Meeting:	Accountability System: Intro and Overview of Accountability System PARCC 3+ PARCC 4+
Date/Time:	Wednesday, June 14 12:00-3:00 pm
Location:	OSSE 810 First St. NE Conference Room 806 Washington, DC 20002
Facilitator(s):	Darrell Ashton, Naomi Watson, Laura Maurizi and Danielle Branson
Date Notes Posted	June 21, 2017

Meeting Objective: To provide the introduction and overview of Accountability System and deep dive of the PARCC 3+ and PARCC 4+ metrics.

Agenda Items	
I. **Intro and Overview of Accountability System**	All
II. **PARCC 3+**	Danielle Branson
III. **PARCC 4+**	Danielle Branson
IV. **Next Steps/Next Meeting**	All

Meeting Notes (Q & A and Feedback)

Intro and Overview of Accountability System

Q: Clarify whether these domains were in the submitted ESSA plan?
A: Yes.
Q: Will there be a meeting for this group to review the data before it is implemented to look at the aggregate data?
A: For major business rule decisions like HS growth and in developing the measure for access to opportunity, yes aggregate data will be made available to a technical working group to help make decisions. For the majority of the business rule decisions that remain to be made between now and August, OSSE will take it under consideration.
Q: In these sessions, should LEAs focus on developing the business rules? If there was something the group felt strongly about for the domain, will an amendment be needed to the ESSA plan?
A: The next series of meetings should focus on the business logic. If someone felt strongly about changing a domain or removing a metric, OSSE would have to go through a different process and possibly request a waiver from the U.S. Department of Education. Changing a domain or adding or removing a measure is not the focus of this series of meetings.
Q: Under the Academic Achievement domain, are there any considerations for dual enrollment or AP?
A: Yes, AP is included. Dual enrollment was considered but was not ultimately included.
Q: If and how will CTE be included in the framework?
A: CTE will not be included.

Q: Is IB only captured for high schools and not middle schools?

A: Correct.

Q: For Academic Growth, are we talking about growth and MSAA? Does this not include grades received internally from school?

A: Academic Growth is made up of PARCC and MSAA results only.

Q: Will compulsory age be included - i.e. ACGR?

A: See meeting calendar for the schedule of topics. This will be discussed at a later date.

Q: Is the goal to include academic growth in HS in SY2019-20?

A: The goal is to include a valid measure as soon as possible.

Q: Is OSSE covering growth for high schools in the next meeting?

A: We will not be covering it in the meetings currently scheduled through August as it is not a current part of the plan due to years of data available.

Q: How will the AP and IB performance be assessed? Who will be a part of the AP and IB performance assessed?

A: See meeting calendar for the schedule of topics. This will be discussed at a later date.

Q: How will metrics be redistributed with weights, if they do not apply to a school?

A: Points will not be redistributed if a metric doesn't apply to a school.

Q: How will the frameworks look for schools serving mixed grades levels (i.e. elementary, middle and/or high schools)?

A: See meeting calendar for the schedule of topics. This will be discussed at a later date.

Q: Is there detail on how the subgroups are adding up to calculate a full score?

A: See meeting calendar for the schedule of topics. This will be discussed at a later date.

Q: Will weights be discussed in a future meeting agenda?

A: Weights at the measure and domain level are locked into the state plan and will not be revisited for the dry run.

Q: Why are students with disabilities (SWD) points doubled that of other groups?

A: Based on stakeholder feedback, this aligns with OSSE's desire to accelerate progress for students who are the furthest behind.

Q: Are EL students being monitored for four years?

A: No, for two years.

Q: What is the N size for the metrics?

A: It is 10.

Q: Can minimum N size be changed since it was written into the plan?

A: No and it was discussed in length through the stakeholder feedback sessions and public comment. OSSE understands that there are some concerns from schools however N size of 10 is written into the state plan and will not change for the Dry Run.

FEEDBACK: Stated concern that some attendees to do not like N = 10, it is a huge impact with schools with 15 students (at least 3 LEAs agree)

Q: Will all races be weighted equally regardless of the number of students in each race category?

A: Yes.

Q: How will economically disadvantaged students be managed for CEP schools?

A: See meeting calendar for the schedule of topics. This will be discussed at a later date.

Q: If a school goes up to grade 3, will they be dropped from certain frameworks?

A: See meeting calendar for the schedule of topics. This will be discussed at a later date.

Floors and Targets

Q: Will floors and targets be used between school types (or span grade levels) - i.e. middle school to high

school?
A: No, they will be calculated within each framework.
Q: Are floors and targets recalculated yearly and based on the previous school year?
A: For the annual run, yes. TBD for the 3-year run.
Q: What are the floors and targets for CLASS?? Will this be different than PCSB framework?
A: Floors and targets for CLASS are 10th and 90th.
Q: There is value in creating business rules to manage the volatile data. Will it be managed by using data over several school years? Will we talk about this in future meetings?
A: See meeting calendar for the schedule of topics. This will be discussed at a later date.
Q: How are the PARCC scores calculated? Who will set the PARCC Floors &Targets?
A: PARCC scores calculation will be discussed at this meeting. We will talk in more detail about floors and targets at a future meeting.
Q: When and what will the conversation(s) look like for school years when there are major assessment measurement changes?
A: In the instance the state changed the assessment, we would have more in-depth conversations about how and when to make that change and how to align it to the accountability framework.

Summative Classifications
Q: In slide 37, will the previous school year data be used?
A: For the results that come out in 18-19, the 17-18 data will be used.
Q: Fordham knocked us for not getting kids to exceeding expectations, how are we doing that in this plan?
A: Our growth measure gives schools credit for taking a student from PARCC 4 to a PARCC 5.
Q: Should we consider PARCC 5+ for exceeding expectations, or is PARCC 4+ enough?
FEEDBACK: No, we should review moving toward level 5 but meeting level 4 is a great goal for this time period.

PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ and PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+: Business Rules - Academic Achievement Domain
FEEDBACK: I am really please 3+ was included.

Special Cases
Q: If a student who never took the PARCC geometry test enrolls at the LEA, does the student need to go back and take the assessment?
A: No.

Full Academic Year
FEEDBACK: Enrollment Audit vs Start of School: Do not add another validation date for start of school; LEAs do not need more "rosters."
FEEDBACK: LEAs have been doing FAY for years, so why change to 85%, there are enough changes with other things - i.e. USPFF
Q: Is there a problem that we are looking to solve with FAY questions?
A: There is not, but this is the opportunity to make changes.
FEEDBACK: Changes will have a huge impact on LEAs considering the data on different dates, if there isn't a good reason to change, don't.
Q: There are medical conditions of students that occur that can impact the full academic year?
A: The 85% should account for that.
Q: In regards to grade level 7 & 8 taking advanced math courses, is that policy still tentative? Also will policy be resolved before 2017-18 school year? If not, will it be a part of the business rules? Should we define a

date to determine the business rules?

A: We need to work with the U.S. Department of Education (USED) to determine what is possible. Working to make it happen prior to the start of school year. OSSE is working with USED.

Q: Is the testing window or Enrollment Audit (Oct. 5) when the N size is determined? This could pose some problems.

A: OSSE will provide feedback later.

Q: Is the test window based on the state or school?

A: The state test window.

Q: Why was science not included in the assessment measure?

A: This allows people to have time with their data since it was new.

Q: Are the eligible participants in the denominator? Do eligible participants apply to N sizes, after opt out? Perhaps a mock up is needed.

FEEDBACK: LEAs need to have solid conversations with OSSE to have a policy defined for assessment participation opt-outs. Currently, OSSE has been silent on this issue, and LEAs are left with dealing with attorneys, parents and students. LEAs would like to rely on OSSE to provide guidance to push back on attorneys, parents and students. LEAs cannot force a student to take a test, cannot force a parent to send a child to school. Guidance is needed when these students will be in my denominator.

Q: Why did 95% policy change? It looks like 100% participation is being pushed now. Are there consequences for LEAs that do not meet 95% participation?

FEEDBACK: Getting to 100% is not possible, and if you test the impact of the 5% is probably not that impactful.

Q: The plan speaks to 95% and not 100%, why the shift?

A: We would like your feedback and thoughts on risk factors and benefits.

FEEDBACK: This may look like OSSE is displaying accountability, but at the same time LEAs are being dinged for things out of their control.

FEEDBACK: We should consider changing minimum enrollment dates.

FEEDBACK: Consider students who have started testing elsewhere - i.e. student started testing in MD and transferred into DC during the timeframe.

FEEDBACK: DCPS defined an opt-out policy. It included students who are incarcerated. Also medical issues with students was reviewed.

FEEDBACK: Focus on students who are incarcerated outside the district.

Q: Will there be subsequent times to talk about eligibility?

A: Yes.

FEEDBACK: 95% was not broken so not sure why this is changing. However, gave some schools a cushion for opt outs and incarceration. This will accurately represent our performance in a real way with non-public students.

FEEDBACK: There is a problem with non-public students, how they are tested and how their accountability is determined. Consider Non-Public students and their participation.

FEEDBACK: Define Minimum enrollment days for assessment especially for fluent entry/exit populations.

Q&A

Q: What is meant by school without frameworks?

A: Some schools serve Pre K-2 and do not meet the minimum number of points needed to apply a framework.

Q: Are there definitions for elementary, middle, high schools and etc. - PK-5, 6-8, 9-12?

A: There is no definition for middle school in DCMR, which has always been defined by OSSE in the Accountability Framework.

FEEDBACK: Middle schools are not defined.

FEEDBACK: Elementary and middle schools have the same framework, so does it really matter?

FEEDBACK: Can the data be aligned between OSSE and PCSB - i.e. re-enrollment – since LEAs have to give data to PCSB and want to avoid submitting the data twice with different meanings.

Q: What does transition looks like, if the school is considered a Priority or Focus school?

A: More information will be coming from OSSE to LEAs on this. .

FEEDBACK: The goal "Become the fastest improving state and city in the nation in student achievement outcomes" and floors and targets are not aligned because the floors and targets shift every school year. Is there room for feedback to help achieve the goal and credit schools who meet the goal? PCSB resets every 3 years and then weighs it. Is this a waiver? Also there will be some schools that will have 1 or 2 stars although we met the goal. How does this work with the stars that might be 1 and 2?

Q: Is there room within the feedback to provide alternative options?

A: Yes, this is why we are having a full meeting to talk about how we combine 3 years of data when we run the school improvement designation

FEEDBACK: Advocating, separate discussion for high school assessments, i.e. use SAT score instead. Some SAT content is not in other assessments.

Q: SAT/ACT option - OSSE is sponsoring SAT, if a school shifts to ACT, will OSSE assist with the funding?

A: We would have to look into that.

QA & Feedback on Meeting Style

Q: Could OSSE define what things can be changed easily, requires waiver, or cannot be changed?

A: Yes

Q: Has OSSE received feedback from the U.S. Department of Education?

A: No.

Q: Once feedback is received, will OSSE shared it publically?

A: Yes, it is published on the Internet.

Q: Will language for business rules be issued out for LEAs to review and be prepared to provide feedback in the meetings?

A: Yes

Q: Will data from 2016-17 school year will be viewed in the dry run?

A: Yes

FEEDBACK: The PMF process shares business rules, runs numbers, shows LEAs and then LEAs provide feedback. Other attendees stated to let this group define business rules as opposed to OSSE making the rules initially.

Feedback via OSSE.ESSA@dc.gov

- Set aside time to discuss sub-group weights. In particular, counting students with disabilities double the weight of any other sub-group is a concern as it impacts schools disproportionately and may emphasize one sub-group over another even when performance may be similar. For example, a school may have a n size of 12 for students with disabilities, meet the 50 point-minimum rule, and have 50 ELL students. The 12 students with disabilities, while representing a substantially smaller population, will count double the ELL student outcomes. Second, considering how race sub-groups are weighted should be further discussed. In schools where there are small subgroups, their performance may mask the performance of small sub-groups.
- Align data collection and business rules with the PMF. To the extent possible, metrics that overlap on the charter PMF (e.g. re-enrollment) have one collection of the same data points and to the extent possible, the same business rules to avoid two different calculations of the same metric and data collections.

- Begin the discussion about high school assessments and CTE as soon as possible.
- Use the 95% participation rate as is in lieu of a 100% testing requirement
- Provide both clarity and support around opt-out.
- Maintain the October enrollment count roster and 85% instructional days. Clarify school days versus instructional days.
- Reconsider how PARCC 3+/PARCC 4+ achievement target floors are determined. Under current plan of using the 10th percentile, it is possible DC meets OSSE's overall goal of being the city/state with the highest PARCC achievement gains and yet the average number of points schools earn on this metric could stay the same or decrease. A floor at zero would be more appropriate.
- Adjust the PARCC achievement calculation denominator rule. Schools would be penalized for parent opt-outs while there is no legitimate enforcement mechanism for schools. Perhaps business rule that sets the denominator as all tested students or 95% of potentially eligible students, whichever is higher, would be a valid compromise to include the 95% tested requirement.
- Reconsider how small n-sizes are included in the framework. Explore a business rule that accounts for year-over-year variability with small n-sizes between 10 and 25.
- Create an amendment to elementary school inclusion in STAR framework if they end in 3rd grade and have no opportunity to demonstrate academic growth. So instead of just 50% of possible points as the rule, it should be "50% possible and plus must be eligible to earn academic growth metric points." The PMF allows these schools to demonstrate growth on approved assessments. While this may not be the best approach for the statewide accountability system, we must carefully consider alternatives to the status quo.
- Minimum n-size should also apply to CLASS observation data, meaning a school must receive 10 observational scores in order to be included.
- Reference filename: RDC-DSC Joint_ESSA_State_Plans_letter June 2017.pdf

Next Steps

1. LEAs can provide feedback within 3 business days (by June 19, 2017) via OSSE.ESSA@dc.gov.
2. Notes will be sent out 5 business days after the meeting (by June 21, 2017).
3. LEAs send other special cases for impact on the assessment participations via OSSE.ESSA@dc.gov.
4. OSSE will add additional topics that came up in this meeting to the meeting schedule.

Next Meeting

Friday, June 16, 2017
1:30 pm - 3:30 pm

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

June 19, 2017

Hanseul Kang
810 1st Street NE, Ninth Floor
Washington, DC 20002

Dear State Superintendent or ESSA contact:

Restorative DC, the national Dignity in Schools Campaign (DSC), a coalition of over 100 organizations from 29 states dedicated to dismantling the school-to-prison pipeline, and the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., submit this letter as a follow-up to our January letter outlining our recommendations regarding DC's implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA).

As detailed in our previous letter, our key priorities include ensuring that states meaningfully engage a diverse group of parents and community stakeholders throughout the ESSA implementation process, as well as ensuring that state plans support the success of all students, including by incorporating strategies to promote positive school climates and reduce discipline disparities. Specifically, we encourage state officials to use multiple methods to engage historically underrepresented stakeholders (including those from low-income communities of color) throughout the development of the state plan. We also urge states to include school climate and safety in their accountability systems and to measure this indicator by using discipline data and school climate surveys. States and districts should also include positive school climates as a comprehensive support and improvement strategy for low-performing schools and use ESSA funds to address school climate issues and to help justice-involved students transition back into public schools.

We have reviewed the ESSA state plans submitted to the U.S. Department of Education for the Spring deadline. While we are not endorsing any particular plan, we write to highlight several promising provisions incorporated in these plans.

Using Multiple Methods to Engage Stakeholders

Connecticut's state plan outlines a multi-pronged stakeholder engagement process that included the launch of an informational ESSA webpage that provides links to resources, webinars, and ways to get involved in the state planning process; a series of focus groups with parent and student

organizations; the wide distribution of a stakeholder feedback survey available in English and Spanish; and an extensive media and social network outreach and engagement effort.[1] **New Jersey** held four regional open forums and additional meetings with community organizations, parent groups, and civil rights organizations; collected stakeholder feedback via an online survey; and created an ESSA email account for stakeholders to submit comments and recommendations on the state's plan.[2] **Tennessee** implemented a statewide feedback tour, facilitated webinars, held community meetings, distributed online surveys, and convened advisory groups.[3] The state also partnered with civil rights and immigrant organizations to gather feedback.[4]

We also encourage DC to ensure that language access supports are aligned with the language needs of local communities by providing translations, etc. in languages beyond Spanish when needed. In addition, DC should engage stakeholders by taking feedback on the state's plan into consideration and using this input to inform revisions to the final plan before submission to the U.S. Department of Education, as required by ESSA.[5] Finally, we urge DC to create a mechanism for communicating to the public the feedback received on the state plan, changes made to the final plan based on this feedback, and changes that were not made and why.

School Climate Incorporated in State Accountability Systems

Tennessee is including a "Chronically Out of School" indicator in its accountability system, which will be measured by the number of students missing 10 percent or more school days; students who are absent or suspended out of school will be included in this metric.[6] The state is considering including all exclusionary discipline practices, including in-school suspensions, in an expanded "Opportunity to Learn" indicator in the future. **Vermont** is including "Safe and Healthy Schools" as a performance measure in its accountability framework.[7] This indicator will include school climate data and will examine the rate of exclusionary discipline practices in schools, with an emphasis on examining the disproportionate impact on historically disadvantaged students. Finally, in its plan, **North Dakota** provides a definition for school climate, which states that: Students learn to their potential when learning in a safe, caring and healthy environment which promotes trusted peer and adult relationships, a climate which supports student academic and social growth and leadership, and strides to motivate students to adapt to personal and

---

[1] Connecticut State Department of Education, Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act, 9-10 and Appendix A, (April 3, 2017),
http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/essa/april_3_ct_consolidated_state_essa_plan1.pdf.
[2] New Jersey Department of Education, Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act, 25 and Appendix B, (May 3, 2017), http://www.state.nj.us/education/ESSA/plan/plan.pdf.
[3] Tennessee Department of Education, Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act, 22-23, (April 3, 2017), https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/education/attachments/ESSA_state_plan.pdf.
[4] *Id.* at 307-308.
[5] Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114.95, S. 1177, 114th Cong. §1111(a)(8) (Dec. 10, 2015), https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ95/PLAW-114publ95.pdf.
[6] Tennessee Department of Education, *supra* note 3 at 71.
[7] State of Vermont Agency of Education, Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act, 74-75, (March 2017), http://education.vermont.gov/sites/aoe/files/documents/edu-essa-vermont-state-plan-draft-050317.pdf.

academic rigors.[8] North Dakota's plan includes school climate and student engagement as indicators of school quality as part of a comprehensive strategy to reduce incidents of bullying and harassment and the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom.[9]

Including Positive School Climates as a Support and Improvement Strategy and Utilizing ESSA Funds to Address School Climate Issues

Connecticut currently requires its 30 lowest-performing school districts to identify prioritized interventions, including those that address issues related to climate and culture.[10] The state will create a list of evidenced-based practices for improving school climate which will provide guidance to low-performing schools and districts regarding staffing, social-emotional supports, and restorative/non-exclusionary discipline practices.[11] **Massachusetts** will use Title IV, Part A funds to build upon its Rethinking Discipline initiative, which currently engages over 30 districts in a professional learning network to reduce the inappropriate or excessive use of long-term suspensions and expulsions, including disproportionate rates of suspensions and expulsions for students of color and students with disabilities.[12] **Delaware** will utilize a variety of funding sources to provide statewide professional learning and training on restorative practices, which serve as an alternative to exclusionary discipline and a strategy to address the root causes of student behavior and foster positive school climate.[13] The state will also support districts in the school wide training of all teachers on conducting restorative circles. Finally, **New Mexico** will use McKinney-Vento funds to create a process that includes a review of school discipline policies that disproportionately impact homeless students, including students of color, students with disabilities, English language learners, and those who identify as LGBTQ.[14] We celebrate OSSE's existing efforts in regard to restorative practices and hope they will be sustained and expanded.

Ensuring Accountability for the Success of Each Subgroup of Students

Louisiana and **Maine** have committed to using an n-size of 10 for accountability purposes. A total of thirteen states have previously used an n-size of 10 or fewer, and there is research to support the use of these numbers.[15] Setting an n-size as low as possible, without revealing personally identifiable information about individual students, will help to ensure that states capture as many student subgroups in the accountability system as possible. We also encourage DC to include students who self-identify as LGBTQ as a subgroup of students whose performance is measured due to the discrimination

---

[8] North Dakota Department of Public Instruction, Every Student Succeeds Act State Plan, 95, https://www.nd.gov/dpi/uploads/1494/FinalNDESSAPlanforSubmission.pdf

[9] *Id.* at 95.

[10] Connecticut State Department of Education, supra note 1, at 41.

[11] *Id.* at 57.

[12] Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act, 80, (April 3, 2017), www.mass.gov/ese/essa.

[13] Delaware Department of Education, Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act, 96-97, (April 3, 2017), http://www.doe.k12.de.us/cms/lib09/DE01922744/Centricity/Domain/425//April%203%20Submission/DE_consolidatedStateplan.pdf.

[14] New Mexico Public Education Department, Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act, 149, (April 3, 2017), http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/ESSA_docs/NewMexicoStatePlanDraft_ESSA.pdf.

[15] See, e.g., Jessica Cardichon, Ensuring Equity in ESSA: The Role of N-Size in Subgroup Accountability, Alliance for Excellent Education, 5-7 (June 2016). http://all4ed.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/NSize.pdf.

these students often experience, which could have a strong, negative impact on their academic achievement.[16]

Ensuring that Students Involved in the Juvenile Justice System Receive Quality Instruction and Transition Back into the Public Educational System

One of **Oregon's** stated goals and objectives for the use of Title I, Part D funds is to increase students' access to quality instruction and teachers in juvenile facilities. The state requires educational programs in these facilities to be aligned with state standards in all content areas and students receiving diplomas must meet the same requirements as their public school peers.[17] **Michigan** also states that its juvenile facilities will implement or develop a rigorous curriculum aligned with state standards and offer regular high school diplomas to the greatest degree possible.[18] **Colorado** will use Title I, Part D funds to support transition teams that follow children and youth from facilities back to their public schools to minimize barriers to transition and to ensure consistency in coursework and course credits.[19]

We hope you will take these examples into consideration as you continue to develop and refine DC's state plan. We look forward to continuing to work with you and other stakeholders to support the successful implementation of ESSA in DC and to ensure that the strategies outlined in the state's plan promote inclusion, achievement, and equity for all students.

Sincerely,

Tarek Maassarani
Restorative DC, a project of SchoolTalk
tarek@schooltalkdc.org
(202) 374-0369

Zakiya Sankara-Jabar
Dignity in Schools Campaign (DSC)
Zakiya@dignityinschools.org
(937) 825-1791

Elizabeth Olsson
Monique Dixon
NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.
(212) 965-2200

---

[16] Hilary Burdge, et al., LGBTQ Youth of Color: Discipline Disparities, School Push-Out, and the School-to-Prison Pipeline, 2 (2014), https://gsanetwork.org/files/aboutus/LGBTQ_brief_FINAL-web.pdf.

[17] Oregon Department of Education, Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act, 116, (May 3, 2017), http://www.oregon.gov/ode/rules-and-policies/Documents/OR_consolidatedStateplan.pdf.

[18] Michigan Department of Education, Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act, 50, (April 3, 2017), http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Michigan-ESSA-Consolidated-Plan_558370_7.pdf.

[19] Colorado Department of Education, Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act, 117 (May 1, 2017), https://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essa.