

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Domain	Metric	Source	Decision Points/Feedback	OSSE Response
English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	OSSE	What is the ACCESS growth methodology?	OSSE is using a WIDA-based approach, which sets a fixed number of years a student has to reach proficiency based on starting point.
English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	OSSE	If/when to restart a student's baseline year?	If a student moves to a new school, the student's baseline year will restart.
English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	OSSE	How to handle students whose time allotted to reach proficiency exceeds their expected enrollment time in school?	OSSE will not change the time allotted to reach proficiency even if it exceeds expected enrollment time.
English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	OSSE	What to do with students who are identified as EL but do not take ACCESS?	If a student is identified as EL but does not take ACCESS, the student will be counted as not making sufficient growth.
English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	OSSE	How to treat students who score proficient in the first year of ACCESS testing?	If a student scored proficient in their first year of ACCESS testing, the student will be removed from the dry run. OSSE will revisit before actual run to see if OSSE can give credit to schools for students who score proficient in their first year of ACCESS testing. To do this, OSSE will explore collecting screener data to confirm EL status at the start of the school year.
English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	OSSE	When to establish the baseline of data for how many years a student has to reach proficiency?	OSSE will use 15-16 school year as the baseline for how many years a student has to reach proficiency.
English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	OSSE	How to provide information to LEAs about expectations for when students should reach proficiency?	A Qlik application will be created that provides comprehensive information on EL students, including when they are expected to reach proficiency.
English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	OSSE	Handling students who take Alternate ACCESS for ELLs?	Students will be excluded from the ACCESS Growth metric if they have taken the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs assessment.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	OSSE	Handling students who do not meet their growth targets after the allotted number of years?	OSSE will require a student to reach proficiency every year after their allotted number of years to receive credit for that student.
English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	OSSE	Whether to use scores from private schools that administered ACCESS in calculating growth?	OSSE will not use private school scores for determining ACCESS growth.
English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	OSSE	How to address students who are identified as EL in 16-17 but do not have a valid score in the previous year?	OSSE will create expected test universe for the 15-16 school year in which students must have been identified by the same school in which the student is enrolled in 16-17; was enrolled for at least 90 days from audit to beginning of ACCESS test window; and was continuously enrolled during the 15-16 ACCESS testing window.
English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: So WIDA is research based, but it doesn't take everything into account. Is that correct?</p> <p>A: It's based on their analysis of ACCESS scores across states in many years; however, there is other research in other venues that have looked at specific rates of growth for variables other variables that right now the WIDA methodology does not incorporate.</p> <p>Q: WIDA already says not use proficiency levels, so why are we using it?</p> <p>A: We are using scale scores. A student's score and their targets differ by grade. In our calculations we use scale score and proficiency level associated with grade based scale score. These slides are modeled in a way for ease of communication.</p>	A response was provided during the meeting.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Do you have an expected timeline for how methodology will change as the test shifts?</p> <p>A: The shift in cut points is being considered by WIDA, but no specific date. There is a plan to re-evaluate.</p>	The cut points will not change for the dry run; however, OSSE will revisit before the actual run.
English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>There should be a business rule for ACCESS similar to Full Academic Year for PARCC that clarifies which students count. For example, some students withdraw during the ACCESS testing window before they are tested (February-May) while others are unable to test (e.g. medical, incarceration) during the school's scheduled testing window. For example, a school schedules ACCESS testing April 1- 30. A student on February 27 is hospitalized with a long-term illness that extends beyond the ACCESS test window.</p>	OSSE agrees with this feedback and will implement the following business rule as well as share data that informed this decision: Student must be enrolled for at least 90 calendar days from the enrollment audit to the beginning of the ACCESS testing window to count toward this metric to align with ESSA. The student must also be continuously enrolled during the ACCESS testing window.
English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Add in a minimum participation rule for ACCESS (e.g. 95% which has been accepted by the Department of Education for federal accountability). Schools must test 95% of eligible students. Schools could appeal to OSSE to exclude any student beyond 95% on an individual basis (e.g. medical exemption, withdrawal, incarceration). Schools would not be penalized for not meeting the 95% threshold if an appeal is granted.</p>	If a student is identified as EL but does not take ACCESS, the student will be counted as not making sufficient growth.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Families have the option to deny ELL services for students. Students for whom families have denied ELL services (in writing) should not be included in the school's accountability and should not count towards test participation. Otherwise, a school is being held accountable for a student's language acquisition when the school is not allowed to provide ELL services.</p>	<p>If a student is identified as EL but doesn't take ACCESS, the student will be counted as not making sufficient growth. Please refer to OSSE's September 2017 "Delivering Education Services to English Learners: A Guidebook for Administrators, Instructional Leaders, and Teachers in the District of Columbia" section on opt-outs.</p>
English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>OSSE should revisit the recommendation to use 2015-16 ACCESS scores as the baseline, given that the scores will have to be converted to a new scale and will change. Many students were exited from EL services based on the old scale, and are no longer receiving services, but schools could be accountable for their ACCESS growth. Using 2016-17 scores as the baseline makes more sense.</p>	<p>For the dry run, OSSE will use school years 2015-16 and 2016-17. Due to WIDA's standard setting process, OSSE will align the 2015-16 data to match the adjusted proficiency cuts for the 2016-17 data.</p>

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>In determining how to treat students who score proficient in their first year of ACCESS testing, OSSE recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation: Do not count the student in this metric unless the student is in grade K and the student was identified as EL in PK3 or PK4 <p>DCPS Comment- Although this rationale meets the requirement of having a baseline test and re-test to measure growth it does not credit LEAs for growth to proficiency that occurs if a student reaches proficiency in their first year of ACCESS testing. It seems that we could get stuck as many of our PK 3 and 4 do not actually attend the same school in Kinder.</p> <p>DCPS Recommendation: – Count as making sufficient growth if student is identified as EL in that year’s feed by administering a new screener like the MODEL K at the beginning of Kindergarten to establish a baseline where the student is receiving the service. OSSE should start collecting screener information that verifies that students have been accurately identified as EL as part of the audit process.</p>	<p>If a student scored proficient in their first year of ACCESS testing, the student will be removed from the dry run. OSSE will revisit before actual run to see if OSSE can give credit to schools for students who score proficient in their first year of ACCESS testing. To do this, OSSE will explore collecting screener data to confirm EL status at the start of the school year.</p>
------------------------------	---------------	---------------------------	--	--

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>In determining which ACCESS year should establish the baseline of data for how many years a student has to reach proficiency, OSSE recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation: Use the 2015-16 school year to establish the baseline. DCPS Comment – Although It is the earliest year of data we have for ACCESS for ELLs 2.0, the new window did not account for a full academic year in addition to the fact that the scales were changed significantly between the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years. The proposed conversion will cause (In DCPS’s case) massive confusion. Over 800 students exited using the 2016 Access score. If we use the conversation, based on the results of this year, over 600 students would come back to being eligible to received ESL services after we’ve told their parents that they exited and received no ESL support during the school tear 2016-2017. In addition, this student DID NOT take a new Access for ELLs 2.0 in 2017 so even if they were brought back- there would be no baseline. This will also have a 2.7-million-dollar impact immediately to return those students to service this year. DCPS Recommendation – Use 2017 test results to establish baseline and 2018 to determine growth targets and allow WIDA to release new research. 	<p>For the dry run, OSSE will use school years 2015-16 and 2016-17. Due to WIDA's standard setting process, OSSE will align the 2015-16 data to match the adjusted proficiency cuts for the 2016-17 data.</p>
------------------------------	---------------	---------------------------	---	---

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>In determining how to handle students who take Alternate ACCESS, OSSE recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation: Exclude those students from the ACCESS Growth metric <p>DCPS Comments- We agree that students who take Alternate ACCESS comprise less than 1% of student population with few schools with greater than ten students and it aligns with how other states are treating students who take Alternate ACCESS</p> <p>DCPS Recommendation- We are recommending that the percentage be increased to allow for students who have a proven disability in one of the 4 language domains tested by the ACCESS 2.0 (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing) be considered to take the Access ALT. OSSE should research what other WIDA states are doing for this subset of the population.</p>	Students will be excluded from the ACCESS Growth metric if they have taken the Alternate ACCESS for ELLs assessment.
------------------------------	---------------	---------------------------	---	--

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

<p>English Language Proficiency</p>	<p>ACCESS Growth</p>	<p>LEA/Organization Feedback</p>	<p>In determining how to provide information to LEAs about which students are English Learners and their expectations for when they should reach proficiency, OSSE recommends: Recommendation: Create an application in Qlik that provides comprehensive information on EL students, including identifying EL students and when they are expected to reach proficiency DCPS Comment- Although we agree that OSSE needs to create a comprehensive and accurate system of information to LEAs to support EL students, DCPS already purchase a similar system Ellevation, that can minimize the use of several databases.</p> <p>Recommendation: That OSSE should look at Ellevation as a potential database instead of creating their own.</p>	<p>A Qlik application will be created that provides comprehensive information on EL students, including when they are expected to reach proficiency.</p>
-------------------------------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	---	--

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	LEA/Organization Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We recommend OSSE review actual data to see how schools serving different grade bands (within ES/MS/HS) may be impacted by the variation in expected growth by age/grade level. • Establish a business rule for ACCESS growth similar to Full Academic Year for PARCC that clarifies which students count. • We strongly recommend OSSE calculate the baseline ACCESS growth on the 2017 scores, not the 2015-16 scores. • We agree with the rationale for excluding students taking the Alternate ACCESS. However, we encourage OSSE to work with WIDA to research ways to hold schools accountable for these students. Additionally, we encourage OSSE to explore avenues for exiting dual-identified students who are not passing ACCESS due to a disability as opposed to limited English proficiency. • We appreciate OSSE's effort to streamline data sharing through Qlik. We want to stress the importance of giving EL coordinators access to newly enrolled students in a timely manner, especially for schools that start their school year in July and August. 	<p>If a student scored proficient in their first year of ACCESS testing, the student will be removed from the dry run. OSSE will revisit before actual run to see if OSSE can give credit to schools for students who score proficient in their first year of ACCESS testing. To do this, OSSE will explore collecting screener data to confirm EL status at the start of the school year.</p> <p>OSSE agrees with this feedback and will implement the following business rule as well as share data that informed this decision: Student must be enrolled for at least 90 calendar days from the enrollment audit to the beginning of the ACCESS testing window to count toward this metric. The student must also be continuously enrolled during the ACCESS testing window.</p> <p>A Qlik application will be created that provides comprehensive information on EL students, including when they are expected to reach proficiency.</p>
------------------------------	---------------	---------------------------	--	--

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>In determining the ACCESS Growth methodology, OSSE recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation: WIDA-based approach that sets fixed number of years a student has to reach proficiency based on his/her baseline • Rationale: Aligns with research-based evidence from WIDA <p>DCPS Comments-Even though it is said to be aligned, OSSE agrees that the rules do not account for research indicating different rates of growth depending on starting grade level, starting level of proficiency, and years of formal education. In addition, OSSE acknowledged that the rule does not account for bilingual programs that use a student’s native language for instruction, meaning that they progress more slowly toward English proficiency. This methodology doesn’t seem to take into account research and will not reflect the needs of bilingual programs nor guarantee a reasonable growth target for our most vulnerable students. Recommendation: Wait for WIDA to release the new research on the length of time it takes for students to become English language proficient.</p>	OSSE is using a WIDA-based approach, which sets a fixed number of years a student has to reach proficiency based on starting point.
------------------------------	---------------	---------------------------	--	---

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>In determining if/when to restart a student's baseline year, OSSE recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation: Restart a student's baseline when a student enrolls in a new school, including students who transfer schools as well as enter a new school after completing a terminal grade <p>DCPS Comments- We do agree that this will avoids any disincentive for enrolling students who have not been meeting their growth targets and has the potential for not penalizing schools for a student's lack of growth at a previous school</p> <p>Recommendation: There needs to be additional clarity as to when and how this will be tracked and viewed. What are the consideration for students incarcerated or those that travel outside the USA and return? This form of baseline might make sense if the additional accountability like PARCC and ACGR travel with the student in the same way.</p>	OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration.
------------------------------	---------------	---------------------------	---	--

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>In determining how to handle students whose time allotted to reach proficiency exceeds their expected enrollment time in school, OSSE recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation: Do not change time allotted to reach proficiency even if it exceeds expected enrollment time <p>DCPS agrees.</p>	OSSE will not change time allotted to reach proficiency even if it exceeds expected enrollment time.
English Language Proficiency	ACCESS Growth	LEA/Organization Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation: Count the student as not making sufficient growth • Rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Holds schools accountable to all EL students o Eliminates incentives for not testing EL students <p>DCPS Comments: We agree that OSSE needs to have a data validation processes that is clear on which students are EL and what their growth targets are. We also feel that schools need to be held accountable for the language proficiency of their EL students.</p> <p>OSSE should document an ACCESS participation policy in the same way that PARCC, MSAA and DC Science participation is documented.</p>	In September 2017, OSSE created the "Delivering Education Services to English Learners: A Guidebook for Administrators, Instructional Leaders, and Teachers in the District of Columbia."

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

<p>English Language Proficiency</p>	<p>ACCESS Growth</p>	<p>LEA/Organization Feedback</p>	<p>In determining how to set growth targets for students who do not reach proficiency after the allotted number of years, OSSE recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation: Require students to achieve proficiency every year after their allotted number of years <p>DCPS Comment – Although we agree to continue to hold schools accountable for their students’ progress, provision could be set in place for school to provide rationale for the student who did not reach proficiency (i.e. out of school for health reasons, or out of the country for a significant amount of time, SLIFE or others). OSSE to monitor and collect documentation.</p> <p>Recommendation- Allow for explanations with documentation of special cases.</p>	<p>Students are required to achieve proficiency every year after their allotted number of years</p>
-------------------------------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	---	---

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Domain	Metric	Source	Decision Points/Feedback	OSSE Response
Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: In ACGR guidance, there is "transferred out," but it does not provide the exit codes. Could OSSE add the exit codes to the guidance?</p> <p>A: For 2015-16 school year, the terminology was different because the validation period expanded to 4 years. This will change in the 2016-17 school year guidance because student exits can be responded to in real-time by LEAs.</p>	Transferred out refers to students who transferred to another LEA within DC has validated through Demo Certification or Exit Management.
Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Has OSSE reached out to PGPCS regarding data sharing agreement?</p> <p>A: OSSE spoke to Maryland Department of Education and PG County Public Schools and will continue conversations.</p>	OSSE provided a response during the meeting.
Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Why is a student exiting to another LEA not on the list?</p> <p>A: This list includes valid exit reasons from the state cohort. You are correct that students transferring to another LEA may also be removed from the cohort of the sending LEA; this omission was an oversight.</p>	OSSE provided a response during the meeting.
Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Could OSSE be more specific in the guidance by stating that students must transfer to a diploma granting school?</p> <p>A: Yes, the content will be updated.</p>	OSSE updated the ACGR guidance in response to this request.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Will there be a business rule for high schools growing grade levels (up to 12th)?</p> <p>A: OSSE specifies the schools that are diploma-granting. This is also captured in SLIMS database at OSSE. Also the high schools growing grade levels will not have an ACGR calculated prior to the school offering a grade level 12.</p>	OSSE provided a response during the meeting.
Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: How long will the verification window be for ACGR?</p> <p>A: The first collection is Responsible LEA, which can be seen in feed. The second collection is First Ninth Grade Year, which must be completed by June 23 for students taking assessments and July 7 for all other students. The third collection is the student's outcome, which is supported via Exit Management and OST and must be completed by mid-August.</p>	For the 2017-18 verification, the timeline for verification will be moved earlier to align more fully with the Demo Certification process and to allow for the finalization of the ACGR data by September.
Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>FEEDBACK: OSSE should have a policy for deported students. It is hard for LEAs to obtain deportation from the government.</p>	LEAs should use exit code 1941 with proper documentation. OSSE will create a form that will be added to exit management as acceptable documentation. This will also apply to reenrollment.
Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: What do we do with special populations?</p>	OSSE uses the guidance from the U.S. Department of Education concerning the calculation of the ACGR.
Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Schools do not have control over a student once they enter DYRS.</p>	Students whose most recent degree-granting school is DYRS belong to the state cohort and will not be included in the ACGR metric for the sending school.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	Q: What is the policy for a student that is incapacitated?	OSSE has researched federal and state definitions and will update exit management guidance with definition.
Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	Q: What to do when a school receives a student that enrolls in a school for the first time and it is not a proper placement?	OSSE uses the guidance from the U.S. Department of Education concerning the calculation of the ACGR.
Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	Q: Will schools with subgroups that are under 67% be targeted for intervention?	Schools with subgroups that are under 67% will not be targeted for intervention.
Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	FEEDBACK: The Floor and Targets are different than the rest of the Accountability. A: OSSE will provide the actual floors and targets for each metric during the dry-run.	Floors and targets will be set at the 10th and 90th percentile while adjusting for the long-term goal defined in OSSE's ESSA state plan.
Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	Please consider including students who graduate with an IEP Certificate of Completion in the Alternative Grad measure. Schools already are penalized on 4-Year ACGR because these students do not graduate with a regular diploma, schools should receive credit for these students on the alternative measure.	Students who graduate with an IEP Certificate of Completion will not be included in the Alternate Graduation metric.
Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	On the slide with reasons a student is exited from a school's cohort, does it include when a student transfers to a diploma-granting program within DC?	Yes

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	Reporting ACGR and alt grad metric reported side-by-side may create confusions and reporting the data differently might be a good solution to this potential problem. So ACGR would be reported as a percentage (say, 75%), and the alt grad metric would be reported as + percentage (+10%). This would make it clear that a school's ACGR is xx%, but they were able to graduate +xx% on top of their ACGR cohort who are outside of the 4 year cohort.	OSSE will publicly report this information on the report card that it is creating and looks forward to receiving additional feedback and suggestions from LEAs to address potential confusion.
Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	OSSE should just keep the 3-yr graduates in ACGR and not worry about including them in the alt grad metric.	Three-year graduates will be included in the Alternate Graduation metric corresponding to the accountability year in which they were set to graduate.
Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	Additional clarity concerning the floor and the target for this metric (is it 10th and 90th percentile? Does the long-term goal outlined in the state plan of 90% graduation rate factor in?).	Floors and targets will be set at the 10th and 90th percentile while adjusting for the long-term goal defined in OSSE's ESSA state plan.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Graduation Rate	4 Year ACGR	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>For students who enter the US during their 9th grade year, is it possible to consider resetting their cohort year so that they have an additional year to graduate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o These students are in scenarios that lead to being off-track upon arrival to the U.S. (such as being placed in ESL and not enrolled in core content courses needed to be promoted to the next grade level promotion) o Students new to the U.S. with limited Eng. Proficiency should not be expected to graduate in less than 4 full academic years (if these students arrive in the middle of 9th grade, then they only have 3.5 years to graduate on time) 	<p>This metric will not give students who enter the U.S. an additional year to graduate per the guidance from the U.S. Department of Education concerning the calculation of the ACGR.</p>
-----------------	-------------	---------------------------	--	--

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Domain	Metric	Source	Decision Points/Feedback	OSSE Response
School Environment	Alternate Graduation Metric	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Can LEAs pushback on the denominator?</p> <p>A: Yes, please send feedback. There is potential discretion for this metric compared to the ACGR.</p>	OSSE provided a response during the meeting, and since the meeting, provided additional detail in revisions to its ESSA state plan.
School Environment	Alternate Graduation Metric	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Can we create a business rule, show how or explain the difference in the metrics and how can a school be over 100%?</p>	OSSE will publicly report this information on the report card that it is creating and looks forward to receiving additional feedback and suggestions from LEAs to address potential confusion.
School Environment	Alternate Graduation Metric	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: When will the alternative framework be released?</p> <p>A: There are a lot of details that need to be defined, so OSSE cannot provide a release date.</p>	OSSE will provide additional information later.
School Environment	Alternate Graduation Metric	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Can there be business rule as to how ACGR vs Alternate Graduation are defined since a school could be above 100%?</p> <p>A: OSSE will need to review the language and be transparent.</p>	OSSE will publicly report this information on the report card that it is creating and looks forward to receiving additional feedback and suggestions from LEAs to address potential confusion.
School Environment	Alternate Graduation Metric	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>FEEDBACK: For simplicity: If they graduated early, count the student in the same year they are included in ACGR.</p>	Three-year graduates will be included in the Alternate Graduation in the same year they are included in the ACGR (the accountability year in which they were set to graduate).
School Environment	Alternate Graduation Metric	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>FEEDBACK: Do not track a student across 2 years.</p>	Three-year graduates will be included in the Alternate Graduation in the same year they are included in the ACGR (the accountability year in which they were set to graduate).

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	Alternate Graduation Metric	LEA/Organization Feedback	FEEDBACK: It does not make sense for the Alternate to be lower than ACGR; therefore, add the student in the same year as ACGR.	Three-year graduates will be included in the Alternate Graduation in the same year they are included in the ACGR (the accountability year in which they were set to graduate).
School Environment	Alternate Graduation Metric	LEA/Organization Feedback	3-Year Grads: please consider including these grads only in one year- the year they are set to graduate. That way these students count in the same year for 4-Year ACGR and the alt grad measure.	Three-year graduates will be included in the Alternate Graduation in the same year they are included in the ACGR (the accountability year in which they were set to graduate).
School Environment	Alternate Graduation Metric	LEA/Organization Feedback	If there is flexibility, OSSE should absolutely include completion of IEP students in the numerator in the alt grad metric.	Students who graduate with an IEP Certificate of Completion will not be included in the Alternate Graduation metric.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Domain	Metric	Source	Decision Points/Feedback	OSSE Response
Academic Achievement	AP/IB Participation	OSSE	What is the numerator of AP/IB Participation?	The AP/IB Participation numerator is the ACGR cohort minus students who dropped out in 9th or 10th grade who took an AP/IB test.
Academic Achievement	AP/IB Participation	OSSE	What is the denominator of AP/IB Participation?	The AP/IB Participation denominator is the ACGR cohort minus students who dropped out in 9th or 10th grade.
Academic Achievement	AP/IB Performance	OSSE	What is the numerator of AP/IB Performance?	The AP/IB Performance numerator is all AP/IB test takers who scored 3+ on at least one AP exam or 4+ on at least one IB exam in the accountability year.
Academic Achievement	AP/IB Performance	OSSE	What is the denominator of AP/IB Performance?	The AP/IB Performance denominator is all AP/IB test takers in the accountability year.
Academic Achievement	AP/IB Performance	LEA/Organization Feedback	For the AP/IB performance measure, why not make the numerator the number of AP exams scored 3+ and/or the number of IB exams scored 4+, instead of the number of students scoring 3+ or 4+ respectively on the exams? Every AP and IB exam is different; therefore, passing one exam is not equivalent to passing multiple exams. Furthermore, with the numerator as it currently stands, you're not rewarding students for passing multiple exams and you're not rewarding teachers/schools for sufficiently instructing students to pass their exams.	The AP/IB Performance numerator is all AP/IB test takers who scored 3+ on at least one AP exam or 4+ on at least one IB exam in the same accountability year. OSSE considered this option and will present data analysis when the business rules are released that informed this decision.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Achievement	AP/IB Participation	LEA/Organization Feedback	Using simulated data, what does the distribution of rates and points earned in past years look like for AP/IB participation? Has OSSE conducted that analysis? If so, can you please share those results out? We want to ensure schools with certain populations aren't being more penalized by this measure, compared to other schools. Additionally, including a participation measure may result in a tradeoff between participation and performance. Schools may encourage more students to take advanced coursework, even though they may not have fully developed the tools needed to succeed in the course, thus resulting in lower AP/IB exam scores.	OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration. OSSE conducted data analysis and will share this information when the business rules are released.
Academic Achievement	AP/IB Participation	LEA/Organization Feedback	For AP/IB participation and performance, OSSE representatives indicated that schools with zeros would be included when establishing floors and targets. Request that OSSE spell this out in a business rule.	Zeros will be included, and OSSE will be providing the business rules for the metrics.
Academic Achievement	AP/IB Participation & Performance	LEA/Organization Feedback	For the AP/IB ones, I actually think OSSE's formulas make a little more sense than PCSB's, but it is notable I think how different these calculations will be from the PMF ones, so I wonder if that means we'll see a change in the PMF calcs a few years down the line. Either way it's notable that families will likely see relatively significantly different outcomes for schools in these areas.	OSSE values your feedback.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Achievement	AP/IB Performance	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Here are the business rules we would like to see adopted for AP, if possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AP/IB Performance: [# of passed AP exams (3 or higher) + # of passed IB exams (4 or higher)]/[total # of AP and IB exams taken] 	<p>The AP/IB Performance numerator is all AP/IB test takers who scored 3+ on at least one AP exam or 4+ on at least one IB exam in the accountability year.</p> <p>The AP/IB Performance denominator is all AP/IB test takers in the accountability year.</p> <p>OSSE considered the proposed option and will present data analysis when the business rules are released that informed this decision.</p>
Academic Achievement	AP/IB Performance	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Here are the business rules we would like to see adopted for AP, if possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AP/IB Equity and Excellence: [# of 12 grade students passing at least one AP or IB exam]/[Total # of 12th grade students] 	<p>The AP/IB Performance numerator is all AP/IB test takers who scored 3+ on at least one AP exam or 4+ on at least one IB exam in the accountability year.</p> <p>The AP/IB Performance denominator is all AP/IB test takers in the accountability year.</p> <p>OSSE considered the proposed option and will present data analysis when the business rules are released that informed this decision.</p>

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Achievement	AP/IB Participation	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>General feedback about using ACGR minus 9th and 10th grader students who have exited as the denominator for college readiness and AP/IB participation metrics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCPS agrees with using ACGR minus 9th and 10th grade students who have exited but suggest that OSSE also exclude 11th and 12th graders who have exited. Schools will be already lose points on the HS graduation and re-enrollment metrics for losing 11th and 12th graders. By including them in the denominators for both the SAT/ACT college readiness and AP/IB participation metrics, these schools will be “dinged” multiple times for the same group of students. 	<p>The AP/IB Performance denominator is all AP/IB test takers in the same accountability year.</p> <p>OSSE considered the proposed option and will present data analysis when the business rules are released that informed this decision.</p>
Academic Achievement	AP/IB Performance	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>AP/IB Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCPS suggest that OSSE both recognize and incentivize schools that offer multiple AP courses and students who take and pass (with a 3+) multiple AP exams. For the performance metric, We suggest the following business rule for AP/IB performance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o $[\# \text{ of passed AP exams (3 or higher)} + \# \text{ of passed IB exams (4 or higher)}] / [\text{total \# of AP and IB exams taken}]$ 	<p>The AP/IB Performance numerator is all AP/IB test takers who scored 3+ on at least one AP exam or 4+ on at least one IB exam in the accountability year.</p> <p>The AP/IB Performance denominator is all AP/IB test takers in the accountability year.</p> <p>OSSE considered the proposed option and will present data analysis when the business rules are released that informed this decision.</p>

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Domain	Metric	Source	Decision Points/Feedback	OSSE Response
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance/ Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	OSSE	Should we include attendance records of students who are not of compulsory age?	Attendance records of students who are not of compulsory age will be included.
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance/ Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	OSSE	Should we include attendance records that conflict with enrollment periods?	The attendance records that correspond to verified enrollment periods as validated through the Demographic Certification will be used in the calculation of attendance metrics.
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance/ Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	OSSE	How do we treat enrollment days for which schools don't submit attendance data?	For dry run, OSSE will follow current policy in that the days on which schools do not submit attendance data and where there is missing data will be counted as absences. For the future, OSSE is exploring enacting a policy that LEAs must submit positive attendance.
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance/ Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	OSSE	What is the minimum number of days that a student must enroll at school to be counted in these metrics?	The minimum number of days that a student must enroll at school to be counted in these metrics is being stage 5 enrolled for 10 instructional days.
School Environment	Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	OSSE	Which school(s) is/are held accountable for a student who doesn't spend the whole year at a particular school?	All schools at which the student is enrolled (stage 5) for at least 10 instructional days are held accountable for that student's time at their school (days attended/days enrolled at a particular school). Students may be included in the metric calculation for multiple schools.
School Environment	Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	OSSE	What is the grade level used as a comparison for students who change grades during the school year?	The students will be compared to other students in the same grade based on their grade as of the year-end demographic certification (assessment and reporting grade).

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	OSSE	How many years of data do we use to calculate the attendance growth metric?	The attendance will be only compared to the previous year (2015-16 school year) for the dry run. OSSE may add additional years after further review.
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance	LEA/Organization Feedback	Q: Is there not enough discrepancy between 10th & 90th percentile?	The metric will set the maximum floor at 90% and will not set a maximum target
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance/ Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	The current ISA methodology as reflected in the Attendance Qlik application will be used.
School Environment	Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	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)?	OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration.
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance	LEA/Organization Feedback	Will the attendance target keep going up every year even if the 90th 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.	The metric will set the maximum floor at 90% and will not set a maximum target

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>FEEDBACK: In PARCC, you're only counted at a maximum of one school. If a student has ISA percentages at two LEA/schools then each of those gets compared back. A student could have multiple growth measures and multiple schools.</p> <p>RESPONSE: In looking at prior year's attendance to measure against, we would be looking at a student's attendance record across all schools holistically. If a student missed 25 percent of days in the prior year overall and the following year missed 10 percent of days at one school and 40 percent of days at another, those two schools would be treated differently in the calculation of attendance growth for the same student and in making a determination as to whether that student grew.</p>	All schools at which the student is enrolled (stage 5) for at least 10 instructional days are held accountable for that student's time at their school (days attended/days enrolled at a particular school). Students may be included in the metric calculation for multiple schools.
School Environment	Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>FEEDBACK: 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>RESPONSE: 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>	A response was provided during the meeting.
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: What about PK3? Seems one band of compulsory is there and not the other?</p>	Attendance records of students who are not of compulsory age will be included.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	In-Seat Attendance	LEA/Organization Feedback	Q: PCSB's ISA includes all students regardless of age as that's part of the regulations or the laws for how ISA is calculated.	Attendance records of students who are not of compulsory age will be included.
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance	LEA/Organization Feedback	FEEDBACK: I love idea that this will slowly disappear. These are enormous problems that we know we have conflicting data that we have trouble reconciling.	OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration.
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance	LEA/Organization Feedback	Q: 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.	For dry run, OSSE will follow current policy in that the days on which schools do not submit attendance data and where there is missing data will be counted as absences. For the future, OSSE is exploring enacting a policy that LEAs must submit positive attendance.
School Environment	Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	Q: Is possible that in a future year you would consider using multiple years of data as data gets better? A: Yes. When these business rules are re-visited, that would be interesting to look at.	Currently attendance is only compared to the previous year (2015-16 school year) for the dry run. OSSE may add additional years after further review.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	In-Seat Attendance	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>FEEDBACK: 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>RESPONSE: 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>	There will not be an appeals process for this issue.
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance/ Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: 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>A: That was a threshold agreed to by both sectors.</p>	All schools at which the student is enrolled (stage 5) for at least 10 days are held accountable for that student's time at their school (days attended/days enrolled at a particular school). Students may be included in the metric calculation for multiple schools.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	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?	OSSE will provide data to LEAs that show there is variation as part of the engagement process that will follow the dry run.
School Environment	Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	The Addressing Chronic Absenteeism metrics use the 'best of' either the 90%+ attendance or attendance growth metric to award points to schools. Students with higher than 90% attendance will not be excluded from the calculation of the attendance growth metric.
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance/ Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	The minimum number of days that a student must enroll at school to be counted in these metrics is being stage 5 enrolled for 10 instructional days.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	In-Seat Attendance	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	OSSE will update this language for consistency.
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance/ Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>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.</p>	For dry run, OSSE will follow current policy in that the days on which schools do not submit attendance data and where there is missing data will be counted as absences. For the future, OSSE is exploring enacting a policy that LEAs must submit positive attendance.
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance/ Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	The minimum number of days that a student must enroll at school to be counted in these metrics is being stage 5 enrolled for 10 instructional days.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	In-Seat Attendance	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	OSSE will update this language for consistency
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance/ Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration.
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance	LEA/Organization Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is In-Seat Attendance calculated based on all students or only students who are enrolled for at least ten days? 	In-Seat Attendance is calculated for students who were stage 5 enrolled for 10 instructional days.
School Environment	Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	OSSE will provide data to LEAs that show there is variation.
School Environment	Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	Can OSSE share data that shows how SGPs and MGPs would work in practice?	OSSE will share the student-level SGP data underlying the Attendance Growth metric in the release of the dry-run.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	In-Seat Attendance/ Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	Can OSSE share the research that was cited on the differences in outcomes between relatively high attendance rates?	OSSE will share this research in the business rules document.
School Environment	Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	Why are we comparing students with satisfactory attendance against one another in comparing growth?	Addressing chronic absenteeism reflects an LEA's best performance on either satisfactory attendance or growth in attendance.
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance/ Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	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?	The minimum number of days that a student must enroll at school to be counted in these metrics is 10 instructional days, and OSSE wants to ensure that schools are responsible for each student who attends school for at least ten days.
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance/ Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	What are the floor/ceilings set at for the other frameworks? The presentation only showed us what these are set at for elementary	The floors and targets will be set at the 10th and 90th percentiles.
School Environment	In-Seat Attendance/ Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	Clarity on whether PCSB excludes any absences a student accrues after they turn 18 from ISA, which differs from how DCPS calculates	Attendance records of students who are not of compulsory age will be included.
School Environment	Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	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	Currently attendance is only compared to the previous year (2015-16 school year) for the dry run. OSSE may add additional years after further review.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	In-Seat Attendance/ Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	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?	OSSE currently provides this information through duplicative enrollment and exit management processes; LEAs are responsible for reviewing the Qlik Unified Data Errors application and following the appropriate procedures to resolve student membership issues.
School Environment	Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	LEA/Organization Feedback	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?	There is not a systematic relationship between the growth metric and 90+ metric; schools can be high in one metric and low the another.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Domain	Metric	Source	Decision Points/Feedback	OSSE Response
School Environment	CLASS (Pre-K only)	OSSE	How to handle observations at different times of day?	CLASS observations will be required to occur at least 30 minutes after school starts and when the majority of students are present.
School Environment	CLASS (Pre-K only)	OSSE	How to handle observations at different times of year?	CLASS observations will be assigned a three-month window to each sector, so they are observed around the same period of time. Within the three month period, observations days are randomly assigned to ensure that we are not systematically assigning observations days in a biased way.
School Environment	CLASS (Pre-K only)	OSSE	What are the rules around the number of classrooms being observed?	All preschool classrooms will be observed.
School Environment	CLASS (Pre-K only)	LEA/Organization Feedback	FEEDBACK: Want to set target at 6 because that's where you get high quality based on the publishers' recommendation.	OSSE will implement the following floors and targets and provide additional information that informed this decision: Emotional support: 4.5, 6 Classroom organization: 4.5, 6 Instructional support: 2, 4
School Environment	CLASS (Pre-K only)	LEA/Organization Feedback	Q: Could data be run again to distinguish this? A: We have the data, and it could be run again to see if the timeline makes a difference for a change in the established protocol.	OSSE will maintain the current protocol and provide data analysis that informed this decision.
School Environment	CLASS (Pre-K only)	LEA/Organization Feedback	Q: This is the 45th percentile performance, so to get zero points for a 4 doesn't add up with the published targets. We should go with what the publisher guidelines are. A: This is good feedback. Part of our decision to go above and beyond is to be aggressive here as this is a point where schools are doing really well, but we can consider whether getting a 4 might be worth partial points.	OSSE will implement the following floors and targets and provide additional information that informed this decision: Emotional support: 4.5, 6 Classroom organization: 4.5, 6 Instructional support: 2, 4

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	CLASS (Pre-K only)	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Reconsider the floors and targets used for CLASS. Setting the floor at 4.5 seems arbitrary, and getting 0 points for a 4 (close to the publisher's definition of quality) doesn't make sense. Consider using either the publisher guidelines, or the 10th/90th percentile.</p> <p>Provide data on what the floors and targets would be if 10/90 was used.</p>	<p>OSSE will implement the following floors and targets and provide additional information that informed this decision: Emotional support: 4.5, 6 Classroom organization: 4.5, 6 Instructional support: 2, 4</p>
School Environment	CLASS (Pre-K only)	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Release all CLASS scores for each metric by school (de-identified) and sector so that we can review data to better inform floor and target discussion.</p>	<p>OSSE will implement the following floors and targets and provide additional information that informed this decision: Emotional support: 4.5, 6 Classroom organization: 4.5, 6 Instructional support: 2, 4</p>
School Environment	CLASS (Pre-K only)	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>The decision to conduct observations in different windows according to sectors seems to introduce systematic inequities. OSSE should create a common observation window and randomly assign all schools to be observed within the common window.</p>	<p>CLASS observations will be assigned a three-month window to each sector, so they are observed around the same period of time. Within the three month period, observations days are randomly assigned to ensure that we are not systematically assigning observations days in a biased way.</p>
School Environment	CLASS (Pre-K only)	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>There should be a business rule around the number of cycles per observation, and documented length of cycle within observations (cycles may vary in length from 10-20 minutes -- should be some standardization around this)</p>	<p>OSSE currently requires six cycles of every classroom for 30 minutes.</p>
School Environment	CLASS (Pre-K only)	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Is there a minimum n-size for CLASS observations to be included in the framework? Will a school with one CLASS observation be included in the framework therefore publically linking results to one teacher?</p>	<p>No, there is no minimum number of students for CLASS observations.</p>

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	CLASS (Pre-K only)	LEA/Organization Feedback	Will another tool be used to assess the quality of interactions in the self-contained special education classrooms?	Currently, OSSE will not employ another tool to assess the quality of interactions in the self-contained special education classrooms.
School Environment	CLASS (Pre-K only)	LEA/Organization Feedback	Can OSSE provide additional information about the "Teachstone Endorsed" reliability protocol? Research suggests that there is significant variability in scoring by data collectors. What are the double-coding (co-scoring) by data collector guidelines? Slide 23 notes that 12% of classrooms will be double coded, but what percentage of the data collectors will be double-coded (co-scored)?	OSSE will provide additional information about the "Teachstone Endorsed" reliability protocol in the business rules that will be released.
School Environment	CLASS (Pre-K only)	LEA/Organization Feedback	If a data collector is found to not meet the fidelity requirements, what is the impact on the classroom? Will make-up observations be scheduled?	All data collectors are required to meet reliability requirements before they can observe classrooms. OSSE employs a higher, more rigorous fidelity check than what is recommended by the publisher to ensure high-quality data and conducts checks to ensure the data collectors are meeting the higher fidelity requirements. If a data collector is found to not meet the higher fidelity requirements, the data collector receives additional training; however, a training make-up observation will not be scheduled as the data collector has met the reliability requirements as a pre-requisite to observing classrooms.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

<p>School Environment</p>	<p>CLASS (Pre-K only)</p>	<p>LEA/Organization Feedback</p>	<p>The methodology for determining the points for the CLASS metric is sound; we believe that the business rules will ensure reliable and valid measure of classroom quality.</p> <p>Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies Incentives to improve teaching and learning in Pre-K classrooms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include criterion-referenced target for CLASS, Instructional Support Domain, as an academic achievement and academic progress indicator (rather than school environment indicator) • Recommend using Emotional Support and Classroom Organization domains for school environment Indicator (not Instructional Support). • Consider using measure for Addressing Chronic Absenteeism instead of In-Seat Attendance, given the salience of individual student absenteeism rates to achievement. • Consider including separate indicators for PreK and K-5 academic progress, school environment, addressing chronic absenteeism indicators for PreK programs in elementary schools, in state report cards 	<p>OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration.</p>
---------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------------	---	---

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

<p>School Environment</p>	<p>CLASS (Pre-K only)</p>	<p>LEA/Organization Feedback</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider including a plan for supporting the transition from PreK to Kindergarten (Provision of statewide assessment system such as Teaching Strategies GOLD for PreK-K would provide for better coordination across Division of Early Learning and Elementary divisions, for example). ESSA authorizes support for joint efforts to address transition to elementary school, including issues related to school readiness. Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Include PreK in plan for improving educational outcomes of dual language learners. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While PreK is included in Home Language Survey data collection and the dual language learner screening plan (Preschool IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test (Pre-IPT)), there is no indication of PreK in OSSE's EL Flowchart. We need a flowchart for PreK. • DCPS currently uses Teaching Strategies GOLD Home Language surveys in all PreK programs and would be willing to share that data with OSSE in order to prevent duplication of effort and undue burden on families and teachers. 	<p>OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration.</p>
---------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------------	---	---

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

<p>School Environment</p>	<p>CLASS (Pre-K only)</p>	<p>LEA/Organization Feedback</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We support equal weight allotted to the three domains, Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support for calculating the CLASS portion of the framework. • We strongly support OSSE researching ways to narrow the observation window to ensure an equitable comparison of schools. • OSSE should establish a clear process for reporting concerns regarding CLASS observations. Last year, for example, our observer spent time evaluating recess, which was not an appropriate time to gather data. 	<p>OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration.</p>
---------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------------	--	---

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Domain	Metric	Source	Decision Points/Feedback	OSSE Response
Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	OSSE	What is the growth model methodology?	The growth model methodology will be the Hybrid methodology in which students' baseline scores determine number of years to reach to proficiency but baseline is reset every year to reflect previous growth.
Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	OSSE	Which growth percentile is used to set proficiency growth targets?	The 75% growth percentile will be used to determine the proficiency growth targets.
Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	OSSE	How to address students who previously scored proficient?	Points will be given for students who maintain proficiency. No points will be given for students who do not maintain proficiency.
Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	OSSE	How to handle growth targets that exceed expected time a student is enrolled in school?	The metric will allow growth target to exceed expected enrollment period.
Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	OSSE	How to handle grade repeaters/grader skippers?	The metric will use the data from previous year as the basis for growth target (same methodology as for non-repeaters/non-grade skippers).
Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	OSSE	If/how to remove student-level outliers?	The metric will use the same business rules for determining the student universe as is used for assessment reporting.
Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	OSSE	How to treat recently arrived English Learners?	The metric will use the same business rules for determining the student universe as is used for assessment reporting. The students must be in the achievement universe for both school years.
Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	OSSE	Whether to count a recently arrived English Learner's first year as part of growth?	The metric will use the same business rules for determining the student universe as is used for assessment reporting. The students must be in the achievement universe for both school years.
Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	OSSE	How to address if a student takes the wrong SGPs based on student universe?	The metric will use the same business rules for determining the student universe as is used for assessment reporting.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	OSSE	How to handle 3rd graders who repeat their grade and could calculate growth?	The metric will use the data from previous year as the basis for growth target (same methodology as for non-repeaters/non-grade skippers).
Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: A lot of research says performance levels don't measure anything. Does it matter what scale score the student starts at?</p> <p>A: Percentile is a growth percentile. For example, we examined all 5th grade students at performance level 1 in 2014-15 and examined their change in scale score from 2014-15 to 2015-16. We then ranked this growth in scale scores from highest to lowest and calculated percentiles. A student growing at the 25th percentile on PARCC among the entire population of 5th graders at performance level 1 in 2014-15, showed a decreased in scale score of 8 in 2015-16.</p> <p>Q: Does it matter what scale score they started at?</p> <p>A: When we are creating this universe, it doesn't matter what their scale score is within a given performance level. If we had many years of data, we could potentially explore other methodologies (e.g., examining growth among smaller ranges of scale scores as opposed to performance levels). But since we only have two years of data, examining growth by performance level was the most sound methodology we could come up with while still maintaining sufficient n-sizes by grade.</p>	OSSE provided a response during the meeting.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Where we do not have data, we have to think about what this means for schools. This feels scary given potential consequences.</p> <p>A: In the first version of the state plan, we indicated that we would allow for three years for students to reach proficiency on PARCC. This seemed potentially harsh for students starting at performance level 1. The purpose of exploratory analysis was to determine if the three year time frame is reasonable, and what we found is that the 3 year time frame is not reasonable. This analysis was responsive to the concern over the ambitious three year goal, particularly for students at performance levels 1 and 2.</p>	OSSE provided a response during the meeting.
-----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------	---	--

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Option A</p> <p>FEEDBACK: Growth is not linear, so growth targets should not be linear, especially if you start at different points.</p> <p>RESPONSE: What was described in the initial draft of the state plan was an expectation of three-year linear growth to proficiency. The calculation was a simple subtraction of the current scale score from the target of 750, and dividing by three to determine the target. In conducting exploratory analysis, we created a different methodology based on observed student growth, which set more realistic but ambitious growth targets. To us, the big problem with allowing only three years for students to reach proficiency was that it did a disservice to students starting at performance level 1. Within the parameters of state plan, we are proposing a methodology which makes growth targets ambitious, but realistic, for larger number of students.</p>	OSSE provided a response during the meeting.
Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Option A</p> <p>Q: Floors and targets - why is it three years or five years and not by the time it takes to get to 10th grade? This is the end point.</p> <p>A: That would make it harsher. College and career ready should be by year 16 or 17.</p>	OSSE provided a response during the meeting and offers the following example. A student in 8th grade at proficiency level 1 would be given five years of growth even though this would take them to year 13. If we required students to be proficient by 10th grade, the student would only be given two years of growth, requiring much larger growth targets.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	LEA/Organization Feedback	Option A Q: Is the floor and target based on 10th and 90th percentile?	The metric will have the floor and target based on 10th and 90th percentile.
Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	LEA/Organization Feedback	Option A Q: What happens if you have a 7th grader who is taking Algebra 1 exam? Would the target still be based on 6th grade basic math?	If you have a 7th grader who is taking the Algebra 1 exam, they will be included in the metric; their growth targets will be calculated using the same methodology as all other students in grades 3-8.
Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	LEA/Organization Feedback	When a kid is retained, the next year's target should be based not on the prior year's score but the prior grade's score (so if the 5th grader was retained and repeats 5th grade, the target should be based on her score from 4th grade not the first 5th grade score). It's all about progressing in PARCC as you progress through grades, and also I don't think that comparing growth from 4th to 5th grade PARCC is the same as comparing 5th to 5th grade PARCC.	The metric will use the data from previous year as the basis for growth target (same methodology as for non-repeaters/non-grade skippers).

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Also, my problem I think is boiled down to the fact that this growth model is calculated/based on a student-level analysis, which is why it's so hard to do this right b/c how, without a ton more data points, can you actually model this out effectively with PARCC. But:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What options are there (or does it even exist) for some sort of school-level criterion based growth model? • Put differently, I can see this as a 2x2 quadrant chart where x axis = complexity of measure, and y axis = validity of measure. I think what OSSE is proposing is somewhere high on the x-axis but low on the y axis. I'd rather shoot for something that is simple (low on x axis) and high on validity. Even if it's something that is sort of based on a notion of how much schools are moving kids from level 1 and 2 to level 3 – where they have a chance eventually to be level 4+ later... etc. None of this fake growth target at the student level. 	<p>The growth model methodology will be the Hybrid methodology in which students' baseline scores determine number of years to reach to proficiency but baseline is reset every year to reflect previous growth.</p> <p>Given the size of DC and the number of years over which we have administered PARRC, we do not have sufficient data to create a methodologically robust non-linear growth model. In the future, OSSE will consider adopting a non-linear growth model methodology.</p>
-----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------	---	---

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Some colleagues (who will also comment) have noted that the PARCC scale, while it appears linear, is not actually linear in terms of acquisition of skill expectations. We would need to reread the PARCC tech report, but most assessment scale scoring systems are not based on some sort of linear expectations but with complex calculus instead ... I think that's actually a major deal breaker on this one if true</p>	<p>The growth model methodology will be the Hybrid methodology in which students' baseline scores determine number of years to reach to proficiency but baseline is reset every year to reflect previous growth.</p> <p>Given the size of DC and the number of years over which we have administered PARRC, we do not have sufficient data to create a methodologically robust non-linear growth model. In the future, OSSE will consider adopting a non-linear growth model methodology.</p>
Academic Growth	Growth to Proficiency	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Did you consider splitting performance level 1? Was it more about the number of students in each level?</p> <p>A: We tried different ways. We did not split performance level 1 into two groups because of how the PARCC test is created and described by PARCC, so a lot of students are falling into the performance level 1 group. More students are at that performance level than performance level 2 and 3. Creating an arbitrary cutoff in performance level 1 is not methodologically sound.</p>	OSSE provided a response during the meeting.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Domain	Metric	Source	Decision Points/Feedback	OSSE Response
Academic Growth	Median Growth Percentile	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Why use a one year measurement? Is this etched in stone despite OSSE's report that it fluctuates year-to-year? Traditionally it's true smaller schools can vary from year to year. PARCC MGPs in particular as they have only one year of growth data to go on.</p> <p>A: Yes, this is what will be used for the foreseeable future, but we will be continuing to evaluate this. We will be revisiting calculations like this to determine if improvements are needed in the future.</p>	Two years of growth data will be used when available to create SGPs; students for whom there is only one year of growth data will also be included in the calculation of SGPs. OSSE will use one year of SGPs to determine a school's MGP.
Academic Growth	Median Growth Percentile	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: For the 2016-17 school year informational dry run, it is suggested do a similar analysis for 2015-16 school year data to see how schools are fluctuating.</p> <p>A: We want to make sure there is not a particular grade configuration or school size that ends up fluctuating more than other groups of schools. We will be doing that analysis and monitoring using DC-level SGP vs. consortium level. For example, how many years of data will included in the metric. OSSE feels confident now that consortium level is what we want to use, but OSSE will continue to monitor how schools are performing in the dry run and accountability system.</p>	OSSE provided a response during the meeting.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Growth	Median Growth Percentile	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: If the floors and targets are based on 10th and 90th percentile, What happens if every school turns into a school with an MGP of 50?</p> <p>A: There is the possibility of convergence, so the other part of yearly review is examining the frequencies of scores and how metrics are holding up under real-world conditions. Currently, there is a good range of scores, but we will be watching and revisiting that if needed.</p>	OSSE provided a response during the meeting.
Academic Growth	Median Growth Percentile	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: What if all results of MGPs are similar?</p> <p>A: There is currently a large spread, but if it begins to diminish, the floors and targets may be set on some minimal thresholds. Certainly every 3 years when there is an opportunity for growth targets to change, but OSSE will be looking into it each year.</p>	OSSE provided a response during the meeting.
Academic Growth	Median Growth Percentile	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Will this go into the business rules? If the distribution begins to diminish, OSSE would need to lower the floor that year. LEAs do not want conversation only to start when this happens.</p>	OSSE has not finalized this business rule for the dry run and will seek LEA input to inform this decision.
Academic Growth	Median Growth Percentile	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>FEEDBACK: Please use both years of PARCC data so that we can use with our own LEA level research. LEAs also request that OSSE shares all of the dry runs with LEAs, including using PARCC consortium vs. DC SGPs. One problem over years is that not enough students at advanced levels for those to be robust and students to get positive SGPs.</p>	OSSE will use the state SGPs for calculation of MGPs for Equity Reports and PARCC Consortium SGPs for calculation of MGPs for dry run.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Domain	Metric	Source	Decision Points/Feedback	OSSE Response
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	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).	OSSE acknowledges concerns from schools; however, the N size of 10 is written into OSSE's ESSA state plan and cannot be changed without an amendment.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	OSSE will continue to use PARCC 4+ as the goal as level 4 is the performance level indicator of whether a student is on track or ready for college and careers.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	FEEDBACK: Enrollment Audit vs Start of School: Do not add another validation date for start of school; LEAs do not need more "rosters."	OSSE is not changing the business rules for continuous enrollment and FAY, so there not be additional burden on LEAs to submit or verify rosters.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	FEEDBACK: LEAs have been doing FAY for years, so why change from 85%, there are enough changes with other things - i.e. USPPF	OSSE is not changing its definition of Full Academic Year (FAY).
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	For the 2017-18 school year, the 2016-17 policy on students taking advanced mathematics coursework and assessments in 7th and 8th grade will be maintained. OSSE is working on a waiver with the U.S. Department of Education which will be publicly shared in the coming months.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	The N size is determined within the assessment universe business rules. The testing participation universe is finalized during the Demographic, Enrollment, and Assessment Participation Certification process.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	Q: Are the eligible participants in the denominator? Do eligible participants apply to N sizes, after opt out? Perhaps a mock up is needed.	Eligible participants who are not in a school's achievement universe are not included in the denominator.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ is calculated based on the achievement universe, not on all eligible participants. The 95% participation requirement has been maintained by the U.S. Department of Education.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	FEEDBACK: We should consider changing minimum enrollment dates.	OSSE's policy, consistent with 2016-17, is that a student must be continuously enrolled or not continuously enrolled and received a valid score.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	FEEDBACK: Consider students who have started testing elsewhere - i.e. student started testing in MD and transferred into DC during the timeframe.	If a student begins the testing in another jurisdiction, they will have the ability to take a makeup unit in the DC public or charter school.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	FEEDBACK: DCPS defined an opt-out policy. It included students who are incarcerated. Also medical issues with students was reviewed.	OSSE will maintain its current PARCC business rules.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	FEEDBACK: Focus on students who are incarcerated outside the district.	OSSE will maintain its current PARCC business rules.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	OSSE will maintain its current PARCC business rules.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	FEEDBACK: Define Minimum enrollment days for assessment especially for fluent entry/exit populations.	OSSE's policy, consistent with 2016-17, is that a student must be continuously enrolled or not continuously enrolled and received a valid score.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	OSSE will provide the business rules regarding how it will assign schools with irregular grade configurations to frameworks.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	OSSE has consulted with DCPS and PCSB on its business rules related to re-enrollment and is committed to minimizing burden on LEAs.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	FEEDBACK: Advocating, separate discussion for high school assessments, i.e. use SAT score instead. Some SAT content is not in other assessments.	OSSE hosted a separate meeting on SAT and AP/IB on July 17.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	Begin the discussion about high school assessments and CTE as soon as possible.	OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration. Currently, CTE is not included in the metrics and would require an amendment to its ESSA state plan.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	Maintain the October enrollment count roster and 85% instructional days. Clarify school days versus instructional days.	OSSE will maintain its current PARCC business rules.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	For the dry run, OSSE will provide data for all metrics where the minimum n size and points threshold are met. Following the dry run, OSSE will explore implications for schools that did not meet the threshold for growth.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	Minimum n-size should also apply to CLASS observation data, meaning a school must receive 10 observational scores in order to be included.	There is no minimum number of students for CLASS observations; however, each classroom is observed at least six times.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	Q: What is realistic cut-off for minimal enrollment? A: School testing window is what we use, but there are issues with that.	OSSE's policy, consistent with 2016-17, is that a student must be continuously enrolled or not continuously enrolled and received a valid score.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: If student is enrolled and test, but then in the middle of the window the student transfers, do they count?</p> <p>A: No, we haven't defined "minimally enrolled" This is difficult to determine when the absence is not expected. This may encourage schools to move their testing date later.</p>	OSSE's policy, consistent with 2016-17, is that a student must be continuously enrolled or not continuously enrolled and received a valid score.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: What does the data collection process look like?</p> <p>A: We are looking at different collections and looking into course titles. We want to reduce burden but also be aligned with our goal of matching coursework with testing.</p> <p>Q: Is the vision of OSSE to collect data throughout the year, instead of a one-time collection.</p> <p>A: This will have to be one-time collection initially.</p> <p>Q: Is this about how we're feeding the data or making sure course content aligns with testing standards? How is this different than what we currently send you?</p> <p>A: Want to make sure the course aligns with assessment. Another piece is that all students who should test are not registered.</p>	Although this cannot be implemented for the dry run or the first actual run, OSSE is considering a future collection and verification of relevant course data from LEAs to determine students who should take PARCC/MSAA course-based high school assessments.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	LEA/Organization Feedback	I don't like the move from "continuously" enrolled to "minimally" enrolled for the denominator calculation for PARCC, b/c (a) what's the point then of holding schools to a testing calendar and (b) there are too many one offs/case-by-case situations where a kid's not testing despite being enrolled for 15 days in the window (or whatever benchmark is set) was valid and not manipulative by the school.	OSSE's policy, consistent with 2016-17, is that a student must be continuously enrolled or not continuously enrolled and received a valid score.
Academic Achievement	PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+ PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+	OSSE	How can we standardize the determination of student participation for course-based high school assessments?	Although this cannot be implemented for the dry run or the first actual run, OSSE is considering a future collection and verification of relevant course data from LEAs to determine students who should take PARCC/MSAA course-based high school assessments.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Domain	Metric	Source	Decision Points/Feedback	OSSE Response
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	OSSE	Minimum number of days enrolled to count in this metric	The minimum number of days that a student must enrolled at school to be counted in these metrics is being stage 5 enrolled for 10 instructional days.
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	OSSE	Which enrollment dates are used to determine re-enrollment?	The baseline data to calculate the floor and target are as follows: Dry run: Ever enrolled in the 2015-16 school year compared to reenrolled in 2016-17 school year as of the enrollment audit; and Actual run: Ever enrolled in 2016-17 school year compared to reenrolled in 2017-18 school year as of the enrollment audit.
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	OSSE	Are students who repeat a grade counted toward re-enrollment?	Students who repeat a grade will be counted toward re-enrollment.
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	OSSE	How is adding a grade to a school's grade configuration handled?	A school's terminal grade will be based on the grades served in the accountability year. When a school adds a grade to its grade configuration in the accountability year, all students who were ever enrolled at that school in the previous year will be included in the universe for the re-enrollment metric.
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	OSSE	How is dropping a grade from a school's configuration handled?	A school's terminal grade will be based on the grades served in the accountability year. When a school adds a grade to its grade configuration in the accountability year, all students who were ever enrolled at that school in the previous year will be included in the universe for the re-enrollment metric.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	Re-Enrollment	OSSE	Are students who move within the state but away from their in-boundary school (or other school) included in the student universe?	The metric will not exclude students who move out of boundary. This may be reconsidered after the dry run when DCPS has finalized business rules and enrollment policy.
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	OSSE	Are students with involuntary exits included in the student universe?	The metric will exclude students consistent with the ACGR rules. Also there will be exceptions for students with disabilities who are placed in a nonpublic school or any student who is expelled for federally-mandated reasons.
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: 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 they be included if they move out of boundary?</p> <p>A: Students are encouraged to stay at school of origin if it's where they were beforehand.</p>	A response was provided during the meeting.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

<p>School Environment</p>	<p>Re-Enrollment</p>	<p>LEA/Organization Feedback</p>	<p>Q: 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 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 to choose 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>Q: 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>A: 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>The metric will not exclude students who move out of boundary. This may be reconsidered after the dry run when DCPS has finalized business rules and enrollment policy.</p>
---------------------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	---	--

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: This metric conflicts with our daily reality. Are we required to include it?</p> <p>A: 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>	<p>The metric will exclude students consistent with the ACGR rules. Also there will be exceptions for students with disabilities who are placed in a nonpublic school or any student who is expelled for federally-mandated reasons.</p>
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Isn't there an in-boundary flag?</p> <p>A: 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>Q: 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>A: 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>	<p>The metric will not exclude students who move out of boundary. This may be reconsidered after the dry run when DCPS has finalized business rules and enrollment policy.</p>

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>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?</p> <p>Also, how will the membership tracker with October and March audits impact this?</p>	OSSE is employing ACGR methodology which excludes students who exit to DYRS, and the October and March audits will not impact this scenario.
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>For re-enrollment, PCSB's PMF has a couple of exemptions from the calculation that I think should be included here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	The metric will exclude students consistent with the ACGR rules. Also there will be exceptions for students with disabilities who are placed in a nonpublic school or any student who is expelled for federally-mandated reasons.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	<p>The baseline data to calculate the floor and target are as follows:</p> <p>Dry run: Ever enrolled in the 2015-16 school year compared to reenrolled in 2016-17 school year as of the enrollment audit; and</p> <p>Actual run: Ever enrolled in 2016-17 school year compared to reenrolled in 2017-18 school year as of the enrollment audit.</p>
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	DC PCSB agrees with the recommendation to include all currently enrolled students who are eligible to move into a newly added grade(s).	OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration.
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	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).	The metric will exclude students consistent with the ACGR rules. Also there will be exceptions for students with disabilities who transfer to a nonpublic school or any student who is expelled for federally-mandated reasons.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Goodwill Excel Center has been identified as a school for the alternative accountability system.
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	OSSE will share the student-level data underlying the re-enrollment metric in the release of the dry-run and can provide additional information after the dry run.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	How will OSSE determine baseline data for calculating reenrollment rates?	<p>The baseline data to calculate the floor and target are as follows:</p> <p>Dry run: Ever enrolled in the 2015-16 school year compared to reenrolled in 2016-17 school year as of the enrollment audit; and</p> <p>Actual run: Ever enrolled in 2016-17 school year compared to reenrolled in 2017-18 school year as of the enrollment audit.</p>
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	The metric will not exclude students who move out of boundary. This may be reconsidered after the dry run when DCPS has finalized business rules and enrollment policy.
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	Could there be an appeals process for students with extenuating circumstances (that affect attendance or reenrollment)?	There will not be an appeals process for this metric.
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	Propose that OSSE exclude students if they do not re-enroll but did live in-boundary at a 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.)	The metric will not exclude students who move out of boundary. This may be reconsidered after the dry run when DCPS has finalized business rules and enrollment policy.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration.
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration.
School Environment	Re-Enrollment	LEA/Organization Feedback	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).	OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Domain	Metric	Source	Decision Points/Feedback	OSSE Response
Academic Achievement	SAT Performance	OSSE	How to handle students who take the ACT and SAT?	ACT will not be included in this metric as described in OSSE's revisions to its ESSA state plan.
Academic Achievement	SAT Performance	OSSE	How to determine the SAT Superscore?	The best superscore ever will be used.
Academic Achievement	SAT "College Ready" Benchmark	OSSE	What is the numerator of the SAT "College Ready" Benchmark?	The "College Ready" Benchmark numerator will be the number of students in ACGR cohort minus students who dropped out in 9th or 10th grade meeting/exceeding the "college ready" benchmark.
Academic Achievement	SAT "College Ready" Benchmark	OSSE	What is the denominator of the SAT "College Ready" Benchmark?	The "College Ready" Benchmark denominator will be the ACGR cohort minus students who dropped out in 9th or 10th grade.
Academic Achievement	SAT "College Ready" Benchmark	OSSE	How to set the ACT "College Ready" Benchmark?	ACT will not be included in this metric.
Academic Achievement	SAT DC Percentile Threshold	OSSE	What is the numerator of the SAT DC Percentile Threshold?	The DC Percentile Threshold numerator will be the number of students in ACGR cohort minus students who dropped out in 9th or 10th grade meeting/exceeding the threshold.
Academic Achievement	SAT DC Percentile Threshold	OSSE	What is the denominator of the SAT DC Percentile Threshold?	The DC Percentile Threshold denominator will be ACGR cohort minus students who dropped out in 9th or 10th grade.
Academic Achievement	SAT DC Percentile Threshold	OSSE	Will the percentile threshold for SAT be based on the national or DC 50th percentile?	The metric will use the national 50th percentile for SAT.
Academic Achievement	SAT Performance	LEA/Organization Feedback	What is the plan for including CTE as a component of the HS framework? We understand it is not included at this time, but is OSSE open to incorporating it into the framework further down the road?	Currently, CTE is not included in the metrics and would require an amendment to its ESSA state plan.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Achievement	SAT Performance	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>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. Ninety-nine percent of students who come to the Excel Center are overaged and under-credited and cannot possibly graduate with their cohort.</p> <p>We understand the careful consideration that OSSE gave to the ACT/SAT business rules and we acknowledge that the business rule is appropriate for a traditional high school. But similar to the Four Year Graduation Rate measure, the very nature of our school model and student population renders it impossible for us to be successful (or even score above zero) on this measure. We believe this is clear evidence that The Goodwill Excel Center should be included in the Alternative Framework under ESSA and 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.</p>	Goodwill Excel Center has been identified as a school for the alternative accountability system.
Academic Achievement	SAT Performance	LEA/Organization Feedback	Please clarify whether OSSE will use DC data from ACT to establish the 10th and 90th percentiles, or whether it will use the SAT concordance tables to translate ACT scores to SAT equivalents and then calculate the 10th and 90th percentiles? Both approaches present different problems.	ACT will not be included in this metric as described in OSSE's revisions to its ESSA state plan.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Academic Achievement	SAT Performance	LEA/Organization Feedback	Can business rules reflect that we will revisit this issue if ACT comes out with its own concordance tables? There are issues associated with concordance tables – they’re built off of the populations of kids who take both tests, which is not the full universe of all ACT or all SAT takers and so to use results from the concordance and to apply them to students who take either one or the other is not really appropriate.	ACT will not be included in this metric as described in OSSE's revisions to its ESSA state plan.
Academic Achievement	SAT DC Percentile Threshold	LEA/Organization Feedback	In slide 22, OSSE mentions that they are okay using the national 50th percentile for the ACT/SAT to set that threshold b/c partly b/c it addresses an “LEA concern that calculating the 50th percentile for ACT within DC will result in comparing a limited set of LEAs to each other.” That’s fine, but as they also note, the benchmark itself doesn’t matter as much as where the floors and targets are set. So, if the floors and targets are passed on the 10th/90th percentiles, those are DC-based, right? So it’s still a very limited set of LEAs that are determining the floors and targets, which feels like it leaves the potential for wacky results.	ACT will not be included in this metric as described in OSSE's revisions to its ESSA state plan.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Domain	Topic	Source	Decision Points/Feedback	OSSE Response
All Domains	School Support Designations	OSSE	How to combine three years of data to determine accountability designation?	OSSE will calculate an average over three years.
All Domains	School Support Designations	OSSE	How to weight years of data when calculating an average?	OSSE will calculate a weighted average that emphasizes the most recent year more than past years.
All Domains	School Support Designations	OSSE	How to calculate the average of three years of data?	OSSE will calculate the average data by student population.
All Domains	School Support Designations	OSSE	How to treat schools with less than three years of data?	OSSE will calculate the weighted average using as many years of available data as possible, even if less than three.
All Domains	School Support Designations	OSSE	How often to re-run the bottom 5% threshold for school support designations?	OSSE will re-run the bottom 5% threshold for school support designations every three years.
All Domains	School Support Designations	OSSE	Is the bottom 5% threshold weighted or unweighted?	OSSE will calculate a weighted average that emphasizes the most recent year more than past years.
All Domains	School Support Designations	OSSE	Which year of data to use for the comprehensive support Type II designation?	OSSE will use both the 4- and 5-year graduates that represent the same year of graduation (i.e. different cohorts).
All Domains	School Support Designations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: What are the weights that would be applied to the average?</p> <p>A: We have not determined the exact weights yet because we wanted initial feedback on this proposal before we talk about what the exact weights would be. Other states have identified weights that are approximately 10 percentage points apart, such as 22-33-45.</p>	After the dry run, OSSE will finalize the weights.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	School Support Designations	LEA/Organization Feedback	FEEDBACK: It would be helpful to outline in the business rules which changes are so significant that they would require re-engagement or recalculation similar to the rules.	After the dry run, OSSE will collaborate with LEAs to define this criteria.
All Domains	School Support Designations	LEA/Organization Feedback	You could do a business rule in which a school would have to have had the opportunity to earn 150 points (minimum of 50 per year) in the last three years for it to count?	OSSE's ESSA state plan requires that schools are assigned school support designations at least every three years. To include as many schools as possible in this calculation, OSSE will use the number of years that are available.
All Domains	School Support Designations	LEA/Organization Feedback	This appears to be toughest on middle schools in the first year they open with a tested grade. Maybe these schools could get a grace year even though the designate for a star rating. This doesn't seem to be an equitable solution and needs a business rule specifically for middle schools.	OSSE's ESSA state plan requires that schools are assigned school support designations at least every three years. To include as many schools as possible in this calculation, OSSE will use the number of years that are available.
All Domains	School Support Designations	LEA/Organization Feedback	For the 3-year designation, we recommend there be at least two years of data (out of the three) to develop an overall score or a subgroup score. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would remove first year schools from receiving a designation and schools with very low n-size in a subgroup. If a school only reaches 10 students in a subgroup one year (and has less than 10 in the other two years), the school should not receive a designation. • A first-year school should not be eligible to receive a designation. 	OSSE's ESSA state plan requires that schools are assigned school support designations at least every three years. To include as many schools as possible in this calculation, OSSE will use the number of years that are available.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	School Support Designations	LEA/Organization Feedback	We recommend OSSE reconsider using a larger n-size than 10 students for accountability purposes. Schools with small n-sizes may experience fluctuations from year to year that may then result in having designations based on fewer than three years' worth of data. OSSE should explore business rules that will prevent a school from falling into targeted support based on just one year of subgroup performance.	OSSE acknowledges concerns from schools; however, the N size of 10 is written into OSSE's ESSA state plan and cannot be changed without an amendment.
	School Support Designations	LEA/Organization Feedback	New schools with only one year of data should not be compared to established schools for the purposes of making support designations. The comparison is not valid, and a support designation should reflect persistent performance problems rather than a (possibly) short-term challenge. We recommend that OSSE consider a grace period whereby a school would not be identified for comprehensive or targeted support until two or three years of STAR ratings are available.	OSSE's ESSA state plan requires that schools are assigned school support designations at least every three years. To include as many schools as possible in this calculation, OSSE will use the number of years that are available.
All Domains	School Support Designations	LEA/Organization Feedback	Given that OSSE is federally required to publicly report a school's support designation, we encourage OSSE to report them in a way that is non-prominent and avoids confusion with a school's one-year STAR rating.	OSSE acknowledges this concern and will work with LEAs and other stakeholders to determine how to present this information on the report card in ways that minimize potential confusion.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	School Support Designations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>It is impossible to evaluate the pros and cons of different methods of combining three years of data without a more detailed understanding of how different weights and methods would work. Request that OSSE provide more detailed examples illustrating its recommendations, and run some models illustrating how different decisions would work in practice.</p>	<p>OSSE will provide this information after it conducts the dry run as the dry run is necessary to generate this information.</p>
All Domains	School Support Designations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Addressing Students with Disabilities in the STAR Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools have differing proportions of students with disabilities at each level (i.e., levels 1 through 4). Schools serving large populations of level 4 students will be <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • disproportionately impacted in the framework in the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Scores for academic growth and achievement will be lowered for both overall and subgroup calculations (the point system assigns 10 points to this subgroup as opposed to 5 points for other subgroups.) o These schools will be more likely to receive a targeted designation based on the students with disabilities subgroup. • We request a meeting to discuss this topic with the larger school community 	<p>OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration.</p>

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	School Support Designations	LEA/Organization Feedback	Consider a business rule that states “Schools (and subgroups) must have been able to earn a grand total of 150 points under the STAR system in the last 3 years to qualify for a 3-year Designation Score. For schools (or subgroups) with less than 150 total possible STAR points then OSSE may include a 4th or 5th prior year of STAR data. If no additional 4th or 5th prior year is available, then OSSE will give the school (or subgroup) a “3-year” designation after the school year in which the total possible STAR points finally reaches 150 and then the school (or subgroup) will follow the typical OSSE 3-year cycle moving forward	OSSE's ESSA state plan requires that schools are assigned school support designations at least every three years. To include as many schools as possible in this calculation, OSSE will use the number of years that are available.
All Domains	School Support Designations	LEA/Organization Feedback	OSSE should reconsider waiting 3 years after initial designations for high school due to the introduction of the growth measure in the intervening years. Currently, there is too little data to commit to the timing proposed for designating HS status.	OSSE will not delay assigning school support designations for high schools.
All Domains	Floors and Targets	LEA/Organization Feedback	OSSE should consider waiting until SY18-19 to begin instituting the 3-yr designations and cycle. There could be a temporary designation using the one-year SY17-18 data for the year SY18-19, and then use 2 years of data to begin the 3-year designation cycle instituted in SY19-20. OR Use unofficial results from the SY16-17 “dry run” conducted this fall in the first 3-yr designation score calculations next summer/fall.	Per OSSE's ESSA state plan, OSSE cannot delay designations until the 18-19 school year.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Domain	Topic	Source	Decision Points/Feedback	OSSE Response
All Domains	Economically Disadvantaged	OSSE	Should we change the definition of “economically disadvantaged”?	OSSE will change the current definition of economically disadvantaged.
All Domains	Economically Disadvantaged	OSSE	If we do change the definition of “economically disadvantaged”, what will the new definition be?	OSSE will use the at-risk definition, which is "a student-level designation based on TANF, SNAP, CFSA, homeless status, or one year older than the expected age for their grade and in high school." OSSE will provide data that informed this decision.
All Domains	Economically Disadvantaged	OSSE	If we do change the definition of “economically disadvantaged”, do we change for all students, or only students attending CEP schools?	OSSE will use the at-risk definition for all students.
All Domains	Economically Disadvantaged	OSSE	If we do change the definition of “economically disadvantaged”, do we change it only for accountability purposes, or do we implement the change across the agency?	OSSE will only change the definition for accountability and reporting purposes.
All Domains	Economically Disadvantaged	OSSE	Should economic disadvantage be a student-level designation or can it change when students change schools within a given school year?	Within a given school year, each student should only have one “economic disadvantage” designation.
All Domains	Economically Disadvantaged	OSSE	For determining “over age”, what data source should be used?	OSSE will use the grade as reflected in the end of year demographic certification.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Economically Disadvantaged	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>The recommendation to change the definition of Economically Disadvantaged is a major shift that requires much more discussion. If the definition is changed, we agree with the recommendation to continue using FARMS numbers for school-level designations and for all purposes not related to ESSA Accountability. Again, this is a significant shift, and we would be uncomfortable with making such a change without the opportunity for additional discussion and modeling of potential consequences, particularly if funding were to be affected.</p>	<p>OSSE will use the at-risk definition, which is "a student-level designation based on TANF, SNAP, CFSA, homeless status, or one year older than the expected age for their grade and in high school."</p> <p>OSSE will only change the definition for accountability and reporting purposes.</p>
All Domains	Economically Disadvantaged	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>The recommendation to change the definition of Economically Disadvantaged is a major shift that requires much more discussion. Use of the At-Risk definition would result in a much smaller subgroup across the city and would mean that many schools that currently report on FARMS students for accountability purposes would no longer have a reportable economically disadvantaged subgroup.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We recommend OSSE conduct state-level analysis to compare the impact of each of the proposed definitions for Economically Disadvantaged to gauge the impact of specific categories (i.e. Direct Certification, FARMS, over-age) before changing this definition. 	<p>OSSE will use the at-risk definition, which is "a student-level designation based on TANF, SNAP, CFSA, homeless status, or one year older than the expected age for their grade and in high school." OSSE will provide data that informed this decision.</p>

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Economically Disadvantaged	LEA/Organization Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommendation to change the definition of Economically Disadvantaged is a major shift that requires much more discussion. Use of the At-Risk definition would result in a much smaller subgroup across the city and would mean that many schools that currently report on FARM students for accountability purposes would no longer have a reportable economically disadvantaged subgroup. The rationale for such a disruptive change is not compelling. • If the definition is changed, agree with the recommendation to continue using FARM numbers for school-level designations and for all purposes not related to ESSA accountability. 	<p>OSSE will use the at-risk definition, which is "a student-level designation based on TANF, SNAP, CFSA, homeless status, or one year older than the expected age for their grade and in high school."</p> <p>OSSE will only change the definition for accountability and reporting purposes.</p>
All Domains	Economically Disadvantaged	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Defining Economically Disadvantaged</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We propose maintaining the current definition of economically disadvantaged. The at-risk definition presented has the potential to under identify students who are economically disadvantaged. We would prefer to err on the side of over identify than under to ensure that these students receive needed support. Additionally, having multiple definitions may create confusion and unintended consequences around funding and programmatic decisions in the future by those who are not familiar with the historical context. Given the lack of ideal alternatives for changing the definitions, we recommend maintaining the current definition. 	<p>OSSE will use the at-risk definition, which is "a student-level designation based on TANF, SNAP, CFSA, homeless status, or one year older than the expected age for their grade and in high school."</p>

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Economically Disadvantaged	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Schools in wards 7 and 8 have historically served higher proportions of students categorized as economically disadvantaged (based on the federal definition). Changing the definition to only encompass at-risk based on OSSE's definition could disproportionately impact schools in these wards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We request that OSSE provides an analysis on how changing the definition of economically disadvantaged to at-risk would impact results in the model. • The recommendation to change the definition of Economically Disadvantaged is a major shift that requires much more discussion. Use of the At-Risk definition would result in a much smaller subgroup across the city and would mean that many schools that currently report on FARMs students for accountability purposes would no longer have a reportable economically disadvantaged subgroup. The rationale for such a disruptive change is not compelling. • If the definition is changed, agree with the recommendation to continue using FARMs numbers for school-level designations and for all purposes not related to ESSA accountability. 	<p>OSSE will use the at-risk definition, which is "a student-level designation based on TANF, SNAP, CFSA, homeless status, or one year older than the expected age for their grade and in high school." OSSE will provide data that informed this decision.</p>
-------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	--	---

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Domain	Topic	Source	Decision Points/Feedback	OSSE Response
All Domains	Floors and Targets	OSSE	How often to recalculate floors and targets?	OSSE will re-evaluate floors and targets every three years.
All Domains	Floors and Targets	OSSE	What is the level at which floors and targets will be calculated?	OSSE will calculate floors and targets for groups of students at the school level.
All Domains	Floors and Targets	OSSE	If/how to set minimum level of dispersion and recognize success when setting floors/targets?	OSSE will evaluate and address this after the dry run.
All Domains	Floors and Targets	OSSE	If/how to include students in schools without frameworks?	Students who attend schools that do not meet the minimum point threshold will still be included in setting floors and targets.
All Domains	Floors and Targets	OSSE	If/how to include students in schools with irregular grade configurations that serve only one grade level outside the traditional grade configuration?	OSSE will calculate floors and targets by including the students in the grade level outside the traditional grade configuration in the framework that is used to create the STAR rating. For example, a school serving grades 6-9 will have their students included in setting floors and targets for the Middle School framework.
All Domains	Floors and Targets	OSSE	If/how to include students in schools with irregular grade configurations that serve two or more grade levels outside the traditional grade configuration?	OSSE will calculate floors and targets by including the students in the frameworks that are used to create the STAR rating. For example, a school serving grades 6-10 will have their students 6-8 grade students included in setting floors and targets for the Middle School framework and 9-10 grade students included in setting floors and targets for the High School framework.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Floors and Targets	OSSE	How to calculate floors and targets for the K-8 framework?	OSSE will create floors and targets based on the traditional grade configurations described in OSSE's ESSA state plan: Grades K-5 (Elementary); Grades 6-8 (Middle) and Grades 9-12 (High School). Schools serving only one grade level outside the traditional grade configuration will receive one framework score whereas school serving two or more grade levels outside the traditional grade configuration will receive two or more framework scores. Schools will be assigned an overall summative score based on the relative populations of students served under each framework in addition to receiving separate framework scores.
All Domains	Floors and Targets	OSSE	How to set floors and targets for metrics that have long-term goals defined in OSSE's ESSA state plan: PARCC/MSAA and ACGR?	OSSE will calculate floors and targets by calculating the 10th and 90th percentiles and adjusting for the long-term goal defined in OSSE's ESSA state plan.
All Domains	Floors and Targets	OSSE	How to set floors and targets for metrics that do not have long-term goals defined in OSSE's ESSA state plan: alternate graduation, MGP, and Growth to proficiency?	OSSE will calculate floors and targets by calculating the 10th and 90th percentiles.
All Domains	Floors and Targets	OSSE	How to set floors and targets for metrics that do not have long-term goals defined in OSSE's ESSA state plan but do have significant research available: CLASS?	OSSE will calculate floors and targets by utilizing available local and national research.
All Domains	Floors and Targets	LEA/Organization Feedback	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.	A response was provided at the meeting, and after the dry run, floors and targets will be re-evaluated every three years.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Floors and Targets	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Is it possible to create a business rule that is similar that one in the PMF that sets conditions about how high the floor can jump (e.g. it cannot do so more than 33 percent)?</p> <p>A: This is helpful feedback, and we'll evaluate this as a potential additional business rule.</p>	OSSE will evaluate and address this after the dry run.
All Domains	Floors and Targets	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Can we have an overarching business rule that accounts for significant shifts like changing assessment, etc.?</p> <p>A: We will look into creating a business rule like this.</p>	OSSE will evaluate and address this after the dry run.
All Domains	Floors and Targets	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Even though our middle school starts in grade 5, those students would be included in elementary school framework?</p> <p>A: It is worth having a separate discussion on this because you have different grade bands you have decided for elementary school and middle school. I know this is complicated. We have many grade configurations with upwards of 30 in the state.</p>	OSSE will create floors and targets based on the traditional grade configurations described in OSSE's ESSA state plan: Grades K-5 (Elementary); Grades 6-8 (Middle) and Grades 9-12 (High School). Schools serving only one grade level outside the traditional grade configuration will receive one framework score whereas school serving two or more grade levels outside the traditional grade configuration will receive two or more framework scores. Schools will be assigned an overall summative score based on the relative populations of students served under each framework in addition to receiving separate framework scores.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Floors and Targets	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>I understand about floors and targets, but there are not definitions for how schools fall into the four frameworks.</p> <p>A: We need to provide more clarifications about this.</p>	<p>OSSE will create floors and targets based on the traditional grade configurations described in OSSE's ESSA state plan: Grades K-5 (Elementary); Grades 6-8 (Middle) and Grades 9-12 (High School). Schools serving only one grade level outside the traditional grade configuration will receive one framework score whereas school serving two or more grade levels outside the traditional grade configuration will receive two or more framework scores. Schools will be assigned an overall summative score based on the relative populations of students served under each framework in addition to receiving separate framework scores.</p>
All Domains	Floors and Targets	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Please consider an additional business rule for the floors and targets that they will not change more than x% when recalculated. Because the floors and targets are only changing every three years, the following year could see large shifts. The additional business rule would help to mitigate large shifts in scores. DC PCSB includes a business rule that a floor or target will not change more than 33.3% for the PMF.</p>	<p>OSSE will evaluate and address this after the dry run.</p>

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Floors and Targets	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>DC PCSB strongly advocates against two star ratings for a single PK-8 campus. The plan submitted to the Department of Education (DOE) has a single rating plan for PK-8 schools and this should be maintained. Two ratings for a single campus at the PK-8 level is confusing for accountability and for parents.</p>	<p>OSSE will create floors and targets based on the traditional grade configurations described in OSSE's ESSA state plan: Grades K-5 (Elementary); Grades 6-8 (Middle) and Grades 9-12 (High School). Schools serving only one grade level outside the traditional grade configuration will receive one framework score whereas school serving two or more grade levels outside the traditional grade configuration will receive two or more framework scores. Schools will be assigned an overall summative score based on the relative populations of students served under each framework in addition to receiving separate framework scores.</p>
All Domains	Floors and Targets	LEA/Organization Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We strongly encourage OSSE to establish rules to clearly outline what qualifies as a “significant change” to the accountability framework that would prompt a revision to the floors/ceilings or timing of determinations, including the process for how business rules will be adjusted. 	<p>OSSE will evaluate and address this after the dry run.</p>

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Floors and Targets	LEA/Organization Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSSE should also establish a process to address and define a significant change to any assessment included in the accountability framework (i.e. changes to the SAT/PSAT). • These rules should also address what happens when/if assessments change and define what a significant change to the assessment may be (e.g. changes in SAT/PSAT). • We recommend OSSE exclude outliers when calculating the floors and targets of each metric. We also add a maximum increase of floors and maximum decrease of targets. • Currently, OSSE is proposing to revise the floors and targets for every metric on a three-year cycle only using the data from the year before the revision. We strongly recommend that OSSE base these calculations on an average of the three previous in order to control for random fluctuations in data year to year. 	OSSE will evaluate and address this after the dry run.
All Domains	Floors and Targets	LEA/Organization Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PCSB sets floors and targets for metrics on the elementary and middle school PMF based on an average of all K- 8 students in the charter sector. PCSB made this decision after conducting analysis to compare the averages of only elementary and only middle grades and did not find a meaningful difference between the two. We recommend that OSSE conduct a similar analysis to determine if the results of elementary and middle are different enough to warrant the additional complication of issuing two STAR ratings to K-8 schools. 	OSSE will evaluate and address this after the dry run.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Floors and Targets	LEA/Organization Feedback	Floor and target measures should be modeled to determine if choices have disproportionate impact on any particular grade configuration.	OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration.
All Domains	Floors and Targets	LEA/Organization Feedback	PK-8th grade campuses should not receive two separate STAR ratings. This is confusing and inconsistent with the ESSA plan. Possible ways to create a single rating include: 1. Calculate the floor and target for each grade combination using all students in these grades across the city. So for a PK-8 school's attendance rate, take school level rates for each school in the city that has any combination of PK-8 grades and then calculate the 10th and 90th percentiles. 2. Base the amount of points allocated for each measure on n size. For the 10 points allocated for PARCC 4+ ELA, if a school has 60% of students in grades 3-5 and 40% of students in grades 6-8, display both rates of PARCC ELA 4+ with the aligned floor and target but then give 6 of the possible points to grades 3-5 and 4 possible points to grades 6-8.	OSSE will create floors and targets based on the traditional grade configurations described in OSSE's ESSA state plan: Grades K-5 (Elementary); Grades 6-8 (Middle) and Grades 9-12 (High School). Schools serving only one grade level outside the traditional grade configuration will receive one framework score whereas school serving two or more grade levels outside the traditional grade configuration will receive two or more framework scores. Schools will be assigned an overall summative score based on the relative populations of students served under each framework in addition to receiving separate framework scores.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Floors and Targets	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Consider a business rule that limits the size of any jump in the floor from one year to the next. (The PMF has a rule that could be used as an example.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rules should be set to define what qualifies as “major changes” to the frameworks that would require revisiting floors/ceilings or timing of determinations, and should lay out a process for how business rules would be adjusted. These rules should also address what happens when/if assessments change and define what a significant change to the assessment may be (e.g. changes in SAT/PSAT). 	OSSE will evaluate and address this after the dry run.
-------------	--------------------	---------------------------	---	--

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

Domain	Topic	Source	Decision Points/Feedback	OSSE Response
All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	OSSE	Dynamic schools with irregular grade configuration that do not have sufficient points	Dynamic schools serving only one grade level outside the traditional grade configuration will not have the students in that single grade included in the framework calculation.
All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	OSSE	Static schools that do not have sufficient points for both frameworks	Static schools serving only one grade level outside the traditional grade configuration will have the students in that single grade included in the framework calculation.
All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	OSSE	How to assign STAR rating to schools with irregular grade configurations	The following traditional grade configurations will be used to determine which frameworks will be calculated for a given school: Grades K-5 (Elementary); Grades 6-8 (Middle) and Grades 9-12 (High School). Schools serving only one grade level outside the traditional grade configuration will receive one framework score (e.g., a school serving grades 6-9 will receive a Middle School framework score only), whereas school serving two or more grade levels outside the traditional grade configuration will receive two or more framework scores (e.g., a school serving grades 6-10 will receive a Middle School framework score and a High School framework score). Schools will be assigned an overall summative score based on the relative populations of students served under each framework in addition to receiving separate framework scores.
All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	OSSE	How to combine multiple scores into one STAR rating?	OSSE will weight the ratings based on student population falling into each framework

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Our concern at PCSB is a grade without growth should not be rated – i.e. schools serving grades PK3 to3. Is there consideration of not rating these since it is based only on achievement? Either advocating no star rating but only a report card or is there interest in looking at alternative growth measure so parents have more information on schools that do not have enough points for a rating?</p> <p>A: The minimum threshold of 50 points was designed to ensure there was a substantial number of metrics making up the star rating. As a consequence, certain grade configurations may have enough points even though they are missing certain metrics, like growth. The initial way this will play out is for a school in a situation would still receive star rating because it is over the 50-point threshold. The 50-point threshold was designed to ensure (in the case of schools with no PARCC scores) that we avoid an unreliable score because it is based totally on re-enrollment and attendance, in other words, not enough metrics to comprise a star rating. But we also know that by having a threshold, there will be some borderline cases and we will be considering them. As that bucket of schools gets more populated, we may need to consider having additional metrics for those schools.</p>	<p>For the dry run, OSSE will provide data for all metrics where the minimum n size and points threshold are met. Following the dry run, OSSE will explore implications for schools that did not meet the threshold for growth.</p>
-------------	---	---------------------------	---	---

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Based on public comments submitted, will OSSE be open to considering for 2017-18 school year?</p> <p>A: Understand no growth issue. We need to take a look at what some of the options are at this point. There is a couple of different ways to approach and address it. In short, OSSE is going to be keeping this considerations in mind moving forward. One of possibilities is to consider alternative frameworks.</p>	OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration.
All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: What about schools serving grades PK3 to 3?</p> <p>A: Schools would not have enough for MGP, so they could have a total of 60, but it depends on the minimal student threshold for N size in student groups.</p> <p>FEEDBACK: Our schools serving grades PK3 to 3, the 3rd grade is 15%-17% of the student population would equal 55% of the STAR rating. This is a high percentage for a little group at the school because they are the only students taking PARCC. This will disproportionately attribute to the star rating.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Some of that is also a consideration for other grade configurations, as well, such as high school students taking PARCC. Those taking PARCC will contribute disproportionately to star rating. Those students, if they remain, could possibly be contributing.</p>	OSSE values your feedback and has taken it into consideration.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: If it is a school serving grades 6-12, you will not get a middle school rating and a high school rating, if the populations are not the right size?</p> <p>A: We have scenarios with both frameworks meeting the minimum and frameworks where only one is meeting it. Along with that, we have instances where the grades served by a school are static and where they are changing. Where both frameworks meet the minimum point threshold and grade levels are static, we are proposing giving schools two scores. Similarly, with changing grade levels, where minimum thresholds are met, we would also propose schools having two scores. Where it gets more complicated is when only one grade configuration meets the minimum point threshold. Where there are static grade levels, we propose applying the middle schools framework to high school. For the scenario we gave earlier for a school with grades 6-9, we would propose a middle school framework. For changing grade levels, we would exclude those grades without sufficient points.</p>	<p>The following traditional grade configurations will be used determine which frameworks will be calculated for a given school: Grades K-5 (Elementary); Grades 6-8 (Middle) and Grades 9-12 (High School). Schools serving only one grade level outside the traditional grade configuration will receive one framework score (e.g., a school serving grades 6-9 will receive a Middle School framework score only), whereas school serving two or more grade levels outside the traditional grade configuration will receive two or more framework scores (e.g., a school serving grades 6-10 will receive a Middle School framework score and a High School framework score). Schools will be assigned an overall summative score based on the relative populations of students served under each framework in addition to receiving separate framework scores.</p>
All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: In the case of attendance, is it one full rate banded together, or are they separated?</p>	<p>They will be calculated for groups of students at the framework level and would then be combined using a weighted average based on student population.</p>

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Are you lumping all grade 6-12 students together where applicable? Is the ISA one full rate or is it divided based on grade band?</p>	<p>They will be calculated for groups of students at the framework level and would then be combined using a weighted average based on student population.</p>
All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: Unique case: A school serving grades 8-12 that has a big enough N size that it would meet elementary-middle, in this case, that school would have both ratings?</p>	<p>The following traditional grade configurations will be used determine which frameworks will be calculated for a given school: Grades K-5 (Elementary); Grades 6-8 (Middle) and Grades 9-12 (High School). Schools serving only one grade level outside the traditional grade configuration will receive one framework score (e.g., a school serving grades 6-9 will receive a Middle School framework score only), whereas school serving two or more grade levels outside the traditional grade configuration will receive two or more framework scores (e.g., a school serving grades 6-10 will receive a Middle School framework score and a High School framework score). Schools will be assigned an overall summative score based on the relative populations of students served under each framework in addition to receiving separate framework scores.</p>

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: This is confusing for static versus changing. Is this similar to schools serving grades 6-9 scenario? Just one rating?</p> <p>A: We would group 9th graders and apply the middle school framework because it is a permanent configuration. If we applied minimum points threshold, we would arrive in situation where 9th graders were never counted and school never held accountable for the performance of those students.</p>	A response was provided at the meeting.
All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>FEEDBACK: But this is static - they are 8th graders - there would be no problem for not meeting those measures.</p> <p>RESPONSE: If 8th graders alone meet the minimum threshold, then that would be separate. In scenario where they did not, we would group them so the school would be held accountable still for them. We do not want a situation where students are never included in any metric.</p>	OSSE updated this business rule with its revisions to the ESSA state plan. The following traditional grade configurations will be used determine which frameworks will be calculated for a given school: Grades K-5 (Elementary); Grades 6-8 (Middle) and Grades 9-12 (High School). Schools serving only one grade level outside the traditional grade configuration will receive one framework score (e.g., a school serving grades 6-9 will receive a Middle School framework score only), whereas school serving two or more grade levels outside the traditional grade configuration will receive two or more framework scores (e.g., a school serving grades 6-10 will receive a Middle School framework score and a High School framework score). Schools will be assigned an overall summative score based on the relative populations of students served under each framework in addition to receiving separate framework scores.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: We are talking about STAR rating. But there is another side to accountability system - classifications. Is it our thought that a school serving grades 6-12 that also meets minimum criteria for both frameworks then would have two classifications or do we not know yet?</p> <p>A: I think we have discussed possibility of having two classifications.</p>	OSSE is still considering this decision point and will provide its final decision as part of the business rules that will be released with the dry run.
All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Q: How will OSSE determine if a school is static or changing?</p> <p>A: In the charter sector, we will use what they apply for in their charter. In DCPS, we will have conversations about whether schools intend to change grade configurations.</p> <p>FEEDBACK: Consider a deadline that makes sense (like August 1) for when we identify schools as static or changing.</p>	A response was provided at the meeting.

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	LEA/Organization Feedback	Schools should only receive a STAR rating on the ES/MS framework if they meet the minimum points AND have the state approved growth measure included.	The following traditional grade configurations will be used determine which frameworks will be calculated for a given school: Grades K-5 (Elementary); Grades 6-8 (Middle) and Grades 9-12 (High School). Schools serving only one grade level outside the traditional grade configuration will receive one framework score (e.g., a school serving grades 6-9 will receive a Middle School framework score only), whereas school serving two or more grade levels outside the traditional grade configuration will receive two or more framework scores (e.g., a school serving grades 6-10 will receive a Middle School framework score and a High School framework score). Schools will be assigned an overall summative score based on the relative populations of students served under each framework in addition to receiving separate framework scores.
-------------	---	---------------------------	---	---

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>For schools split across two frameworks – we propose that the school must have at least two grades operated in the other framework to receive two ratings. This allows a 6-9 to stay on ES/MS (as already proposed), but also allows only one framework for a 8-12.</p>	<p>The following traditional grade configurations will be used determine which frameworks will be calculated for a given school: Grades K-5 (Elementary); Grades 6-8 (Middle) and Grades 9-12 (High School). Schools serving only one grade level outside the traditional grade configuration will receive one framework score (e.g., a school serving grades 6-9 will receive a Middle School framework score only), whereas school serving two or more grade levels outside the traditional grade configuration will receive two or more framework scores (e.g., a school serving grades 6-10 will receive a Middle School framework score and a High School framework score). Schools will be assigned an overall summative score based on the relative populations of students served under each framework in addition to receiving separate framework scores.</p>
-------------	---	---------------------------	--	--

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

<p>All Domains</p>	<p>Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations</p>	<p>LEA/Organization Feedback</p>	<p>No Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eager to know about the process for report cards once the process has been determined. How would information in report card be reported publicly and how would OSSE communicate regarding any potential confusion regarding the difference between a report card and a star rating? • Given that 50-point minimum for receiving a framework, it appears that new growing elementary schools (starting with kindergarten/1st grade) and high schools (starting with 9th grade) will not have a framework (and therefore no star rating). For consistency and fairness across school types, we suggest that new growing middle schools also not have a framework (or star rating) starting in their first year. 	<p>OSSE looks forward to ongoing engagement with LEAs on how information will be presented on the report card.</p>
--------------------	--	----------------------------------	---	--

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>Multiple Frameworks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the event that a “static” school becomes a “growing” school, suggest that there is a deadline for saying/process for determining that the school is a growing school. Suggest there be a deadline of August 1st. • Agree with using 2 star ratings for schools serving both middle schools and high schools but OSSE should consider how to communicate this transparently to the public and provide guidance to schools on how to communicate this to families. OSSE should come back to the feedback group to share how multiple frameworks will be reported and obtain feedback around communication strategy. 	OSSE will evaluate and address this after the dry run.
-------------	---	---------------------------	---	--

STAR Framework: Summary of LEA Feedback and OSSE's Responses

All Domains	Schools with Irregular Grade Configurations	LEA/Organization Feedback	<p>We thoroughly disagree with the presented business rules that will generate multiple ratings for our schools. We understand the premise of using the most comparable data for every school's rating when determining the school's performance against a floor and target. There are many ways OSSE can accomplish this goal without generating multiple confusing overall ratings. For example, OSSE could create individual floors and targets for the performance of each grade level, and then calculate a weighted aggregate performance score for the school based on the number of tested students in each grade.</p>	<p>The following traditional grade configurations will be used determine which frameworks will be calculated for a given school: Grades K-5 (Elementary); Grades 6-8 (Middle) and Grades 9-12 (High School). Schools serving only one grade level outside the traditional grade configuration will receive one framework score (e.g., a school serving grades 6-9 will receive a Middle School framework score only), whereas school serving two or more grade levels outside the traditional grade configuration will receive two or more framework scores (e.g., a school serving grades 6-10 will receive a Middle School framework score and a High School framework score). Schools will be assigned an overall summative score based on the relative populations of students served under each framework in addition to receiving separate framework scores.</p>
-------------	---	---------------------------	--	--