

Accountability Working Committee
Meeting Summary 09/06/2016

Overview and Introductions

The Committee Chairs welcomed members, went over the agenda, and the committee then reviewed the guiding principles and areas of focus developed by the State Advisory Committee

Guiding Principles

1. Develop clear, transparent, stakeholder-friendly reports
 - Include summary information; use user-friendly language; explore data visualization and analytic possibilities
2. Maintain consistency across districts and across years
3. Ensure the summative rating reflects student outcomes
 - Not processes that force schools to take specific actions. Schools should have flexibility to determine what actions to take.
 - Have a good balance between achievement and growth
4. Provide results in a timely manner to inform improvement
5. Seek ways to measure growth or progress on other indicators

Areas of Focus

1. Assessment – multiple forms, mixed options, multiple measures
2. Release data in a more timely manner
3. Report with context – what do the numbers mean?
4. Focus on subgroup data
5. Address unintended impact on charter and strategic waivers
6. Prioritize information – what is important for the purpose of the index?
7. Validity
8. Focus on growth vs. static numbers
9. Comparability – comparisons to other schools with similar populations

The committee then reviewed and refined the purpose, goals, intended uses, and intended outcomes identified during the previous meeting.

Purpose

- Communication
 - Inform all stakeholders about the performance of their schools *on key indicators*
 - Inform all stakeholders about their school's progress toward preparing students for college and careers
- School improvement
 - A statewide system that drives school improvement
 - Provides guidance to improve utilization of data
- Accountability

CCRPI is not intended to provide a complete picture of school quality. It is one set of measures that provide an indication of a school's progress in preparing students for college and careers.

Goals

1. Increase student achievement
2. Increase graduation rates
3. Increase literacy and numeracy
4. Increase the number of students completing pathways (and/or higher level courses)
5. Increase college and career readiness

Intended Uses

- Identify areas where progress has been made and areas in need of improvement
- Identify schools that need additional support
- Hold schools and districts accountable for improving student opportunities and outcomes
- Communicate publicly student performance and effective instructional practices
- Use results to prioritize resources
- Provide a mechanism for comparisons of schools within districts and across the state

Intended Outcomes

- Schools and districts can identify and work toward goals that will improve student opportunities and outcomes
- All stakeholders will understand school and district goals and can understand their role in working toward attaining those goals
- Greater collaboration among all stakeholders
- Highlight schools that are effective or making progress and recognize their strategies
- Communicate to stakeholders a school/district rating on selected indicators of school quality
- Create a shift towards results-oriented improvement

The committee will continue to revise the purpose and goals throughout the process.

Indicator Review

Committee members engaged in small group discussions about current CCRPI indicators. A series of questions was used to evaluate each indicator. Indicators were evaluated for alignment with the theory of action (purpose/goals), alignment with state and federal requirements, and technical qualities (validity, reliability, comparability). The review questions included:

1. Purpose: What is the indicator trying to measure?
2. Does it measure what it is supposed to measure?
3. To what goal does the indicator align?
4. Is it appropriate/fair to use for accountability/CCRPI?
5. Reliability: Do changes in indicator performance reflect actions taken by schools?
6. Would progress on this indicator likely increase student achievement or HS graduation rates?
7. Does the indicator meaningfully differentiate among schools?
8. Comparability: Is it equally reflective of school quality across the state?
9. Is it a statewide measure?
10. Can it be disaggregated by subgroup?

11. What is the intended outcome by including this indicator?
12. What are the unintended consequences of including this indicator?
13. Recommendation (keep, modify, remove)
14. Rationale

Committee members reported out on their discussions. They will continue discussing indicators at the next meeting.

Closing Remarks

At the next meeting, the committee will continue to review indicators; look at indicators across grade bands; and determine if the indicators work holistically and align to the stated goals. Future topics also include scoring, weighting, and labeling; 95% participation rate; measuring primary and other unique schools; minimum N size; setting long term goals and interim progress; and comprehensive and targeted support schools.