Accountability Working Committee

December 12, 2016

Agenda

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

Update on Final Regulations

Final Regulations

- The U.S. Department of Education (ED) officially published the final rule in the Federal Register on November 29, 2016.

- The rule covers accountability provisions included in Title I and consolidated state plan requirements of ESEA.

- The rule is effective on January 28, 2017.

- The effective date of this regulation could be delayed under the incoming administration or the regulation could be subject to repeal under the Congressional Review Act.

Note: Slides for this section of the PPT are sourced from CCSSO.

Major Changes

Issue	NPRM	Final Rule
Identification Start Date	States start identification of schools using new accountability system requirements before the start of the 2017-2018 school year	States start identification of schools using new accountability system requirements before the start of the 2018-2019 school year
Plan Submission Date	Two windows of submission – March 6, 2017 and July 5, 2017	Two submission windows maintained with delayed dates – April 3, 2017 and September 18, 2017
Academic Achievement and 5th Indicator	States required to select indicators that are supported by research that shows connection to student achievement.	Expands NPRM requirement to include research showing student learning, such as grades, advanced coursework, persistence, etc.
95% Assessment Participation	State option to be "equally" rigorous to options spelled out in the regulation	State option to be "sufficiently rigorous" to options spelled out in regulation
Years needed to identify consistently underperforming subgroups	States must base determinations of consistently underperforming subgroups on 2 years worth of data	States may use more than 2 years worth of data based on demonstration of how longer timeframe will support low-performing students
School improvement minimum grant amounts	States required to make grants of $500,000 to comprehensive support schools and $50,000 to targeted support schools	States permitted to adjust grant sizes based on school's size, identified needs, and selected interventions

Indicators

Indicator	Regulatory Requirement(s)
Academic proficiency as measured through assessments	• Must equally weight reading/ELA and math
High school graduation rate	• 4-year cohort rate and, at the state's discretion, an extended rate
Elementary/middle school indicator	• Growth or another academic measure
Progress towards English language proficiency	• Must use objective and reliable measure of progress • Not included for schools with number of EL students below the state's N size
School quality or student success	• Does not have to be different from other indicators in state's accountability system • Cannot change the status of identified schools without significant progress on at least one other indicator • Progress must be likely to increase student learning • Must aid in the meaningful differentiation of schools

All indicators must include at least 3 levels of performance.

Identification

Timing	Comprehensive Support and Improvement	Targeted Support and Improvement

• Identification under new accountability structure must take place for 2018-19 school year, based on data available in 2016-17 and 2017-18 school years
• Identification of chronically low-performing subgroups does not have to take place until 2019-20 school year
	• Data can be averaged over a period of up to 3 years
	• Identification must take place at least once every 3 years
	• Requires that states use four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (excludes use of extended year graduation rate)
		• Requires the establishment of a uniform, statewide methodology for identification of consistently underperforming subgroups that meets the following:
		  • Considers performance among the subgroup for no more than 2 years, or longer timeframe if state demonstrates this will enable attainment of state's long term goals
		  • Is based on all the accountability indicators, consistent with weighting requirements
		  • Defines such subgroups in a uniform manner across all LEAs in the state through a statewide definition, or whether the subgroup is (1) meeting at least one of the state's interim progress measures, (2) not on track to meet at least one of the long-term goals, or (3) is performing below a state determined threshold on an indicator without long term goals

Discussion Questions

- What questions do you have about the final regulations?

- Is there anything that changes the conversations we have been having?

- Are there specific areas of the final regulations we need to examine further?

Georgia Department of Education

Discuss Stakeholder Feedback

Survey

- CCRPI Survey of School and District Leaders
  - Set clear, attainable goals
  - Include indicators that promote improved student opportunities and outcomes
  - Simplify the index
  - Maintain consistency
  - Release CCRPI scores earlier

ESSA Public Hearings

- August 24: Columbia County

- August 29: Habersham County

- September 14: Fulton County

- September 19: Muscogee County

- October 12: Laurens County

- October 17: Gordon County

- November 1: Dougherty County

- November 3: Chatham County

Common Themes

- Columbia County
  - Figure out how to measure true growth and use it for accountability.
  - Simplify the CCRPI. It's not fair or clear.
  - While growth is important, include other factors in the system for a holistic view of performance.
  - Attendees do not think the current system accurately reflects their schools' performance.

Georgia Department of Education

Common Themes

- Habersham County
  - Stakeholders were most interested in knowing about school safety, student growth and achievement, teacher effectiveness and qualification, and school climate.
  - There are mixed opinions on the current rating system. Some believe it is too complicated and rigorous, while others believe it accurately represents some parts of school performance.
  - Stakeholders recommend a wide range of improvement for the system, primarily focused on making it simpler and less focused on CCRPI.

Common Themes

- Preliminary themes from meetings 1-6
  - Emphasize/prioritize student growth
  - Use multiple measures
  - Simplify current index
  - Create more consistency
  - Simplify and streamline reports
  - Concern that the index doesn't take everything into consideration (such as parent involvement, curriculum changes, poverty, transiency, things outside schools' control)
  - Focus should be on school improvement
  - Want more information on school offerings, holistic education
  - Want more information on student preparation for life (life skills, soft skills, etc)

Discussion Questions

- For those that attended a session, what were your take-aways?

- What are the central themes that need to be addressed?
  - How can we address these themes?

- Are there themes that cannot be addressed?
  - Why not?
  - How might they be addressed outside of the accountability system?

- Any additional take-aways?

Update on CSI and TSI

Updates

- Accountability and Federal Programs subcommittee meeting
  - Major outcome – discussed the need for 1) additional data (such as progress made) and 2) professional judgement in identification
  - "Second looks"

- Need alignment with SWSS and Charter Contract goals

- Develop a School Improvement system of tiered support and determine how identified schools fit into those tiers

- Show how CSI and TSI fit into existing state accountability system (contracts)

Discussion Questions

- What additional considerations need to be made as we identify the criteria for CSI and TSI schools?

- What issues did we have with Priority and Focus identification that need to be addressed?

- How do we build collaboration between the state, the district, and the school to engage in meaningful improvement (not quick fixes to get off the list)?

- How do we change the conversation to make this about continuous improvement and support and not about "failing" or "being on a list"?

Update on Progress Towards EL Proficiency

Requirements

- Identify ambitious state-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for increases in the percentage of all English learners in the State making annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency

- Establish research-based student-level targets on which the goals/progress are based. The uniform procedure must
  - Take into consideration, at the time of a student's identification as an English learner, the student's English language proficiency level, and may take into consideration, at a state's discretion, one or more of: time in language instruction educational programs; grade level; age; native language proficiency level; limited or interrupted formal education, if any.
  - Determine the applicable timeline for ELs sharing particular characteristics to attain English language proficiency
  - Establish student-level targets, based on the applicable timelines, that set the expectation for all ELs to make annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency within the applicable timeline for such students

Requirements

- For all schools, a Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator, based on English learner performance on the annual English language proficiency assessment in at least each of grades 3 through 8 and in grades for which English learners are otherwise assessed, that
    - Uses objective and valid measures of student progress on the assessment, comparing results from the current school year to results from the previous school year, such as student growth percentiles
    - Is aligned with the applicable timelines, within the state-determined maximum number of years, for each English learner to attain English language proficiency after the student's identification as an English learner
    - May also include a measure of proficiency (e.g., an increase in the percentage of English learners scoring proficient on the English language proficiency assessment compared to the prior year)

Possibilities

- Change in level (or score)
  - Value table/index
  - Similar or same as current ACCESS indicator

- Student growth percentiles
  - Growth to proficiency

- Other options
  - Reclassification rate – moving from not proficient to proficient
  - Student growth model – change over time (typically requires vertical scale)
  - Value added model – expected vs. actual performance

Change in Level

- Similar or same as current ACCESS indicator

- Looks at students moving from one performance band to a higher performance band

- Can adjust values associated with movement

		Year 2					
	Level	1	2	3	4	5	6
	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
	2	0	0	1	1	1	1
Year 1	3	0	0	0	1	1	1
	4	0	0	0	0	1	1
	5	0	0	0	0	0	1
	6	0	0	0	0	0	0

		Year 2					
	Level	1	2	3	4	5	6
	1	0	1	2	3	4	5
	2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
Year 1	3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
	4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2
	5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1
	6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0

Student Growth Percentiles

- Percent of students on track towards proficiency

- Utilize targets – level of growth necessary to become proficient in a defined timeframe

- Can incorporate other variables (number of years to proficiency, other variables)

- Compare student SGP (on ACCESS) to target to determine if a student is on track to become proficient in identified number of years

Discussion Questions

- What feedback do you have on change in level vs. SGPs?
  - What are the advantages and disadvantages to each method?

- Should we consider any of the other options?

- What recommendations do you have for variables to consider? Timeline for proficiency?

- What considerations need to be made?

CCRPI Process and Timeline

2016 CCRPI Calculations

- For a single school, an elementary CCRPI report contains 232 calculations/values, a middle school report contains 223, and a high school report contains 375

- Reports were calculated for 2,473 schools, 204 districts, and the state

- 8 data sources, including 38 elements and 41 data files were utilized
    - Student Record – 35 data elements
    - FTE Survey – 2 data elements
    - FTE-1 – 1 data element
    - USG and TCSG – 3 data files
    - Schools/districts – 16 files
    - GaDOE – 5 files (PBIS, STEM, SLDS, EOPA, SLOs for innovative practice)
    - Assessment – 17 files (AP, IB, SAT, ACT, ACCESS, GAA, and multiple Georgia Milestones files)

- 210-215 additional data files from districts for corrections and special situations

Data Quality

- CCRPI is calculated by pulling data directly from the source (Student Record, applications, etc)

- When a correction is necessary, it is a "hot fix," requiring us to bypass the underlying data sources to make a one-time fix using a new file

  - Requires a rerun of the impacted school(s), associated district(s), and the state

  - Requires IT to implement hot fix and Accountability team to QC fix – diverts resources from other calculations and delays timeline

  - Data will no longer match other reporting systems (Student Record, SLDS, GOSA Report Card, etc.)

Data Quality

- Most common data quality issues:
  - Attendance
  - ED status
  - Career data (lessons, IGP, career portfolio)
  - Marking periods identified in FTE Survey do not match course data submitted in SR
  - Course codes
    - Students must be enrolled in an EOC-required course for them to be an expected participant and for their test score to be included in CCRPI
    - Also impacts other indicators (pathway completion, physics, etc.)

Data Quality

- Most common data entry issues:
  - Applications
    - CCRPI Data Collection – failure to upload document and/or to address all components of application
    - Assessment Matching – making incorrect matches
    - Non-Participation – selecting incorrect reasons
    - Summer Graduates – failure to identify all summer graduates
    - Cohort Withdrawal Update – select incorrect reasons or failure to complete
  - Common issues with applications
    - Failure to review all selections and save reports before superintendent sign-off
    - Failure to understand the importance of data quality and the impact the information provided has on CCRPI and, in particular, graduation rates

Ideas to Improve CCRPI Process and Timeline

- Calculate some CCRPI indicators in real-time
  - Indicators can be calculated using information in Student Record (SR) before SR closes. CCRPI would refresh either nightly or when clicking a button.
    - Examples – attendance rate; career awareness lessons; career inventories/IGP
  - Schools/districts can see their CCRPI indicators before SR closes, allowing them to make corrections, if necessary, directly in SR
  - Could improve data quality while also improving timeline
  - Possible challenge – tinkering with data to yield a certain CCRPI score

Ideas to Improve CCRPI Process and Timeline

- Combine summer graduate and cohort withdrawal update applications
  - Open single application upon close of Student Record and close in August (this year Summer Grad closed August 26)
  - Allows application to be open longer while improving timeline
    - No longer need to open Cohort Withdrawal after Summer Grad
  - Use single application to indicate summer graduates (G) as well as update withdrawal reasons
  - Could try to calculate graduation rate in real-time with application. This would allow schools/districts to see graduation rate and the impact of data quality. Could also improve timeline as graduation rates would be calculated shortly after application closes.

Ideas to Improve CCRPI Process and Timeline

- Open Assessment Matching earlier
  - Open Assessment Matching as soon as assessments are available, providing districts with more time to complete the activity.
    - National assessments (SAT, ACT, IB, AP) become available in the fall.
    - Winter EOCs become available in the winter.
  - This provides districts with additional time as well as allows us to close the applications earlier in the summer, shortly after final assessments (EOG and EOC Spring/Summer) are loaded.

Ideas to Improve CCRPI Process and Timeline

Richard Woods,
Georgia's School Superintendent
"Educating Georgia's Future"
gadoe.org

- Data quality campaign
  - More information to help districts understand the CCRPI process and the importance of data quality
    - Videos? Webinars? More emails? Regional sessions?
  - Lunch and learn webinars?

- Challenges
  - Who do we target?
  - How do we keep it simple?
  - What methods do we use?

Discussion Questions

- What are your thoughts on these ideas?

- How could we approach a data quality campaign to assist districts with data quality without burdening them with too much information?

- Are there other ideas for
  - Improving the calculation timeline?
  - Improving data quality?
  - Streamlining the process?

- What else about the CCRPI process needs to be reviewed?

Wrap Up