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Objectives

• Reviewing the 2016 CCRPI
• Looking ahead to the 2017 CCRPI
• ESSA and opportunities for CCRPI
Reviewing the 2016 CCRPI
CCRPI Overview

• Four main components, encompassing multiple indicators, are combined for a total CCRPI score on a scale of 0 to 100, with a possibility of 10 additional points
  • Achievement
  • Progress
  • Achievement Gap
  • Challenge Points

• Informational components
  • Performance Flags
  • School Climate Star Rating
  • Financial Efficiency Star Rating
Scoring

CCRPI Score
100 points

Achievement
50 points
Content Mastery
40% = 20 points
Post Readiness
30% = 15 points
Graduation Rate/Predictor
30% = 15 points

Progress
40 points

Achievement Gap
10 points

Challenge Points
Up to 10 points
ED/EL/SWD Performance
Exceeding the Bar
Changes for 2016

• High School
  • The GHSWT indicator is removed
  • Mathematics content mastery includes both sets of EOCs – Coordinate Algebra/Algebra I and Analytic Geometry/Geometry

• Middle School
  • Middle school students enrolled in mathematics and/or science high school courses assessed by the EOC no longer take the grade-level EOG in the corresponding content area. The EOC scores will be included in CCRPI calculations for the middle school.
  • This does not extend to ELA and social studies.

• 2016 SBOE-approved indicators and summary of changes available on the accountability website
## 2016 Results – Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Band</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>- 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>+ 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>- 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>- 1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2016 Results – Elementary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>- 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+ 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Gap</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge Points</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>- 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/EL/SWD Performance</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>- 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETB</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student performance increased in math, science, and social studies, but did not increase enough to meet 2016 targets. ELA performance decreased in parallel with all students.
# 2016 Results – Middle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>+ 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>+ 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Gap</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge Points</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/EL/SWD Performance</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETB</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gains in weighted proficiency rates in ELA (+ 2.168), math (+ 3.364), science (+ 2.583), and social studies (+ 2.665).
Grade 8 Lexile increased + 6.152.
Proficient/Distinguished increased + 2.872.
## 2016 Results – High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>- 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>+ 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Gap</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge Points</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>- 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED/EL/SWD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>- 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETB</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gains in all weighted proficiency rates, including +7.3 in Economics, + 7.1 in Geometry, + 5.9 in American Literature, + 5.4 in Biology, + 5.3 in US History, + 3.8 in Algebra, + 2.1 in 9th Grade Lit, and + 1.5 in Physical Science.

4-year grad rate increased + 0.484 and 5-year rate increased + 6.
2016 CCRPI Calculations

- For a single school, an elementary CCRPI report contains 232 calculations/values, a middle school report contains 223, and a high school report contains 375
- Reports were calculated for 2,473 schools, 204 districts, and the state
- 8 data sources, including 38 elements and 41 data files were utilized
  - Student Record – 35 data elements
  - FTE Survey – 2 data elements
  - FTE-1 – 1 data element
  - USG and TCSG – 3 data files
  - Schools/districts – 16 files
  - GaDOE – 5 files (PBIS, STEM, SLDS, EOPA, SLOs for innovative practice)
  - Assessment – 17 files (AP, IB, SAT, ACT, ACCESS, GAA, and multiple Georgia Milestones files)
Data Quality

• Most common data quality issues:
  • Attendance
  • ED status
  • Career data (lessons, IGP, career portfolio)
  • Marking periods identified in FTE Survey do not match course data submitted in SR
  • Course codes
    • Students must be enrolled in an EOC-required course for them to be an expected participant and for their test score to be included in CCRPI
    • Also impacts other indicators (pathway completion, physics, etc.)
Data Quality

• Most common data entry issues:
  • Applications
    • CCRPI Data Collection – failure to upload document and/or to address all components of application
    • Assessment Matching – making incorrect matches
    • Non-Participation – selecting incorrect reasons
    • Summer Graduates – failure to identify all summer graduates
    • Cohort Withdrawal Update – select incorrect reasons or failure to complete
  • Common issues with applications
    • Failure to review all selections and save reports before superintendent sign-off
    • Failure to understand the importance of data quality and the impact the information provided has on CCRPI and, in particular, graduation rates
Importance of Course Codes

• Ensure schools are enrolling students in the correct courses using the correct course codes!
  • They impact several indicators...
    • Pathway completion, earning credit for AP/IB/MOWR, work-based learning, physics credit, earning credit in core content areas, credit in world language, concentration in middle school, earning high school credit in middle school, above grade level courses in elementary school, world language or fine arts in elementary school...
    • They impact achievement data and participation rates!
      • EOC scores are only used in CCRPI if students are enrolled in the correct EOC-required course
        • EOC Courses 2016-2017
Looking Ahead to the 2017 CCRPI
Changes for 2017

• Content Mastery – elementary and middle only
  • ELA/math will be worth ¾ of the points and science/social studies will be worth ¼ of the points

• Progress – all levels
  • Progress will be based on growth (SGPs) in ELA and mathematics

• Achievement Gap – all levels
  • Achievement gap will be based on ELA and mathematics

• These changes are due to Senate Bill 364 and the elimination of Georgia Milestones science and social studies assessments in select grades.
Changes for 2017

• High School
  • Work-based learning program or career related capstone project has moved from the ETBs to the face of CCRPI
  • SAT college readiness benchmark for redesigned SAT updated – 480 on Evidence-Based Reading and Writing and 530 on Math

• Elementary School
  • 5th grade students with a complete career portfolio has moved from the ETBs to the face of CCRPI

• All Levels
  • STEAM certification added to STEM certification ETB
  • Other wording clarifications (not calculation changes)

• 2017 SBOE-approved indicators and summary of changes available on the accountability website
Changes for 2017

• Amendment to SBOE Rule 160-3-1-.07 Testing Programs – Student Assessment
  • Among other amendments, “exempts” dual enrollment/MOWR students from the EOC other than those required by ESSA for accountability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required of All Students</th>
<th>Allowed Exemption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade Literature</td>
<td>American Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate Algebra / Algebra I</td>
<td>Physical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic Geometry* / Geometry*</td>
<td>US History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Analytic Geometry/Geometry are not allowable as a dual enrollment/MOWR option.

• To ensure high schools are not negatively impacted, the college-issued course grade will be used in the CCRPI for remaining EOC-related courses.
Ideas to Improve Process and Timeline

• Calculate some CCRPI indicators in real-time
  • Indicators can be calculated using information in Student Record (SR) before SR closes. CCRPI would refresh either nightly or when clicking a button.
    • Examples – attendance rate; career awareness lessons; career inventories/IGP
  • Schools/districts can see their CCRPI indicators before SR closes, allowing them to make corrections, if necessary, directly in SR
  • Could improve data quality while also improving timeline
  • Possible challenge – tinkering with data to yield a certain CCRPI score
Ideas to Improve Process and Timeline

- Combine summer graduate and cohort withdrawal update applications
  - Open single application upon close of Student Record and close in August (this year Summer Grad closed August 26)
  - Allows application to be open longer while improving timeline
    - No longer need to open Cohort Withdrawal after Summer Grad
  - Use single application to indicate summer graduates (G) as well as update withdrawal reasons
  - Could try to calculate graduation rate in real-time with application. This would allow schools/districts to see graduation rate and the impact of data quality. Could also improve timeline as graduation rates would be calculated shortly after application closes.
Ideas to Improve Process and Timeline

• Open Assessment Matching earlier
  • Open Assessment Matching as soon as assessments are available, providing districts with more time to complete the activity.
    • National assessments (SAT, ACT, IB, AP) become available in the fall.
    • Winter EOCs become available in the winter.
  • This provides districts with additional time as well as allows us to close the applications earlier in the summer, shortly after final assessments (EOG and EOC Spring/Summer) are loaded.
Ideas to Improve Process and Timeline

• Data quality campaign
  • More information to help districts understand the CCRPI process and the importance of data quality
    • Videos? Webinars? More emails? Regional sessions?
  • Lunch and learn webinars?

• Challenges
  • Who do we target?
  • How do we keep it simple?
  • What methods do we use?
ESSA and Opportunities for CCRPI
Georgia’s ESSA Plan

• State Advisory Committee
  • Comprised of 40 stakeholders representing a variety of organizations, agencies, and advocacy groups across the state of Georgia

• Working Committees (20 members each)
  • Accountability
  • Assessment
  • Education of the Whole Child
  • Federal Programs
  • Teacher & Leader Development

Superintendent Woods held 8 ESSA Listening Sessions across the state:
Columbia County, Habersham County, Fulton County, Muscogee County, Dougherty County, Laurens County, Chatham County, Gordon County

GaDOE administered an online survey and held a Twitter chat.
ESSA Statutory Provisions

• Establish long-term goals and measurements of interim progress
  • Academic achievement based on proficiency rates on annual assessments
  • High school graduation rate
  • Progress in achieving English language proficiency

• Elementary and middle school required indicators
  • Proficiency on state assessments, English language proficiency, one other academic factor (such as growth), and at least one school quality or student success measure

• High school indicators
  • Proficiency on state assessments, English language proficiency, cohort graduation rate, and at least one school quality or student success measure
ESSA Statutory Provisions

• Academic factors have to receive “much greater weight” than quality/success
• 95% participation requirement
• All indicators must be broken out by each subgroup and available statewide
• Must differentiate all schools overall
• Identify schools for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement (CSI and TSI)
Accountability Working Committee

- Discuss current CCRPI – successes, issues, challenges
- Review and consider stakeholder feedback, ESSA provisions and regulations
- Clearly define purpose and goals of CCRPI, intended uses and outcomes
- Review and select indicators and components that align with the purpose and goals
- Discuss weighting, aggregating indicators, and determining an overall score
- Discuss reporting and communicating information
- Discuss long-term goals and measurements of interim progress
- In conjunction with Federal Programs, discuss criteria for identification of Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement (CSI and TSI) schools
Major Themes Emerging from Working Committee

• Role of Accountability
  • Accountability should play a supporting role in assisting schools, districts, and the state to reach its mission of offering a holistic education to every child and preparing them for college, career, and life. Accountability should not be the driving force behind decisions about educating students.
  • CCRPI should provide an objective measure that illustrates the extent to which schools and districts are succeeding in providing improved opportunities and outcomes for all students.
  • CCRPI should focus on universal goals and outcomes instead of encouraging specific programs. This retains local flexibility to implement the programs and policies important to local communities that will lead to improved opportunities and outcomes for their students.
Major Themes Emerging from Working Committee

• Purpose of CCRPI
  • CCRPI should be intentionally redesigned to make the ultimate goal continuous improvement.
  • CCRPI can serve as a school improvement and communication tool by providing schools and districts with information on their progress and information to share with their communities as they set goals and work together towards improved student opportunities and outcomes.
  • A focus on continuous improvement can be accomplished through how the state sets goals, weights components, reports information, and identifies schools for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement (CSI and TSI).
  • The accountability system should encourage long-term, sustainable improvement, not quick fixes for immediate points.
Questions?

Allison Timberlake, Ph.D., Director of Accountability
atimberlake@doe.k12.ga.us or (404) 463-6666

Kris Floyd, Accountability Specialist
kfloyd@doe.k12.ga.us or (404) 463-1175

August Ogletree, Ph.D., Accountability Research Specialist
aogletree@doe.k12.ga.us or (404) 463-6675

Qi Qin, Assessment Specialist, Growth Model
qqin@doe.k12.ga.us or (404) 657-0311

Tianna Sims, Accountability Specialist
tfloyd@doe.k12.ga.us or (404) 463-1166

Paula Swartzberg, Accountability Specialist
pswartzberg@doe.k12.ga.us or (404) 463-1539

Melissa Fincher, Ph.D., Deputy Superintendent for Assessment and Accountability
mfincher@doe.k12.ga.us or (404) 651-9405

GaDOE Customer Service Survey: http://gadoe.org/surveys/AsAc-H8PBVZM