

Accountability Working Committee  
Meeting Summary 10/06/2016

## Welcome and Overview

The Committee Chairs welcomed members and reviewed the responses from the homework.

### *Content Mastery:*

- Should we keep weighting Georgia Milestones by achievement level?
  - Recommendation: Yes
    - Rationale: Incentivizes moving all students to the next level
    - Unintended Consequences: Not as sensitive as overall scale score distributions
    - Discussion: Should we report subgroup performance in addition to all students?
      - Recommendation: Yes
    - Discussion: Should content mastery be capped at 100%?
- Should we continue to weight ELA, math, science, and social studies according to the number of tests given (3/4 to ELA/math and 1/4 to science/social studies)?
  - Recommendation: Yes
    - Rationale: Weight given aligns with number of tests administered
    - Unintended Consequences: Less emphasis/instruction in science and social studies. Sends message science and social studies are not as important
    - Discussion: Can we continue to keep an emphasis on science and social studies if they are not weighted equally?

### *Progress:*

- Are there any modifications that need to be considered for the Progress/SGP component?
  - Recommendation: Maybe. Report growth for subgroups in addition to all students. Should progress continue to be based on all students? Or should subgroup growth (lowest 25%?) be a component?
    - Rationale: Allows schools with high at-risk populations to earn points by demonstrating growth. Can reveal growth opportunities for traditionally high-achieving schools. Gives insight on future trends of the school.
    - Unintended Consequences: Misinterpretation/misunderstanding of SGPs and what they measure, in particular, the misconception that high-achieving students cannot demonstrate high growth. Decreased emphasis on science and social studies given reduction in testing.
    - Discussion: Should growth still be based on all students or should there be something that shows the growth of the lowest 25%?

### *Graduation Rate:*

- In addition to the four-year cohort graduation rate, do we want to retain the five-year rate? Add a six-year rate?
  - Recommendation: Retain five-year rate; do not add six-year rate. Investigate if there any additional flexibilities to remove students from the cohort.

- Rationale: Five-year rate provides incentive to continue working with at-risk students. Six-year rate sends the wrong message.
- Unintended Consequences: None
- Discussion: Is there a way to add flexibility in changing the students that are part of the cohort? Need to investigate flexibility through USED and state rule.

*Additional Questions/Comments:*

- Would it be possible to give schools an option of which component (progress or achievement) would count for a greater percentage of their overall score?
- How can poverty (and other demographics) be a consideration in CCRPI?
- We either need to find a way to work the ETB indicators into the face of CCRPI or get rid of them.
- The CCRPI should be simplified greatly.

## **Closing Gaps**

Committee members engaged in small group discussions about performance flags, ED/EL/SWD performance and achievement gap components of CCRPI. The goal was to identify one or more promising methods of addressing subgroup performance and achievement gaps. Committee members raised the following considerations through the homework:

- Reporting and holding schools accountable for subgroup performance is important
- Current system (performance flags, ED/EL/SWD performance, achievement gap) is too complicated
- Need better communication/explanation about targets
- Each school may not have subgroups, but they do have a bottom quartile of performers

Groups were given the following questions to guide their conversations:

- Why should achievement gap be a component of CCRPI? How does it align with the purpose and goals?
- Does the current achievement gap calculation work? Why or why not?
- How should we measure achievement gap?
  - Current method or a modification of the current method?
  - Extent to which targets are met?
  - Another method?
- Should we focus on super-subgroups (lowest 25% or ED/EL/SWD) or traditional subgroups?
- Questions to consider:
  - Advantages? Disadvantages? Considerations? Unintended consequences? Would this calculation be fair to all schools? Why or why not? What happens if a school only has one traditional subgroup? Or no traditional subgroups meeting the minimum N size? How about students who belong to multiple subgroups? Should subgroup participation rates be factored in? How does the minimum N size (15) impact the calculation? Is the target method too “NCLB”? Would we be setting

ourselves up for having fewer and fewer schools meeting targets and closing gaps?

Committee members reported the following after their discussions:

- Subgroups should factor more into calculations of achievement gap.
- Achievement gap should count for more than it already does.
- Achievement gap should be removed and only progress should be modified and used. The modification would include looking at the progress of all students as well as the progress of the lowest 25% of students, not just individual subgroups.
- The scoring and weighting of progress and achievement gap should be reviewed. Some of the information that is contained in the calculations is good, however, it does not need to have a point value attached.
- What the lowest 25% looks like is different across the state, schools should be recognized if they are doing a good job of closing the gaps with particular students.
- When you have both gap progress and gap size, schools can lose focus on the lowest 25% because they know they can gain their points via gap size and are not worried about gap progress.

## **Readiness**

CCRPI is the *College and Career Ready* Performance Index. The intent is to measure the extent to which students are prepared for college and career; and, at earlier levels, prepared for the next level/on track to be prepared for college and career. One of the goals this committee defined for CCRPI is to *increase college and career readiness*. In order to review CCRPI to ensure it is an appropriate measure of readiness, the committee must define what readiness looks like.

Superintendent Woods has defined a new readiness:

- Early grades: Foundational skills and concepts
- Later grades: Multiple paths to succeed by expanding opportunities and personalizing learning
- Graduates are college and/or career ready
- Life-long learning

Committee members then discussed what readiness look likes at each level:

- Elementary school: What is necessary for a student to be ready for middle school?
- Middle school: What is necessary for a student to be ready for high school?
- High school: What is necessary for a student to be ready for college and career?

## **Working Draft of a Revised CCRPI**

Small groups were given a *working draft* of a revised CCRPI based on the work of the committee, the theory of action developed by the committee (also a working document), and stakeholder feedback received to date. Committee members were asked to review, discuss, and refine the draft using the following questions as a guide:

- Do the indicators align with the purpose, goals, and intended outcomes?
- Do the indicators work together? Do they work across grade bands?
- Do the indicators adequately address readiness for the next level?
- What works? What doesn't work? What is missing? What are the unintended consequences? What considerations are there? What questions do you have?

Committee members reporting the following after their discussions:

- Possibly change achievement gap to gap progress for only the lowest 25% of students
- Like the reduced number of indicators
- Potentially take science and social studies out of the content mastery section and add them into the readiness section
- Possibly modify the attendance indicator
- Possibly modify the indicator referring to students taking higher level courses
- Individual graduation plans (IGPs) are good for 8<sup>th</sup> graders, maybe it should not be a part of CCRPI, however, it should be reported elsewhere
- Possible modifications to graduation rate
- Possible change to indicator that relates to English Learners

## **Closing Remarks**

At future meetings, the committee will continue to discuss:

- Continue revising CCRPI framework
- Scoring, weighting, and labeling
- Setting long term goals and interim progress
- Reporting
- Review stakeholder feedback
- Subcommittees
  - Comprehensive and targeted support schools
  - English language proficiency