Proposed Amendment to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plan

On January 31, 2020, TEA submitted an ESSA state plan amendment to adjust the Closing the Gaps domain graduation rate methodology used in the academic accountability system, as well as the methodology used to identify schools for support and improvement. The U.S. Department of Education has 120 days to respond to the amendment request. The following are the most frequently asked questions regarding the proposed amendment.

For additional information about the proposed amendment, please see the redlined amendment on TEA’s ESSA page.

Proposed Graduation Rate Methodology FAQ

1. **How is the growth target calculated?**

   Whether the student group demonstrated a 10 percent decrease in the difference between the prior year rate and the long-term target is determined using the following formula:

   \[
   \text{current year four-year graduation rate} - \text{prior year four-year graduation rate} \geq \frac{94.0 \text{ (long-term target)} - \text{prior year four-year graduation rate}}{10}
   \]

   \[
   \text{current year four-year graduation rate} \geq \text{prior year four-year graduation rate}
   \]

   [Diagram of graduation rate methodology]

   Did the student group meet the 94.0% four-year long-term target?  
   Did the student group meet the 90.0% four-year interim target and make improvement of at least 0.1% over the prior year?  
   Did the student group meet the four-year growth target?
For example, the 2018 four-year federal graduation rate for the special education student group was 66.7%, and the 2019 four-year federal graduation rate was 70.0%. Using this methodology, the student group would meet the growth target as demonstrated below:

$$70.0 - 66.7 = 3.3 > \frac{94.0 - 66.7}{10} = 2.73$$

2. **Will student groups be required to show growth even after meeting the 94.0 percent long-term target?**

No, any student group with a graduation rate at or above 94.0 percent would meet the requirement as illustrated in step 1. Steps 2 and 3 would only apply if the student group did not meet the 94.0 percent long-term target. The graduation rate flowchart shown above summarizes the proposed graduation rate methodology.

3. **Will this amendment improve outcomes for alternative education accountability (AEA) campuses?**

Yes, this amendment is specifically designed with AEAs in mind. Evaluating graduation rate growth is a better reflection of the intent and purpose of AEA programs.

**Proposed Identification of Schools for Support and Improvement Methodology FAQ**

1. **Will the methodology for targeted support and improvement remain the same?**

Yes, the proposed amendment does not include any changes to targeted support and improvement identification.

2. **Will targeted support have any type of “consecutive year” consequences?**

If the amendment is approved, no. Title I additional targeted support campuses would escalate to comprehensive support. Consecutive years of targeted support would not result in escalation.

3. **Will the methodology for additional targeted support remain the same?**

Yes, the proposed amendment does not include any changes to additional targeted support identification or exit methodologies.

4. **Will the shift from the 4-year graduation rate to the 6-year graduation rate for comprehensive support and improvement identification impact the exit criteria that requires at least a 67 percent graduation rate for two consecutive years?**

Yes, the agency will evaluate the six-year graduation rate to determine if a campus is eligible to exit in 2020. If the six-year rate is not at least 67 percent, the four-year rate will be evaluated.
5. **How does escalating campuses who are additional targeted support to comprehensive support after three years align with the intent of ESSA?**

In ESSA, additional targeted support is described as a subset of comprehensive support and improvement—the same methodology (bottom 5 percent), applied to each student group. ESSA statute requires that additional targeted support schools that do not exit within a State-determined number of years, then be identified for comprehensive support. Page 26 of the state plan template also indicates the intent to align these two identifications as shown below.

   a. **Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools.** Describe the methodology by which the State identifies public schools in the State receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (based on identification as a school in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State’s methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)) and that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years.

   Any Title I campus identified for additional targeted support and improvement for three consecutive years will be identified for comprehensive support and improvement the following school year. The first year additional targeted support campuses will be escalated and required to implement comprehensive support and improvement interventions will be the 2022–23 school year.

6. **Would data from 2018–19 be considered year one for this amendment?**

No, additional targeted support identification in 2020, 2021, and 2022 would result in comprehensive support and improvement implementation in the fall of the 2022–23 school year.