator, the weight of each measure can affect interpretations of measures by influencing ranges, averages, and interpretations. Consider how different combinations or presentation in the ACGRs might affect the interpretation of the indicator and how it differentiates schools. Develop additional talking points, communications, or data exploration resources to help educators and educational leaders plan using these data.</li> </ul>	
<b>Consideration 2.2:</b> The graduation rate indicator itself is comparable with and contributes as intended in the state’s system of AMD.	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are the graduation rate measures (i.e., four-year ACGR and, at the state’s discretion, one or more extended-year ACGRs) and graduation rate indicator differentiating schools in the state’s system of AMD as intended?</p>	
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> Other, more global factors should also be considered when evaluating how indicators contribute to the overall state’s system of AMD. The degree of differentiation within and across the indicator is important to consider and should be evaluated.</p>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine the degree to which the four-year ACGR and any extended-year ACGRs, if applicable, contribute to the overall graduation rate indicator results. Variability may increase or decrease with the use of extended-year ACGRs and their level of influence on the overall indicator should be evaluated.</li> <li>• Determine how well the indicator detects changes in graduation rates. This is a key evaluation step if there have been combinations or transformations to the measures to create an overall indicator score.</li> <li>• Determine the relative contribution the graduation rate Indicator has on the overall state’s system of AMD, whether this level of contribution is intended, and how it compares to the policy weight or order in decision rules.</li> </ul>	



Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similar to evaluations of the state’s system of AMD in <b>Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD</b>, it is important understand how each ACGR, if a state chooses to incorporate one or more extended-year ACGR, contributes to the overall graduation rate indicator. Understanding which ACGR exhibits more influence can help interpretations around how the graduation rate indicator impacts school accountability determinations, including identifications. The relative influence should be compared to the overall theory of action and rationale behind the graduation rate indicator to determine how to best communicate this influence to the public. Note that the requirement to use solely the ACGR to identify CSI-low graduation rate high schools means that there is a level of predetermined impact on the level of influence of this indicator for high schools.</li> <li>• The relative contribution of the graduation rate indicator when compared to the other indicators in the state’s system of AMD was addressed in <b>Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD</b>. In light of the deeper examination of measures and the graduation rate indicator itself, results from <b>Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD</b> should be revisited to ensure the graduation rate indicator is influencing the state’s system of AMD as intended (aside from CSI identification).</li> </ul>	
Claim 2 Reflection Prompts	Claim 2 Response
We have sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand whether the graduation rate indicator supports valid and reliable school results.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address key questions and can confirm the graduation rate indicator supports valid and reliable school results.	Yes/No

**Claim 3: We have conceptualized how data from the graduation rate indicator should be used and how the data support continuous improvement.**

The utility and use of data from a state’s accountability system goes beyond evaluating the design and operations of the system. It is important to also consider how stakeholders, educators, and the community intend to use the data. This includes both accountability and related non-accountability data. While additional data may not directly be part of the state’s accountability system, it is important to think about how other coherent lagging<sup>5</sup> and leading<sup>6</sup> indicators connect to accountability data and the degree to which we should support reporting, provide access (where possible), or raise questions related to those data.

*For this claim, consider the following statements, and explore the key questions and evidence suggested.*

**Consideration 3.1:** Graduation rate indicator data are useful to the consumers of the state’s accountability system because they represent important signals of school performance.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are the four-year and any extended-year ACGR measures associated with the graduation rate indicator perceived as important and useful?	
<b>Why is it important?</b> Accountability indicators and reporting can be relegated to information that serves a punitive or labeling purpose. It is important to help consumers of the state’s accountability system understand that data reflect important markers of school quality and can be used to set future performance targets linked to more real-time data. Graduation rates may be less susceptible to this challenge because they are often referenced as the end objective for K–12 education and the citation of early warning indicators begins in the early grades (e.g., access to pre-K, early childhood readiness, literacy in Grade 3, numeracy in Grade 8). Despite its significance, meeting graduation criteria can feel very distal, and it can be challenging to link changes to instructional practice or intervention implementation to improvements in graduation rates.	

<sup>5</sup> Lagging indicators: These are the data elements that are closely related outcome data; they may or may not be appropriate or ready for high-stakes use. These might also include data that are not interpretable until the end of a quarter, semester, trimester, or school year.

<sup>6</sup> Leading indicators: These are the data elements that inform progress against lagging and accountability indicators. They may not be collected at the state level but are important to identify. These data elements also might include more real-time, process-oriented data that reflect day-to-day, week-by-week, or periodic decisions and activities.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine whether there is specific-enough framing around the importance, role, and intended use of data in this indicator. If there are guiding principles around why the graduation rate indicator was designed, ensure they are readily available to the public and part of communication strategies.</li> <li>Identify how the data for the graduation rate indicator should be used for planning and how data should be used to determine future performance targets.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b> Performance on graduation rate indicator (i.e., ACGRs) will likely receive a large degree of attention a high-stakes outcome in accountability. However, it is important to frame how data from the graduation rate indicator reflects and supports the high-level objectives of the educational system and the state’s accountability system’s theory of action. Consider supplementing or highlighting communications, documentation, or access to resources that describe how the graduation rate indicator reflects a culmination of educational experiences that begin even before students enroll and how even incremental changes in policies, programs, or instruction can promote progress toward graduation. In addition, support the public and educators in understanding how graduation rate trend data can be used as an information tool for system progress against challenging education standards that, depending on state context, continue to increase.</p>	
<b>Consideration 3.2:</b> Primary users are able to interpret data reported through the graduation rate indicator.	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are graduation rate indicator and measure data understandable, interpretable, and informative?</p>	
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> Performance framed as graduation rates are familiar and frequently cited pieces of information, but can be perceived as punitive rather than constructive. It is important to ensure educators and instructional leaders understand how to interpret graduation rate data and the graduation rate indicator.</p>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examine the graduation rate indicator across the state and over time to determine what cut scores, thresholds, or flags within the indicator reflect meaningful progress or performance and how these compare to other academic data (e.g., proficiency cuts, academic progress, SQSS data). Determine whether these qualifiers are available to the public and primary consumers of accountability data.</li> <li>• Identify the potential stakeholder groups that would be considered the primary actors who use the data. Consider how each of these stakeholders should be interacting with graduation rate data and determine whether the information provided is sufficient to support understanding and use. For example, district leaders may need a blend of both state accountability and related school data, whereas school leaders may need reports that highlight school-level data with references to why they are relevant to improving accountability-based data.</li> <li>• For each of the identified stakeholder groups and users of the state’s accountability, determine whether there are unique or common data displays, visualizations, or reporting strategies that are useful to examining, interpreting, and acting upon graduation rate data.</li> </ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depending on the presentation of the graduation rate indicator or the way in which it is transformed, it may be important to scaffold access and interpretation of graduation rates. If data are transformed, consider developing meaningful cut scores for the graduation rate indicator or its composite indices to help people understand the meaning of performance or progress.</li> <li>Developing meaningful reports and resources is an iterative and resource-intensive process. Depending on the key stakeholders identified, consider reframing, repackaging, or creating additional resources that are targeted to high leverage groups that use accountability data (e.g., district leaders, principals, or school improvement teams) that connect the graduation rate data to other, more frequent indicators of school and student performance (e.g., assessment, progress, access to educational opportunities, course grades, engagement measures, progress monitoring data).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Consideration 3.3:</b> Primary users understand how graduation rate accountability data are connected to other coherent and meaningful data to inform continuous improvement practices.</p>	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are graduation rate accountability data linked with coherent lagging and leading indicators to support continuous improvement?</p>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> A risk associated with graduation rate data is that it can be perceived as data that reflect a “self-fulfilling prophecy” for struggling or underserved schools or students. It is important to help practitioners and educators understand the links between more frequent instructional decisions, professional development selection, program implementation, progress indicators, and outcome indicators (both for and beyond high-stakes accountability) to changes in graduation rates. For example, despite graduation rates being retrospective data, they are delayed markers of success that reflect systematic changes in policy and practice. Graduation-rate data should be linked coherently to more proximal data (e.g., achievement data, academic progress, and decisions that improve those outcomes) to keep it relevant and perceived as malleable.</p> <p>In other words, consider what resources or support structures can be put in place to not only to help users of the state’s accountability know how to recognize improvement on the graduation rate indicator, but also how they might drive improvement using other local academic performance, academic progress, and school quality data.</p>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify related outcome data or lagging indicators that can help inform progress against the graduation rate indicator that may be available statewide, regionally, or at the district and school levels.</li> <li>• Identify leading indicators and process data that are linked to improvements on the statewide summative assessment based on evidence or research (e.g., indicators of student and teacher engagement, advanced course access, core course grades, credit acquisition, rates of chronic absenteeism) and draw connections for how these are related to changes in graduation rates over time.</li> <li>• Using evidence, determine the links among accountability and other lagging, leading, and process indicators to help consumers draw connections between coherent data. Differentiate these connections by grade span, content area, and outcome type if relevant.</li> <li>• Determine how these different types of information result in different actions for SEA staff, regional staff, district leaders, school principals, and school leadership teams.</li> </ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A state’s theory of action should provide a rationale for each indicator selected for inclusion in the system. This rationale should clarify the actions and initiatives the state believes will be incentivized through the inclusion of the indicator and how those actions will serve to improve performance. States should articulate the range of actions they believe will contribute to improved academic achievement based on any statewide, systematic, regional, or districtwide initiatives or interventions (e.g., endorsed evidence-based strategies, tiered intervention approaches, curriculum and instruction initiatives). In the case of graduation rate data, it may be important to highlight how this represents a very distal measure, but that it also represents the culmination of a student’s K–12 educational expectations as defined by the state.</li> <li>• Connecting evidence across time (i.e., process, leading, and lagging data) can be challenging when users of the state’s accountability are not aware of all the available data. Consider helping users of the state’s accountability understand the connection of accountability and related data to process-oriented data that may be associated with program decisions at the school or district level (e.g., intervention selection, curricular programs, progress monitoring, or use of district-developed assessment to refine classroom assessment practices). Drawing a bright line between the smaller decisions and actions that accumulate in achieving objectives set by states and districts to graduation requirements can help maintain the relevance of graduation-rate requirements in early grades.</li> <li>• In conjunction with state and district school improvement teams, consider embedding examinations of coherent data connections that are differentiated by grade span and data type (e.g., academic achievement data, access to opportunity data, student and teacher engagement data, course-related data) into school-improvement planning processes, data reviews, or district-led school improvement plan reviews.</li> <li>• Engage in listening or feedback sessions to crowd-source additional ideas or strategies. Consider embedding these into state-supported resources to help engage in systematic capacity-building efforts.</li> </ul>	



Claim 3 Reflection Prompts	Claim 3 Response
We have sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand how data from the graduation rate indicator should be used and how they inform continuous improvement.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address key questions and can confirm we have conceptualized how data from the graduation rate indicator should be used and how they support continuous improvement.	Yes/No

**Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA**  
**Module 3D: Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) Indicator**

Progress in achieving English language proficiency (ELP) is a new Title I accountability indicator under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA). Previously required under Title III, moving this requirement to Title I has facilitated a more widespread focus on supporting students as they make progress toward achieving ELP. Under ESEA, a state has the flexibility to determine the definition of English proficiency, its statewide ELP assessment, and how ELP progress is included in its system of AMD. However, all states must include a Progress in Achieving ELP indicator for all schools, given they meet inclusion requirements (i.e., minimum subgroup size).

There are various policy and technical issues that will need to be addressed as a state’s accountability system matures, which include how student ELP progress is being calculated, how school-level ELP progress is aggregated, and how it is included in the state’s accountability system to not privilege or penalize schools based on the demographic characteristics of the school (i.e., the population of ELs relative to other subgroups of students). Given that the populations of English learners (ELs) are not randomly distributed across school districts in states, thoughtful design work is needed to minimize unintended consequences.

This module includes three sets of self-reflection prompts intended to address the following concepts for the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator within the broader accountability system. These three sets of prompts 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 3D: Progress in Achieving ELP Indicator**

Section	What is it?	Why is it important?
Section 1. Articulate the Rationale Behind the Indicator	The opportunity to clearly and concisely describe why the indicator is designed the way it is	To develop a message that can be used for multiple audiences to describe the “what,” “why,” and “how” behind a given indicator.
Section 2. Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of Rationale	A reflection on whether stakeholders understand the rationale behind the indicator helps identify possible areas that may be misinterpreted or misunderstood by the public	Determining what assumptions or design decisions might require more explanation can help minimize the public’s misunderstanding and help prioritize resources to support communication efforts.

Section	What is it?	Why is it important?
Section 2. Assess Confidence in Operations and Results	Based on your state’s rationale and potential risk, the opportunity to examine your state’s level of confidence that design decisions are sound and evidence supports your state’s assumptions for a specific indicator	Determining your state’s confidence in the results and presentation of a specific indicator can help you build confidence across the indicators and help clarify where additional evidence, revisions, or outreach materials can be useful.

**Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA**  
**Module 3D: Progress in Achieving English-Language Proficiency (ELP) Indicator**  
**Section 1. Articulating the Rationale Behind the Progress in Achieving ELP Indicator**

Consider the following questions regarding the rationale behind how the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator was designed.

**Table 2. Articulate the Rationale Behind the Progress in Achieving ELP Indicator**

<b>Articulate the Rationale Behind the Progress in Achieving ELP Indicator</b>	
<i>Reflection Questions</i>	<i>Notes</i>
<b>Specific policy objective for the Progress in Achieving ELP Indicator:</b> What policy objective does the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator serve? This will be based in large part on how progress is calculated, and how it is included in the state's system of AMD.	
<b>Policy mechanisms or levers:</b> Are there any challenges with calculating, including, or aggregating progress measures for the indicator? These will be based in large part on the way this is calculated and how starting point, EL demographic characteristics, and how time to reclassification are conceptualized.	
<b>Behavioral intent:</b> What behaviors is your state trying to incentivize through the way in which the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator is designed? For example, is your state trying to focus people's attention on time to reclassification or on a reasonable expectation for students based on their age and ELP level? Why might that be? How will this be communicated to the public, parents, educators, and community?	
<b>Expected results:</b> For the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator, what data-based findings or trends do you expect to observe? This may include trend data, challenges associated with changes in programs or policies, or how this indicator is expected to influence the overall state's system of AMD.	

**Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA**  
**Module 3D: Progress in Achieving English-Language Proficiency (ELP) Indicator**  
**Section 2. Stakeholder Perceptions: Progress in Achieving ELP Indicator**

In Section 2 of the **Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD**, you were asked to reflect on how well stakeholders perceive and understand how the indicators in the state’s system of AMD interact. You may use these previous reflections and prompts to inform your state’s reflections on how well stakeholders perceive and understand the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator. Review your state’s responses to those questions to prioritize what next steps may be needed in light of your state’s responses to the operations and results questions for the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator.

**Table 3. Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of the Progress in Achieving ELP Indicator Rationale**

Review Stakeholder Perceptions Reflections	
Notes	Next Steps

**Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA**  
**Module 3D: Progress in Achieving English-Language Proficiency (ELP) Indicator**  
**Section 3. Confidence in the Operations and Results of the Progress in Achieving ELP Indicator**

The following self-reflection prompts provide states with the opportunity to consider how the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator is designed, operationalized, and implemented. Please consider your state’s responses to **Module 1: Theory of Action**, **Module 2: State’s System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation (AMD)**, and **Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD** to inform responses to the following prompts.

Respond to the following prompts to engage in the reflection around the way in which the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator functions:

1. Read the claim, consideration, and potential sources of evidence, then examine the specific evidence available in your state.
2. 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 (a) have 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 members of your SEA.

**Table 4. Confidence in the Operations and Results of the Progress in Achieving ELP Indicator**

<b>Claim 1: The Progress in Achieving ELP indicator aligns with the overall system theory of action and its policy objectives.</b>	
<p>The Progress in Achieving ELP indicator is highly dependent on the state’s theory of action and its conceptualization of ELP progress. Specifically, the state should be able to clearly articulate what schools should be held accountable for regarding EL progress in achieving ELP. By specifying that progress (i.e., progress and, at the state’s discretion, achievement of ELP) is meaningfully being measured to differentiate whether students have achieved or are on track to achieve ELP, states can better equip districts and schools to identify where additional resources may be necessary to support English language-acquisition programs.</p> <p><i>For this claim, consider the following statements, and explore the key questions and evidence suggested.</i></p>	
<b>Consideration 1.1: The Progress in Achieving ELP indicator helps to achieve our policy objectives for the state’s accountability system.</b>	
<b>Reflection Prompts</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> What is the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator intended to represent?	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> The Progress in Achieving ELP progress indicator is a new requirement for states under Title I but may be informed by the theory of action that was in place through the specification of Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) under required under Title III of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. AMAOs were used to hold school districts accountable for progress, status, and academic achievement of ELs. Several considerations should be made when considering the design of the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator that are a function of expectations for ELP development, acquisition, and expectations set by the state.</p>	
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine that ELP standards are available and understood by the public and educators. In addition to the ELP standards, ensure clear expectations are available for schools and districts regarding policies, programs, and support to help ELs attain ELP.</li> <li>• Ensure you have compiled evidence for a defensible trajectory of English development and time-to-proficiency that includes considerations of individual student characteristics as appropriate.</li> <li>• Ensure that expectations for students for exiting ELP status are evidence-based and reflected in policy and practice. This should include program factors that influence progress, time-to-EL-proficiency, and the appropriateness of the ELP assessment.</li> </ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design, development, and implementation of the ELP standards help communicate expectations around program implementation, monitoring, and support. Consider aligning communications and support around the ELP standards to state expectations in the state’s system of AMD.</li> <li>• The trajectory of English language development will be based in part on the student characteristics included in evaluations of student progress, the measure of ELP, and the stringency of the ELP target. Although the ELP assessment is a reflection of the ELP standards, it is important to understand the degree to which EL progress reflects average, attainable, or exceptional expectations for students and schools.</li> <li>• The Progress in Achieving ELP indicator will be heavily influenced by the characteristics of the ELP assessment. Ensure that any ELP assessment peer-review feedback is incorporated and that stakeholders understand the interpretations associated with ELP assessment results.</li> </ul>	
<b>Consideration 1.2:</b> The Progress in Achieving ELP indicator fairly represents the construct as intended.	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent do the measures (i.e., progress and, at the state’s discretion, achievement of ELP) that comprise the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator represent the construct of ELP and progress toward it fairly and without bias?</p>	
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> There are many nuanced considerations embedded within the conceptualization of the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator. Because the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator expands conceptualizations of accountability for school performance under ESEA Title I to include English-language acquisition, it is important to determine whether the ELP assessment and the indicator do so fairly and appropriately. Using the ELP assessment, it is important to determine how progress is determined, the appropriateness of expectations, and how progress is modeled.</p>	



Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that the state context is sufficiently reflected in the design of the indicator.</li> <li>• Determine whether EL status exit criteria are statewide and objective.</li> <li>• Ensure that the model selected to reflect growth of EL students reflects ELP progress as intended.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State context is an important factor in Progress in Achieving ELP indicator design because of the demographic differences within and across states. Understanding the number of ELs, the proportion of ELs by location and programmatic level, the characteristics by grade, and English language development characteristics of students at entry is critical to specifying the requirements for schools and districts in supporting ELP and progress.</li> <li>• Despite the variable timeline to achieving ELP set by states, shorter timelines will demand greater amounts of progress for ELs. States should examine the timelines based on historical data to reflect sufficiently realistic timelines that still reflect meaningful improvement for students and schools that do not extend too far into the future. States should compare their specified timelines with empirical considerations and recommendations presented in the literature to determine whether their timelines and included student characteristics are appropriate.</li> <li>• The interpretation of Progress in Achieving ELP indicator data are dependent on the types of models selected for calculating the indicator and whether those models approximate observed ELP progress sufficiently. It is important to ensure that the progress model actually reflects progress (i.e., is not solely based on ELP attainment) and that expectations are attainable and meaningful. It is also important to determine whether the inclusion of student characteristics in determining growth targets can and should be included (e.g., possible for value-added models but not simple gain models) and determine the influence categorical variables (e.g., initial English-language development level, grade of entry) should have on the model trajectories.</li> </ul>	

Claim 1 Reflection Prompts	Claim 1 Response
We have sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand whether the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator aligns with the overall system theory of action and its policy objectives.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address key questions and can confirm the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator aligns with the overall system theory of action and its policy objectives.	Yes/No

### Claim 2: The Progress in Achieving ELP indicator supports valid and reliable school results.<sup>7</sup>

In **Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State's System of AMD**, you were asked to consider how the weighting of indicators or the order of decision rules affected the differentiation of schools. In this module, we will more deeply examine how well the Progress in Achieving supports valid, fair, and reliable ratings by assessing the technical qualities specific to the Progress in Achieving.

*For this claim, consider the following statements, and explore the key questions and evidence suggested.*

**Consideration 2.1:** Technical considerations specific to the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator have been addressed.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent have relevant technical design decisions and characteristics associated with the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator been addressed?	
<b>Why is it important?</b> One of the primary uses of indicators is to contribute to an overall state's system of AMD that differentiates schools in a meaningful way. The characteristics of the indicators have an impact on how the overall system operates. The Progress in Achieving ELP indicator includes several unique considerations associated with the ELP assessment and the EL population that are important to explore. This helps evaluate the degree to which the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator influenced the overall state's system of AMD appropriately.	

<sup>7</sup> For more information, see the *State Approaches to Incorporating English Learners Into Title I Accountability Systems* resource from the State Support Network. Please 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.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The minimum number of students for accountability is relevant to all indicators but has particular ramifications on how the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator is examined and used. Ensure that the threshold for minimum number of students is supporting the theory of action and the state’s system of AMD’s policy objectives.</li> <li>• Evaluate and determine the reliability of the indicator at the school level to support objectives for differentiation.</li> <li>• Evaluate the stability of Progress in Achieving performance over time to determine how much variability it demonstrates and how much variability it contributes to overall classifications.</li> </ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The minimum number of students threshold has implications with regard to how schools interpret their level of accountability to demonstrate EL progress. In addition, the specification of the minimum number of students for EL students has direct impact on the school-level indicator reliability and on calculations of ELP progress. Consider examining minimum number of students rules in light of Progress in Achieving ELP indicator constraints (e.g., more complex progress models require more historical data), objectives for supporting schools and districts with EL programs, the role of multi-year aggregation rules, or in light of the system’s objectives for accountability to evaluate whether minimum number of students decisions are supporting statistically sound indicator and accountability calculations.</li> <li>• The reliability of the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator at the school level will be related to the minimum number of students, which is relevant for any indicator. However, reliability and stability should be examined in conjunction with one another. A more-reliable and more-stable indicator will almost always be more defensible than a less-reliable and less-stable indicator. However, any changes to business rules or calculations must be weighed against policy objectives, capacity constraints, and interpretation of the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator.</li> <li>• The amount of stability (e.g., consistency of classification of results over time; correlation over time) at the indicator level can help detect substantive changes in school performance over time. The amount of stability in the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator or system overall is dependent on the technical characteristics of the data, the number of performance categories that are defined, and the specified minimum number of students. Evaluating the stability over time will help identify meaningful changes in school and performance on the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator when compared to typical fluctuations.</li> </ul>	

**Consideration 2.2:** The Progress in Achieving ELP indicator itself is comparable with and contributes as intended within the state’s system of AMD.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent is the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator contributing to differentiating schools in the state’s system of AMD as intended?	
<b>Why is it important?</b> Other, more global factors should also be considered when evaluating how indicators contribute to the overall state’s system of AMD. The degree of differentiation within and across the indicator is important to consider and should be evaluated.	
<b>Key evidence checks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine the degree to which different measures (i.e., progress and, at the state’s discretion, achievement of ELP) within the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator contribute to the overall Progress in Achieving ELP indicator score.</li> <li>• Determine how well the indicator meaningfully differentiates schools based on changes in progress results (i.e., the degree to which the measure is malleable).</li> <li>• Determine the relative contribution the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator has on the overall state’s system of AMD and whether this level of contribution is intended. This should be compared to cases where the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator is not applicable due to specifications for minimum number of students.</li> </ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similar to evaluations of the state’s system of AMD in <b>Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD</b>, it is important understand how each measure contributes to the overall result of the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator. If multiple measures are used (i.e., progress and, at the state’s discretion, achievement of ELP), it is important to understand which measures have greater influence on the result of the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator. In addition, it may be important to determine the likelihood of combined probabilities of different conditions (i.e., progress and attainment) to identify any unintended negative consequences of the indicator’s design.</li> <li>• Evaluating whether measures support meaningful differentiation is more than determining how much measures contribute to the indicator score. It is also important to understand whether changes in the measures lead to changes in overall indicator performance. If the indicator is insensitive to changes in ELP progress or ELP attainment, improvement will not be detected in overall school results. This should be compared to the rationale behind the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator to determine what, if any, revisions should be made.</li> <li>• The relative contribution of the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator when compared to the other indicators in the system was only partially addressed in <b>Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD</b>. In light of the deeper examination of the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator, it is particularly important to understand how the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator impacts schools that exceed the minimum number of students of ELs compared to those that do not. Results comparing different minimum number of students, comparing the presence and absence of EL subgroups, and stability comparisons should be examined to ensure school differentiation is defensible.</li> </ul>	

Claim 2 Reflection Prompts	Claim 2 Response
We have sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand whether the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator supports valid and reliable school results.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address key questions and can confirm the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator supports valid and reliable school results.	Yes/No

**Claim 3: We have conceptualized how data from the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator should be used and how it supports continuous improvement.**

The utility and use of data from a state’s accountability system goes beyond evaluating the design and operations of the system. It is important to also consider how stakeholders, educators, and the community intend to use the data. This includes both accountability and related non-accountability data. While additional data may not directly be part of the state’s accountability system, it is important to think about how other coherent lagging<sup>8</sup> and leading<sup>9</sup> indicators connect to accountability data and the degree to which we should support reporting, provide access (where possible), or raise questions related to those data.

*For this claim, consider the following statements, and explore the key questions and evidence suggested.*

**Consideration 3.1:** Progress in Achieving ELP indicator data are useful to the consumers of the state’s accountability system because they represent important signals of school performance.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are the measures included in the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator (i.e., progress in achieving ELP and, at the state’s discretion, attainment of ELP) perceived as important and useful?	

<sup>8</sup> Lagging indicators: These are the data elements that are closely related outcome data; they may or may not be appropriate or ready for high-stakes use. These might also include data that are not interpretable until the end of a quarter, semester, trimester, or school year.

<sup>9</sup> Leading indicators: These are the data elements that inform progress against lagging and accountability indicators. They may not be collected at the state level but are important to identify. These data elements also might include more real-time, process-oriented data that reflect day-to-day, week-by-week, or periodic decisions and activities.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> The inclusion of ELP progress as a Title I accountability indicator may have the benefit of culturally embedded early identification, progress monitoring, and continued access to supporting improved performance on ELP assessments. However, the use of data regarding EL progress in attaining ELP is still new to many accountability stakeholders, and it is important to frame how EL progress is an important marker of school quality.</p>	
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine how EL progress and are framed in the state’s accountability system and whether its importance, role, and intended use are clear. If guiding principles for the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator exist, ensure they are readily available to the public and part of communication strategies.</li> <li>• Identify how the data for the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator should be used for planning, including how this might differ for schools with different-size EL populations, and how data should be used to revise, if necessary, student-level targets for student ELP progress.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b> Given its newness as a measure of performance under Title I, it is important to frame how Progress in Achieving ELP indicator data reflect and support the high-level objectives of the educational system and the state’s accountability system’s theory of action. Consider supplementing or highlighting communications, documentation, or access to resources that describe how the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator reflects progress in ELP and how that is related to achievement in core content areas. Consider framing data from the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator as a system-level measure of EL progress that can lead to improvements or adjustments in how resources are allocated.</p>	
<p><b>Consideration 3.2:</b> Primary users are able to interpret data reported through the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator.</p>	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are Progress in Achieving ELP indicator data understandable, interpretable, and informative?</p>	



Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> ELP performance framed as progress may not be as familiar to everyone as achievement growth and proficiency. It is important to ensure that educators and instructional leaders understand the meaning of ELP progress and how the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator reflects the aggregate and retrospective nature of these data. Further, any transformations, predictor variables (e.g., EL student characteristics), or ELP assessment characteristics should be communicated in meaningful ways to help people understand how to interpret the data presented.</p>	
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examine the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator across the state and over time to determine what cut scores, thresholds, or flags within the indicator reflect meaningful progress and how these compare to data on attainment of ELP and EL or former EL reading/language arts achievement, if appropriate. Determine whether these qualifiers are available to the public and primary consumers of accountability data.</li> <li>• Identify the potential stakeholder groups that would be considered the primary actors who use the data. Consider how each of these stakeholders should be interacting with ELP and progress data and determine whether the information provided is sufficient to support understanding and use. For example, district leaders may need a blend of both state accountability and related district or school data, whereas school leaders may need reports that highlight school-level data with references to why they are relevant to improving accountability-based data.</li> <li>• For each of the identified stakeholder groups and users of the state's accountability, determine whether there are unique or common data displays, visualizations, or reporting strategies that are useful to examining, interpreting, and acting upon ELP data.</li> </ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depending on the presentation of the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator or the way in which it is transformed, it may be important to scaffold access and interpretation of progress data. If data are transformed, consider developing meaningful cut scores for the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator or its composite indices to help people understand the meaning of progress.</li> <li>Developing meaningful reports and resources is an iterative and resource-intensive process. Depending on the key stakeholders identified, consider reframing, repackaging, or creating additional resources that are targeted to high-leverage groups that use accountability data (e.g., district leaders, principals, or school-improvement teams) that connect the state ELP assessment to other localized sample data (e.g., screener data, progress monitoring data, access to intervention, reclassification).</li> </ul>	
<b>Consideration 3.3:</b> Primary users understand how ELP accountability data are connected to other coherent and meaningful data to inform continuous improvement practices.	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are Progress in Achieving ELP indicator data linked with coherent lagging and leading indicators to support continuous improvement?</p>	
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> Perhaps similar to the content-area statewide summative assessments, ELP assessments may also be perceived as less relevant by educators and educational leaders than other locally administered or developed assessments. It is important to help practitioners and educators understand the links between available resources, EL program availability and implementation, progress indicators, and outcome indicators (both for and beyond high-stakes accountability) and ELP assessment data. In other words, consider what resources or support structures can be put in place not only to help users of the state’s accountability know what to improve but also how they might drive improvement using other local academic performance data.</p>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify related outcome data or lagging indicators that can help inform progress against the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator that may be available statewide, regionally, or at the district and school levels.</li> <li>• Identify leading indicators and process data that are linked to improvements on the ELP assessment based on evidence or research (e.g., time in program, meeting growth expectations, access to English content, type of EL programs).</li> <li>• Using evidence, determine the links among accountability and other lagging, leading, and process indicators to help consumers draw connections between coherent data. Differentiate these connections by grade span, content area, and outcome type if relevant.</li> <li>• Determine how these different types of information result in different actions for SEA staff, regional staff, district leaders, school principals, and school leadership teams.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A state’s theory of action should provide a rationale for each indicator selected for inclusion in the system. This rationale should clarify the actions and initiatives the state believes will be incentivized through the inclusion of the indicator and how those actions will serve to improve performance. States should articulate the range of actions they believe will improve EL progress in achieving ELP based on the statewide ELP assessment, systematic, regional, or districtwide initiatives or interventions (e.g., endorsed evidence-based strategies, tiered-intervention approaches, progress monitoring initiatives).</li> <li>• Identifying relevant leading indicators and proximal data can help inform any root cause analyses or cause and effect explanation. Providing models or exemplars around ELP assessment and progress-monitoring data can help educational leaders who may not typically engage with ELP data better support their schools and staff.</li> </ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps (continued):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connecting evidence across time (i.e., process, leading, and lagging data) is important but should also include considerations of what affects EL progress both within and outside of the school setting. Student characteristics may already be taken into account in setting student-level progress targets for the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator and should be part of interpretation efforts. Other internal factors that affect the relationship between an input (e.g., program or intervention) and ELP progress or performance should be identified to help practitioners design programs and support students. These mediating factors may help identify barriers or efficiencies to supporting ELs.</li> <li>In conjunction with any state and district school-improvement teams, consider embedding examinations of coherent data connections that are differentiated by grade span and data type (e.g., academic achievement data, access to opportunity data, EL reclassification rates, EL reading/language arts performance) into school-improvement planning processes, data reviews, or district-led school-improvement plan reviews. Identify additional process or program-related indicators that can help evaluate the impact of and identify high-quality programs throughout the state that can serve as models for others.</li> </ul>	
Claim 3 Reflection Prompts	Claim 3 Response
We have sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand how data from the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator should be used and how they inform continuous improvement.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address key questions and can confirm we have conceptualized how data from the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator should be used and how they support continuous improvement.	Yes/No

**Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA**  
**Module 3E: School Quality or Student Success (SQSS) Indicator**

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA) requires the use of one or more **SQSS indicators** that are statewide, meaningfully differentiate between schools, and are valid, reliable, and comparable. This indicator is designed to consider school quality, which may include looking at performance beyond academic test scores. Any SQSS indicators should be aligned with the objectives and intended outcomes of the state’s accountability system while balancing constraints associated with policy, practice, availability, and defensibility. This indicator differs from the other indicators in the state’s accountability system in that each metric is considered a separate indicator (e.g., if a state includes both chronic absenteeism and college readiness metrics, each of these would be its own SQSS indicator). A state that has more than one SQSS indicator should complete this module for each different metric included.

This module includes three sets of self-reflection prompts that are intended to address the following concepts for the SQSS indicator within the broader state’s accountability system. These three sets of prompts 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 3E: SQSS Indicator**

Section	What is it?	Why is it important?
Section 1. Articulate the Rationale Behind the Indicator	The opportunity to clearly and concisely describe why the indicator is designed the way it is	To develop a message that can be used for multiple audiences to describe the “what,” “why,” and “how” behind a given indicator.
Section 2. Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of Rationale	A reflection on whether stakeholders understand the rationale behind the indicator helps identify possible areas that may be misinterpreted or misunderstood by the public	Determining what assumptions or design decisions might require more explanation can help minimize the public’s misunderstanding and help prioritize resources to support communication efforts.
Section 2. Assess Confidence in Operations and Results	Based on your state’s rationale and potential risk, the opportunity to examine your state’s level of confidence that design decisions are sound and evidence supports your state’s assumptions for a specific indicator	Determining your state’s confidence in the results and presentation of a specific indicator can help you build confidence across the indicators and help clarify where additional evidence, revisions, or outreach materials can be useful.

**Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA**  
**Module 3E: School Quality or Student Success (SQSS) Indicator**  
**Section 1. Articulating the Rationale Behind the SQSS Indicator**

Consider the following questions regarding the rationale behind how the SQSS indicator was designed.

**Table 2. Articulate the Rationale Behind the SQSS Indicator**

<b>Articulate the Rationale Behind the SQSS Indicator</b>	
<i>Reflection Questions</i>	<i>Notes</i>
<b>Specific policy objective for the SQSS indicator:</b> What policy objective does the SQSS indicator serve? This will be based in large part on the measure used and how this is calculated and may include ideas about focusing attention on non-traditional measures, or access to educational opportunities.	
<b>Policy mechanisms or levers:</b> How does the measurement and communication of this indicator support policy objectives? How is your state reducing barriers to use and interpretation of this indicator? Do people understand it? Does it seem important and relevant? Is it easy to use?	
<b>Behavioral intent:</b> What behaviors is your state trying to incentivize through the way in which the SQSS Indicator is operationalized? For example, is your state trying to focus people’s attention on deepening the measure of college- and career-readiness or on expanding the construct of school performance (e.g., using non-core measures)? Why might that be? How will this be communicated to the public, parents, educators, and community?	
<b>Processes to support indicator:</b> What measures is your state using to calculate the SQSS Indicator? Are there any challenges with calculating, including, or aggregating these measures for the indicator?	

**Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA**  
**Module 3E: School Quality or Student Success (SQSS) Indicator**  
**Section 2. Stakeholder Perceptions: SQSS Indicator**

In Section 2 of the **Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State's System of AMD**, you were asked to reflect on how well stakeholders perceive and understand how the indicators in the state's system of AMD interact. You may use these previous reflections and prompts to inform your state's reflections on how well stakeholders perceive and understand the SQSS indicator. Review your state's responses to those questions to prioritize what next steps may be needed in light of your state's responses to the operations and results questions for the SQSS Indicator.

**Table 3. Consider Stakeholder Perceptions of the SQSS Indicator Rationale**

Review Stakeholder Perceptions Reflections	
Notes	Next Steps

**Evaluating State Accountability Systems Under ESEA**  
**Module 3E: School Quality and Student Success (SQSS) Indicator**  
**Section 3. Confidence in the Operations and Results of the SQSS Indicator**

The following self-reflection prompts provide states with the opportunity to consider how the SQSS indicator is designed, operationalized, and implemented. Please consider your state’s responses to **Module 1: Theory of Action**, **Module 2: State’s System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation (AMD)**, and **Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD** to inform responses to the following prompts.

Respond to the following prompts to engage in the reflection around the way in which the SQSS indicator functions:

1. Read the claim, consideration, and potential sources of evidence, then examine the specific evidence available in your state’s state.
2. 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 (a) have 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 members of your state’s SEA.

**Table 4. Confidence in the Operations and Results of the SQSS Indicator**

<b>Claim 1: The SQSS indicator aligns with the overall system theory of action and its policy objectives.</b>	
There are several ideas a state should consider as the state examines the design decisions behind the SQSS indicator. These concepts might include the state’s overall policy objectives and how fairly the SQSS indicator represents the intended construct. <i>For this claim, consider the following statements, and explore the key questions and evidence suggested.</i>	
<b>Consideration 1.1: The SQSS indicator helps to achieve our policy objectives for the state’s accountability system.</b>	
<b>Reflection Prompts</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> What type of construct is the SQSS indicator intended to represent?	
<b>Why is it important?</b> The SQSS indicator is a new requirement for states that can deepen or expand conceptualizations of accountability. It is important to determine the intended purpose and use of this indicator.	



Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key evidence checks:</b> Determine the type of information <sup>10</sup> the SQSS indicator is intended to represent. Consider whether this information supports your state’s overall theory of action.	
<b>Potential next steps:</b> SQSS indicators may reflect pre-cursor variables, additional measures that broaden the conceptualization of school quality, or student success in other academic or non-academic activities. Any indicators that are not coherent with your state’s overall theory of action should be revisited and evaluated against policy objectives. New indicators that more directly address system objectives may need to be considered but should be reviewed for technical quality and adequacy.	
<b>Consideration 1.2:</b> The SQSS indicator fairly represents the construct as intended.	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent do the measures that comprise the SQSS indicator represent the construct fairly and without bias?	
<b>Why is it important?</b> Because the SQSS indicator can deepen or expand conceptualizations of accountability, it is important to determine whether its measures do so fairly.	
<b>Key evidence checks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine whether schools have an equal opportunity to demonstrate progress.</li> <li>Identify any potential sources of bias in how data are collected or quantified.</li> </ul>	

<sup>10</sup> Information types might include the following from Marion, S., & Lyons, S. (2016). *In search of unicorns: Conceptualizing the “fifth indicator” in ESSA accountability systems*. Dover, NH: The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Inc.

1. Precursor variables: causal precursors to student success based on research;
2. School quality indicators: Process- or outcome-based measures that broaden the definition of school quality by improving student success or enhancing best practice; and
3. Student success indicators: outcome-based value judgments about what characterizes a successful student.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In an effort to maximize fairness, it is important to understand administration and data collection conditions for any measures that make up the SQSS indicator. If differences in administration, data collection, or interpretation of policy are identified, consider ways to ensure data can be compared without concerns over equality.</li> <li>• Bias can stem from data-based characteristics that are not related to the construct being measured, such as systematic contextual factors that contribute to underperformance. This is distinct from the likely intended use of detecting the absence of a truancy officer or attendance program. If bias is associated with certain data elements, then consider incorporating structures to address any bias or replace the data element with one that is free from bias.</li> <li>• Accessibility to the construct may be relevant if high-inference data are used for the SQSS indicator. For example, do surveys administered to students allow them to reflect their standing on the construct without age, race/ethnicity, language, or gender influencing responses? Is there any evidence of post-secondary readiness measures being insensitive to lower-performing groups of students? Identifying any measures that reflect accessibility challenges should be examined and revisited in light of your state's theory of action.</li> </ul>	
Claim 1 Reflection Prompts	Claim 1 Response
We have sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand whether the SQSS indicator aligns with the overall system theory of action and its policy objectives.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address key questions and can confirm the SQSS indicator aligns with the overall system theory of action and its policy objectives.	Yes/No

**Claim 2: The SQSS indicator supports valid and reliable school results.**

In **Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State's System of AMD**, you were asked to consider how the weighing of indicators or the order of decision rules affected the differentiation of schools. In this module, we will more deeply examine how well the SQSS indicator and its composite measure (if applicable) support valid and reliable school results.

*For this claim, consider the following statements, and explore the key questions and evidence suggested.*

**Consideration 2.1: The SQSS indicator demonstrates sufficient internal technical quality.**

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> Do the measures that comprise the SQSS indicator demonstrate sufficient internal consistency and reliability related to differentiation?	
<b>Why is it important?</b> If the SQSS indicator uses non-test-based measures, consistency and reliability should be considered to support the validity of school accountability results.	
<b>Key evidence checks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Determine the degree to which there is sufficient consistency in the measures used in the SQSS indicators.</li><li>• Determine whether the level of precision is sufficient for its application as a tool to differentiate schools.</li></ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistency is an important factor to consider because a state's accountability system relies on the ability of indicators and measures to detect changes over time. If there is a high amount of volatility in a measure across repeated administrations or data collections, it can be difficult to determine whether the volatility is due to measure idiosyncrasies, sampling issues, or changes in the construct of interest. The reasons behind volatility (i.e., a lack of consistency) should be identified and addressed. If high volatility/low consistency is a function of factors that affect the interpretation of school performance, it may be necessary to revise the measures that make up the SQSS indicator or identify ways to systematize documentation and collection of data to improve consistency.</li> <li>Measures may differ in the level of precision afforded. Measures that are reduced to a yes/no (e.g., pass/fail) criterion may be less precise than those that provide a range of performance. Evaluating an appropriate level of precision is dependent on the intended interpretations from the measure. This evaluation should be used in conjunction with empirical examinations of differentiation (described in Consideration 2.2) to determine whether measurement approaches should be revised or additional measures should be included.</li> </ul>	
<b>Consideration 2.2:</b> The measure that comprises each SQSS indicator can be compared and differentiate appropriately.	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are the measures that comprise an SQSS indicator able to be compared and combined as a single indicator?</p>	
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> One of the primary uses of indicators is to contribute to an overall state's system of AMD that differentiates schools in a meaningful way. The characteristics of the indicators have an impact on how the overall system operates. Similarly, the characteristics of a measure play a role in how indicators influence the overall state's system of AMD. It is important to consider whether multiple measures should be compared and combined as part of the SQSS indicator.</p>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify outliers in any of the measures and determine what effect they have on the interpretations before or after transformation.</li> <li>• Determine the differences in differences of data. This may include examining measures of central tendency, shape, skew, and standard deviation among measures that comprise the SQSS indicator.</li> <li>• Determine whether it is appropriate to standardize or otherwise transform data to support more direct comparisons across measures.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When combining measures to create an indicator, outliers can affect interpretations of measures by influencing standardization techniques, comparisons of range, or comparisons of averages. However, outliers can also reflect very high-performing or under-performing schools and districts that should be recognized in system development. If outliers are affecting the calculation or interpretation within the SQSS indicator, it will be important to understand how it affects the indicator and whether it becomes difficult to understand how it affects the overall differentiation of schools. Too much distortion may require standardization, revision of business rules, or revising the new data element.</li> <li>• Differences in data characteristics within the SQSS indicator can help determine whether there is a need to transform or standardize data. For example, data that are scored on a 0–100 metric will likely affect overall indicator ratings more than a 0–10 metric, if combined. However, if standardized, it will be important to determine whether the 0-100 metric has a major restriction (e.g., attendance rates clustering around 5 score points) and the 0–10 metric allows for measurement across all 10 points. If combined data are reflecting substantively different data characteristics, consider methods to make data more comparable. Note that standardizing data makes interpretations more challenging, especially for the public. Excessive transformations can make data less actionable and should be considered in conjunction with reporting design.</li> </ul>	

<b>Consideration 2.3:</b> The SQSS indicator itself is comparable with and contributes as intended in the state’s system of AMD.	
<b>Reflection Prompts</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are the SQSS measures and SQSS indicator contributing to differentiating schools in the state’s system of AMD as intended? <sup>11</sup>	
<b>Why is it important?</b> Other, more global factors should also be considered when evaluating how indicators contribute to the overall state’s system of AMD. The degree of differentiation within and across the indicator is important to consider and should be evaluated.	
<b>Key evidence checks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine the degree to which different measures within the SQSS indicator contribute to the overall SQSS indicator result.</li> <li>• Determine how well the indicator meaningfully differentiates based on changes in measure scores (i.e., the degree to which the measure is malleable).</li> <li>• Determine the relative contribution the SQSS indicator has on the overall state’s system of AMD and whether this level of contribution is intended.</li> </ul>	

<sup>11</sup> Note: SQSS indicators are required to be weighted less than academic indicators (i.e., academic achievement, other academic, graduation rate, progress in achieving ELP) under ESEA.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similar to evaluations of the state’s system of AMD in <b>Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD</b>, it is important to understand how each measure contributes to the overall SQSS result. If multiple measures are used, it is important to understand which measures have greater influence on the SQSS result than others. The relative influence should be compared to the overall theory of action and rationale behind the SQSS indicator to determine what, if any, revisions should be made to the design of the indicator.</li> <li>• Evaluating whether measures support meaningful differentiation is more than determining how much measures contribute to the indicator result. It is also important to understand whether changes in the measure results lead to changes in overall indicator results. If the indicator is insensitive to changes in measures of school quality or student success, improvement will not be detected in overall school results. This should be compared to the rationale behind the SQSS to determine what, if any, revisions should be made.</li> <li>• The relative contribution of the SQSS indicator when compared to the other indicators in the system was addressed in <b>Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD</b>. In light of the deeper examination of measures within the SQSS indicator, results from <b>Module 2B: Indicator Interaction in the State’s System of AMD</b> should be revisited to ensure the SQSS indicator is influencing the state’s system of AMD as intended.</li> </ul>	
Claim 2 Reflection Prompts	Claim 2 Response
We have sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand whether the SQSS indicator supports valid and reliable school results.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address key questions and can confirm the SQSS indicator supports valid and reliable school results.	Yes/No

**Claim 3: We have conceptualized how data from the SQSS indicator should be used and how they support continuous improvement.**

The utility and use of data from a state’s accountability system goes beyond evaluating the design and operations of the system. It is important to also consider how stakeholders, educators, and the community intend to use the data. This includes both accountability and related non-accountability data. Although additional data may not directly be part of the state’s accountability system, it is important to think about how other coherent lagging<sup>12</sup> and leading<sup>13</sup> indicators connect to accountability data and the degree to which we should support reporting, provide access (where possible), or raise questions related to those data.

*For this claim, consider the following statements, and explore the key questions and evidence suggested.*

**Consideration 3.1:** SQSS indicator data are useful to the consumers of the accountability system because they represent important signals of school performance.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are the measures associated with the SQSS indicator perceived as important and useful?	
<b>Why is it important?</b> Accountability indicators and reporting are often at risk of being relegated to information that serves a punitive or labeling purpose. It is important to help consumers of the state’s accountability system understand that data reflect important markers of school quality and can be used to set future performance targets linked to more real-time data.	
<b>Key evidence checks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Determine whether there is specific enough framing around the importance, role, and intended use of data in this indicator. If there are guiding principles around why certain measures were included as part of the SQSS, ensure they are readily available to the public and part of communication strategies.</li><li>• Identify how the data for the SQSS measures should be used for planning and how data should be used to determine future performance targets.</li></ul>	

<sup>12</sup> Lagging indicators: These are the data elements that are closely related outcome data; they may or may not be appropriate or ready for high-stakes use. These might also include data that are not interpretable until the end of a quarter, semester, trimester, or school year.

<sup>13</sup> Leading indicators: These are the data elements that inform progress against lagging and accountability indicators. They may not be collected at the state level but are important to identify. These data elements also might include more real-time, process-oriented data that reflect day-to-day, week-by-week, or periodic decisions and activities.



Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b> Some attention will be paid to the measures that comprise the SQSS indicator because the SQSS indicator is a high-stakes outcome in accountability. However, if there is insufficient information that frames the measures associated with SQSS indicators, educators and the public may not recognize why it is important or how it reflects school quality based on your state’s theory of action. Consider supplementing or highlighting communications, documentation, or access to resources that describe the importance of the SQSS indicator as a measure of school performance and how it plays an important role in district and school improvement planning.</p>	
<b>Consideration 3.2:</b> Primary users are able to interpret data reported through the SQSS indicator.	
Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are SQSS indicator and measure data understandable, interpretable, and informative?</p>	
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> The SQSS indicator alone may not be as transparent as other indicators if one or more measures have been transformed. In addition, it may be important to help consumers of these data contextualize indicators through meaningful demarcations of performance, suggested questions, and role-specific displays/reports.</p>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examine SQSS indicator data across the state and over time to determine whether cut scores, thresholds, or flags within indicator measures reflect meaningful progress or performance. Determine whether these qualifiers are available to the public and primary consumers of accountability data.</li> <li>• Identify the potential stakeholder groups that would be considered the primary actors who use the data. Consider how each of these stakeholders should be interacting with SQSS data and determine whether the information provided is sufficient to support understanding and use. For example, district leaders may need a blend of both state accountability and related district or school data, whereas school leaders may need reports that highlight school-level data with references to why they are relevant to improving student and school performance.</li> <li>• For each of the identified stakeholder groups and users of the state’s accountability, determine whether there are unique or common data displays, visualizations, or reporting strategies that are useful to examining, interpreting, and acting upon SQSS data.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depending on the number of measures and the complexity of the indicator, it may be important to scaffold access and interpretation of SQSS data. If they do not already exist, consider developing meaningful ratings for the SQSS indicator or its composite measures to help people understand the meaning of performance or progress.</li> <li>• Developing meaningful reports and resources is an iterative and resource-intensive process. Depending on the key stakeholders identified, consider reframing, repackaging, or creating additional resources that are targeted to high-leverage groups that use accountability data (e.g., district leaders, principals, or school improvement teams).</li> </ul>	

**Consideration 3.3:** Primary users understand how SQSS accountability data are connected to other coherent and meaningful data to inform continuous improvement practices.

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Key questions for the indicator:</b> To what extent are SQSS accountability data linked with coherent lagging and leading indicators to support continuous improvement?</p>	
<p><b>Why is it important?</b> A risk associated with high-stakes accountability data is that they can be perceived as less relevant than other progress or performance data to local educators or educational leaders. It is important to help practitioners and educators understand the links between instructional decisions, professional development selection, program implementation, progress indicators, and outcome indicators (both for and beyond high-stakes accountability). In other words, consider what resources or support structures can be put in place to not only to help users of the state’s accountability know what to improve, but also how they might drive improvement on related data.</p>	
<p><b>Key evidence checks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify related outcome data or lagging indicators that can help inform progress against SQSS indicator data that may be available statewide, regionally, or at the district level.</li> <li>• Identify leading indicators and process data that are linked to improvements in high-stakes measures that are part of the SQSS indicator and based on evidence or research.</li> <li>• Using evidence, determine the links among accountability and other lagging, leading, and process indicators to help consumers draw connections between coherent data. Differentiate these connections by grade span, content area, and outcome type if relevant.</li> <li>• Determine how these different types of information result in different actions for SEA staff, regional staff, district leaders, school principals, and school leadership teams.</li> </ul>	

Reflection Prompts	Notes
<p><b>Potential next steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A state’s theory of action should provide a rationale for each indicator selected for inclusion in the system. This rationale should clarify the actions and initiatives the state believes will be incentivized through the inclusion of the indicator and how those actions will serve to improve performance. States should articulate the range of actions they believe will move the needle in terms of performance on the SQSS indicator and collect evidence to validate that those actions ultimately have the impact desired.</li> <li>• Connecting evidence across time (i.e., process, leading, and lagging data) can be challenging when users of the state’s accountability system are not aware of all the available data. Consider helping users understand the connection of accountability and related data to process-oriented data that may be associated with program decisions at the school or district level (e.g., intervention selection, curricular programs, progress monitoring).</li> <li>• In conjunction with state and district school improvement teams, consider embedding examinations of coherent data connections that are differentiated by grade span and data type (e.g., academic achievement data, school climate data, access to opportunity data, engagement data) into school-improvement planning processes, data reviews, or district-led school improvement plan reviews.</li> <li>• Engage in listening or feedback sessions to crowd-source additional ideas or strategies. Consider embedding these into state-supported resources to help engage in systematic capacity-building efforts.</li> </ul>	
Claim 3 Reflection Prompts	Claim 3 Response
We have sufficiently explored the confidence claims above to understand how data from the SQSS indicator should be used and how they inform continuous improvement.	Yes/No
We have collected enough evidence to sufficiently address key questions and can confirm that we have conceptualized how data from the SQSS indicator should be used and how they support continuous improvement.	Yes/No