



219 North Main Street, Suite 402, Barre, VT 05641
 (p) 802-479-1030 | (f) 802-479-1835

ESSA State Plan: Recommendation Form

Development Cycle No: 3	Decision Point No(s): 23 and 24	Author: Amy Fowler
Date submitted: 9/2/16		Bounce Team Coordinating: Accountability
ESSA Citation: 1111(c)(4)(C)		ESSA Page Number: 38 - Link to ESSA
Question(s) being considered: Can the AOE research two separate recommendations regarding the weighting of federal accountability performance measures?		
What ESSA requirements need to be met? ESSA requires that a state-defined performance index must include multiple performance indicators, and that "substantial weight" be given to federally-identified academic indicators.		
Solution being proposed (in bullet point format):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AOE would like to research multiple scenarios for weighting as a part of determining Vermont's proposal to the USED regarding school accountability under ESSA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Option 1: propose an approach to weighting if the state expressed school/supervisory union performance through multiple scores (VT Board of Education preference). ○ Option 2: propose an approach to weighting if the state expressed school/supervisory union performance through a single, aggregate score (USED Regulations suggest this is required). ○ Both approaches would weight an identical set of school/supervisory union performance measures. 		
Rationale: Explain why your proposal supports each decision logic element below:		
<i>Equity:</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fundamentally, we need to be well poised to respond to the requirements of submitting an approvable response to USED to ensure that the federal funding gets to our most vulnerable youth. Pursuing Option 2 allows us to be prepared if option 1 is not allowed. 		
<i>Alignment with current VT policy and practice:</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 pushes the approach currently outlined by the Education Quality Review process; Option 2 would require us to determine an alternate path from EQR as currently conceived. 		
<i>Efficiency (streamlining processes, eliminating duplicative systems or requirements):</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simultaneously pursuing two weighting schemes creates additional work for the AOE but no additional work for school systems. 		
<i>Possibility (implementation feasibility for the AOE and impacted stakeholders):</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any approach to weighting would require collection of the same data sets, and would be equally feasible. 		
Identify any known or potential risks associated with your proposed solution:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doing additional research carries no risks. 		
What are the expected benefits associated with your proposed solution:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By working on both options concurrently we believe we are better poised to respond to anticipated changes in USED policy if they do not change rules and regulations as we hope they will. 		
Secretary's Decision		Date: 9/6/16 Initials:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Confirm recommendation of ESSA State Plan Management Team <input type="checkbox"/> Reject recommendation of ESSA State Plan Management Team and offer the following as an alternative: (will expand with typing)		