



DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF  
**EDUCATION**

<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Accountability System - STAR Framework:</b> In-Seat Attendance Addressing Chronic Absenteeism Re-Enrollment
<b>Date/Time:</b>	Friday, July 21 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm
<b>Location:</b>	OSSE 810 First St. NE Conference Room 806 Washington, DC 20002
<b>Facilitator(s):</b>	Darrell Ashton, Naomi Watson, Laura Maurizi and Kelley Scholl
<b>Date Notes Posted:</b>	July 28, 2017
<b>Meeting Objective:</b> To provide the introduction and overview of Accountability System and deep dive of In-Seat Attendance, Addressing Chronic Absenteeism, and Re-Enrollment metrics.	
<b>Agenda Items</b>	
I. In-Seat Attendance	Kelley Scholl
II. Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	Kelley Scholl
III. Re-Enrollment	Laura Maurizi
IV. Next Steps/Next Meeting	All
<b>Meeting Notes (Q &amp; A and Feedback)</b>	
Slide #	Questions & Answers
Slide 1: STAR Framework Attendance and Re-Enrollment Metrics	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	N/A

<b>Schools without Pre-Kindergarten</b>	
<b>Slide 9: STAR Framework: Elementary Schools with Pre-Kindergarten</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 10: STAR Framework: Middle Schools</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 11: STAR Framework: High Schools</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 12: Deep Dive: Attendance Metrics</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 13: Attendance Metrics: Overview</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 14: Attendance Metrics: Overview</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 15: Attendance Metrics: Overview</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 16: In-Seat Attendance: Hypothetical Point Calculation</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> How did we set the maximum floor?</p> <p><b>A:</b> It is set at 88 percent because as we mentioned the 10-90 percentile isn't ideal for this metric. There's research around attendance and what constitutes a realistic goal that's aligned with student success. That 88 percent was based on national research.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> What is the current in-seat attendance (ISA) in DC?</p> <p><b>A:</b> We can see ISA by LEA published in equity reports. It falls well above 90 percent.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Was there another method for establishing the target considered, given the distribution?</p> <p><b>A:</b> Yes. The methodology in general is to set at 10th and 90th percentile. We visited whether there should be a maximum floor after which point schools start receiving points. We wanted to maintain differentiation at higher levels, which is why we are suggesting a maximum floor.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Is there the potential for the upper bound to continue to increase year after year?</p> <p><b>A:</b> There is that potential. For other metrics, if we reach a point where the upper bound isn't aligned with research or meaningful, we would be open to reconsidering.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Is that research available? Can you share it?</p> <p><b>A:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Are floors and targets same for all students?</p> <p><b>A:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Is there not enough discrepancy between 10th &amp; 90th percentile?</p> <p><b>A:</b> We are observing a range from 90-97 for elementary school, but this is more of a question around whether 90 is an appropriate floor. We're suggesting lowering that 10th percentile to 88.</p>

	<p><b>Q:</b> Does research say that 88 percent attendance minimum is acceptable rate of attendance?</p> <p><b>A:</b> It is the minimum level of attendance that's considered acceptable. We want to reiterate that would be associated with lowest number of points. We're not saying that's where we want people to be.</p>
<b>Slide 17: Addressing Chronic Absenteeism: Overview</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> Considering last bullet, does that start immediately when school year begins?</p> <p><b>A:</b> It includes attendance (irrespective of Count day) for each day the student is enrolled and is not limited to enrollment audit population.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Could a student be enrolled for 10 days and absent for 9 days and still count?</p> <p><b>A:</b> If a student is enrolled for 10 days, and regardless of days absent, the student would count.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Can you increase the minimum days enrolled to 20 or 30? We have students who are enrolled and do not come in.</p> <p><b>A:</b> 10 days was selected last year through meetings with DCPS and PCSB because it aligned with other state initiatives and other triggers, for example for truancy, and LEA policies about attendance.</p>
<b>Slide 18: 90+ Attendance: Overview</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> Does this include any student who attends school throughout whole year and is enrolled at least 10 days, regardless if they are enrolled at the end of the year?</p> <p><b>A:</b> Yes. This is all students served in your school for at least 10 days.</p>
<b>Slide 19: 90+ Attendance: Hypothetical Point Calculation</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 20: Growth: Overview</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> Do the students who are in these individual categories included at any or across the school year, even if they move across LEAs? Also those students are tracked the next year on average their performance in the next year is the thing against which every other student in that group is measured?</p> <p><b>A:</b> Yes, similar to PARCC MGP methodology. For students who move across schools, we'll calculate attendance level for all days across school year. We'll come up with a year-end attendance rate, and that's what we'll use to compare for growth regardless of how many schools they were in.</p> <p><b>FEEDBACK:</b> In PARCC, you're only counted at a maximum of one school. If a student has attendance at two LEA/schools then each of those gets compared back to attendance in the previous year. A student could have multiple growth measures and multiple schools.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE:</b> In looking at prior year's attendance to measure against, we would be looking at record across all schools holistically. If a student missed 25 percent of days and next year missed 10 percent of days at one school and at another they missed 40 percent. Those two schools would be treated differently for the same student on making a determination of if that student grew.</p>
<b>Slide 21: Growth: Overview</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> Growth is measured by change in attendance rate from this year to last year. Students that have 21 percent absences are in same buckets as students with 29% absences. They both come in at 90 the next year. They have come from same starting point, one kid's growth was 11 and one was 19 so the student that only grew 11 is given a lower percentile than the one who grew 19?</p> <p><b>A:</b> They're in the same grouping for ranking percentiles.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> If they both end up at 90, the student who started at 79 will have a lower percentile?</p>

	<p><b>A:</b> Yes because they started higher. Student who grew more will have a higher percentile. That's reason we have best of for addressing chronic absenteeism. If students in your school are doing well and they're not growing, you're still getting credit for good attendance. When you look at distribution of data, you really see schools that have very small percentage of students meeting 90+ plus but they are growing substantially.</p>
<b>Slide 22: Growth: Hypothetical Point Calculation</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 23: 90+ Attendance vs. Growth</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> Are there schools that had a 99 MGP?</p> <p><b>A:</b> Yes. They have a lot of students achieving but still improving on their attendance. This is plotting the percentile of the percentile and the distribution of how points would be assigned. Students who are low on both would be a 1, for example. If you're positive on both, you'd be a 5.</p>
<b>Slide 24: Addressing Chronic Absenteeism: Example Determination</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> Would a student who is enrolled for 10 days but sick for 2 who is labelled chronically absent count against school?</p> <p><b>A:</b> Yes. Students who are missing days are still at higher academic risk and that's why we have both ISA and chronic absenteeism.</p> <p><b>FEEDBACK:</b> Concern about the lack of differentiation with the addressing chronic absenteeism metrics. It's works for assessment because there is a wide band of results.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE:</b> The limited variation we see is in ISA, which is a completely different metric. When you look at distribution of chronic absence, it varies widely so it has a sufficient distribution to create floors and targets. It looks very different.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> We shouldn't be penalizing schools if students with perfect attendance miss a day of school and SGP is low.</p> <p><b>A:</b> Scenarios with 10 days of enrollment are extreme. When we looked at data, there are very few students only enrolled for 10 or 20 days. Vast majority are enrolled for all 180 days. It's possible if a school has a high proportion of students enrolled for only 10 days, it could have an impact, but the desire is that they would be enrolled longer than 10 days and then one to two days wouldn't make much of a difference.</p>
<b>Slide 25: Attendance Metrics: Overview</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 26: Attendance Metrics: Business Rules</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> What about PK3? Seems one band of compulsory is there and not the other?</p> <p><b>A:</b> Recommended including all students.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Did you calculate this for equity reports?</p> <p><b>A:</b> They were conducted by both sectors and OSSE and cross-validated.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> PCSB's ISA includes all students regardless of age as that's part of the regulations or the laws for how ISA is calculated.</p> <p><b>A:</b> If we're already doing it that way, there are no trade-offs.</p>
<b>Slide 27: Attendance Metrics: Business Rules</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> If a school with grades PK3, PK4, and K does not receive a STAR rating because it doesn't have enough points for a framework, would this be scored as a metric / points displayed?</p> <p><b>A:</b> It would be displayed on report card.</p>
<b>Slide 28: Attendance Metrics: Business Rules</b>	<p><b>FEEDBACK:</b> I love idea that this will slowly disappear. These are enormous problems that we know we have conflicting data that we have trouble reconciling.</p>
<b>Slide 29 Attendance Metrics: Business Rules</b>	N/A

<b>Slide 30: Attendance Metrics: Business Rules</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> What do you mean by schools that don't submit attendance data?</p> <p><b>A:</b> It was Tuesday, November 4, and nothing came across the SIS. So we don't know what happened that day at your school.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> To clarify, this is about us submitting data to you. If a particular teacher doesn't take attendance, we can't mark all those students absent. We have internal policies. You're talking about the data not being submitted.</p> <p><b>A:</b> We're expecting an attendance value on every date that a student has a stage 5 enrollment. Our expectation is that we would have attendance from the teacher on every day for which the student is enrolled.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> DCPS has an internal policy that if teachers do not post attendance, it defaults to present because there are legal ramifications for students being absent. You would have a record for every day regardless. I don't know what other LEAs do, but it would be a big deal to change that.</p> <p><b>A:</b> I don't think we're in a position where we can get involved in individual LEA policies. Our concern is more that we don't want to incent a purposeful not sending attendance across. I think it's helpful to have conversations. I know there are some LEAs default to present and some to absent. It has implications for this measure. From a data perspective, we're expecting attendance value for every stage 5 enrolled student. That should accurately reflect whether student was present or absent from school that day. From data OSSE receives across SIS every day - if we expected to receive data and it's not there, we will count it as absence.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Why is this different from ISA? Is this the same?</p> <p><b>A:</b> In prior years we received a year-end file, we would map it to school calendars, and there were significant days where we expected to receive data on students that just weren't there. We didn't include them in numerator or denominator.</p>
<b>Slide 31: Attendance Metrics: Business Rules</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 32: 90+ Attendance and Growth: Business Rules</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> Why did you decide weighting it based on how much time they spent at the school didn't suffice?</p> <p><b>A:</b> We considered all manner of weighting but didn't want school to focus less on a student enrolled or expected to be enrolled fewer days. Where we landed was to reinforce the need to focus on attendance of all students in the building by the schools they attended throughout the year.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Can you let me know if my thinking is right. If a student attends an LEA and they have 25 percent absenteeism and that was last year's metric. This year, they're at same LEA but increased to 40 percent. Parents switch them to a different school and have 5 percent. New school has improved it a lot but if you average it out, it looks like they haven't.</p> <p><b>A:</b> For growth metric, average prior years across schools. In your scenario, school A would have low MGP and school B would have a high MGP. School A would receive few growth points and school B would receive more.</p>
<b>Slide 33: 90+ Attendance and Growth: Business Rules</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 34: Growth: Business Rules</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> Rather than grade in year-end demographic certification, is it more accurate to say assessment grade as of end-of-year demographic certification?</p> <p><b>A:</b> Yes. You are correct. We have a copy edit to make this clearer. We are comparing to</p>

	other students in same grade based on assessment and reporting grade from the end-of-year demographic certification.
<b>Slide 35: Growth: Business Rules</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 36: Growth: Business Rules</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> Is possible that in a future year you would consider using multiple years of data as data gets better?</p> <p><b>A:</b> Yes. When these business rules are re-visited, that would be interesting to look at.</p> <p><b>FEEDBACK:</b> Conversation about attendance: ask for consideration to have an appeals process. The reason I bring that up - I wish these stories were outliers. If we had children who witnessed their parent being killed outside of the school and they are out of the building for 10 days because of the trauma and then they have to move because of the nature of the crime? Other children who had to leave us because they were put under protective custody and had to move to MD. If they did it and it just happened. But process takes longer. You could look at a child being in for 10 days and then leave for whatever reasons. I would ask you to consider having an opportunity to appeal by providing documentation for why a student was out for such a long time.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE:</b> OK. Thank you for that. In re-enrollment metric, we have applied business rules similar to ACGR to make accommodations for leaving the state, etc., and we can consider.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Is this same as PARCC growth?</p> <p><b>A:</b> Controls for grade level. Very similar to PARCC but not exact.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Concern about those students who are enrolled for 10 days - concern about treating a student who is sick 2 out of 10 days similar to student who is out longer.</p> <p><b>A:</b> That was a threshold agreed to by both sectors.</p>
<b>Slide 37: Attendance Metrics: Summary</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 38: Deep Dive: Re-Enrollment</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 39: Re-enrollment: Overview</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 40: Re-Enrollment: Hypothetical Point Calculation</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 41: Re-enrollment: Overview</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 42: Re-enrollment: Business Rules</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> Just as an example, the short-term family housing sites being rolled out, it's intentional to have families be there temporarily. Would those schools/students be included if they move out of boundary?</p> <p><b>A:</b> Students are encouraged to stay at school of origin if it's where they were beforehand.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Last bullet is not just an aside. Part of the point of charters is choosing where you want to go. With lottery, first month is churn is because of higher ranked school takes in.</p> <p><b>A:</b> In our calculation, it does account for beginning of year churn.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Is there opportunity to have a provision - under circumstances like temporary housing - could you have extenuating circumstance appeal? With PMF, something comes up that is out of the scope of the definition. Is there a waiver possible? Attendance is associated with</p>

	<p>performance and causative. If we think this is causative, the entire way this state is organized around schools is problematic. We go to so much trouble to encourage choosing different schools. People have strong positive and negative feelings. To hold schools accountable for that - I don't think it's a waiver process or a detail that can be headed around the edges. This is extremely problematic.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Just to piggyback, on the one hand, retention is great for kids. I don't think we would disagree. Within this same agency is MySchoolDC that encourages students to choose. So it is counterintuitive.</p> <p><b>A:</b> We want to encourage schools to keep students enrolled in the same school. Choice to enter the lottery and seek out a different school is indicative of environment of school student was at.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> This metric conflicts with our daily reality. Are we required to include it?</p> <p><b>A:</b> Because re-enrollment is in the state plan and approved by SBOE - we have to have it absent a plan amendment. Please bring up situations where we could consider an exemption or exclusion from the metric or to think about and offer suggestion for how a re-enrollment metric or methodology could look different.</p>
<b>Slide 43: Re-enrollment: Business Rules</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 44: Re-enrollment: Business Rules</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 45: Re-enrollment: Business Rules</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 46: Re-enrollment: Business Rules</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 47: Re-enrollment: Business Rules</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 48: Re-enrollment: Business Rules</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> Isn't there an in-boundary flag?</p> <p><b>A:</b> We do have access to that factor via DME, but it's after the audit and related amendments. It's not timely enough, and it's limited to the audit students, so we couldn't apply it equitably.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> You're unfairly punishing parents who don't want to drive student across city to stay in same school? Why are we punishing for choosing a neighborhood school.</p> <p><b>A:</b> If you move and choose to enroll in a new school, we're considering that a reflection of a choice that may be indicative of the quality of the previous school.</p>
<b>Slide 49: Re-enrollment: Business Rules</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 50: Re-enrollment: Business Rules</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 51: Re-enrollment: Business Rules</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 52: Re-enrollment Summary</b>	N/A
<b>Slide 53: Questions and Next Steps</b>	<p><b>Q:</b> Has the U.S. Department of Education given feedback on our plan?</p> <p><b>A:</b> We anticipate receiving feedback any day now.</p>

	<p><b>Q:</b> If they start challenging this, does it give us leeway to re-visit how you're doing this?  <b>A:</b> They have been asking other states for clarifications rather than saying something might be unallowable.</p>
<b>Slide 54: Ways to Stay Engaged</b>	N/A

**Feedback via OSSE.ESSA@dc.gov**

### **Kingsman Academy PCS**

#### **Reenrollment**

Is it possible to have a waiver for students who attended a school then are incarcerated at the time of the audit and return to initial school after incarceration?

Also, how will the membership tracker with October and March audits impact this?

### **KIPP DC**

- I'm not sure SGP is appropriate for attendance rates... is there that much variation from year to year in attendance rates at the student level?
- For kids who were at/above 90% attendance, as long as they stay at or above 90%, they should be somehow excluded from the calculation (or perhaps somehow the school gets credit for them) even if their "SGP" is low ... they're attending the school. This issue actually re-confirms that SGP really isn't a great metric for this.
- I don't understand fully why schools are accountable for a kid who is enrolled for 10 days at the school. I get the consistency with other decisions that both sectors agreed to, but in the end you're saying a kid who was enrolled for 10 days but missed more than just 1 day counts against the school, which seems arbitrary. I'd rather this be changed to an FAY consideration or at least 1-2 months. A kid who is at an LEA for just 10 days (or less than a month) is likely going through external issues like placement or moving or something like that that ensures he/she is not attending every day, through no fault of the school.
- For re-enrollment, PCSB's PMF has a couple of exemptions from the calculation that I think should be included here:
  - Kids who are expelled for a federal reason are taken out of the denominator. This makes sense b/c it's not a choice about the school the kid is making, but rather a very serious incident that led to removal.
  - I know DCPS makes this harder, but kids who move to a different school within the same LEA are taken out of the denominator for this too... for larger charter LEAs like us, when a kid goes from one middle school to another within our network, it's pretty much always b/c of geography... and in fact it's an indicator that he/she LIKES our schools, not a choice against our schools. I could see this making sense for DCPS too, honestly.

### **DC Public Charter School Board**

#### **Attendance**

- On Slide 15 of the presentation it states that In-Seat Attendance is a measure that describes the average daily attendance rate. Average daily attendance was the old metric used prior to ISA. DC PCSB recommends not referring to ISA in this way, it could lead to confusion.
  - The Equity Reports uses the language "ISA Rate is the rate at which students are present in the school building." This is a clearer definition.

- DC PCSB suggests that OSSE include the minimum of 10 day enrollment business rule for ISA in addition to the Addressing Chronic Absenteeism and Re-enrollment metrics.
  - Equity Reports ISA already excludes students who are enrolled for fewer than 10 days. The ESSA documentation on page 15 should clearly state that the 10-day enrollment business rule applies to Equity Reports, and should apply here as well.
- Slide 26 states that Equity Reports only use attendance records for compulsory aged students to calculate ISA. I do NOT believe that this is true. This is NOT stated in the Equity Reports business rules document. The Equity Reports business rules document implies that all students, regardless of age, are included in the ISA rate. ISA Rate is included in the equity reports for schools that serve adult populations. Furthermore, if OSSE intends to include Pre-K ISA rate as part of ESSA for schools with Pre-K, it would have to calculate ISA Rate for students below the compulsory education age.
- Slide 28 states that OSSE recommends excluding attendance dates that conflict with entry/exit data. I am ONLY comfortable with this rule if the Qlik ISA application uses the business rule as well next year. It causes extreme confusion for schools to treat Qlik as authoritative while OSSE uses business rules for reporting that do not reflect in Qlik. The definition for ISA in the Equity Reports should match the definition in ESSA and the data as it is shown in OSSE's Qlik application.
- Slide 30 states that schools that do not submit attendance will count missing data as absences. Does this imply that OSSE is eliminating the Qlik logic that allows schools to submit only negative attendance? Currently, some schools which do not submit attendance receive 100% present on those days. OSSE will need to ensure that all schools are treated the same in terms of how missing attendance is reported in Qlik.
- Agree with the recommendation made on slide 32 regarding students that attend multiple schools.
- Agree with the recommendation made on slide 34 regarding students that change grades.

#### **Re-enrollment**

- For re-enrollment, how will OSSE determine the baseline data to calculate the floor and target for year 1? It is unclear to us how the measure will be accurately calculated with the information that OSSE has.
- DC PCSB agrees with the recommendation to include all currently enrolled students who are eligible to move into a newly added grade(s).
- In the list of recommendations, OSSE did not cite students who are expelled. We recommend these students be included in the metric. This may need to be clearly stated since each charter school has a unique discipline policy. The only expulsion DC PCSB allows for re-enrollment is an expulsion for a federally mandated reason (firearms or incendiary devices).

#### **Goodwill of Greater Washington/ The Goodwill Excel Center**

The Goodwill Excel Center's mission is to offer an opportunity to earn a high school diploma to adults who have not graduated from high school. As a part of our model, we offer five eight-week terms a year and we enroll students throughout the year. We have found that many of our students face the same barriers to completing their education that kept them from completing their high school education on schedule. In just our first year we have seen a number of instances where students withdrew for a term or two but then reengage.

Because of situations like those described above, the proposed Re-enrollment business rule presents a challenge for us, since a student who was enrolled in a prior year but re-enrolls after the Enrollment audit

roster date would not be counted as having re-enrolled.

We understand the careful consideration that OSSE gave to the re-enrollment business rules and we acknowledge that the business rule is appropriate for a traditional high school. But similar to the Four Year Graduation Rate and ACT/ SAT measures, the very nature of our school model and student population will result in an inaccurate measure of our re-enrollment rate using the proposed business rule.

We believe this is additional evidence that The Goodwill Excel Center should be included in the Alternative Framework under ESSA. We look forward to additional dialog with OSSE to help you better understand our model and why it is not appropriate to include our LEA in the high school framework.

### **Friends of Choice in Urban Schools (FOCUS)**

#### **Attendance**

- Is In-Seat Attendance calculated based on all students or only students who are enrolled for at least ten days?
- We have major concerns about the use of SGPs for measuring growth in attendance. OSSE states that it is similar to the use of SGP as a proxy for growth on PARCC but it seems very different, especially given the limited variability in attendance data.
- Can OSSE share data that shows how SGPs and MGPs would work in practice?
- Isn't there a more straightforward way to think about attendance growth, for example comparing actual student attendance rates from year to year and counting how many improved (and exempting students with satisfactory attendance from this count)?
- Will the attendance target keep going up every year even if the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile reaches 98 or 99%? Suggest OSSE consider a point at which we would stop raising the target, since 100% attendance does not make sense.
- Can OSSE share the research that was cited on the differences in outcomes between relatively high attendance rates?
- Why are we comparing students with satisfactory attendance against one another in comparing growth?
- It seems wrong that a student who is enrolled for 10 days and is sick for 2 of those days is treated the same as a student enrolled the whole year. Why is OSSE not considering a weighted approach? OSSE states that the number of such students is very small, and does not change the metrics for individual schools. Can OSSE share this analysis?

#### **Reenrollment**

- Although reenrollment is an element of the PMF, it has not historically been calculated for DCPS. It would be helpful for OSSE to share data showing how proposed reenrollment metrics would function in practice.
- How will OSSE determine baseline data for calculating reenrollment rates?
- Some issues seem to require additional discussion--such as the treatment of in-boundary students who move out of their attendance zone, and whether there are circumstances (such as short-term family housing) which would disproportionately affect particular schools.
- Could there be an appeals process for students with extenuating circumstances (that affect attendance or reenrollment)?

### **District of Columbia Public Schools - Data & Accountability**

#### **Attendance:**

- The 90% ISA threshold included in both chronic absence & 90+

- What are the floor/ceilings set at for the other frameworks? The presentation only showed us what these are set at for elementary
- Clarity on whether PCSB excludes any absences a student accrues after they turn 18 from ISA, which differs from how DCPS calculates
- For the attendance growth metric, suggest that when the data is available that OSSE use multiple years of data to establish growth rather than only just the previous year of data
- How will OSSE support LEAs in having the correct entry and exit dates to determine membership days throughout the year, for example, when a student is reported as truant at one school but is actually enrolled and attending another LEA, how will OSSE notify the first school of the appropriate exit date they can retroactively give the student?
- On slide 24, all of the values of Growth Metric that are higher than the 90+ metric for the subgroup are still lower than the 90+ metrics for both groups. Is this a coincidence at this school that students with better attendance also improved more compared to the previous year, or are subgroups with fewer attendance challenges systematically advantaged by this pairing of metrics, and if so is this intentional?

**Re-Enrollment:**

- Propose that OSSE exclude students if they do not re-enroll but did live in-boundary at any point in the previous year and they are in the audit at a different DC school with an address currently out of boundary for the previous school attended (To answer the question of if that student moved out of the boundary but not out of the district.)
- There are many external factors taking place that LEAs have no control over that contribute to this metric. For example, DC General is turning over. Barry Farm and Sursum Corda closing this year (and several others are turning over the next five years) which could lead to families having to move across the city. Holding LEAs accountable in these situations seems unnecessarily punitive.
- What messaging is going to families from OSSE to promote retention? As the State Education Agency that now owns MSDC, OSSE should be educating families on the importance on not bouncing around from school to school, that choice doesn't necessarily equal better.
- The assumptions behind this metric (that re-enrollment is a measurement of school environment or school quality) does not reflect the numerous reasons parents may decide to select a different school (some of which may have little to do with school quality).

**Next Steps**

1. LEAs can provide feedback within 3 business days (by July 26, 2017) via [OSSE.ESSA@dc.gov](mailto:OSSE.ESSA@dc.gov).
2. Notes will be sent out 5 business days after the meeting (by July 28, 2017).

**Next Meeting**

Monday, July 24, 2017  
1:00 pm - 3:00 pm

OSSE  
810 First St. NE  
Conference Room 806  
Washington, DC 20002

