

**Notes: Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Accountability Updates and Next Steps**

LEA leaders meeting: Jan. 10, 2017, 9-10 a.m., Office of the State Superintendent of Education

Quarterly DC Association of Chartered Public Schools Meeting: Jan. 11, 2017, 4:30-6:30 Maya Angelou PCS Young Adult Learning Center

During this meeting with LEA leaders and the DC Association of Chartered Public Schools, State Superintendent of Education Hanseul Kang reviewed OSSE’s proposal for a floors and targets model of earning points with the ESSA accountability framework, as well as OSSE’s proposal for classifying schools. In addition, this meeting took a deeper look at how English learners are included in the system based on previously posed questions and reviewed aspects of the framework structure, including n-size and minimum points possible.

Area Discussed	Summary of Discussion	Next Steps & Follow Up (if applicable)
Timeline for ongoing refinement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four phases moving forward: Now until Jan. 30 when OSSE releases full draft of plan; January to March 3 for state plan public comment period; start of 2017-18 school year additional business rules development, report card design, and alternative framework; and by start of 2018-19 run full system and release results publicly.</li> <li>• In addition, OSSE commits to continuous improvement of the accountability framework throughout all stages and after 2018-19 school year. OSSE plans to communicate a specific point in time for a full review of the system as part of the state plan submission.</li> <li>• Question regarding when during the school year OSSE plans to run the accountability system for 2017-18 and 2018-19. Response that while no date is set, OSSE plans on running the system and communicating with LEAs during the fall of each year. Due to the timeline around state assessments, challenging to run the system earlier than fall.</li> <li>• Comment that if possible, receiving information earlier in the academic year (i.e., before the fall) would be helpful for planning, especially for measures that are new for schools.</li> <li>• While OSSE does not plan to create a framework for adult-serving schools, the line between alternative schools and those</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HS working group meeting scheduled for Jan. 18 at 9 a.m.</li> </ul>

	<p>serving adults is not always clear and needs further discussion. OSSE plans to take additional time to build the specifics of both the design and the policy designating to which schools an alternative framework would apply.</p>	
Proposed approach to allocating points within the system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key decision points include how OSSE should allocate points, set long-term goals, and whether the long-term and interim goals connect with points earned by schools.</li> <li>• Must balance ambition, urgency, and aspirations for all students with feasibility, the realities of the current gaps between students, and the time needed to improve.</li> </ul>	
Proposed floors and targets model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE’s proposal is a floors and targets model where points are allocated on a continuous scale.</li> <li>• Schools must meet the minimum threshold (floor) to begin receiving points, and will get full points for reaching the target.</li> <li>• Other approaches beyond floors and targets create additional thresholds/cutoffs.</li> <li>• OSSE is proposing targets for PARCC and graduation rate metrics that include targets set based on interim goals. For other measures, targets would be set at the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile. For all measures floors would be set at the 10<sup>th</sup> percentile and differentiated by subgroup.</li> <li>• Plan to leave the targets in place for three year periods and then re-assess whether new targets are needed.</li> </ul>	<p>OSSE is running and will determine the best way to get the specific numbers represented in the floor and target points for the PARCC and graduation rate metrics to LEA leaders. OSSE also expects to host a meeting/webinar for LEA leaders during the public comment period.</p>
Proposed school classifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under ESEA Waiver, OSSE had a system of identification that included school improvement labels as part of school ratings. The current proposal under ESSA is to separate these two things – to have annual ratings for public reporting and school improvement/support identifications that generally take place every three years.</li> <li>• Proposal for classifications for annual public reporting is to have five levels, from one stars (lowest) to five stars (highest).</li> <li>• Five levels arrived at through conversations with charter LEAs around formally or informally recognized differences within tiers in the PMF (for example, the PMF has an automatic closure point within Tier 3) and a number of levels that would create meaningful differentiation among schools in DC.</li> </ul>	<p>OSSE is seeking feedback from LEA leaders around approaches to using one or more years of data to calculate school classifications.</p>

- The Department of Education requires OSSE to identify the bottom 5 percent of schools, high schools with lower than a 67 percent 4-year graduation rate, and schools with chronically underperforming subgroups as comprehensive support schools (similar to Priority designation under ESEA Waiver) as well as targeted support schools (similar to Focus designation under ESEA Waiver).
- OSSE will do further work on the exit criteria for schools to leave these required categories.
- Current plan is for comprehensive and targeted support designations run every three years to provide sufficient time for schools to implement approaches to improvement. This information would likely be on the public report card, but would not be in the same place as the school's rating within the star system.
- Question around whether the classifications will be based on one year of data, three years of data, or some other approach.
- Response that for the first year, OSSE will use one year of data (2017-18) because other approaches go back too far and prior to when the system was designed.
- Open question of how to approach the number of years of data used to determine ratings in future years (e.g., one year of data, three years of data on rolling average, best two out of three years). There are pros and cons to each option and OSSE is seeking feedback.
- Based on running the system for informational purposes in 2017-18, OSSE will likely make some funding available for schools that may fall within the bottom 5-10 percent to begin planning possible approaches to school improvement.
- Comment about the changing nature of DC schools – many years where new charter LEAs or schools both open and close. Concern that these changes impact how many and which schools are in the bottom 5 percent and could require OSSE to continue to identify more schools.
- Response that closure would depend on timing of school closure and that closure may be considered an intervention under ESSA regulations.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently 5 percent is about 10 schools, far fewer than the schools identified as “Priority” under OSSE’s ESEA waiver accountability framework.</li> <li>• LEA leader question about if OSSE is wedded to the cut point distribution for the star rating.</li> <li>• Response was that the current cut points make sense, are clear and we have schools that fall in all categories. OSSE is open to other options if there is a strong rationale for the suggested change.</li> </ul>	
<p>In-depth look at English language proficiency (ELP)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on feedback, OSSE has removed the previous measure reflecting ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 scoring at level 5 or above. Instead, the framework for ELP will only include a growth metric.</li> <li>• The decision reflects the difference in test purpose and structure between ACCESS and PARCC. ACCESS measures language acquisition rather than PARCC that measures college- and career-readiness.</li> <li>• Concern expressed around including a growth metric for ACCESS, particularly if it’s calculated on single-year growth. English learners often have uneven growth on ACCESS due to the nature of language acquisition.</li> <li>• Response that growth takes into account a range of potential student starting points. If a student makes substantial growth in one year the amount of growth needed the next year to meet the growth target is lessened. OSSE is continuing to explore how to calculate this measure to best reflect the challenge mentioned. OSSE plans to average across all students.</li> <li>• Comment related to how the availability of PARCC exams in students’ native language and could relate to use of ACCESS in accountability.</li> <li>• Question around the requirement that EL students take PARCC math, but not PARCC ELA. View expressed that the math exam is still text-heavy.</li> <li>• Response that the math testing for EL students is a federal requirement. In the first year, math test counts toward participation but the score does not count in accountability results.</li> </ul>	

<p>Minimum N size and minimum points possible rule</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question raised about the decision to move to minimum N size of 10 versus 25.</li> <li>• Previously, OSSE had an N of 10 for public reporting, and N of 25 for accountability. Desire to make these systems consistent.</li> <li>• The minimum points possible rule will add an additional “buffer” for schools with groups of students near the minimum N size cutoff. This provides additional stability across years and fairness to schools.</li> <li>• OSSE continues to think about additional ways to protect student privacy, including complimentary suppression.</li> </ul>	
<p>Discussion/Q&amp;A</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LEA leader question regarding ongoing conversation with the State Board of Education, particularly in regard to the draft resolution being circulated regarding the accountability framework proposal.</li> <li>• Response that while OSSE and the SBOE have some points of disagreement about how to incentivize schools, ultimate concerns are the same – how to improve instruction for all students, how to create welcoming and excellent school culture.</li> <li>• OSSE particularly has questions about the SBOE’s request for a specific school climate metric, specifically the appropriateness of a citywide school survey in a high-stakes type of framework. One option under consideration is inviting schools to a pilot or including school- or LEA-specific survey results on report cards.</li> <li>• In addition, ongoing conversation with the SBOE about the balance of growth v. proficiency on PARCC and the overall weight of academic domain in the system.</li> <li>• Feedback from LEA leaders is that while growth is important, leaders and parents focus on whether students are performing well at a given school. Need for sustainable growth from year-to-year as well.</li> <li>• View expressed that the label “growth to proficiency” is misleading if OSSE means to capture growth beyond level 4 and within levels in this measure.</li> <li>• Feedback from LEA leader that for measures like re-enrollment OSSE take into consideration schools that span grade bands (ES, MS and HS). There are natural transition points for families and</li> </ul>	

	<p>schools should not be penalized for students who leave at these natural transition points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response was that OSSE hopes to address these types of questions/issues at the more in-depth conversations about business rules with LEA leaders between now and April.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

<p><b><u>Organizations/Schools Present</u></b></p> <p>Capital City PCS  Carlos Rosario PCS  Cesar Chavez PCS  City Arts and Prep PCS  DC International School  DC Public Charter School Board  DC Public Schools  E.L. Haynes PCS  IDEA PCS  Ed Forward DC  Ed Strategies  FOCUS</p>	<p>Friendship Public Charter Schools  KIPP DC  Luke C. Moore High School  Maya Angelou PCS  National Collegiate Prep  Office of the State Superintendent of Education  Paul PCS  Raise DC  Richard Wright Public Charter School  TenSquare  Thurgood Marshall Academy  Two Rivers PCS  Washington Latin</p>
--	---