

Accountability Working Committee
Meeting Summary 11/14/2016

Overview and Introductions

The Committee Chairs welcomed members and reviewed the agenda. The committee then heard a presentation by Dr. Richard Welsh from the University of Georgia.

Georgia's Opportunity: Comparisons and Systems Research of States' Accountability Measures

Dr. Welsh presented his research comparing CCRPI to other state accountability systems. The committee then discussed Dr. Welsh's findings and what the implications may be for CCRPI. Discussion points include:

- Is the committee's recommendation bound by any state law or policy regarding the 100 point scale? It was noted that the 0-100 scale is required by state law.
- Is there a cap on the percentage of schools in each category (A, B, C, etc.)? It was noted that there is no such cap.
- Can there be a change to Distinguished/Proficient/Developing schools (or another labeling method) instead of the A, B, C, D, F system currently used? It was noted that the current grading system is implemented by GOSA. The committee then suggested looking at standard setting and/or benchmarking to work within those parameters.
- There is a concern regarding the national comparisons made using the current letter grades (that Georgia has more failing schools).

The committee did not have time to discuss stakeholder feedback as listed on the agenda. The committee will discuss the feedback at their next meeting.

Reporting

The committee discussed what they want to see in a new CCRPI reporting system. Sample reports from other states and districts were reviewed and suggestions were given as to how to display the CCRPI reports in a manner which would be most beneficial to the general public.

Recommendations include:

- Have a high-level summary up front with more detailed information on additional tabs
- Have a description of each component
- Show trend data
- Have comparisons to the district and state
- Have comparisons to "schools like yours"
- Include an indication of points possible or performance on each component
- Include performance gauges
- Use color and graphics
- School demographics or summary information should be included
- The report should not be too busy

- GOSA School Grades report should dovetail with CCRPI
- Provide a visually-pleasing report to the public and allow districts to dig deeper into the data
- The committee likes the current tabs and data detail (secure student-level data available to educators)
- No bonus points
- District and state comparisons are helpful and should be provided

CCRPI Working Draft

The CCRPI working draft was reviewed and discussed. There is general committee approval of the proposed components: Content Mastery, Progress, Closing Gaps, Readiness, Graduation Rate (High School Only). The committee felt that these components made sense and were simple. They liked that there are no subcomponents within components like the current CCRPI. Additional discussions include:

- Content Mastery
 - Proficiency rates in ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies
 - Georgia Milestones achievement levels should continue to be weighted using current weighting system (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5)
 - More emphasis should be placed on ELA and mathematics given limited testing in science and social studies
- Progress
 - Student growth percentiles (SGPs) in ELA and mathematics
- Closing Gaps
 - Explore if there is a more meaningful method of calculating achievement gaps, either by using student growth percentiles or performance flags
- Readiness
 - High School – English language proficiency of EL students (consider moving to progress component), pathway completion, completion of advanced courses, combine multiple college and career readiness indicators into one indicator, literacy/Lexile indicator, chronic absenteeism
 - Middle School - English language proficiency of EL students (consider moving to progress component), SWDs served in a general education environment, literacy/Lexile indicator, career inventories and individual graduation plans, chronic absenteeism, opportunity to explore
 - Elementary School - English language proficiency of EL students (consider moving to progress component), SWDs served in a general education environment, literacy/Lexile indicator, career awareness lessons and/or career portfolio, chronic absenteeism, opportunity to explore
- Graduation Rate (High School Only)
 - Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate
 - Five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

The committee wants to continue discussing the definition of chronic absenteeism and whether or not to include this indicator for each grade band. They want to explore expanding the Lexile indicator to include all grade levels. They also want to explore if there are other options for

demonstrating college and career readiness that could be included in the associated high school indicator. The committee wants to ensure that all methods included are rigorous and a true measure of preparation for college or career. Despite a single indicator being used for accountability, the underlying data should be reported separately so schools know how they are performing on each component. The committee also noted that, by combining the current college and career readiness indicators into a single indicator, additional methods of demonstrating readiness could be added in the future without changing CCRPI.

The committee discussed including the percentage of middle school students earning high school credit as a middle school indicator. However, they recommended not including it as it could lead to schools pushing students into higher level courses who are not prepared for high school work. They were concerned there would be more unintended consequences than benefits to students.

The committee also discussed the significant stakeholder feedback that requested some measure of the extent to which students have access to a well-rounded curriculum, especially fine arts. They want to continue discussing an indicator at the elementary and middle school level that would measure student completion of such courses. They noted that there is currently an Exceeding the Bar indicator at each level that could serve as the basis for such an indicator. Some members expressed a concern that funding has a significant impact on this indicator and funding varies significantly across the state.

The committee will continue discussing indicators and review impact data at a future meeting.