

Accountability Working Committee Meeting Summary 08/22/2016

Overview and Introductions

The Committee Chairs welcomed members, who then introduced themselves. The chairs reviewed the first meeting small group discussion.

- What works: Holistic view, communicates what schools are about; data in portal; transparent; improvement over previous system; indicators – performance flags, two grad rates, growth, post high school readiness (pathways), Milestones classifications.
- What is not working: Too complex; timeline; context is missing; too much room for human error; too many changes; too many indicators; primary schools; indicator issues – attendance, ETBs, CTAE pathway completers earning a credential, Lexiles for high school, no K-3 growth data, achievement gap, innovative practice.
- What questions do you have? What issues do you want to discuss?: How can we create a working index as data comes out (even if it is not final) to continue to inform decisions and making plans? Is there a way to streamline? What role does attendance play in enrollment or should it just be linked with climate? Maybe give points on CCRPI for climate stars? Are there additional levels of varieties that we can examine with new/other indicators? Can you get a fair Lexile score from a single assessment? Can it be easier to determine scores? How can we better educate district-level staff about how data is being used? Is current CCRPI too much information? Are parents understanding what they are seeing in CCRPI indexes? Does CCRPI communicate well? What is the purpose of the final CCRPI scores? To communicate a “grade” ABCD for schools? Could a school be recognized as exemplary, distinguished, improving, and developing? What causes the need for several data collections for TKES, CCRPI, etc.? Why can’t the surveys apply across programs? How can CCRPI measure children, not just measure schools? How do all indicators relate to effective practice?

Overview of ESSA Accountability Provisions by Ryan Reyna, Education Strategy Group

- ESSA replaces NCLB and adequate yearly progress. Under ESSA, states must establish ambitious long-term goals and interim measures of progress aligned with those goals for all students and all student subgroups.
- The system must include: proficiency based on annual assessments, a measure of student growth or other statewide academic indicator for elementary and middle schools, graduation rates for high schools, progress in achieving English proficiency for English Learners, and at least one measure of school quality or student success.
- The system must differentiate all schools overall; academic factors have to receive “much greater weight” than quality/success; all indicators must be broken out by each subgroup and available statewide.
- Super subgroups may supplement but may not replace individual subgroups.
- Former EL students may count for up to 4 years in the EL subgroup.
- States must use one of four methods to respond to participation rates that fall below the 95% threshold for all students or subgroups. Schools not meeting the 95% participation requirement must develop an improvement plan that is approved and monitored by the

local education agency. LEAs with significant number of schools must implement improvement plans reviewed and approved by state.

- Each state is required to identify schools for comprehensive support and improvement *and* targeted support and improvement.

Overview of State Accountability Provisions by Allan Meyer, GaDOE Policy Division

- End of grade assessments are required in English language arts/reading and mathematics in grades three through eight annually; end of grade assessments are required in science and social studies in grades five and eight annually; and end of course assessments are required for students in grades nine through twelve for all core subjects determined by the State Board of Education.
- The Office of Student Achievement (GOSA) shall create a single state-wide accountability system; establish indicators of performance; rate schools and school systems; develop annual report cards for elementary, middle and secondary schools; formulate system of school awards and interventions; and the performance of indicators of quality of learning shall be based on data that include student achievement, achievement gap closure and student progress.
- GOSA, in coordination with the Department of Education, shall establish and annually calculate individual school and school system ratings, which shall be a numerical score on a scale of 0-100 for each public school and school system in the state.

History of CCRPI and Lessons Learned by Becky Chambers, GaDOE Curriculum & Instruction Division

- It started as a tool to help high school principals identify areas of school improvement and then morphed into CCRPI when ESEA flexibility became an option.
- The CCRPI should not be a programmatic check list but an accountability tool that contains indicators that make schools better.
- There is not much needed to change CCRPI so that it meets new USED guidance, but we have the opportunity to improve the indicators.

Review and Discussion of CCRPI Survey of School and District Leaders

The survey was administered online May 25 – June 10, 2016 and received 1,910 valid responses from school and district leaders. Results can be viewed in the meeting PowerPoint. The general conclusion is to 1) set clear, attainable goals, 2) include indicators that promote improved student opportunities and outcomes, 3) simplify the index, maintain consistency, and 4) release CCRPI scores earlier.

Setting Goals and Identifying Expected Outcomes

Setting goals is important as it develops a common vision for accountability and clarifies the rationale for the system and its design. It is critical to define the goals of the accountability system in order to ensure that it is designed to meet those goals. This process includes identifying the purpose, goals, expected outcomes, and intended uses of the results.

Small Group Discussion

Committee members engaged in small group discussions around five main questions:

- Purpose
 - What is the driving force behind the CCRPI? What do we hope to accomplish through CCRPI?
- Goals
 - What observable, measurable outcomes are we hoping to realize if CCRPI is working as intended? Prioritize!
- Intended uses of the results
 - In what ways are the state and its stakeholders intended to use the information provided by CCRPI? Overall scores and component/indicator scores?
- Intended outcomes of the system
 - What do we expect to happen if CCRPI is working as intended?
- Vision
 - What does CCRPI look like? Must haves? Can't haves? Aha moments?

Report Out

Small groups reported out on their discussions as follows:

- Purpose:
 - Communication purpose: To communicate student achievement to communities and public in specific ways and inform communities about a school's progress toward preparing students for college and careers, as well as the school's ability to close the achievement gap.
 - School improvement purpose: CCRPI should be a statewide system that drives school improvement, provides guidance to improve school's utilization of data.
 - Accountability purpose: The CCRPI scores should reflect school improvement.
- Goals:
 - Increase student achievement, graduation rates, literacy and numeracy
 - Increase the number of students that are college and career ready, pathway completers and those passing pathway assessments
 - Reflect students that score at the proficient level
 - Should be released timely to inform practice in school improvement across the state
 - Alert schools of areas of strength and weakness. If a school does make improvement, the CCRPI score should reflect that.
- Intended uses of the results
 - Alert schools of weakness

- Hold schools accountable
- Identify schools where additional support is needed
- Communication of student achievement and effective instructional practices
- School improvement
- Use the CCRPI results to prioritize resources (such as funding)
- Provide a mechanism for comparisons of schools within districts, across the state, and nationally
- Intended outcomes of the system
 - School collaboration
 - Guide schools in school improvement plans
 - Highlight schools that are effective and recognize their strategies
 - Flexible enough to accommodate nuances across the state
 - Communicate to stakeholders a school/district rating on selected indicators of school quality
 - Create a shift towards results-oriented improvement
 - Fidelity of educational advisement for students to support workforce development
- Vision
 - What does CCRPI look like?
 - Tools that allows schools to look at other schools that are similar
 - A portion that is visually appealing
 - Simplistic but provide more information through drill downs
 - Flexible enough to meet the needs of waivers and charters
 - Based on research and not just a compliance check off
 - Must have:
 - Achievement/growth are the main components
 - It is a way to address gaps in achievement
 - Not just a hammer but a tool for improvement
 - Have an easily understood scoring system
 - Needs to be timely
 - Can't have:
 - No complex math formulas
 - No more than 5 indicators per level
 - More universal than programmatic
 - Remove ETBs

The committee will continue to discuss and refine the goals of the system as they proceed through the next phases in designing the system.

During the day's discussion, committee members raised several issues and suggestions that will be discussed at a later date.

- Districts have different requirements for physics and physical science which could impact how many points they are awarded on CCRPI.
- Some primary schools do not have the opportunity to earn achievement points for assessments that occur in their building. How can the CCRPI be modified to better capture what primary schools are doing?

- For charter school and strategic waiver systems, how do you make comparisons across years when the index is always changing?
- If ETBs are important enough to measure, should they be placed on the face of the CCRPI or removed entirely?
- CCRPI comes out too late to be used for school improvement. What are some ways to speed up the timeline?
- There are certain indicators of effective schools that are hard to capture quantitatively, are there ways to collect other information that can better show what is happening in schools?
- How can CCRPI be improved to really show what is happening in alternative schools?

Closing Remarks

At the next meeting, the committee will continue to work on developing the CCRPI framework and review indicators.