

Accountability Working Committee
Meeting Summary 3/2/17

Overview and Introductions

The Committee Chair welcomed the committee and the external facilitator, Dr. Erika Hall from the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCIEA), and reviewed the agenda. The agenda primarily focused on prioritizing the components of CCRPI.

Purpose

Dr. Hall began by defining the purpose of the meeting. The purpose was to work as a group to clarify how the CCRPI components and associated indicators should be prioritized within the system. The committee was informed that they would be focusing on assigning policy weights, not points, to the components of the CCRPI system. Dr. Hall defined the difference between nominal and effective weights, clarifying that nominal weights are the assigned or intended weights (policy weights) associated with each indicator while effective weights represent the true contribution of each indicator after accounting for differential variability. The committee was told that they would be recommending nominal/policy weights for GaDOE to consider in defining procedures for calculating the CCRPI. Since some components of the system may be highly correlated, Dr. Hall indicated that the committee may ultimately recommend applying weights to combinations of components (or indicators) within the system.

To understand and quantify the intended emphasis of each component in the CCRPI, the committee engaged in three activities. Specifically the committee members:

1. worked in small groups to discuss what it means to be an effective school
2. discussed and evaluated different profiles of school performance
3. quantified and discussed the relative emphasis of different components of the CCRPI system

Working Draft of the Revised CCRPI Framework

The GaDOE provided an overview of the current draft of the revised CCRPI framework based on the recommendations of the committee. The framework includes five components: Content Mastery, Progress, Closing Gaps, Readiness, and Graduation Rate (high schools only).

Content Mastery includes performance on Georgia Milestones and the GAA and will continue to utilize weights based on achievement level. Elementary and middle schools will continue to have ELA and math weighted more than science and social studies to correspond with the number of tests administered. In order to satisfy the 95% participation requirement, the achievement score for all students or a subgroup that falls below 95% participation will be multiplied by the actual participation rate divided by 95%.

Progress includes growth in ELA and mathematics based on Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs). This component will also include progress towards EL proficiency. This indicator is still under development.

Closing Gaps is based on the percent of achievement targets (flags) met and includes targets for all students and subgroups. Full points are awarded when targets are met. Partial points are awarded when progress is made but targets are not met. No points are awarded when performance declines.

Readiness includes multiple indicators which vary by level. Some Readiness indicators have been approved for inclusion in the system, while others are still under discussion:

- Elementary school (include): literacy (Lexiles in grades 3-5); academic enrichment (earning credit in fine arts, world language)
- Elementary school (discuss): chronic absenteeism (10% of enrollment or 15 days); career awareness lessons and/or career portfolio; students with disabilities served in a general education environment
- Middle school (include): literacy (Lexiles in grades 6-8); academic enrichment (earning credit in fine arts, world language, career exploratory)
- Middle school (discuss): chronic absenteeism (10% of enrollment or 15 days); career inventories/assessments and individual graduation plan; students with disabilities served in a general education environment
- High school (include): literacy (Lexiles in 9th Grade Literature and American Literature); completion of advanced courses; pathway completion; college and career readiness
- High school (discuss): chronic absenteeism (10% of enrollment or 15 days)

Graduation Rate, for high schools only, includes the four- and five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.

Theory of Action

Dr. Hall reviewed the components of a theory of action and the work that the committee has done to develop a theory of action for CCRPI. She summarized the purpose, goals, and intended uses of the CCRPI, as articulated by the committee at previous meetings, and discussed the importance of establishing coherence between these factors and the procedures used to calculate the CCRPI. The committee noted that a primary purpose of the CCRPI is to give stakeholders an indication of how a school is performing at a point in time, both overall and specific to the indicators identified as important for inclusion in the system. The system should also be easy to communicate.

The emphasis given to different components of the system influences the attention and focus they receive in schools/districts and reflects the information the state values in supporting the intended uses. It is, therefore, vital that the component weights accurately reflect the state's goals and priorities as defined within the Theory of Action.

Activity 1: What Makes a School

For Activity #1 the committee was asked to think about and describe a school in their district that they would consider effective and one that they would consider ineffective. Within small groups, the committee summarized and prioritized what they believed to be the factors that best

distinguished an effective school from an ineffective school. To prevent the committee from focusing on the components addressed in the CCRPI, the task was presented as follows.

“Think about a school in your district that you would consider effective. Pretend you are describing that school to a friend who is considering moving into the area. What features, outcomes, and/or teacher/student experiences would you include in your description to support the claim that the school is effective? What do you believe constitutes the most compelling piece of evidence?”

Comments from committee members included the following:

Effective high school

- Evidence of high achievement in all course offerings with focus on achievement, soft skills, social-emotional skills, and building positive relationships
- Having high rigor and relevant course offerings – or finding ways of offering other rigorous opportunities
- Students involved in clubs, leadership opportunities, anything to better the whole child
- If you have an effective school, the kids are there. They want to be there. They’re attending. It’s engaging.

Effective middle school

- Leadership really sets the tone for the school, students, and community. The building is open and inviting. Progress is monitored and leadership looks at all kinds of data (letting data be a driving focus).
- School is safe.
- Kids are still interested in learning. Having those expectations for kids. Fun but challenging environment.

Effective elementary school

- High academic achievement for all students. Might look different depending on context and students.
- High commitment to excellence. Constantly reaching and striving for more.
- High rate of satisfaction among all stakeholders. Students, parents, teachers are happy.

Activity 2: Evaluate CCRPI Profiles

For the second activity, committee members were tasked with comparing the performance profiles of two hypothetical schools and identifying which profile they believed represented the more effective school (paired comparison approach). For each pair of performance profiles the two hypothetical schools differed in two CCRPI areas (e.g., content mastery/progress) so that the relative importance of those two components could be isolated and discussed.

The purpose of the task was to inspire group discussion about the relative value of different components of the CCRPI in making inferences about the success of schools “in providing improved opportunities and outcomes for all students.”

The following points were made during the discussion.

Profile 1 (High Content Mastery vs High Progress in High School):

- The school showing high content mastery is more effective because it represents on-grade-level performance. If students are below grade level, high progress is important, but it still isn't on-grade-level.
- High School A may have had an opportunity to move kids further than they did, but didn't, so they may not have been effective. School B moved their kids so they may be more effective.
- I said C because of both arguments. Some high achieving schools don't think their kids can grow because they're already high achieving. We need to push the progress piece so all schools pay attention and push their kids. For School B, they're making progress and could maybe outperform School A at some point in time.
- There will come a point in time where kids have to be at a certain level to be college and career ready. There will be an expectation that kids can read technical writing and have those skills.
- You'd like to think both could be effective. You don't want to pick one over the other. One is high achieving and the other is making great progress.
- At high school, mastery is more important. I was between A and C but by high school it needs to be mastery. Kids need to be ready to go out independently and be successful.

Profile 2 (High Progress vs High Graduation Rate in High Schools):

- Graduation rate and progress can't really be compared. You want to see high content mastery and graduation rate. Graduation rates need to be high.
- Making graduation rate be weighted more than progress would be a very large change for CCRPI. There are already a lot of status measures. I would be in camp B because it's the one improvement measure over just status.
- The problem with A is that if your growth is that low, you're not addressing the students that need help. You can't be doing a good job overall. Both schools should be ineffective.

Profile 3 (High Readiness vs High Graduation Rate in High Schools):

- Graduation rate is important but the students have to be prepared to succeed at the next level.
- Readiness is vital. Students have to be ready to succeed. School A is graduating kids but not focusing on the whole child. School B is looking at everything necessary to grow their students, community, etc.
- For most systems, the bottom line is did you graduate the student.

Profile 4 (Success in Closing Gaps vs Success in Demonstrating Readiness in High Schools)

- Both are equally important.
- School A is more effective because I believe content mastery, progress, and closing gaps go together and readiness is another piece. So I would rate readiness higher knowing that the other measures work together.

Profile 6 (High Content Mastery vs. High Progress in Elementary/Middle Schools)

- Schools can better control progress. Schools at this level need to move kids from where they are. Depending on where they start, it may take some time to get them to mastery.

Profile 7: (Success in Closing Gaps vs Success in Demonstrating Readiness in Elementary/Middle Schools)

- I lean towards readiness.
- Reading on grade level is critical for success

On several occasions the committee stated that this activity was extremely difficult, as there were a variety of additional factors (e.g., the demographic representation of the school and the technical characteristics of each indicator) that they would want to know and consider if they were really making decisions about the effectiveness of the two schools. The discussion therefore served to not only emphasize differences in how the committee members prioritized different components of the system (as intended), but highlight the range of factors that must be considered when establishing and validating the appropriateness of CCRPI calculations.

Activity 3: Determining the Relative Emphasis of Components and Indicators

For the last activity committee members were asked to quantify what they believed should be the relative emphasis of 1) each component within the overall CCRPI system (for elementary, middle and high school) and 2) each indicator within the Progress component (e.g., math progress, ELA progress, and progress in achieving ELP. To avoid the specification of points or weights committee members were asked to *distribute 100 pennies across the different components based on their belief regarding the extent to which each should be reflected in the overall CCRPI*. The results for high schools, elementary schools and middle schools are provided below:

Table 1. Recommended Distribution of Emphasis across Components in High School

Components	Min.	Max.	Average Response (out of 100)	Median Response (out of 100)
Content Mastery	20	50	29	30
Progress	20	50	28	25
Achievement Gap	5	15	9	10
Readiness	5	30	18	15
Graduation Rate	10	20	16	20

Table 2. Recommended Distribution of Emphasis across Components in Middle School

Components	Min.	Max.	Average Response (out of 100)	Median Response (out of 100)
Content Mastery	30	50	35	30
Progress	20	50	33	35
Achievement Gap	10	25	15	15
Readiness	10	30	17	20

Table 3. Recommended Distribution of Emphasis across Components in Elementary School

Components	Min.	Max.	Average Response (out of 100)	Median Response (out of 100)
Content Mastery	30	50	35	32
Progress	20	50	33	35
Achievement Gap	10	20	14	15
Readiness	10	30	17	15

In the progress component there are 3 indicators: math progress, ELA progress, and EL progress toward English language proficiency. To understand how these three indicators should be weighted within the progress component, committee members were asked *to distribute 30 pennies across the progress indicators based on their perceptions of the relative importance of each*. The results are provided below in terms of the average number of pennies assigned to each component and the percentage that number represents¹.

Table 4. Recommended Distribution of Emphasis across Indicators in the Progress Component

Indicators	Min.	Max.	Average Response (out of 30)	Proportion of Emphasis in Progress Component
ELA Progress	10	14	12	40%
Math Progress	11	15	13	43%
ELL Progress	2	8	5	17%

Despite the variability observed in the results presented in Tables 1-4, the committee members did *generally* agree on the following:

- In high school:
 - Content mastery and progress should receive most of the emphasis, followed by graduation rate.
 - Content mastery is the key for college readiness, so reasonable that this gets a bit more emphasis than progress.
 - Content mastery, progress, and gap should represent about 60-80% (i.e., about 70) of the overall emphasis in the CCRPI.
 - There was *moderate* agreement that readiness and graduation rate should receive equal emphasis in high school.
- In middle and elementary school
 - It is more appropriate to *consider* giving content mastery and progress equivalent emphasis at these grades.
 - It is reasonable to *consider* weighing progress a little higher at the elementary level.
- Within the progress component
 - EL progress to proficiency should be receive less emphasis than ELA and math
 - ELA and Math progress should receive equal emphasis.

¹ Since the median and mean were identical only the latter is reported in Table 4.

Minimum N Size

The committee continued their discussions on the minimum N size. The purpose of setting a minimum N size is to balance 1) protecting student confidentiality and maximizing reliability with 2) maximizing the number of students and student subgroups included in accountability.

The Accountability team presented additional analyses that examine these two aspects. Committee members expressed concern that if the minimum N size is raised, fewer students would count in accountability and there could be the potential for gaming. Other members expressed concern that at lower N sizes, each student carries a greater weight in the system. One member noted that a major concern is that there would be big year to year changes due to small sample sizes; however, the impact data shows that once you have a size of 15, little to no stability is gained going from 15 to 30.