

LFC Requester:	Sunny Liu
----------------	-----------

**AGENCY BILL ANALYSIS
2017 REGULAR SESSION**

WITHIN 24 HOURS OF BILL POSTING, EMAIL ANALYSIS TO:

LFC@NMLEGIS.GOV

and

DFA@STATE.NM.US

{Include the bill no. in the email subject line, e.g., HB2, and only attach one bill analysis and related documentation per email message}

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

{Indicate if analysis is on an original bill, amendment, substitute or a correction of a previous bill}

Check all that apply: Date January 26, 2017
Original **Amendment** _____ **Bill No:** SB62
Correction _____ **Substitute** _____

Sponsor: Senator Mimi Stewart **Agency Code:** 924
Short Title: SCHOOL RATING GRADING POINT SYSTEM **Person Writing:** Cindy Gregory
Title: _____ **Phone:** _____ **Email:** _____

SECTION II: FISCAL IMPACT

APPROPRIATION (dollars in thousands)

Appropriation		Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY17	FY18		

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

REVENUE (dollars in thousands)

Estimated Revenue			Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY17	FY18	FY19		

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (dollars in thousands)

	FY17	FY18	FY19	3 Year Total Cost	Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
Total						

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Duplicates/Conflicts with/Companion to/Relates to:
 Duplicates/Relates to Appropriation in the General Appropriation Act

SECTION III: NARRATIVE

BILL SUMMARY

Synopsis: SB 62 assigns points to factors for rating public schools and provides for a work group to study school grading issues.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

These elements of the work group are not explicit in the bill and could possibly have significant fiscal implications:

- Frequency and location of meetings
- Life span of the work group
- Director of the work group
- Funding for travel or stipends
- Administrative support

Costs cannot be determined without more information.

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

Alteration in School Grading Components

The current and proposed point differences are shown in the tables below:

Elementary and Middle Schools (EL Model)	Current*	Proposed
Overall Grade	100	100
Proficiency (PED defines “Current Standing” differently)	40	5
Student Growth (represented as “School Growth”)	10	10
25 th Percentile (Q1) Growth	20	15
50 th Percentile (Q2 & Q3) Growth	20	10
75 th Percentile (Q4) Growth		5
English Language Proficiency (ELP) - Progress	0	5
Surveys	5	10
Improvements in Truancy, Chronic Absenteeism	(2,0)	20
Parent Engagement	(2)	10
Extended Learning Time, Extracurricular, Cocurricular activities	(1)	10
Attendance	5	0
(awarded through bonus points, capped at 5)		

* Codified in NMAC 6.19.8.9

Note: Absolute student proficiency is valued at 25% of an elementary of middle school’s rating under the current School Grading system.

High Schools (HS Model)	Current*	Proposed
Overall Grade	100	100
Proficiency (PED defines “Current Standing” differently)	30	5
Student Growth (represented as “School Growth”)	10	7
25 th Percentile (Q1) Growth	10	10
50 th Percentile (Q2 & Q3) Growth	10	5
75 th Percentile (Q4) Growth		5
English Language Proficiency (ELP)- Progress	0	5
Surveys	5	10
Improvements in Truancy, Chronic Absenteeism	(2,0)	10
Parent Engagement	(2)	10
Extended Learning Time, Extracurricular, Cocurricular activities	(1)	10
Attendance	3	0
Graduation	17	13
College and Career Readiness	15	10
(awarded through bonus points, capped at 5)		

* Codified in NMAC 6.19.8.9

Note: Absolute student proficiency is valued at 20% of a high school’s rating under the current School Grading system.

The current school grading models (HS and ES/MS) have components that measure general concepts of 1) status (i.e., grade level proficiency), 2) growth, and 3) non-academic indicators.

In the current rating configuration, status and growth are the most heavily weighted, especially in elementary grades where the foundation for reading and math success is paramount (and research-driven). The proposed weighting scheme in SB 62 shifts the emphasis to devalue and dilute status (students being on grade-level in reading and math) and to elevate non-academic indicators such as extracurricular activities. The proposed indicators are qualitative in nature, which hampers objectivity and precision.

The addition of English Language Proficiency (ELP) progress into school accountability is mandated by the Every Student Succeeds Act. PED will be incorporating this indicator in future models.

Updating Language to Meet Current Standards

The bill makes technical corrections intended to bring statutory wording into compliance with current practice:

- Changes references from “school” to “public school” would clarify that non-PED schools such as private, Bureau of Indian Education, or home schools are not legally subject to the A-F School Grading system.
- Striking reference to No Child Left Behind.
- Disaggregation for school grades on the school report card is revised to include new subgroups (students who are homeless, in foster care, or have a parent in the military). While *reporting* of these groups is federally required, their inclusion into school grading report card *ratings/accountability* is not. As these are small groups with sensitive information, it would be better to confine publication to the District Report Card, which limits aggregations to a reasonable size and better protects student confidentiality. This would be in keeping with current practice for the subgroups of Migrant and Recently

Arrived students.

- Corrections that should be included but were not (page 4, line 20) refer to current assessments. Annual student assessments are now given in grades KN through 11.

Establishing a School Grading Work Group

Members would consist of:

- Teachers (2)
- Union representatives (2)
- Principals (2)
- Charter school representatives (2)
- Superintendents (2)
- School board members (2)
- Parents (2)
- Tribal leaders (2)
- Community organization (2)
- LESC chair and vice chair
- PED (2)

The mission of the group includes advising the following:

- Additional or new indicators
- Align summative rankings and indicators with federal legislation
- Integrate innovative assessments
- Turnaround models for low performing schools

The work group would report to the LESC in December 2018.

The PED has already convened stakeholders over the last four months in response to ESSA and its requirements and opportunities available in the realm of school accountability.

Furthermore, legislation is not required for such feedback to be provided and such technical expertise to be sought. The PED has provided expert testimony before the LESC and LFC on school accountability models as needed, particularly during their developmental phases. Included in these efforts were clarifying and educational documents (see below). Ongoing technical review already involves revisions based on stakeholder input from all groups denoted above, with consistency/stability being placed at a premium by those involved.

The current A-F school grading system was developed (2012) with several groups advising and providing feedback, and these groups continue their work as new information is learned:

- U.S. Department of Education (peer review and approval for NCLB flexibility waiver in 2012, 2013, and 2015)
- Nine Superintendent's Advisory Work group meetings on the development of the A-F regulation and model
- Two hearings on the A-F final regulation (only 1 is required)
- Eight regional School Board Association meetings to present the A-F model, answer questions, and receive feedback

- Training to more than 2,000 school leaders and district administrators on how A-F works and supports for D and F schools, updated annually
- Development and convening of a Technical Working Group on the A-F school grading system (see TWG below)
- Coalition for Excellence in Science and Math Education (advocacy group)
- Assessment and Accountability Advisory Council, members include superintendents and other school administrators from across the state, ongoing monthly

In the first three years of school grading, the PED made a concerted effort to reach out to stakeholders about the accountability model, through such mechanisms as numerous documents, webinars, advisory committees, and on-site presentations around the state. These School Grades educational resources are listed below for reference and are revised periodically:

- **Bonus Points Rubric and School Grading Technical Guide** details the A-F School Grading calculations and business rules.
- **School Grading FAQs** provide a user-friendly explanation of each component of school grading

There does not appear to be a necessity in forming an additional advisory group. The school grading model in-place fully satisfies the requirements and expectations of ESSA, and emphasizes student growth for *all students* as the most important factor.

PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS

The PED has successfully implemented the A-F grading system over the past five years. School accountability has been and will continue to be required for ESSA federal and state accountability. Intensive effort has gone into aligning internal systems, disseminating the calculations and principles of the models to constituents and stakeholders, and gaining approval from the federal government, which has translated into favorable acceptance and meaningful accountability. To alter the model at this time would risk nullifying those efforts and the significant efforts put forward by the state's educators to improving schooling as a result.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

CONFLICT, DUPLICATION, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP

TECHNICAL ISSUES

The use of language “middle 50th percentile” is confusing and was likely meant to represent the middle 50% of students (from 25th percentile to the 75th percentile). This analysis interpreted these terms as such but they should be clarified. Similarly “highest 25th percentile” was interpreted to mean the highest performing quartile (25%) of students.

OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

ALTERNATIVES

WHAT WILL BE THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ENACTING THIS BILL

Consistency, comparability, and reliability over time.

AMENDMENTS