

Accountability Working Committee
Meeting Summary 4/10/17

Overview and Introductions

The Committee Chairs welcomed members and reviewed the agenda, which focused on discussing outstanding items and discussing weighting and scoring.

Inclusion of Graduation Rate Targets in Closing Gaps

The accountability team presented impact data on the possible inclusion of graduation rate targets in the Closing Gaps component for high schools. The committee discussed the advantages and disadvantages and unintended consequences. Committee members voiced several concerns, including the following:

- By including graduation rate targets, it decreases transparency. Stakeholders may not understand that, by including graduation rates, elementary and middle schools would not be held accountable for the same thing as high schools. That is an important consideration as we want to see appropriate comparisons between elementary, middle, and high school scores.
- High schools are already getting credit for graduation rates in the Graduation Rate component.
- Progress towards graduation rate targets will be reported even if they not included in Closing Gaps.

Progress Component Scoring

The accountability team noted that two issues with the current CCRPI Progress calculation have been raised by committee members or other stakeholders:

- The percent of students demonstrating typical/high growth ($SGP \geq 35$) does not acknowledge higher levels of growth.
- The current calculation, especially with the benchmark, does not differentiate the amount of growth demonstrated by students at different schools. Even schools with low growth rates earn most of the Progress points, providing a misleading representation of school performance.

The accountability team presented impact data on four possible scoring options:

1. Percent typical/high growth ($SGPs \geq 35$; CCRPI calculation prior to 2015)
2. Adjusted percent typical/high growth ($SGPs \geq 35$ with a benchmark applied; current CCRPI calculation)
3. Weighted typical/high growth 1 ($SGPs 1-34 = 0$; $SGPs 35-65 = 1$; $SGPs 66-99 = 1.5$)
4. Weighted typical/high growth 2 ($SGPs 1-29 = 0$; $SGPs 30-40 = .5$; $SGPs 41-65 = 1$; $SGPs 66-99 = 1.5$)

The levels in option 4 align with TKES where 30-40 represents a “warning track” around low growth. The committee discussed the advantages and disadvantages and unintended consequences of each approach. Committee members voiced support for option 4, stating that it

aligns with TKES, provides encouragement for low performing schools, and incentivizes higher levels of growth.

Next, the committee discussed the progress towards English language proficiency indicator. Given the recommendations of this committee and the ESOL/Title III Advisory Committee, two approaches to measuring EL progress towards proficiency have been explored – a value table (same as or similar to current ACCESS indicator) and SGPs (same as academic growth). Due to several factors and committee input, it is recommended that we continue to utilize a value table approach.

The accountability team presented impact data on four possible scoring options:

1. Percent of EL students moving up one performance band (no benchmark; all students earn 0 or 1)
2. Percent of EL students moving up one performance band (benchmark applied; all students earn 0 or 1)
3. Weighted percent of EL students moving up one performance band 1 (no progress = 0; improvement but did not move one band = 0.5; move up one band = 1)
4. Weighted percent of EL students moving up one performance band 2 (no progress = 0; improvement but did not move one band = 0.5; move up one band = 1; move up more than one band = 1.5)

The committee discussed the advantages and disadvantages and unintended consequences of each approach. Committee members noted that moving to an SGP approach could introduce confusion, and the field is familiar with the current ACCESS indicator and utilizing that data. It was also noted that this indicator will need to be revisited once we have enough ACCESS 2.0 data to understand performance and progress towards proficiency on the new assessment. That will need to be written into Georgia's ESSA plan. The committee expressed support for option 4, as it incentivizes improvement, even if a student does not move a full band. Option 4 also aligns with the previous recommendation for the ELA and math progress indicators and content mastery.

Academic Enrichment Indicator

The accountability team provided an overview of the conversations to date surrounding the academic enrichment indicator at the elementary and middle school levels. The committee had a robust conversation around this indicator. Committee feedback included the following:

- This indicator captures value added to the core curriculum.
- Stakeholder feedback indicated that stakeholders wanted to make sure CCRPI was capturing more than just test scores and performance in core content areas. Stakeholders also want to ensure these opportunities are available to students.
- The stakeholder feedback represents a cry from parents to say that it isn't all about ELA, math, science, and social studies. Children have a whole other side to them that is not being tapped into. That side isn't well cultivated in our schools.
- The term "academic enrichment" could be confusing. This indicator is about access to arts, music, world language, and other content areas beyond ELA, math, science, and

social studies. It is not designed to capture enrichment activities occurring in those core content areas.

As part of the discussion, committee members made the following statements:

- It's more than just arts too. It is a lot of those skills, including technical skills and soft skills, that kids access in a different way through a career/technical experience. Those are every bit as valid for some students as the arts are for other students.
- It needs to be a course with standards or an activity that feeds into a course with standards.
- I would make a strong case that health/PE should be included. Folks also talked a lot about wanting recess (health/PE gets at that).
- I would argue we should report it but not include it. The effective weight will be 0.
- We have some schools that are offering these things. But not all students get them because they are being pulled out for double doses of reading and math. That leads me to believe that we have several students who would not get those points.
- We can stop using content completer to calculate this. We would not be missing anything. Course enrollment and grades would work.
- Can you use standards and just tighten up the GaDOE's procedures to ensure all courses have standards?
- This goes back to reflecting stakeholder feedback and capturing the work schools are doing.
- If we don't look at this, let's just go to test scores. Yes, it's harder to measure these, but they're important.
- I also think about the name – college and career ready performance index. The career piece is getting lost.
- This should include world language, fine arts, CTAE, health/PE (middle school only if it is required at elementary).

Review Weighting Recommendations

The accountability team gave an overview of the redesigned CCRPI based on current committee recommendations and presented preliminary impact data on component and overall scores. The intended outcome of this conversation was for the committee to issue a set of policy recommendations.

A committee member raised a concern that work-based learning was not included, as it is an indication of a student being career ready. A work-based learning experience includes an evaluation by the employer. It was recommended that work-based learning be added to the high school college and career readiness indicator. There was additional conversation around the middle school college and career planning indicator and whether or not there should also be a similar indicator at the elementary school level.

The committee questioned why CCRPI is on a 100 point scale (note: it is specified in state law). The committee discussed if there were any statistical reasons for one scale versus another. There was additional conversation about the weighting of components. It was also noted that it is good that progress and closing gaps are not highly correlated with poverty, but content mastery is highly correlated. A committee member noted that you cannot solve poverty on paper.

Stakeholders need to be encouraged to dive into data and additional information (beating the odds, etc.) to understand why schools perform the way they do. Working with impoverished schools is hard work.

Review Committee Recommendations

The accountability team reviewed the committee's recommendations. The committee concluded the meeting with the following policy recommendations:

- Utilize option 4 for Progress scoring
- For academic enrichment, include fine arts and world language for elementary schools and fine arts, world language, career exploratory, and physical education/health for middle schools. Additional courses could be included once state standards are developed and approved.
- Review the consistency of the elementary and middle school indicators.
- Include work-based learning in the high school college and career readiness indicator.
- Establish a minimum enrollment threshold, informed by data, for the attendance indicator.
- Review the relationship of CCRPI scores to poverty and the weight of content mastery.
- One committee member stated, "The new structure for CCRPI and what the committee has accomplished is really good. We made some real changes for real reasons. We put things in here not for the points but because it is the right thing to do. The decisions we made were from the right standpoint. But my fear is that because of how scores are used externally, nothing will change and the good work will be for nothing. Is there a way to calibrate alignment between scores – does it accurately reflect the quality of the work in schools?"
- Another committee member added, "It is very defeating to work so incredibly hard year after year and see no progress. Schools are doing wonderful, great things out there. But you have this looming "grade" out there."

Next Steps

The GaDOE will use the committee's recommendation to finalize the state's ESSA plan for public comment. The committee will reconvene after the public comment period to review the feedback and recommend changes if necessary.