

# ESEA 2014 RESULTS

## Frequently Asked Questions

### (FAQ)

INDEX OF QUESTIONS	<u>page</u>
Q1. What criteria have been approved by the USED to be applied to the South Carolina ESEA Federal Accountability Methodology for 2014? .....	1
Q2. Why are the means and/or N's different between the 2013 published results versus the 2013 data used as a baseline in the 2014 calculations? .....	2
Q3. Why do some schools have means for science or social studies/history in the 2013 published results but are missing means for science or social studies/history in the 2013 new methodology? .....	3
Q4. Why are the graduation rate results different from what our district staff thought the rate was going to be based on the file submitted in August?.....	3
Q5. What is the difference between South Carolina's state report cards and the federal report cards issued under the ESEA waiver? .....	3
Q6. Why does my K-6 elementary school have two matrixes? .....	3
Q7. What ESEA grades count as meeting the state's expectations? .....	4
Q8. When will the ESEA grades be released to the public?.....	4
Q9. When will the state report cards be released? .....	4
Q10. What are the plans for the new 2015 assessments and accountability methodology? .....	4
Q11. How were the SC-Alt scores incorporated into the calculations? .....	4

#### **Q1. What criteria have been approved by the US Department of Education (USED) to be applied to the South Carolina ESEA Federal Accountability Methodology for 2014?**

- Elementary and Middle schools include PASS aligned SC-ALT scores.
- High Schools include HSAP and End-of-Course (EOC) aligned SC-ALT scores.
- Elementary and Middle Schools have revised weights (ELA and Math = .40 each, instead of .35; Percent Tested have a weight of .05 each.)
- No Standard Error of Measures (SEMs) have been applied to the means.
- No minimum Nsize limit for the all students category (Subgroups still have minimum Nsize of 30 except graduation rate subgroups, which have a minimum Nsize of 10.)
- No prior year minimum Nsize limit for subgroups.
- Subgroups must have two years of data to be included in calculations.
- Use current year graduation rate (not lagged)

- Use current year End of Course test results (not lagged)
- Limited English Proficiency (LEP) subgroup now includes categories 6 and 7 for performance and participation.
- 2014 AMOs:
  - High School: HSAP ELA=229; Math=226; Science EOC=78; History EOC=75; Grad rate=75.1%; Percent Tested=95%
  - Middle School: PASS/SCALT=632; Percent Tested=95%
  - Elementary School: PASS/SCALT=640; Percent Tested=95%
- Proximity to the AMO:
  - Set a minimum scale score for applying partial credit (for example: calculate the percentage between 600-640) PASS=600; HSAP=200; EOC=70; Grad rate=66.7%
  - Set a minimum point score for partial credit to 0.6 and the maximum to 0.9
- Improvement in subgroup performance from previous year:
  - If a subgroup does not qualify for a proximity to the AMO partial credit, then calculate an improvement partial credit. [Note: Only apply improvement if a subgroup did not have partial credit (Example: their mean was below 600 in PASS).]
  - Set a maximum improvement score to 0.5.
- For additional details you may refer to Dr. Nancy Busbee’s PowerPoint Presentation “[ESEA Grades Simulation Meeting - January 2014](#)” posted on the ESEA website under **Introductions**.

**Q2. Why are the means and/or N’s different between the 2013 published results versus the 2013 data used as a baseline in the 2014 calculations?**

- For all school types in ELA and Math: The means used in the 2013 new methodology do NOT include SEMs, the 2013 published results do include SEMs.
- For all schools types across all subjects: The 2013 new methodology incorporates SC-Alt PASS/HSAP/End of Course aligned scale scores, the 2013 published results do not (they were in a separate matrix for elementary and middle schools and not included in high schools at all.)
- For High School End-of-Course scores and Graduation rate: The 2013 new methodology use current year (2013) data, the 2013 published results used lagged (2012) data.
- For Elementary and Middle Schools that have unusual grade-spans, Percent Tested: For K-6 schools, for example, the 2013 new methodology calculates a percent tested separately for each matrix—that is, percent tested for the elementary matrix (grades 3-5) and a separate percent tested for the middle school matrix (grade 6). The 2013 published results calculated a percent tested for the entire school as a whole and repeated that value in both the elementary and middle school matrixes.

**Q3. Why do some schools have means for science or social studies/history in the 2013 published results but are missing means for science or social studies/history in the 2013 new methodology?**

- For Elementary/Middle Schools: In the 2013 published results, because of the way PASS science and social studies are administered (randomly assigned to approximately half the students that are assessed in ELA/Math for students in grades 3, 5, 6 and 8), the performance minimum n-size is based on the number of continuously enrolled students assessed in PASS ELA/Math, since that is the best indicator of how many such students were actually in each subgroup at the school. For the 2013 new methodology: the N-size has been set to be a minimum N-size of 30 for each specific subject area.
- For High Schools: In the 2013 published results, the lagged (2012) End of Course tests were used, but in the 2013 new methodology the current year (2013) End of Course tests were used, thus one year may have been missing Biology 1 or US History and the Constitution end of course tests, whereas in the other year there were no missing results.

**Q4. Why are the graduation rate results different from what our district staff thought the rate was going to be based on the file submitted in August?**

After districts submit their four-year graduation rate file in August, staff in the SCDE Office of Research and Data Analysis process the graduation rate file and verify the appropriateness of the student status code provided. This process includes matching data back to PowerSchool and test score files. This sometimes results in revisions to the student status code based on more recent information available at the SCDE.

**Q5. Why does my K-6 elementary school have two matrixes?**

Because the AMOs for elementary grades (3-5) differ from middle grades (6-8), two matrixes are created for the separate calculations for schools that have grade levels that span both ranges, the results of which are combined into a weighted ESEA index score for the school as a whole.

**Q6. What is the difference between South Carolina's state report cards and the federal report cards issued under the ESEA waiver?**

The state report card process is governed by the Education Oversight Committee. The same methodology cannot be used for our federal accountability results as the state report cards do not reflect subgroup performance data. SCDE and the Education Oversight Committee are working together to create one, unified system of reporting.

## **Q7. What ESEA grades count as meeting the state's expectations?**

Any school rated an A, B, or C meets the state's expectations. On every ESEA page, we include the following definitions:

- 90–100 (A): Performance substantially exceeds the state's expectations
- 80–89.9 (B): Performance exceeds the state's expectations
- 70–79.9 (C): Performance meets the state's expectations
- 60–69.9 (D): Performance does not meet the state's expectations
- Below 60 (F): Performance is substantially below the state's expectations

## **Q8. When will the ESEA grades be released to the public?**

The 2014 Federal ESEA grades are scheduled to be released to the public on Tuesday October 21st.

## **Q9. When will the state report cards be released?**

The 2014 SC state report cards are scheduled to be released to the public on Thursday November 13th.

## **Q10. What are the plans for the new 2015 assessments and ESEA accountability methodology?**

The 2015 assessments and methodology are currently under review.

## **Q11. How were the SC-Alt scores incorporated into the calculations?**

One of the requirements of the US Education Department was that SCDE not only develop a better system for incorporating the SC-Alt scores into the calculations (thus we aligned the scores with the comparable standard assessments PASS/HSAP/EOC) but also that we reestablish the 1% flexibility rule, that used to be in place with AYP. The 1% Flexibility rule is as follows:

### ***1% Flexibility***

If a student takes an alternate assessment and scores proficient or advanced, the student will be counted as scoring proficient or advanced in the calculation of ESEA, provided that not more than 1 percent of the enrollment of the grades tested in the school district that take an alternate assessment score proficient or advanced. The district's enrollment will be the first day of testing enrollment for grades 3–8 for elementary and middle schools and for grades 9–12 for high schools.

If the number of students who score proficient or advanced on an alternate assessment exceeds 1 percent of the school district's enrollment, the "extra" students' scores will be counted as "below Proficient" and as such the PASS aligned SC-Alt scale scores will be set to 599. These students' scores will be ranked from highest to lowest in each district and the highest "extra" scores will be selected to be readjusted to 599.