

Accountability Working Committee
Meeting Summary 12/12/2016
Online Meeting

Overview and Introductions

The Committee Chairs welcomed members and reviewed the agenda. The agenda for the meeting included:

- Update on Final Regulations
- Discuss Stakeholder Feedback
- Update on CSI and TSI
- Update on Progress Towards English Language Proficiency
- CCRPI Process and Timeline

Updates on Final Regulations

Committee Chairs reviewed the final ESSA accountability regulations published on 11/29/2016. Major changes between the proposed and final regulations as pertains to accountability related to the CSI and TSI identification start date, academic achievement and the 5th indicator, 95% assessment participation, years needed to identify consistently underperforming subgroups, and school improvement minimum grant amounts.

The committee discussed the final regulations and any impacts on their work. Discussion points include:

- Questions about rules around utilizing an achievement index where students less than proficient receive partial credit and students above proficient receive additional credit.
- The committee wants to try to explore keeping the weighting as it currently is for accountability but work on another plan if the weighting cannot stay the same.

Stakeholder Feedback

Committee Chairs reviewed feedback from the CCRPI Survey of School and District Leaders and ESSA Public hearing across the state. Some of the common themes include simplifying the index, releasing scores earlier, maintaining consistency, streamlining reports, and including other factors aside from growth and achievement for a holistic view of schools.

The committee discussed the stakeholder feedback and implications for CCRPI. Discussion points include:

- Reports should be clear, concise and compelling.
 - Less is more. Reports should be used for school improvement and accountability. Need to find a balance between the two.
 - There is so much information. Reports are difficult to navigate and principals are not sure where to look.
 - Reports do not accurately reflect Georgia schools.

- Stakeholders are not sure what the CCRPI score means and the score does not align with what they think it should be.
- Could produce a separate tool for school improvement that includes more data so stakeholders can drill down if they would like more information.
- The data should be visualized instead of how we are currently reporting it. Add some colorful graphs to show where a school is and where it should be.

Update on CSI and TSI

The Accountability and Federal Programs Working Committees held a joint subcommittee meeting this fall. The subcommittee discussed the need for additional data (such as progress made) and professional judgment to both be used in the identification of schools. School identification should also align with SWSS and charter contract goals. Additionally, a school improvement system of tiered support should be developed and it would be determined how identified schools fit into those tiers.

Discussion points include:

- There should be an early warning system for schools. The system should be on a continuum so schools can seamlessly go from one level to another.
- When schools can see how they are doing and the need for improvement, it might lessen the stigma of being placed on the list.
- Schools should know before the CCRPI comes out that they are in danger of being identified for CSI or TSI. The criteria must be simple so schools know if they are at risk of being identified.
- It might be hard to get away from schools being labeled as failing because of the 0-100 point scale.
- How often are schools identified? Schools that demonstrate that they are making gains should be removed from the list and not kept on for all three years.

Updates on Progress Toward EL Proficiency

The requirements for the progress to English language proficiency indicator were reviewed with the committee. Additionally, the Chairs went over possibilities of what the indicator could look like, including a change in English language proficiency level (such as a value table or index) and a student growth percentile (growth to proficiency) method. Other options include a reclassification rate, student growth model (change over time), and a value added model.

Discussion points include:

- The committee liked the student growth percentile (growth to proficiency) method as it would be a similar calculation to data currently used for Georgia Milestones. The committee would like to review impact data to understand what this would look like.
- Discussion will continue at a future meeting when impact data is available.

CCRPI Process and Timeline

Allison Timberlake reviewed the 2016 CCRPI calculations, processes, and timeline. Topics included data quality and ideas for improving the CCRPI process and timeline.

Discussion points include:

- The committee liked the ideas for improving the CCRPI process and timeline.
- By the time the superintendent signs off on data, it is often too late to make any changes. The ideas to help with data quality will help with this as well.
- District do check data but there is so much that often times it is not until the final calculations are shown that district/schools notice an issue.
- There should be a lot of communication about the tools that are available/will be available to help check data often and early.