

Accountability Working Committee
Meeting Summary 2/7/17
Online Meeting

Overview and Introductions

The Committee Chairs welcomed members and reviewed the agenda, which focused on discussing the definition of Economically Disadvantaged, reviewing impact data on proposed CCRPI components and indicators, and reviewing the CCRPI working draft.

Defining “Economically Disadvantaged”

The committee heard an overview of the current definition of Economically Disadvantaged, which is based on free and reduced price lunch. This definition also includes the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) where schools and districts at a certain threshold of poverty (40%) can designate all students as Economically Disadvantaged. An alternative definition of Economically Disadvantaged was proposed, based on Direct Certification. On average, direct certification rates are approximately one-half of free and reduced price lunch rates.

The committee strongly recommended that CCRPI should continue to use the current definition of Economically Disadvantaged. They noted that poverty is the biggest challenge schools face and should never be underestimated. Even for schools that move to 100% Economically Disadvantaged with CEP, all students in the school are impacted by poverty as it impacts the entire community.

Targets

At the previous meeting, the committee recommended that a “maintenance level” be included in the target calculations. The Accountability Team presented additional impact analyses to inform where the maintenance level should be set. After reviewing the analyses and having a discussion, the committee recommended setting the maintenance level at 90%. The committee felt 90% represented a high expectation for all students, but would not negatively impact very high-performing subgroups with small N sizes where a single student could impact meeting the target. One committee member also noted that even high-performing schools may have a subgroup or two where improvement can be made and this incentivizes continuous improvement for all students.

College and Career Ready Indicator

The Accountability Team presented an initial impact analysis on the committee’s previous recommendation to combine the current college and career readiness indicators into a single indicator. The committee recommended moving forward with the indicator; however, they also recommended that 1) the work-based learning/career capstone project not be included unless there is a way to ensure consistency of rigor across all schools and 2) the GaDOE explore if ACCUPLACER and ASVAB scores can be included. They noted that other options for demonstrating readiness may become available in the future and can be incorporated into the

indicator at that time without requiring changes to CCRPI. The committee also expressed an interest in including all graduates in the calculation, including those that did not participate in any of the readiness options, particularly if ACCUPLACER and ASVAB can be included. However, the committee wants to examine why students may not have participated in any of the available readiness options.

Middle School High School Readiness Indicator

The Accountability Team presented an impact analysis on an indicator proposed at the previous meeting. This would be a middle school indicator examining the percentage of students who earned three or more core credits in grade 9. The committee noted that this was important information that middle schools should be examining, but did not believe it should be included as an indicator in CCRPI.

Working Draft

The committee reviewed the current working draft of the CCRPI, inclusive of recommendations made to date. The committee will make final recommendations on the remaining indicators being discussed. There was some additional discussion on the attendance indicator. The committee also requested additional information to inform a future conversation about the minimum N size.