

Accountability Working Committee
Meeting Summary 3/16/17
Online Meeting

Overview and Introductions

The Committee Chairs welcomed members and reviewed the agenda, which focused on discussing specific business rules for some CCRPI indicators and components.

Content Mastery Indicators – High School

The committee discussed whether the high school content mastery indicators, based on Georgia Milestones EOCs, should continue to be separate or combined into four indicators based on content area. Currently, CCRPI includes 8 content mastery indicators, one for each EOC. For the combined option, 9th Grade Literature and American Literature would be combined into an ELA indicator; Algebra/Coordinate Algebra and Geometry/Analytic Geometry would be combined into a mathematics indicator; Physical Science and Biology would be combined into a science indicator; and U.S History and Economics would be combined into a social studies indicator.

After reviewing impact data and discussing advantages and disadvantages, the committee recommended combining high school content mastery indicators into four content area indicators because 1) it will be simpler and easier to communicate, 2) it will parallel elementary and middle school content mastery indicators where content area tests across grade levels are combined, 3) it will increase the number of students included in accountability, 4) it will hold more schools accountable for content mastery, and 5) while each content area will be weighted equally, tests within content area will be weighted according to the number of students taking each test. The committee also recommended that the data for all students and for each subgroup continue to be reported separately for each EOC, even though they will be combined for content mastery scoring.

Progress Indicators – All Grade Bands

The committee discussed whether the progress component, based on SGPs in ELA and mathematics, should continue to be reported as a single indicator or separated into ELA and mathematics progress. Currently, all SGPs are included in a single typical/high growth percentage which is used to determine progress points. The committee noted that while there has historically been SGPs in all four content areas, beginning in 2017 there will only be SGPs in ELA and mathematics. For the separated option, the typical/high growth percentage would be reported separately for ELA and mathematics and then weighted equally within the progress component.

After reviewing impact data and discussing advantages and disadvantages, the committee recommending separating progress into two indicators because 1) it provides more information on performance, particularly if a school's progress differs between the two content areas and 2) EL progress to proficiency will be an indicator in this component therefore it will be more transparent to include three indicators and weight them appropriately. The committee noted that

while many schools have similar growth rates in ELA and mathematics, a good number of schools had rates that differ. While the overall progress score looks similar between the two options, the committee felt that separating them was important to highlight the performance of schools in different content areas.

Closing Gaps

The committee discussed whether the closing gaps component should be based on achievement targets only or if graduation rate and EL progress to proficiency targets should be included. The committee recommended that EL progress to proficiency targets not be included since many schools will not have this indicator included in their CCRPI score. The committee likes the idea of included graduation rate targets; however, they are concerned that doing so would cause differences between the elementary and middle school CCRPI and the high school CCRPI. The committee requested more data to help inform a recommendation on whether graduation rate targets should be included.

Academic Enrichment

The committee discussed business rules for the elementary and middle school academic enrichment indicators, including: What content areas/courses should be included at each grade band? Should high school courses be included at the middle school level? What should be the minimum definition of “content completer?” Should we (and how can we) account for things like dual immersion language programs?

The committee again discussed the impact of these indicators on poor and rural districts. While they acknowledged the challenges that some districts face, some members felt that academic enrichment is important and should be included, especially since it was a topic raised consistently throughout the stakeholder feedback. They felt that giving districts flexibility in how they define “content completer,” if a minimum state-defined threshold is attained, would ensure that all districts could give their students access to enrichment courses, such as fine arts. The definition should ensure that students are exposed to such courses in a way that meets the intent of the indicator, but leaves flexibility for districts to determine how such courses are taught. The committee also recommended that the definition should be based on learning outcomes and not seat time. The committee also suggested exploring if courses in STEM and computer science fields could be included.

Members inquired if there could be a mechanism for schools to earn points for creative ways of offering such opportunities, other than enrollment in courses. Other members expressed concerns about 1) having so many options that all schools get points and the indicator doesn't differentiate among schools or have value and 2) how to quantify quality enrichment opportunities. Another committee member stated that it is ok and a good thing if there is an indicator that schools do well on as we want to truly capture the work of schools. It is important to include academic enrichment as readiness should be about things other than test scores and we should include things that are important to us. Another member expressed a concern that if the indicator is not included, schools might not be incentivized to offer enrichment opportunities and focus more narrowly on reading and mathematics.