Meeting:	Accountability System - STAR Framework: CLASS ACCESS Growth
Date/Time:	Friday, July 14 2:00 pm - 4:00 pm
Location:	OSSE 810 First St. NE Conference Room 806 Washington, DC 20002
Facilitator(s):	Laura Maurizi Eva Corcoran Mahlet Getachew Danielle Branson
Date Notes Posted:	July 24, 2017

Meeting Objective: To provide the introduction and overview of Accountability System and deep dive of the CLASS and ACCESS Growth metrics.

Agenda Items	
I. CLASS	Eva Corcoran
II. ACCESS Growth	Laura Maurizi
III. Next Steps/Next Meeting	Laura Maurizi

Meeting Notes (Q & A and Feedback)	
Slide 1: STAR Framework CLASS and ACCESS Growth	N/A
Slide 2: Goals of Our Discussion	N/A
Slide 3: Opportunities for Feedback and Questions	N/A
Slide 4: Agenda	N/A
Slide 5: Overview of STAR Framework	N/A
Slide 6: Timeline	N/A
Slide 7: Domains and Metrics	N/A
Slide 8: STAR Framework: Elementary Schools with Pre-Kindergarten	N/A
Slide 9: STAR Framework: Elementary Schools with	N/A

Pre-Kindergarten	
Slide 10: STAR Framework: Elementary Schools with Pre-Kindergarten	N/A
Slide 11: STAR Framework: Middle Schools	N/A
Slide 12: STAR Framework: High Schools	N/A
Slide 13: Deep Dive: CLASS	N/A
Slide 14: CLASS: Overview	N/A
Slide 15:CLASS: Emotional Support Points	N/A
Slide 16: CLASS: Classroom Organization Points	N/A
Slide 17: CLASS: Instructional Support Points	N/A
Slide 18: CLASS: Instructional Support Points	N/A
Slide 19: CLASS: Business Rules	N/A
Slide 20: CLASS: Business Rules	N/A
Slide 21: CLASS: Business Rules	**Q**: How was sector chosen to assign the observational windows? **A**: Initially when we started administering CLASS, we met with PCSB and DCPS leadership to establish a period of time to observe each sector. PCSB chose the first part window from Nov. through Jan. to make the data available for the PMF. DCPS wanted the second window, so we are maintaining what is already established. **Q**: Are those time periods weighted differently? What you see in classroom in Oct. is way different from March especially classroom management. **A**: OSSE sent this protocol to Teachstone. It verified that the observation windows are valid for both bands, and there is not much variation. The tool is stable enough that that wouldn't make a difference. FEEDBACK: Want to set target at 6 because that's where you get high quality based on the publishers' recommendation. **Q**: Please talk about how floors were set. **A**: We don't see gains until scores of about 5, so that's where we set the floor as that's where the distribution of scores is on the higher end for classroom organization and emotion. **Q:** Was there any variation when you included DCPS, or were PCSB floors just taken? **A**: No. We wanted it to align with QRIS, and there were a lot of conversation before accountability between OSSE and PCSB to establish what this should look like. We want to align QRIS and accountability.

	Q: Would it be possible to get data for all sectors de-identified? I am curious about variation of DCPS. **A**: Looking at all three sectors, the average for emotional support and classroom organization 5.5 others are a little lower than 3.
Slide 22: CLASS: Business Rules	**Q**: Do timelines make a difference? **A**: After consulting research, the variability is accounted for and the data is stable enough that there is not a large difference. **Q**: Could data be run again to distinguish this? **A**: We have the data, and it could be run again to see if the timeline makes a difference for a change in the established protocol. **Q**: Is there a change of threshold from 5 to 6? **A**: They are set differently from the threshold of quality from CLASS from a combination of existing research and what the publishers have recommended. This new target is what we want teachers to strive for. For the past two years the district is meeting the emotional support and classroom support threshold. The floor was set with the same expectations in mind. **Q**: Can this data be released (de-identified) to see how DCPS consideration played into this decision? **A**: This will be considered.
Slide 23: CLASS: Business Rules	**Q**: Could you talk about inter-rater reliability for double coded classrooms? **A**: The anchor observer will have preference for reporting. The second observer, if score is lower than 80% then they will go through training again. **Q**: Shouldn't the point be that the observations are reliable and just taking one person's doesn't make the observation reliable? **A**: This is the protocol that's established by Teachstone and their vendor that's used across the country. Yes, this is different then what we call integrator reliability check, but this is their standard practice. **Q**: Are there any conflict of interest checks for observers? **A**: Yes. **Q**: How can we alert for issues/concerns about consistency in process issues (not showing up on time)? **A**: The protocol will outline this and there will be an appeal process, if protocol isn't followed. Results could be to retest, or some combination of partial score release.
Slide 24: CLASS: Business Rules	**Q**: This is the 45th percentile performance, so to get zero points for a 4 doesn't add up with the published targets. We should go with what the publisher guidelines are. **A**: This is good feedback. Part of our decision to go above and beyond is to be aggressive here as this is a point where schools are are doing really well, but we can consider whether getting a 4 might be worth partial points.
Slide 25: Deep Dive: ACCESS Growth	N/A
Slide 26: ACCESS Growth: Overview	**Q**: Will there be an opportunity to give feedback around the process for guidance around identifying English Learners? **A**: We are already working with working groups and individual LEAs, and we will follow up on the guidance with ESSE.

Slide 27: ACCESS Growth: Overview	N/A
Slide 28: ACCESS Growth: Overview	N/A
Slide 29: ACCESS Growth: Overview	N/A
Slide 30: ACCESS Growth: Business Rules	**Q**: How do you consider students with disabilities who don't qualify for ALT test? **A**: WIDA has a checklist of information for ACCESS and a cross walk to determine what resources students have access to. **Q**: So WIDA is research based, but it doesn't take everything into account. Is that correct? **A**: It's based on their analysis of ACCESS scores across states in many years; however, there is other research in other venues that have looked at specific rates of growth for variables other variables that right now the WIDA methodology does not incorporate. **Q**: WIDA already says not use proficiency levels, so why are we using it? **A**: We are using scale scores. A student's score and their targets differ by grade. In our calculations we use scale score and proficiency level associated with grade based scale score. These slides are modeled in a way for ease of communication.
Slide 31: ACCESS Growth: Business Rules	N/A
Slide 32: ACCESS Growth: Business Rules	**Q**: Do you have an expected timeline for how methodology will change as the test shifts? **A**: The shift in cut points is being considered by WIDA, but no specific date. There is a plan to re-evaluate.
Slide 33: ACCESS Growth: Business Rules	N/A
Slide 34: ACCESS Growth: Hypothetical Point Calculation	**Q**: If a student takes early indicator test or screener and they reach proficiency on ACCESS in the same year, is that student still in this calculation? **A**: The calculation requires a baseline score on ACCESS. If they have this, then they would be expected to test on ACCESS until they reach proficiency. Those with a baseline who reached proficiency in the first year (perhaps they were misidentified) will not be in this calculation as they have achieved proficiency. **Q**: How should we handle if a parent refuses services? **A**: EL policy working group is creating language/guidance on this. OSSE will continue to work on resources, including possible stock language or support tools. **Q**: Does WIDA research show that students progress one level per year? **A**: No it doesn't. We find that growth tends to be greater early on and then level off; therefore, the goals are set as such in regards to growth targets. The two years between 4 and 5 are meant to adjust for the shift in levels of growth we tend to see.
Slide 35: ACCESS Growth: Business Rules	N/A
Slide 36: ACCESS Growth: Business Rules	N/A
Slide 37: ACCESS Growth:	N/A

Business Rules	
Slide 38: ACCESS Growth: Business Rules	N/A
Slide 39: ACCESS Growth: Business Rules	**Q**: Are there going to be FAY rules similar to what occurs with PARCC? **A**: Right now there are no proposed rules for minimum time of enrollment because this requires a baseline exam, so a student will have to be enrolled in the same school for two school years.
Slide 40: ACCESS Growth: Business Rules	**Q**: If a student withdraws during a testing window, will I be penalized? **A**: This is more an issue of continuous enrollment. This is something we will consider creating rules on.
Slide 41: ACCESS Growth: Business Rules	N/A
Slide 42: ACCESS Growth: Business Rules	**Q**: Can you use the 2016-17 data for the baseline year? This makes more sense because students have already been exited and then we'd have to re-introduce them to services. **A**: For the dry run, we have to use school years 2015-16 and 2016-17 because that's the data that we have.
Slide 43: ACCESS Growth: Business Rules	N/A
Slide 44: ACCESS Growth: Business Rules	**Q**: Often students with IEPs in reading, writing, listening and speaking don't qualify for ALT and may never reach proficiency on ACCESS. Schools with these students will be penalized. Please have a conversation with WIDA about something that could be built for students like these that perhaps other states do. **A**: We are a member of the WIDA consortium and can provide this feedback.
Slide 45: ACCESS Growth: Additional Information	**Q**: When will this application roll out? **A**: We want to release this application prior to the start of the school year, but we don't have an exact date at this point.
Slide 46: ACCESS Growth: Additional Information	N/A
Slide 47: ACCESS Growth: Summary and Additional Information	N/A
Slide 48: Questions and Next Steps	**Q**: How would the application work for students who are given screeners in the beginning of the school year? **A**: It would rely on the LEA SIS, so if they are identified as yes for EL, the new school can reach out to the previous school. Over time we can revisit OSSE collecting information on screeners, which would reduce this dependency on cross LEA communication **Q**: To set floors and targets, the 90th percentile + the goal in the plan, and that percentile is divided by 7? **A**: Yes, to reach the long-term goal in the plan, we are shifting the 90th percentile to create a stretch goal, which is more ambitious and longer term. This is the same as we discussed on Wednesday. **Q**: Would monitored students be included at any point in this metric? **A**: Students who reach proficiency wouldn't be included unless their school re-identifies them and retests them and their score demonstrates in some way that they don't reach proficiency. We would require another test.

Slide 49: Ways to Stay Engaged	**Q**: Because the ACCESS growth model may not account for growth grade, age and etc., could we take this on regardless of WIDA? **A**: Unfortunately, given the size of our state, it's difficult to break out subgroups that allow for robust growth modelling, so we are reliant on other states in the consortium due to this. As we have more years of data after adjusting to new versions of tests, looking at this will be more possible. Q: When will this new system be implemented? A: We'd like to roll this out prior to the audit, preferably before start of school.

<div align="center">

Feedback via OSSE.ESSA@dc.gov

</div>

Friends of Choice in Urban Schools (FOCUS)

CLASS

- Reconsider the floors and targets used for CLASS. Setting the floor at 4.5 seems arbitrary, and getting 0 points for a 4 (close to the publisher's definition of quality) doesn't make sense. Consider using either the publisher guidelines, or the 10th/90th percentile. Provide data on what the floors and targets would be if 10/90 was used.
- Release all CLASS scores for each metric by school (deidentified) and sector so that we can review data to better inform floor and target discussion.
- The decision to conduct observations in different windows according to sectors seems to introduce systematic inequities. OSSE should create a common observation window and randomly assign all schools to be observed within the common window.
- There should be a business rule around the number of cycles per observation, and documented length of cycle within observations (cycles may vary in length from 10-20 minutes -- should be some standardization around this)
- Is there a minimum n-size for CLASS observations to be included in the framework? Will a school with one CLASS observation be included in the framework therefore publically linking results to one teacher?
- Will another tool be used to assess the quality of interactions in the self-contained special education classrooms?
- Can OSSE provide additional information about the "Teachstone Endorsed" reliability protocol? Research suggests that there is significant variability in scoring by data collectors. What are the double-coding (co-scoring) by data collector guidelines? Slide 23 notes that 12% of classrooms will be double coded, but what percentage of the data collectors will be double-coded (co-scored)?
- If a data collector is found to not meet the fidelity requirements, what is the impact on the classroom? Will make-up observations be scheduled?

ACCESS Growth

- There should be a business rule for ACCESS similar to Full Academic Year for PARCC that clarifies which students count. For example, some students withdraw during the ACCESS testing window before they are tested (February-May) while others are unable to test (e.g. medical, incarceration) during the school's scheduled testing window. For example, a school schedules ACCESS testing April 1- 30. A student on February 27 is hospitalized with a long-term illness that extends beyond the ACCESS test window.
- Add in a minimum participation rule for ACCESS (e.g. 95% which has been accepted by the Department of Education for federal accountability). Schools must test 95% of eligible students. Schools could appeal to OSSE to exclude any student beyond 95% on an individual basis (e.g. medical

exemption, withdrawal, incarceration). Schools would not be penalized for not meeting the 95% threshold if an appeal is granted.

- Families have the option to deny ELL services for students. Students for whom families have denied ELL services (in writing) should not be included in the school's accountability and should not count towards test participation. Otherwise, a school is being held accountable for a student's language acquisition when the school is not allowed to provide ELL services.
- OSSE should revisit the recommendation to use 2015-16 ACCESS scores as the baseline, given that the scores will have to be converted to a new scale and will change. Many students were exited from EL services based on the old scale, and are no longer receiving services, but schools could be accountable for their ACCESS growth. Using 2016-17 scores as the baseline makes more sense.

District of Columbia Public Schools
CLASS metric
The methodology for determining the points for the CLASS metric is sound; we believe that the business rules will ensure reliable and valid measure of classroom quality. Additional reflections from an early childhood perspective, on the overall ESSA plan, are provided below.

Other recommendations for leveraging early childhood
Given the strength of the evidence demonstrating that high quality preschool programs are effective at developing the formative cognitive, social-emotional and other pre-academic skills of children and reducing the income-based gap in achievement already in progress at kindergarten entry, the investment should pay dividends in achievement outcomes for the District. DCPS ECED hopes to ensure that OSSE leverages all opportunities, available through ESSA, to strengthen early childhood program quality to best ensure the District meets its long-term achievement goals:

Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
Incentives to improve teaching and learning in Pre-K classrooms
- Include criterion-referenced target for CLASS, Instructional Support Domain, as an academic achievement and academic progress indicator (rather than school environment indicator)
- Recommend using Emotional Support and Classroom Organization domains for school environment Indicator (not Instructional Support).
- Consider using measure for Addressing Chronic Absenteeism instead of In-Seat Attendance, given the salience of individual student absenteeism rates to achievement.
- Consider including separate indicators for PreK and K-5 academic progress, school environment, addressing chronic absenteeism indictors for PreK programs in elementary schools, in state report cards
- Consider including a plan for supporting the transition from PreK to Kindergarten (Provision of statewide assessment system such as Teaching Strategies GOLD for PreK-K would provide for better coordination across Division of Early Learning and Elementary divisions, for example). ESSA authorizes support for joint efforts to address transition to elementary school, including issues related to school readiness.

Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement
Include PreK in plan for improving educational outcomes of dual language learners.
- While PreK is included in Home Language Survey data collection and the dual language learner screening plan (Preschool IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test (Pre-IPT)), there is no indication of PreK in OSSE's EL Flowchart. We need a flowchart for PreK.

- DCPS currently uses Teaching Strategies GOLD Home Language surveys in all PreK programs and would be willing to share that data with OSSE in order to prevent duplication of effort and undue burden on families and teachers.

In determining the ACCESS Growth methodology, OSSE recommends:
- Recommendation: WIDA-based approach that sets fixed number of years a student has to reach proficiency based on his/her baseline
- Rationale: Aligns with research-based evidence from WIDA

DCPS Comments- Even though it is said to be aligned, OSSE agrees that the rules do not account for research indicating different rates of growth depending on starting grade level, starting level of proficiency, and years of formal education. In addition, OSSE acknowledged that the rule does not account for bilingual programs that use a student's native language for instruction, meaning that they progress more slowly toward English proficiency.

This methodology doesn't seem to take into account research and will not reflect the needs of bilingual programs nor guarantee a reasonable growth target for our most vulnerable students:

> SLIFE's – Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education and
> Students with specific Learning Disabilities in the Language Domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing (tested by WIDA)

Recommendation: Wait for WIDA to release the new research on the length of time it takes for students to become English language proficient. OSSE should base the growth-targets on the number of years the new research says it takes students to reach language acquisition. OSSE should convert scores from 2016 using the new conversion scale and calculate NEW growth targets while pressuring WIDA (together with the other 39 States) to release their findings. OSSE should identify students' cohorts by initial grade level when entering ESL services and language proficiency level in determining growth targets. Special consideration should be made for SLIFE and ELs with IEPs.

In determining if/when to restart a student's baseline year, OSSE recommends:

- Recommendation: Restart a student's baseline when a student enrolls in a new school, including students who transfer schools as well as enter a new school after completing a terminal grade

DCPS Comments- We do agree that this will avoids any disincentive for enrolling students who have not been meeting their growth targets and has the potential for not penalizing schools for a student's lack of growth at a previous school

Recommendation: There needs to be additional clarity as to when and how this will be tracked and viewed. What are the consideration for students incarcerated or those that travel outside the USA and return? This form of baseline might make sense if the additional accountability like PARCC and ACGR travel with the student in the same way. Furthermore given that determining a student has entered a new school is based on school code, there needs to be exceptions/considerations made for schools that have a school configuration that does not align with this restart rule. For example, a school that serves grades 6-12 like Cardozo or CHEC where they have the same school code for their middle and high school or a school that serves students grades K-8 like Truesdell.

In determining how to handle students whose time allotted to reach proficiency exceeds their expected enrollment time in school, OSSE recommends:

- Recommendation: Do not change time allotted to reach proficiency even if it exceeds expected enrollment time

DCPS agrees.

In determining how to account for students who are identified as EL but do not take ACCESS, OSSE recommends:

- Recommendation: Count the student as not making sufficient growth
- Rationale:
    - Holds schools accountable to all EL students
    - Eliminates incentives for not testing EL students

DCPS Comments: We agree that OSSE needs to have a data validation processes that is clear on which students are EL and what their growth targets are. We also feel that schools need to be held accountable for the language proficiency of their EL students.

OSSE should document an ACCESS participation policy in the same way that PARCC, MSAA and DC Science participation is documented.

Recommendation: This recommendation should be revisited considering a targeted participation rate or additional guidance of who exactly should test. For example, there are a small number of parents that refuse to have their students tested with Access but per this, schools will be penalized for these students meeting an expected growth without giving actual services. What is the guidance to parents on similar state assessments like PARCC? HS students are particularly hard to reach. Maybe revisiting a combination of Access growth as it relates to graduation should be proposed.

In determining how to treat students who score proficient in their first year of ACCESS testing, OSSE recommends:

- Recommendation: Do not count the student in this metric unless the student is in grade K and the student was identified as EL in PK3 or PK4

DCPS Comment- Although this rationale meets the requirement of having a baseline test and re-test to measure growth it does not credit LEAs for growth to proficiency that occurs if a student reaches proficiency in their first year of ACCESS testing. It seems that we could get stuck as many of our PK 3 and 4 do not actually attend the same school in Kinder.

DCPS Recommendation: – Count as making sufficient growth if student is identified as EL in that year's feed by administering a new screener like the MODEL K at the beginning of Kindergarten to establish a baseline where the student is receiving the service. OSSE should start collecting screener information that verifies that students have been accurately identified as EL as part of the audit process.

In determining which ACCESS year should establish the baseline of data for how many years a student has to reach proficiency, OSSE recommends:

- Recommendation: Use the 2015-16 school year to establish the baseline

DCPS Comment – Although It is the earliest year of data we have for ACCESS for ELLs 2.0, the new window did not account for a full academic year in addition to the fact that the scales were changed significantly between the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years. The proposed conversion will cause (In DCPS's case) massive confusion. Over 800 students exited using the 2016 Access score. If we use the conversation, based on the results of this year, over 600 students would come back to being eligible to received ESL services after we've told their parents that they exited and received no ESL support during the school tear 2016-2017. In addition, this student DID NOT take a new Access for ELLs 2.0 in 2017 so even if they were brought back- there would be no baseline. This will also have a 2.7-million-dollar impact immediately to return those students to service this year.

DCPS Recommendation – Use 2017 test results to establish baseline and 2018 to determine growth targets and allow WIDA to release new research.

In determining how to handle students who take Alternate ACCESS, OSSE recommends:

- Recommendation: Exclude those students from the ACCESS Growth metric
DCPS Comments- We agree that students who take Alternate ACCESS comprise less than 1% of student population with few schools with greater than ten students and it aligns with how other states are treating students who take Alternate ACCESS

DCPS Recommendation- We are recommending that the percentage be increased to allow for students who have a proven disability in one of the 4 language domains tested by the ACCESS 2.0 (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing) be considered to take the Access ALT. OSSE should research what other WIDA states are doing for this subset of the population.

In determining how to set growth targets for students who do not reach proficiency after the allotted number of years, OSSE recommends:

- Recommendation: Require students to achieve proficiency every year after their allotted number of years

DCPS Comment – Although we agree to continue to hold schools accountable for their students' progress, provision could be set in place for school to provide rationale for the student who did not reach proficiency (i.e. out of school for health reasons, or out of the country for a significant amount of time, SLIFE or others). OSSE to monitor and collect documentation.

Recommendation- Allow for explanations with documentation of special cases.

In determining how to provide information to LEAs about which students are English Learners and their expectations for when they should reach proficiency, OSSE recommends:

Recommendation: Create an application in Qlik that provides comprehensive information on EL students, including identifying EL students and when they are expected to reach proficiency

DCPS Comment- Although we agree that OSSE needs to create a comprehensive and accurate system of information to LEAs to support EL students, DCPS already purchase a similar system Ellevation, that can minimize the use of several databases.

Recommendation: That OSSE should look at Ellevation as a potential database instead of creating their own.

E.L Haynes
CLASS
- We support equal weight allotted to the three domains, Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support for calculating the CLASS portion of the framework.
- We strongly support OSSE researching ways to narrow the observation window to ensure an equitable comparison of schools.
- We support OSSE's recommendation to observe all preschool classrooms and encourage OSSE to ensure self-contained special education classrooms are included.
- OSSE should establish a clear process for reporting concerns regarding CLASS observations. Last year, for example, our observer spent time evaluating recess, which was not an appropriate time to gather data.

ACCESS
- We recommend OSSE review actual data to see how schools serving different grade bands (within ES/MS/HS) may be impacted by the variation in expected growth by age/grade level.
- Establish a business rule for ACCESS growth similar to Full Academic Year for PARCC that clarifies which students count. For example, some students withdraw during the ACCESS testing window (February-May) before they are tested.
- We strongly recommend OSSE calculate the baseline ACCESS growth on the 2017 scores, not the 2015-16 scores. WIDA stated that there was a deliberate increase in the rigor of the scoring system starting with the 2017 assessment. Additionally, many students were exited from EL services based on the old scale, and are no longer receiving services, but under OSSE's current proposal schools may be accountable for their ACCESS growth.
  - We have included an excerpt from a recent WIDA report for your reference, "Starting in 2017, students will need to demonstrate higher language skills on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 in order to receive the same proficiency level scores. Some students' scores may go down. For example, a 5th grade student who received an overall proficiency level of 4.0 last year would have received a 3.6 under the new score scale...In 2016, 24% of students who took the test scored a 5.0 or above. Under the new score scale, 5% of them would have received a 5.0 or above".
- We agree with the rationale for excluding students taking the Alternate ACCESS. However, we encourage OSSE to work with WIDA to research ways to hold schools accountable for these students. Additionally, we encourage OSSE to explore avenues for exiting dual-identified students who are not passing ACCESS due to a disability as opposed to limited English proficiency.
- We appreciate OSSE's effort to streamline data sharing through Qlik. We want to stress the importance of giving EL coordinators access to newly enrolled students in a timely manner, especially for schools that start their school year in July and August.

Next Steps
1. LEAs can provide feedback within 3 business days (by July 19, 2017) via OSSE.ESSA@dc.gov.
2. Notes will be sent out 5 business days after the meeting (by July 24, 2017).

Next Meeting
Monday, July 17, 2017 8:00 am – 11:00 am OSSE 810 First St. NE Grand Hall 3rd Floor Washington, DC 20002