

**Notes: Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Accountability Focus Group Meeting – Updates about Accountability Framework and Next Steps**  
 October 26, 2016, 10:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m. (in person); October 28, 2016, 9-10 a.m. (webinar)

The in-person meeting on Oct. 26 provided updates about the ESSA accountability framework to date. The Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) reviewed material covered in other focus groups held during fall 2016, as well as key points of feedback received from stakeholders through focus groups, webinars, and the ESSA Accountability Measures Survey. Next steps related to the overall framework and specific domains were also shared. The webinar on Oct. 28 reviewed the same material covered during the in-person session.

Area Discussed	Summary of Discussion	Next Steps & Follow Up (if applicable)
Domain: Academic achievement and growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the measures survey and focus groups, OSSE has received positive feedback about including both the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the college-and-career readiness learning expectation (level 4+ on PARCC and 3+ on MSAA) and including the percentage of students approaching, meeting, or exceeding college-and-career ready targets (level 3+ on PARCC and 3+ on MSAA).</li> <li>Based on feedback from sessions to date, OSSE moving away from including a measure around decrease of students at levels 1 and 2. Instead, exploring including a growth measure that captures movement of students across all scoring levels.</li> </ul>	OSSE is working with independent researchers to explore growth models with DC data.
Domain: Academic growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question raised referencing the strawman accountability framework presented in late September. Have decisions been made about how growth and academic achievement will be weighted?</li> <li>OSSE response that decisions have not yet been made about weighting in the framework, including how academic performance and growth will be weighted relative to one another and within the overall framework. OSSE is exploring weight distributions, including the potential for multiple pathways or differential weighting for these measures.</li> <li>Comment that the conversation around growth at the high school level has been complex. While many stakeholders are interested, there are questions and concerns about whether it's</li> </ul>	OSSE is working with College Board to learn more about whether a high school growth measure related to PSAT and SAT would be possible and psychometrically valid.

	<p>possible to measure growth in high school on PARCC given the variety of tests taken and current one-time testing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point raised that many schools and LEAs are interested in exploring different testing options in high school, particularly the SAT or ACT instead of PARCC.</li> <li>• Question about whether OSSE will consider testing students multiple times during high school to account for growth.</li> <li>• OSSE response that while current plan for PARCC in grades 3-8 and once in high school will be in place during 2016-17 and 2017-18, OSSE is open to considering other testing arrangements in later school years.</li> </ul>	
<p>Domain: Graduation rates</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Per the proposed federal regulations, states must include 4-year ACGR in the accountability system for all high schools. In addition, states are required to identify for “comprehensive support” all high schools that do not have a 67% 4-year ACGR. This includes alternative high schools.</li> <li>• OSSE has the flexibility to include multiple types of graduation rates and has heard positive feedback about including both 5- and 6-year ACGR.</li> <li>• OSSE also has flexibility around the type and level of “interventions” provided to high schools identified only with the trigger at the 67% threshold versus those falling in the bottom 5 percent of schools.</li> <li>• OSSE is not required to include adult-serving high schools in the accountability system and will not incorporate accountability for these high schools next school year (2017-18), but may add in future years.</li> <li>• Based on stakeholder feedback, particularly with regards to stability of the metric over time, OSSE has moved away from consideration of a growth metric related to ACGR.</li> <li>• Question raised about the capacity of OSSE to provide effective support to 5 percent or more of schools in DC.</li> <li>• Response provided that no final decisions have been made about the type or level of interventions, but that it is important to consider what entities in DC (e.g., OSSE, the Public Charter School Board, LEAs) may be charged with intervention at different stages of the process following a school’s identification.</li> </ul>	<p>OSSE is exploring modeling with weight to individual indicators and overall domain and different n-sizes.</p> <p>OSSE is reviewing what schools must be included as “alternative” per the federal regulations.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion made to consider using data to identify schools that are “beating the odds” with different groups of students. Identifying these schools could be incorporated as bonus points in connection with accountability.</li> </ul>	
<p>Domain: English language proficiency</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A change from previous iterations of the law is that English language proficiency (ELP) must be included as a separate measure, outside of reporting English learner (EL) performance on PARCC and MSAA.</li> <li>• Initial data analysis for ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 (DC’s current assessment for English language proficiency) shows that growth is not consistent at all grade levels, and is notably lower in middle school years.</li> <li>• Per feedback from focus groups and national conversations, OSSE would like to find a measure that captures both proficiency and growth on ACCESS.</li> <li>• Under ESSA states have more options of when to test new EL students on PARCC ELA assessment. Options include not testing first year of services, but testing second year and including for accountability purposes. Or, can test both years but not include until the second year. States can also set different rules for different levels of proficiency on ACCESS. For math and science, must test EL students as we do all students.</li> <li>• Question asked about where OSSE plans to set the n-size for inclusion of a group of students like English learners. Comment made that smaller n-sizes can be more challenging for schools due to the instability of those measures over several years. Comment made that smaller n-size is also preferable for transparency.</li> <li>• Currently, our n-size for accountability is 25. OSSE is open to lowering that number while keeping student privacy in mind. DC must identify one n-size for all subgroups across the accountability framework, but could decide to have a different n-size for public reporting.</li> </ul>	<p>OSSE is working on modeling around goals, exit criteria for English learners, and weight to individual ELP indicators and overall domain</p>
<p>Domain: School quality and student success</p> <p>Attendance measures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE is focused on increasing quality instructional time for all students, and one way to look at access to instructional hours is through an attendance measure.</li> <li>• Two metric options include in-seat attendance chronic</li> </ul>	

	<p>absenteeism (students who miss 10% or more of the school year also stated as students attending 90% or more of the school year).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation given that OSSE look into chronic absenteeism in DC by grade level, as there may be different patterns of absence at the elementary, middle, and high school level.</li> <li>• Comment that messaging to teachers and school staff around influencing positive measures (e.g., growth in the in-seat attendance rate) is more effective and better for building culture than messaging around negative measures (e.g., preventing chronic absenteeism).</li> <li>• Comment shared that chronic absenteeism can be a measure of the student population, and that some groups of students may have significant challenges in getting to school, including illness, homelessness, or lack of access to transportation, that may be outside the school’s sphere of influence. Feeling that schools should not be disadvantaged for serving these students.</li> </ul>	
<p>Domain: School quality and student success</p> <p>Other types of measures in this domain</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question asked about including discipline data such as suspensions as the measure in this domain. View expressed that discipline is a strong proxy of school culture.</li> <li>• Another point raised that incentivizing fewer suspensions does not necessarily improve the culture of the school building.</li> <li>• Comment made that since these data have become more publically available in DC through the Equity Reports, suspensions have dropped. Opinion expressed that accountability “points” assigned to this may not be necessary in order to move the numbers in the right direction.</li> <li>• View expressed that school climate surveys are not the right type of measure for an accountability system due to their variance across different schools and LEAs in DC and the ability for schools to “game” the results.</li> </ul>	<p>OSSE is exploring other possible measures in the school quality and student success domain, including re-enrollment and other academic measures in high school (Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, SAT, dual enrollment and career certifications). Some follow up questions being explored about data quality and coverage of some of these measures.</p>
<p>Overall decision points and next steps</p> <p>Full academic year (FAY) calculation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE is working to think through how students are “counted” for different measures, including full academic year (FAY) rules currently in place for state assessments. FAY for state assessments is currently defined as students who are enrolled in a school from Oct. 5 through the testing window, and enrolled 80% of the time during that period.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Also considering the stability of measures over time, how to allocate points and orient the framework, setting short- and long-term goals, and avoiding possible intended consequences while planning business rules.</li> <li>• Point made that due to the current FAY definition, there may be some highly mobile students who switch schools frequently that are not captured in any reporting system used in DC.</li> </ul>	
Goal setting and public reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question as to how goals will be set at the city level.</li> <li>• Response that the state does have to set long-term and short-term goals overall and for different populations of students, but more flexibility exists than under No Child Left Behind with annual yearly progress. OSSE has not proposed any goal-setting targets; this conversation will occur later in the development process.</li> <li>• Question as to the naming conventions for schools – what will schools at different levels be labeled?</li> <li>• Response that while no decisions have been made, there must be at least three levels per ESSA regulations. Ideally the labels will be clear signifiers without punitive connotation.</li> <li>• OSSE will be hosting focus groups with groups of DC parents to message test for report card design and development, building off of work Learning Heroes conducted in New Mexico.</li> </ul>	OSSE will share information about further engagement opportunities around goal setting, naming conventions, and public reporting.

<p><b><u>Attendee Organizations</u></b></p> <p>AppleTree Institute</p> <p>Brookings Institution</p> <p>Center City Public Charter School</p> <p>Community member</p> <p>District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)</p> <p>Friends of Choice in Urban Schools (FOCUS)</p> <p>EdForward</p> <p>E.L. Haynes Public Charter School</p>	<p>Inspired Teaching Demonstration PCS</p> <p>KIPP DC</p> <p>National Collegiate Preparatory</p> <p>DC Public Charter School Board (PCSB)</p> <p>Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE)</p> <p>State Board of Education (SBOE)</p> <p>Thurgood Marshall Academy</p> <p>University Legal Services</p> <p>WestEd</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------