



# Rhode Island Accountability System Under the Every Student Succeeds Act

American Institutes for Research (AIR) has compiled profiles of each state educational agency's proposed accountability system under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as reauthorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015. The profile is based on initial plans submitted to the U.S. Department of Education. Upon final approval, profiles will be updated. For an overview and full set of profiles, visit [www.air.org/ESSAAccountability](http://www.air.org/ESSAAccountability).

- Rhode Island determines summative ratings of 1 to 5 stars for all public schools using business rules that set minimum measure scores for each star rating; this system helps prevent a high score on 1 measure from compensating for a low score on another measure.
- Rhode Island aligns its summative ratings and federal school improvement categories by stipulating that schools identified for targeted support and improvement (TSI) may receive no higher than 4 stars.

## Accountability Snapshot

Snapshot data here capture accountability highlights across states. Accountability measures are grouped by readiness to learn, persistence, and college and career readiness to highlight states' data-based leverage points across the educational trajectory.

Annual Meaningful Differentiation	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Annual summative rating</b> (Annually calculates overall performance rating for all schools and "all students" using all indicators, beyond CSI/TSI schools)	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Data dashboard only</b> (CSI/TSI schools identification only)	
Summative Ratings	
1 to 5 stars	
Accountability Measures	Included in Accountability
Academic	
Achievement status	✓
Achievement growth	✓
Achievement gap	
English language proficiency/progress	✓
4-year graduation rate	✓
Early learning	
Well-rounded education	
Persistence	
Extended-year graduation rate(s)	✓
On-track to graduation	
Dropout rate	
College and career readiness	
College enrollment	
Advanced coursework or sequence	
College placement test(s)	
Career and technical education or work-based learning	
Readiness to learn	
Conditions for learning/school climate	✓
Social-emotional learning	
Chronic absenteeism	✓

Student Groups for Accountability Determinations (N = 20 for accountability, N = 10 for reporting)	
<b>Major racial/ethnic subgroups</b>	
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian	
Black or African American	
Hispanic or Latino	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	
Two or more races	
White	
<b>Other required subgroups</b>	
Economically disadvantaged	
Students with disabilities	
English learners	
<b>Nonrequired subgroups</b>	
Not applicable	

Subjects Used for Accountability		
Subject	Status	Growth
Math	✓	✓
Reading/English language arts (ELA)	✓	✓
Writing		
Science		
Social studies		
Other		

Note: CSI=comprehensive support and improvement; TSI=targeted support and improvement

## Annual Differentiation System

Rhode Island determines a summative rating of 1 to 5 stars for each public school based on minimum scores for each accountability measure as well as status as a TSI school (see table below for maximum point values for each measure). Determinations for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) and TSI schools are based on star ratings for all students and subgroups, respectively (see also "School Improvement Categories").

Each star rating has a different set of cut scores for all measures. For example, the points required for earning a **5-star rating** are as follows:

- Proficiency index: 6 or more points (3 or 4 points per subject)
- Student growth: 4 or more points (2 or 3 points per subject)
- Graduation composite: 3 or more points
- English language proficiency (ELP) progress: 3 or more points
- School quality or student success: 10 or more points (2 or 3 points per measure)
- No school may be awarded 5 stars if it is identified for TSI

This system helps prevent a high score on 1 measure from compensating for a low score on another measure. In the above example, graduation composite score must be at least 3 points regardless of performance on the other measures. See the [Rhode Island ESSA State Plan](#) (pp. 31-35) for more information.

### Maximum Point Values by Measure for Summative Rating Determinations, 2017–18 Proposed State Plan

ESSA Indicator	State Measure	Maximum Points Attainable	
		Elementary/Middle Schools	High Schools
👤 Academic achievement	Proficiency index (ELA, math)	8 points (4 per subject)	8 points (4 per subject)
👤 Other academic	Student growth (SGP for ELA, math)	6 points (3 per subject)	6 points (3 per subject)
🎓 Graduation rate	Graduation composite (4-, 5-, and 6-year rate)	--	4 points
ELP English language proficiency progress	ELP progress	4 points	4 points
<b>Academic indicators subtotal</b>		<b>18 points</b>	<b>22 points</b>
SQSS School quality or student success	Exceeds expectations (ELA, math)	6 points (3 per subject)	6 points (3 per subject)
	Chronic absenteeism (student and teacher)	3 points	3 points
	Student suspensions	3 points	3 points
<b>SQSS indicator subtotal</b>		<b>12 points</b>	<b>12 points</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>30 points</b>	<b>34 points</b>
<b>Business rules</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Schools with 2 or more subgroups identified for TSI status may be rated no higher than 3 stars.</li><li>• Schools with 1 subgroup identified for TSI status may be rated no higher than 4 stars.</li></ul>	

Note: ELA=English language arts; SGP=student growth percentile

## Accountability Measure Descriptions

ESSA Indicator	State Measure	Description
👤 Academic achievement	Proficiency index (ELA and math)	Weighted average performance level achieved across students on statewide assessments based on assigning full credit to students proficient or above and partial credit to nonproficient students (point values pending clarification).
	<i>Participation rate inclusion</i>	The denominator of the proficiency calculation is the higher of the number of students actually participating or 95% of enrolled students in participating grades and subjects. Schools with participation rate less than 95% may not receive a 5-star summative rating.
👤 Other academic	Student growth (ELA and math)	Student growth percentile that ranks year-to-year change in annual statewide ELP assessment results for each participating student.
🎓 Graduation rate	Composite graduation rate	Simple average of the 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation rates. Rates are the percentage of students within an <u>adjusted cohort</u> who graduate within 4, 5, or 6 years, respectively, with a regular high school diploma.
ELP English language proficiency progress	ELP progress	Average percentage progress on statewide ELP tests toward meeting annual individual targets for sufficient progress toward ELP within a state-determined number of years. For example, if a student has an annual target of a 3.0 composite score and scores 2.0 and another student has an annual target of 4.0 and scores 3.0, then the measure score is $(2/3 + 3/4)/2 = (.66+.75)2 = .71$ .
SQSS School quality or student success	Exceeds expectations (ELA, math)	Percentage of students scoring at the "Exceeds expectations" performance level (level 4 out of 4) on annual statewide assessments.
	Chronic absenteeism	Sum of the percentage of students absent for more than 10% of enrolled school days and the percentage of teachers absent for more than 10% of school days (not including approved professional development days and long-term excused absences).
	Student suspensions	Percentage of students receiving an out-of-school suspension for a given school year.

Note: ELA=English language arts

## School Improvement Categories

	<b>Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) Schools</b>	<b>Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) Schools</b>	<b>Additional Targeted Support (ATS) Schools</b>
Identification criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low-performing school: From schools receiving a 1-star summative rating, the bottom 5% of Title I schools, as ranked by proficiency index and student growth combined</li> <li>Low graduation rate school: 4-year graduation rate less than 67%</li> <li>Chronically underperforming subgroup (i.e., 4 consecutive years ATS status with 2 subgroups identified or 1 identified subgroup comprising 50% of school population)</li> </ul>	Any school with subgroup that receives a 1-star rating on its own and that is otherwise not identified for ATS based on combined proficiency index/student growth score	Any school with subgroup that on its own receives a 1-star summative rating and has a combined proficiency index and student growth score below threshold for the identification of bottom 5% of Title I schools based on all students
First year and frequency of identification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2018–19 for low-performing and low graduation rate schools and annually thereafter</li> <li>2021–22 for chronically underperforming subgroup schools and annually thereafter</li> </ul>	2018–19 and annually thereafter	2018–19 and every annually thereafter
Years of improvement to exit status	1 year of improvement required to exit CSI status	States are not required to determine exit criteria for consistently underperforming subgroups	1 year of improvement required to exit ATS status

## Inclusion of Recently Arrived English Learners in Accountability

Under Sec. 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) of ESSA, states may exempt English learners (ELs) who have been enrolled in a school in the United States for less than 12 months from taking the reading/ELA statewide assessment in their first year according to the following 3 options.

State Options Under Sec. 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) of ESSA		Year of Student Enrollment		
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
1		Exempt all recent ELs from ELA/reading statewide testing	Test new ELs and include proficiency scores in accountability for all statewide tests for the first time	Test ELs and include proficiency and growth in accountability
2	✓	Test all recent ELs in ELA/reading but exclude from accountability	Test ELs and include achievement growth scores in accountability for all statewide tests for the first time	Test ELs and include proficiency and growth in accountability
3		Uniform procedure for assigning individual ELs to either Option 1 or Option 2		