The meeting opened at 9:30 a.m. and concluded at 12:00 p.m. Attendees, items of discussion, discussion highlights, and public comments are below.

Attendees Included:

- LEA Staff: Keisha Brinkley (Appoquinimink); Darren Guido (Caesar Rodney); Joseph Jones (New Castle County Vo-Tech); Chris Havrilla (Woodbridge); Lisa Morris (Delmar); Ken Hutchins (Appoquinimink); *Not present:* Carisa Pepper (Indian River); Ed Emmett (Positive Outcomes Charter School)
- DDOE Staff: Luke Rhine; Raifu Durodoye; Terry Richard; Jen Koester; Ted Jarrell; Chantel Janiszewski; Gregory Fulkerson
- Members of the Public: Atnre Alleyne, Delaware CAN; Kendall Massett, Delaware Charter Schools Network; Deb Stevens, Delaware State Education Association; Tammy Croce, Delaware Association of School Administrators; Donna Johnson, Delaware State Board of Education

Items for Discussion:

- The On Track in 9th Grade metric area business rules were distributed and reviewed.
- Revised Academic Achievement business rules based on recommendations received from Meeting 2 were distributed. Revised Graduation Rate business rules are also available for review.
- The proposed growth to target methodology was shared and reviewed in depth. Data modeling results were discussed.
- Next steps were discussed:
    - Next meeting is June 16, 1:30 to 4:00 p.m., in the Cabinet Room of the Townsend Building. Chronic Absenteeism and College and Career Preparedness metric areas will be discussed.
    - Last meeting for the 16-17 school year will be the end of June. A Doodle poll will be distributed soon to determine the date/time. The new Progress toward English Language Proficiency indicator will be discussed.
    - Weighting and overall index calculations discussions will take place in mid to late summer, once DDOE has received feedback from USED regarding its state plan submission.

Discussion Highlights:
- On Track in 9th Grade
    - Recommendations included:
        - Keep the existing definition.
        - Keep the school-level bonus for students who were in the bottom 25th percentile of performance in 8th grade and earned enough credits in 9th grade to be on track to graduate on time.
        - Keep the special rule for students with disabilities with an IEP that targets graduation in more than four years (i.e., certificate track). These students will be

considered to have met the core credit expectation that corresponds with their specific IEP for 9th grade.

- Consider how to address recently arrived English learners who are placed in 9th grade regardless of age because of having no formal record of education history. The Language Acquisition workgroup is currently finalizing a field on the Home Language Survey that would identify a recently arrived English learner's prior education history in the US, and technical assistance will be provided in the near future. It was also suggested that an existing flag in eSchool could be helpful in identifying which students fall into this category. The Data Management Group will consider options for the 17-18 school year and this conversation will continue with the Discussion Group.

- Growth to target methodology (school accountability):
  - Acknowledgments were made to those who have contributed research, data, and input to the development of the proposed growth to target methodology.
  - Proposed model is criterion referenced - based on the vertical scale score of the assessment.
  - Philosophy:
    - *All* students can and should show growth.
    - Growth should be transparent at the student level and reflect the student's individual starting point, void of any preconceived notions of growth based on that student's characteristics.
    - Growth will be variable depending on the student's achievement level for the previous year.
    - Recognizes the request from stakeholder feedback that we have a growth model that is easily understood, replicable at the LEA level, and provides disaggregated student-level data accessible at the teacher, school, district, and state levels—our current model does not provide this information, which is also required by ESSA.
  - Growth tables were shared and a detailed explanation of how growth targets were determined was discussed. Growth targets would be revisited every three years for adjustment as needed.
  - This proposed growth methodology is currently applicable for grades 3-8 as SAT is used for the high school level in grade 11. The grade 10 PSAT is being considered for use in calculating growth at the high school. This may require extra time as the PSAT is not currently part of the accountability system.
  - The difference between growth index (percent of target achieved) and growth rate were discussed.
  - Growth of the lowest quartile, highest quartile, and growth to proficiency calculations were discussed.
  - Comparisons between the current growth methodology and the proposed methodology were discussed. There is a strong correlation between the results of both models; however, there is a much higher level of transparency with the proposed growth model, and it can be run in-house.

- Recommendations and considerations:
  - A concern was raised that the current method of calculation for school ratings provides too high a correlation between proficiency and growth. It was recommended that, when weighting is discussed in the future, this be kept in mind.
  - It was recommended that the Department use a consistent model to set growth targets for both school accountability and teacher accountability systems. Currently, there is too much disparity between the two systems, and the disconnect causes confusion at the LEA level. It is also preferable to have alignment.
  - It was recommended that the Department report actual growth results in graphical ways so that it is apparent to stakeholders how students are growing at the school level. This echoed the concern that combining growth with proficiency results when reporting does not provide a true picture of performance at the school.
  - It was shared that the proposed growth model is more transparent than the existing model, which will allow more students, educators, and parents to understand student performance.

Public Comment: 1 member of the public added comment

  - Atnre Alleyne: Thanked the Department for the work and data modeling behind today's presentation on the proposed growth methodology. Transparency in calculating student growth is valued. Asked that the group recognize that there are differences between how the school accountability model and the teacher accountability model are calculated (Component V). Requested that the Department consider more than one year of student performance data as it sets growth targets, and asked for full transparency when weighting and cut points are discussed in the future. Please include other stakeholders such as parents, community groups, civil rights groups, etc., when having conversations around reporting student performance, and please include them early in the process. Acknowledge the difference between growth and proficiency without compromising either measure of performance.