

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Accountability Meetings - Notes

April 12, 2016 DC Association of Public Chartered Schools Meeting; April 13, 2016 DCPS Central Office Staff Meeting; April 24, 2016 DCPS Principals and LEA Leaders Meeting; June 29 and July 6, 2016 Meetings with LEA staff at OSSE; Sept. 13, 2016 DC Public Charter School Meeting; Sept. 13, 2016 Washington Teachers Union Meeting

Throughout April, June, and July 2016, the Office of the State Superintendent of Education engaged a variety of stakeholders to learn more about the transition to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). These sessions provided a foundation for the accountability system development, including an introduction to ESSA and an overview of the requirements for accountability in the ESSA statute and federal draft regulations. OSSE also used these sessions to discuss and gather feedback on the DC Accountability System Principles (final version [here](#)) and on potential framework structures.

Below you will find a summary of the key points of feedback raised during these discussions by various participants. Note that no final decisions were made in these meetings.

Area Discussed	Summary of Discussion	Next Steps & Follow Up (if applicable)
ESSA overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OSSE shared that the timeline of ESSA requires transition into 2017-18 school year. OSSE explained that federal fiscal competitive and formula funding will flow through old ESEA methodology in 2016-17 school year. OSSE explained that per ED’s transition requirements, DC’s current priority and focus schools will continue implementation in the 2016-17 school year (see Feb. 2016 letter to LEA leaders). OSSE shared key differences between No Child Left Behind and ESSA (see slide 8) 	
Accountability system measures and other requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OSSE shared key system requirements per the federal regulations (see slides 14-17). Question as to how competency-based credentialing factors into accountability. Question raised as to how growth (on PARCC) is being considered – how much it will factor in and weigh. Response that the system must include growth for elementary and middle schools but specific decisions about weight of growth or weight relative to performance have not been decided. 	<p>OSSE looking into the federal requirements related to inclusion of alternative schools in the state accountability system.</p> <p>OSSE will follow up on whether early childhood (grades prior to 3) will be included in the system. Federally this is not required.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comment raised about the need for further conversation around high school assessments as we think about the academic achievement and growth measures. Request to consider all possible growth options for high school, including nationally normed options.• Question as to how alternative schools are included in accountability system. Request made for flexibility and differentiation in how alternative schools are factored into system. Concern over alternative schools being held accountable to a four-year cohort rate for graduation.<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Positive feelings shared about how PCSB handles targets and growth for alternative schools and that it is more focused on gap closure over a two or three year period.• Question raised as to whether adult and early childhood will be included. OSSE explained that neither are federally required. Point made that adult policy definitions require a more detailed discussion outside of accountability process and therefore adult schools will not be included in the first year but may be in the future. OSSE is considering inclusion of early childhood and acknowledges the work that has been underway to incorporate these grade levels into the PMF.• Comment that we may want to consider growth and proficiency for subjects other than math and English language arts.• Question raised on how the cross sector task force work overlaps with common accountability system development.• Comment raised that we should not try to include too much beyond required elements in the formal accountability system. Recognition that additional information could be made public and transparent through mechanisms other than the formal accountability system.• Questions raised as to whether NWEA MAP assessment and/or AP/IB index score will be included in system. Response that OSSE is in the process of exploring possible measures and will be releasing a measures survey to gather additional feedback.• Clarification provided that it is a federal requirement that we incorporate the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR) methodology and identify any school with lower than a	
--	--	--

	67% 4-year rate for “comprehensive support.”	
DC accountability principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment that the principle related to “building the best system” is helpful because it suggests we can continue to add in the future. • Comment made that “commonality” does not respect our current culture the unique nature and diversity of charter schools. Alternative terminology suggested: “comparability.” Comment made that comparability of schools as apples:apples for families through a common system is valuable. • Questions raised as to what “equitable” is referring to – equitable support? Equitable access? Demographic or social equity? Comment made that the principles are a guiding north star and not intended to address resource distribution. 	
Relationship between ESSA accountability and the Performance Management Framework (PMF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment raised that in addition to this being an opportunity for integrated public reporting, it is also an opportunity to streamline and avoid duplication on what gets reported to OSSE and PCSB. • Question raised about what happens when a school is identified for targeted or comprehensive support. What are the interventions and who is responsible for overseeing? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Response that we are focused on commonality to the point it makes sense, starting first with common measures. It is possible that interventions, consequences, and supports based on classifications will differ across sectors and that considering what OSSE, PCSB, and LEAs are each best positioned to do is important as we consider strategy for school improvement, rewards, and consequences. - Discussion about current support through Learning Support Network (Cross & Joftus). Question asked about OSSE staff capacity to provide direct intervention support to high volume of schools. • Comment raised that OSSE and PCSB report differently in terms of n-size and that this is an opportunity to get on the same page. 	OSSE plans to revise principles and post final version.

<p>Other questions and comments about accountability and ESSA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question about what OSSE’s plan is for supporting schools with special education students and English learners. Desire expressed to learn more from strong practices in DC and nationally. • Questions raised about implications of federal funding streams by ESSA. Request for more clarity on requirements. • Question raised as to what will change about monitoring under ESSA, particularly given supplement not supplant changes. • OSSE suggested idea of setting up a working group of charter schools that represents a range of school grade bands and sizes to provide ongoing input to accountability system development. Response for preference for meetings where all LEAs are invited. • Question raised about accounting for non-equivalent inputs of student background and resources when setting goals for schools. Response that goal measurement isn’t defined in the absolute terms that were under annual yearly progress (AYP) under NCLB. Further thinking and input to be gathered, but confirmed that there is no intent to set different long-term goals or a different method of calculation for different schools. 	<p>OSSE is looking further into the supplement not supplant requirements (federal draft regulations are forthcoming) as well as financial reporting and will follow up with additional guidance when it is available.</p>
<p>Possible frameworks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSSE shared possible frameworks for designing accountability systems to get feedback on what pieces best allow our values to be reflected and what raises concerns. See slides 19-29. • Comment that the PMF as it is currently configured would not meet the federal requirements for an accountability system under ESSA. For example, it does not incorporate subgroups or English language proficiency. • Index: Belief expressed that an index has lots of complexity built in particularly with opportunities for normative floors and ceilings. Comment that the index currently in place in DC for the PMF has been clear and easily understandable to parents. • Matrix: Comment raised that this model is confusing and may be difficult for non-academic measures. • Gates: Comment raised that we should select a system that allows every school to be successful if they did well and that this model does that successfully. Interest in how gates model provides multiple pathways for success. Concern expressed as to how this type of model may be complex to communicate. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion about floors and targets. Comment raised about the challenge of floors and targets shifting in the PMF. Suggestion offered for absolute rather than relative floors and targets. • Discussion about number of classifications. Comment raised that three categories may not be sufficient and that in current PMF often categories get blurred into “high” and “low” distinctions. 	
--	--	--

<p><u>Attendee Names & Organizations</u></p>	
<p>Additional LEA Leaders Briya Public Charter School Cesar Chavez Public Charter School Center City Public Charter School Children’s Guild Democracy Prep Public Charter School District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) Central Office Staff and Principals Eagle Academy Public Charter School Early Childhood Academy Public Charter School E.L. Haynes Public Charter School Empower K-12 EW Stokes Public Charter School Washington Teachers Union</p>	<p>Friends of Choice in Urban Schools (FOCUS) Kingsman Academy KIPP Public Charter School Monument Academy Paul Public Charter School Public Charter School Board (PCSB) Rocketship Public Charter School SEED School of DC TenSquare Group The Next Step Public Charter School Two Rivers Public Charter School Washington Latin Public Charter School</p>