

## Accountability Working Committee Meeting Summary 7/19/2016

### Overview and Introductions

The Committee Chairs welcomed members, who then introduced themselves. The chairs reviewed the scope of work, which is to refine and enhance CCRPI, and reviewed the charge of the committee:

- Develop questions for stakeholders for feedback sessions throughout the state
- Discuss stakeholder input, USED's regulations/guidance, focus areas identified by the State Advisory Committee, and working committee-assigned portions of ESSA
- Coordinate with other working committees to write Georgia's draft state plan

All of Georgia's ESSA Working Committees report to GaDOE's ESSA Leadership Team throughout the development process. The draft ESSA State Plan will be presented to the Advisory Committee for feedback. There will also be a review period for the public, State School Superintendent, State Board of Education, and Governor's Office.

Benchmarks for this process include the following:

- July 2016: Charge, Orientation, Overview and committee-specific information
- August-October 2016: Stakeholder feedback shared with Working Committees as it is received
- October-November 2016: Draft ESSA State Plan developed
- December 2016: Presentation to Advisory Committee
- January 2017: Public comment period; Governor, State Board of Education, State School Superintendent review; Overview to the House and Senate Education Committees
- February 2017: If necessary, reconvening of the Advisory Committee to make revisions
- March 2017: Submission of Georgia's ESSA State Plan to USED

The Accountability Working Committee is chaired by Allison Timberlake, Director of Accountability at the Georgia Department of Education, and Molly Howard, Superintendent of Jefferson County Schools. The committee includes 4 Superintendents or Assistant Superintendents; 5 District Administrators – Accountability, Testing/Data, High Schools, Instructional Student Supports, Strategy/Performance; 3 Principals; 1 Teacher; 1 RESA Executive Director; 5 GaDOE staff focusing on assessment/accountability, data collections, college/career readiness, CTAE, special education; and 1 GOSA staff member– research, policy, accountability.

The state plan could change depending on final regulations from USED, which are expected by December. Committee meeting materials will be posted on GaDOE's ESSA website. Committee members were urged to have conversations with their colleagues and stakeholders to inform the committee's work. It was emphasized that this is truly a collaborative process to ensure CCRPI is an accountability system that meets the needs of our state, districts, and schools.

## Small Group Discussion

Committee members engaged in small group discussions around four sets of questions:

- What is currently working about CCRPI and accountability in Georgia?
- What is not working about CCRPI and accountability in Georgia?
- What questions do you have? What issues do you want to discuss in the coming months?
- What are the top 3 stakeholder feedback questions (for the Superintendent's feedback sessions)? What are other methods for soliciting needed feedback?

## Report Out

Due to the limited time available during this first meeting, the report out focused on identifying the top 3 questions for stakeholder feedback. These questions will be asked of stakeholders at public feedback sessions throughout the state in the coming months. The feedback received will help guide the work of this committee. The other small group questions will be discussed at the next meeting.

After discussing several possible questions and the best avenues to collect feedback, committee members identified the following three questions as most important for the feedback sessions:

1. What does a CCRPI score convey about a school (for example, an 83)? Does the CCRPI system accurately reflect the performance of your school?
2. As a stakeholder (such as a school or district leader, a teacher, a parent, a community member, etc.), what are the most important things for you to know about your school in terms of accountability?
3. What do you want to see in terms of school accountability moving forward?

During the discussion, committee members raised several issues and suggestions:

- The CCRPI timeline should be shortened and scores should be produced in a timely fashion to enhance school improvement.
- The CCRPI should be written in such a way as to be understandable by all stakeholders. The use of acronyms should be limited. Additionally, the CCRPI should be able to be communicated easily.
- CCRPI should reflect the most important components for different stakeholders. The critical elements of CCRPI need to be identified by stakeholders in order to drive the work of the working committee.
- Identify where the working committee wants accountability to go in order to define what the working committee should keep in mind when developing the indicators.
- Solicit feedback on the current indicators as well as what metrics, other than student assessments, are indicators of student achievement and school success.
- Parents and other stakeholders often judge schools by letter grades/CCRPI score without looking to see if that is a true reflection of the school. How can we develop an accountability system that is a true reflection of the growth some schools make and not just of achievement?
- The overall CCRPI score is communicated through letter grades, instead of a 1-100 score as provided on reports. How should the CCRPI score be labeled and communicated? It is important to understand how parents and the community view and use CCRPI scores.

- What is viewed as important to student achievement might depend on the school and community in which one lives; however, the state only has one accountability system. Accountability might need to reflect what is important in different districts.
- Identify ways to effectively communicate CCRPI to all audiences, including audiences that are outside of the school (for example, parents).

### **Closing Remarks**

At the next meeting, the committee will take a deep dive into ESSA accountability provisions and proposed regulations; review stakeholder feedback (CCRPI Survey of School and District Leaders); and develop goals and a theory of action for Georgia's accountability system.