

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Accountability Framework LEA Leaders Meeting - Notes

September 28, 2016, 3:30-5:30 p.m. (in person), October 7, 12-1 p.m. (by webinar), and October 13 4:30-6:30 p.m. (at DC Association of Public Chartered Schools Meeting)

During the focus group session on Sept. 28, State Superintendent Hanseul Kang shared a [preliminary draft of accountability frameworks](#) to hear questions and gather feedback from LEA leaders and other stakeholders. The elementary/middle and high school frameworks shared for conversation were informed based on feedback sessions held with stakeholders to date (including our accountability system [principles](#)), input shared through the [accountability measures survey](#) received to date, research of national models, and the proposed federal regulations. The conversation also focused on key questions around how DC’s accountability system will factor in subgroups, a new requirement under the Every Student Succeeds Act.

OSSE also recapped the content and discussion of the Sept. 28 meeting during a webinar on Oct. 7 and at a DC Association of Public Chartered Schools Meeting Oct. 13. Below you will find a summary of the discussion and the range of perspectives shared based on points raised by various participants. Note that no final decisions were made in this meeting or follow-up webinar.

Area Discussed	Summary of Discussion	Next Steps & Follow Up (if applicable)
Domains: Academic performance and academic growth based on state assessments (general - PARCC & alternate - MSAA) Elementary/middle school level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weighting of the domains around achievement and growth. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The accountability system principles state that we “value growth and performance” so here they are equally weighted. - Consider how to incentivize schools to work with students who are more challenging or behind academically. - More likely to incentivize teachers to stay in challenging school environments if we include a strong measure for growth. • Possible measures for academic performance could include students scoring at levels 4 and above on PARCC, as well as levels 3 and above and decrease of students at levels 1 and 2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Including students at levels 3 and above in addition to 4 and above could be valuable to provide differentiation given the current small number of students scoring at levels 4 and above. - If a measure related to levels 3 and above was included in the model, this could be weighted differently over time as schools have more time to transition to the new expectations. 	OSSE is working with an independent research organization to review historical DC assessment and growth data and model DC data in several growth measures, including but not limited to median growth percentile (MGP). We will also look at other types of growth models (e.g., value-added) to better understand the pros and cons of various models in DC’s specific context.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The system should focus on the aspirational intent of getting all students to levels 4 and above, rather than reducing the percentage of students at levels 1 and 2. - Looking at reduction in levels 1 and 2 may be sufficiently captured by a strong growth measure. - Challenge for already high performing schools being able to continue to make progress. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In considering growth measures, the type of growth measure matters a lot. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DC should choose something that works equally well now and when we improve. Matrix that considers growth and performance is one way to balance these two measures. - Also important to reward both high performance and high growth. - Question as to whether it is reasonable to expect schools to move students higher once they are achieving at levels 4 or higher and meeting college- and career-ready bar. 	
<p>Domain: English learner (EL) proficiency</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESSA moves accountability for ELs from Title III to Title I, so it will now be a part of the overall accountability system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The calculation methodology does not need to be the historical AMAO methodology. - A separate measure of EL proficiency is required outside of disaggregation of ELs on PARCC and MSAA. • Question raised as to whether the WIDA has said that ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 assessment appropriate for high stakes accountability systems, given this was not the purpose it was initially intended for. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Point raised that DC has received pushback in the past for considering linking with teacher evaluations. • In DC, EL students are concentrated in certain schools/areas. Recommend OSSE doing data modeling work to understand how schools with little/no EL students would be affected in overall framework weighting. 	<p>OSSE will follow up about WIDA consortium's position about using ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 in accountability under ESSA.</p>
<p>Domain: School quality and student success</p> <p>Measure: Re-enrollment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using re-enrollment measure would require clear planning around business rules and points allocations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It could adversely impact schools with a transient population. - Even if the denominator is correctly adjusted for military families, students who have died, etc. the n-size becomes so 	

	<p>small that a few students can have a large impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential challenge for schools that have mobility that may be outside of their control. 	
<p>Domain: School quality and student success</p> <p>Measure: Attendance – in-seat attendance, truancy, chronic absenteeism</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we are interested in sticking with aspirational principles (what students should do, versus should not do) we would not include truancy & chronic absenteeism. 	
<p>Value/inclusion of subjects other than ELA and math</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous accountability frameworks sent the message that all we care about is math and ELA as measured by test scores. • Agreement that other subjects and areas (socio-emotional learning) are important, but difficult to measure and may not belong in the formal accountability system (i.e., may make sense in public reporting). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - During the recap webinar, thought shared that proposed high school framework has many pieces which may lead to lack of clarity, although all are important for students. • Different schools have different goals – consideration that beyond basic fundamental skills, we may not want to make judgments about which type of school families should value. • Idea for a bank of measures that schools/LEAs could choose to be measured on. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reminder that PCSB tried this – technically challenging and was abandoned despite many efforts. 	
<p>Goal of ESSA – use for spending of Title I funding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encouragement to remember the goal of the law, which is oversight of schools receiving federal Title I funding. There are ways to leverage change without formal accountability. • Point raised that equity reports on LearnDC have taught us that school behavior changes based on public reporting. • Comment that accountability and the measures that inform decisions are partially how we communicate what we value in schools. 	
<p>Domain – School quality and student success</p> <p>Measure: Teacher retention &</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good teachers are important, and previous laws have included metrics for “highly qualified” teachers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ESSA no longer requires reporting on highly qualified teachers. 	

quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comment that it is important to consider teacher quality as a measure of a good school. - Comment that there is potential for perverse hiring practices if inputs with teachers (e.g., doctorates or other degrees) are included in accountability system. 	
<p>Domain: Academic growth</p> <p>High school level</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General agreement that progress is important, but many challenges with how to measure for high school given PARCC assessment course timing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Question as to whether the scope of HS measures is too narrow. - Comment that scope of HS measures isn't narrow and that more students/grades are covered than could be the case for other grade spans. - Despite PARCC and MSAA usually primarily testing grade 10, SAT and ACT and graduation could cover grades 11/12. - During the recap webinar, interest expressed in including SAT and ACT into the academic achievement measures domain, instead of in school quality and student success. 	
Graduation rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest including 5-year cohort rate in addition to 4-year cohort; potential inclusion of 6-year as well. • Less interest in 4-year ACGR progress given changes in enrollment from year to year. 	
College and career preparation and readiness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectations should be higher at the HS level – push to move toward public reporting of true measures of college and career readiness (enrollment, persistence) as this is our ultimate goal. • We should be measuring readiness for college and careers – multiple pathways to success. Rigorous career certifications could be one measure. • Question as to whether to include college completion metrics. Point raised that this is a lagging indicator and one where data quality isn't strong at this point in time. 	
Public reporting – where and how?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State report card development is hugely important, but on a different timeline than the formal accountability system. OSSE does not need to include details on its approach to report cards in its March 2017 submission and the report cards will not be published for the first time until Dec. 2018. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, many different places and systems which are confusing to parents. • The goal is to have aligned system across all schools to make this less confusing. 	
Subgroup measures and weighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value closing gaps within schools and within the city. We also must look at ourselves compared to other states. • Point made that weighting around subgroups may have less significance in schools where the student population is predominantly economically disadvantaged and in a racial/ethnic subgroup. • Point made about how transparency plays a role in subgroups and that weighting subgroups too heavily or having too small of an n-size could have perverse incentives. • Point on the importance of balancing the needs of both homogenous schools and diverse schools so that neither type are “penalized” for their makeup. • Comment on need for clarity about which types of populations are most important in this framework and prioritize those. • ESSA allows different n sizes for accountability and public reporting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recommendation to decrease the n-size for public reporting to 5 students to further drive accountability. • What matters is closing gaps on college and employment outcomes. Test scores and others are just a means to an end. • During the recap webinar, idea shared of including predictive modeling around subgroup gaps and weighting and assigning points based on better performance than predicted. 	OSSE is speaking with the Department of Education and others to understand what’s required and what our options are to meet the requirement around subgroup reporting.

<u>Individuals from these organizations attended in person or by webinar</u>	
Achievement Prep PCS AppleTree Early Learning Center Cesar Chavez Schools Chesapeake Bay Foundation DC Prep PCS DC Promise Neighborhood	Elsie Whitlow Stokes PCS Empower12 Friends of Choice in Urban Schools (FOCUS) Friendship Public Charter Schools KIPP DC NALEO Education Fund

DC Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB)
Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
E.L. Haynes Public Charter School
Ed-Ops
Education Forward DC

Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE)
State Board of Education (SBOE)
Thurgood Marshall Academy
Two Rivers PCS
University Legal Services for the District of Columbia
Washington Latin PCS