

Summary of First Responses to the Jan. 11 Survey on ESSA and the Additional Accountability Indicator

As you know, we asked:

(1) Do you think adding a nonacademic indicator will improve schools? (Yes/No)

(2) What indicator(s) do you recommend?

And we invited any comments to be shared.

Below is a summary of the initial 236 responses received on Jan 11 and 12. We are compiling the detailed comments (concerns, suggestions) and putting them online – see <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/comments.pdf>

>So far, the vast majority of respondents are positive (with some concerns) about adding a nonacademic accountability indicator. (Only 25 responded negatively – some indicating they didn't think adding such an indicator would improve schools; some felt overburdened by accountability; some were concerned that such an indicator would hold schools accountable for factors upon which that they had little influence).

>Most of those who responded positively hoped that adding a nonacademic indicator would broaden the focus of school accountability and provide more support for students, teachers, and families. (Note: Many of the suggestions were for multiple indicators.)

>Types of nonacademic indicators suggested:

I. Student data regularly gathered by schools:

>Attendance (most often suggested). In many instances, attendance was viewed as a proxy for student engagement.

>Discipline referrals, suspensions/expulsions

>Dropout and graduation rates

>Course completion, career pathways

>Parent involvement/participation

II. Data on number of students participating in special learning activities

>Enrichment/electives (e.g., art, music, drama, special clubs, etc.)

>Extracurricular activity

>Community service

>Character education, civics, citizenship

III. Measures of community/family/school challenges that impact school effectiveness

>Poverty

>Barriers to learning and teaching

>Student and staff stress

IV. Data on school resources

>Support for collaboration

>Nature and scope of the teaching staff and staff retention

>Upgrades in facilities/technology

>Safety measures

V. Special Student support provided

- >Social emotional learning to address problems
- >Mental health, general health, wrap around services
- >Continuum of resources available for student and learning supports
- >Special programs related to college and career preparation

VI. Measures of student growth

- >Social emotional learning (skills/resilience/wellness)
- >Student motivation/engagement/curiosity
- >Student self-efficacy/perseverance

VII. Survey data collected from students, teachers, parents, community focused on

- >Teacher/student connection
- >Student engagement and re-engagement
- >Parent involvement, engagement, and re-engagement
- >Satisfaction with school/school climate
- >College completion/career choice

Specific measures mentions:

- *CA Healthy Kids Survey (includes a school connectedness scale)*
- *Gallup Student Poll*
- *Oleweus Bullying Prevention Survey*
- *Center for Educational Effectiveness Staff Survey*
- *Developmental Assets Survey*
- *Maine Integrated Youth Health Survey*
- *Attendance Works indicators*
- *Baldrige Excellence Framework for education*
- *Youth Outcomes Questionnaire*
- *Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire*
- *CAYCI School Experience Surveys*

Given the diverse responses, states and districts have a challenge to confront in deciding on what nonacademic measure to add.

As you analyze the above responses and the related comments, if you have thoughts about how the decision making should be done, jot down your ideas and send them to us (Ltaylor@ucla.edu). We will include these in a report we will prepare and send as input to the decision makers.

Note: Many newsletters and blogs are weighing in on this matter. For example, see *Education Week* –

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2016/01/06/essa-law-broadens-definition-of-school-success.html>