

Accountability Working Committee  
Meeting Summary 11/2/2016  
Online Meeting

### **Overview and Introductions**

The Committee Chairs welcomed members and reviewed the agenda. The two main topics of the virtual meeting were:

- 95% Participation Rate Requirement
- Long Term Goals and Measurements of Interim Progress

Committee Chairs reviewed the ESSA legislation and USED proposed regulations as they pertain to the 95% participation rate requirement. After that review, the committee discussed the four options in the proposed regulations for schools that do not meet the 95% required participation rate for all students or for a subgroup of students.

- Option 1: assign a lower summative rating to the school, described in proposed §200.18
- Option 2: assign the lowest performance level on the State's Academic Achievement indicator, described in proposed §§200.14 and 200.18
- Option 3: identify the school for targeted support and improvement under proposed §200.19(b)(1)
- Option 4 : another equally rigorous State-determined action, as described in its State plan, that will result in a similar outcome for the school in the system of annual meaningful differentiation under proposed §200.18 and will lead to improvements in the school's assessment participation rate so that it meets the 95 percent participation requirement.

### **Discussion Points:**

- How does parent opt-out affect participation when it is out of the school's control?
- There could be a defined penalty, such as a 1% decrease, in the proficiency rate instead of dropping a full letter grade.
- Count the students that don't test and therefore cause the school to fall below the 95% as not proficient.
- Potentially do what is currently done for flags if it works with USED guidance.
- Would rather that the impact not be at the subgroup level
- Calculate content mastery of actual performance and then take points away from some other place if the school is under 95% participation.
- There could be a percentage increment. For example, if the school is at 94% the school could lose 0.5 points, 93% would be a deduction of 1%, 92% would be a deduction of 1.5% etc. It could be something like option 4 where the state would set predefined penalties.

Most committee members were in favor of counting students that fall below the 95% rate as not proficient in content mastery calculations, but not growth or achievement gap. There was also support for an incremental decrease in points as defined by the state. Committee members were not in favor of option 2 or option 3. The committee wants to pursue an approach where the "penalty" is proportional to the participation rate. They expressed concerns, however, over equity and the potential for gaming the system.

Committee Chairs then reviewed the ESSA legislation and proposed regulations as they pertain to long-term goals and measurements of interim progress. After that review, the committee discussed the following questions:

- What time frame should we consider?
- What should be the state goal at the end of that time frame?
- What should we expect of schools?
- What should the interim targets be?
- How do we require subgroups that are further behind make more progress to close gaps?

#### Discussion Points

- We should incorporate the same targets that the districts already have for flexibility contracts. A challenge, however, is that it needs to be consistent across the state and flexibility contracts (SWSS and charter) are not the same.
- A twelve year goal is good because that would follow an entire cohort of students through their K-12 career.
  - It takes longer to see the outcome so a target that is more than 2 to 3 years would be good.
  - Would a twelve year goal be good if schools start testing in grade 3?
  - When looked at from an individual school stand point, there might be new schools, change in feeder patterns, and other things that might impact schools and not the districts overall. This would make a 12 year goal a little tricky for these schools.
  - We can make a twelve year goal and then recalculate it every 3 years.
- Once schools hit the target, it can still have additional targets but are shown as meeting the target overall.
- We should build in a reset of targets to account for the fact that schools get frustrated when they miss one target. It makes it hard to keep going after that.
  - As a reset example, if a school starts with a 3% increase goal and does a good job, as the school get closer to their goal, the percent increase changes to maybe 2%. It would be like a growth trajectory, the closer the school get to its goal, the less drastic the increase would have to be.
  - If schools haven't been making the goals, what advantage do they get for resetting and having them have to meet a higher goal?
  - It might help to identify the schools that need more targeted support.
- There should be a combination of resetting and consistent increase. For example, if a school misses a target then it will still have to increase by 3% next year regardless of where they are, even if they did not meet the last target. Overall, however, the school is reaching for a dictated goal but can factor in resets throughout the twelve years.
- Goals should reflect where schools start and should factor in incremental improvement.
- The targets should be growth targets with a statewide goal of what to expect.
- Having individual goals for the schools helps to increase the overall state goal because as each school makes incremental increases, the state average will move.
- Goals should all be based on growth and not tied to some arbitrary number and some arbitrary date.

- There needs to be documentation about how goals will change if a school closes, opens, restructures, etc.
- Instead of meeting an overall growth number each year, schools should be able to meet the overall growth three out of five years.
- Can repeated failure to meet subgroup targets lead to identification for targeted support and improvement?

The committee recommended ensuring expectations for accountability are the same across the state and should relate to the flexibility contracts to the extent possible. The committee would like for targets to be based on growth/improvement and calculated individually for each school (not based on state averages).

### **Closing Remarks**

At future meetings, the committee will discuss:

- CCRPI research from UGA
- Continuing topics
  - Continue revising CCRPI framework
  - Scoring, weighting, and labeling
  - Setting long term goals and interim progress
  - Reporting
  - Other topics
- Review stakeholder feedback
- Subcommittee updates
  - Comprehensive and targeted support schools
  - English language proficiency