

**Notes: Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Accountability Meeting – Updates and Next Steps for LEA Leaders**  
December 8, 2016, 9-10 a.m.

During this meeting, State Superintendent of Education Hanseul Kang provided updates on the U.S. Department of Education final accountability regulations released Nov. 28, 2016 and next steps for stakeholder engagement and public comment in early 2017. The Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) also reviewed principles and core beliefs that have continued to inform the design and development of the accountability system, shared a structure proposal, and provided an update on current metrics and proposed weights in elementary and K-8, middle, and high school frameworks.

Area Discussed	Summary of Discussion	Next Steps & Follow Up (if applicable)
<p>Final regulations from the U.S. Department of Education (ED) – released Nov. 28, 2016</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ED responded to feedback and there is now flexibility in the implementation timeline. States must now identify schools for comprehensive support <i>no later than</i> the 2018-19 school year [one year later than stated in draft regulations]. The final regulations maintain the timeline for releasing school report cards by Dec. 2018.</li> <li>• Alternative schools continue to need to be a part of the accountability system, but final regulations provide additional flexibility in how alternative schools are included. How “alternative” is defined is not within the regulations and DC has multiple definitions of alternative schools currently being used for different purposes.</li> <li>• While these regulations are final, there are two ways the regulations could be “re-opened”: (1) the new administration could issue an executive order on regulations to freeze, edit, or rescind them (this is possible for any regulations issued in the last 60 days which these would be within if action was taken immediately at inauguration); or (2) Congress could pass a Congressional Review Act to similarly stop or change the regulations.</li> <li>• There is confidence that the final regulations have support and reflect changes informed by broad public comment. If the current regulations were to be changed, it is possible ED would proceed with non-regulatory guidance similar to the final</li> </ul>	<p>OSSE is working to understand the flexibility on alternative schools in the regulations and how it would impact the schools in DC.</p>

	regulations.	
Updated timeline for public engagement based on final regulations from ED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE is still planning on submitting to ED for the first date, which is now April 3, 2017.</li> <li>• DC’s approach moving forward is to continue the momentum around common accountability and be mindful of the limbo schools are in given the last year of data used for accountability and school improvement designations was from the 2013-14 school year.</li> <li>• LEA leaders will have another opportunity to engage in Jan. 2017 and during the public comment period opening by the end of January.</li> <li>• Public comment and engagement through beginning of March; State Board of Education (SBOE) expected to vote in March (requested special session vote).</li> </ul>	
Connections between Accountability Principles and tactical design of the proposed accountability framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In line with commitment to focus on all students, proposed structure includes substantial weight on specific groups of students as well as the performance of all students.</li> <li>• Multiple measures of growth for students from any starting point. Both PARCC and ACCESS for English learner (EL) students include measures of performance and growth.</li> <li>• For schools serving students in early childhood, portion of the framework based on CLASS to continue investment and impact of early childhood on later academic outcomes.</li> <li>• Multiple measures of school quality and student success, including re-enrollment, in seat attendance (ISA), access to quality instructional time, and CLASS for early childhood.</li> <li>• Moved Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, SAT/ACT measures to the academic domain.</li> <li>• Question raised about re-enrollment indicator and how OSSE considered groups of students who are highly mobile and the schools that serve them.</li> <li>• Response that OSSE will continue to look at the entire framework to consider the effects of student population and to ensure that schools aren’t being overly disadvantaged by enrolling population of mobile students. Belief that re-</li> </ul>	

	<p>enrollment and attendance are the most valid and familiar measure currently available to understand student/family satisfaction and engagement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question raised about the inclusion of dual enrollment and career and technical education (CTE) courses and data along with AP and IB.</li> <li>• Response that OSSE is interested in including these measures in the future, but currently have limited data and lack of common way to define success, especially for dual enrollment courses.</li> </ul>	
Structure proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed framework would calculate all values for all students, and then calculate framework values for each specific group of students (race/ethnicity groups, special education, EL students) (see slide 16).</li> <li>• Specific groups would not be included in the overall score calculation if they either do not meet the proposed N size of 10 or if they do not meet the minimum points possible overall for the framework (see slide 17).</li> <li>• “All students” weighted at 75 percent, specific groups of students weighted collectively at 25 percent. If specific groups do not meet the minimum N size or minimum points, OSSE will decrease both the numerator and denominator instead of redistributing those points (see slide 18).</li> <li>• Clarification that groups that meet the points or N size threshold for a specific school could shift over time if the population changes.</li> <li>• Note that OSSE has not yet set classification levels/bands or cut scores.</li> <li>• Question asked about OSSE’s thinking of N size of 10 students for accountability?</li> <li>• Response that many states use N of 10; OSSE would like to use this smaller N size for public reporting and wanted to keep differences between public reporting and accountability to a minimum, given how public reporting functions as a form of accountability in the DC context.</li> <li>• OSSE belief that combination of N size of 10 and proposal of a threshold for minimum points for an overall framework is more stable than just N size for addressing possible swings in student</li> </ul>	

	<p>populations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question and clarification that special education (and other groups of students) for the overall framework score are based on the total population of that subgroup versus the tested population.</li> </ul>	
<p>Proposed frameworks and weighting for elementary and middle school</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question regarding OSSE’s use of the overall score versus parts of the score (e.g., growth score separate from performance). Would there be cases where OSSE would make decisions based on subset of the score?</li> <li>• Response that in the past have used the overall score and anticipate that approach continuing, but have not discussed fully.</li> <li>• Concern expressed around “double-counting” of EL students on PARCC EL sub-group and in the EL proficiency indicator.</li> <li>• Response that ESSA eliminates AMAOs from Title III and now requires a separate EL proficiency measure; OSSE will use ACCESS 2.0 for this indicator.</li> <li>• Many EL students will not be taking PARCC ELA exam so will not double-count them.</li> </ul>	<p>OSSE working to understand Federal regulations around flexibility for English learners taking PARCC ELA exam versus ACCESS 2.0. OSSE also plans to do further modeling to review impact of how ELs are included in the system (through both subgroup score and English language proficiency domain).</p>
<p>Proposed framework and weighting for high school</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current proposed framework does not include growth indicator at the high school level. Not required per ED and not technically possible until spring 2017 exam cycle given DC’s current required high school assessment progression.</li> <li>• OSSE changed academic performance from 70 percent to 50 percent of the overall weight for high school and increased the school quality and student success and grad rate indicators.</li> <li>• OSSE is still working on the thresholds for the SAT/ACT indicators. One will be the college ready threshold defined by College Board; other will be lower.</li> <li>• Clarification provided on why 6 and 7-year ACGR were not included along with 4- and 5-year ACGR. OSSE opted to include an alternate graduation rate measure that will give schools that enroll students who are not part of their original 4-year ACGR cohort credit for moving students to graduate once they arrive.</li> <li>• Question raised whether calculating growth on PARCC will be possible and valid, particularly given students’ varied math</li> </ul>	<p>OSSE to schedule meeting specifically to discuss HS framework measure components in more detail.</p>

	<p>tracks from middle to high school. Opinion expressed that growth is a key reason to consider another high school exam.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE response that alternative approaches to high school tests and growth are being considered, including the potential of growth from PSAT to SAT.</li> <li>• Proposal raised to create a working group specific to the high school framework and assessments to discuss in depth.</li> <li>• Request to consider how to approach schools that include an 8<sup>th</sup> grade and give Algebra assessment (versus Grade 8 Math).</li> <li>• Question asked about students who have no SAT score. How will they be captured in the proposed system?</li> <li>• OSSE wants to include some form of participation on SAT/ACT but is not yet sure how this will look.</li> <li>• Conversation about how and when to take the differences in outcomes for grade bands into consideration when setting floors and targets. Measures common to the three grade bands (e.g., attendance measures) look different at the high school level.</li> <li>• OSSE will continue to consider where it makes sense to take grade bands into account.</li> <li>• Additional point made that while DC must set long-term goals overall and for specific groups of students, OSSE has not yet set these or advanced a proposal for floors and targets. Question of how goals and targets will relate to one another.</li> <li>• Question asked about whether inclusion of 3+ on PARCC will be for the short term, or longer?</li> <li>• Response that at the current moment, plan is for 3+ on PARCC to continue as a measure to recognize growth of students near the cusp of the college and career ready level.</li> </ul>	
Next steps and timeline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE plans to have more proposals about floors and targets, quantity and naming of classifications, and goal setting at the January 2017 meeting for LEA leaders.</li> </ul>	OSSE to schedule and communicate date for Jan. LEA leaders meeting.

**Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and Organizations Present**

BASIS DC PCS

Capital City PCS

Center City PCS

Cesar Chavez PCS for Public Policy

City Arts and Prep PCS

DC International PCS

DC Prep PCS

Eagle Academy PCS

Ed Forward

E.L. Haynes PCS

FOCUS

Harmony DC PCS

IDEA PCS

Inspired Teaching Demonstration School

Kingsman Academy

Lee Montessori

Mundo Verde PCS

Paul International PCS

Richard Wright PCS for Journalism and Media Arts

St. Coletta Special Education PCS

TenSquare

Thurgood Marshall Academy

Two Rivers PCS

Washington Latin PCS

Washington Leadership Academy