

### AFWG MEETING #3

August 7, 2014

1:00 – 4:00 p.m.

ITEM	NOTES
Welcome	<b>Members present:</b> Joe Jones, Jeff Klein, Sharon Digirolamo, Penny Schwinn, Ken Hutchins, Donna Johnson, Chantel Janiszewski, Sandy Smith, David Ring. <b>Members absent:</b> Heath Chasanov, Kevin Fitzgerald, Mark Holodick, Gerri Marshall, Theodore Boyer, Sally Maldonado.
Branding of the accountability system	As discussed during the kickoff meeting in June, the AFWG was tasked with developing options for naming Delaware’s accountability system. This system is not intended to be just a report card, but also a tool that will provide real-time results for districts, teachers, and families. Ideas were brainstormed and a list of options will be presented at the next meeting. The final options will become a part of the Community Planning Process survey and ultimately voted upon by the community.
Plan for community engagement	Penny provided a Community Planning Process (CPP) timeline and asked the team to brainstorm what resources districts will need to effectively execute this process. The following resources/ideas were identified/generated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reach out to stakeholder groups not represented on the AFWG (i.e., DSBA, DSEA, DASA, DESS, Business Roundtable</li><li>• Include updates of the CPP process as a standing line item in the Weekly Memo to Chiefs/Charter Directors</li><li>• DDOE to provide sample informational flyers and a slide deck that can be used by districts to educate their Boards on the changes taking place in the accountability system (where we were, where we are now, rationale)</li><li>• DOE to develop quick online survey (also available for the Android OS) to solicit what our communities value beyond the non-negotiable metrics identified in Part A. The AFWG will evaluate the communities’ input and decide as a team what metrics should be included in Part B. The following survey-specific recommendations were made:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ there be one survey per “hat” (e.g., teacher, parent, community member, etc.)</li><li>○ we also offer the survey in Spanish</li><li>○ include grade band (ES, MS, HS) with the ability to choose multiple options</li><li>○ include race</li><li>○ include zip code of residence</li><li>○ include private, public traditional/charter school, or no child currently enrolled in any school (optional question)</li><li>○ include highest level of education completed (optional question)</li><li>○ include email address (optional)</li></ul></li><li>• DOE to facilitate Town Hall meetings, one in each county, noticed via multiple media outlets; have paper copies of the survey available at these meetings to have a broader reach</li></ul>
Finalize non-negotiable metrics (Part A)	The team reviewed and discussed the adjustments made to the non-negotiable metrics based on last week’s feedback, and generated ideas around the methodology for each metric as well as the business rules for each metric. The following recommendations and additional questions were identified:  <b>1. Academic Achievement</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Math, ELA – proficiency as measured by SBAC in grades 3-8, 11</li><li>○ Science, Social Studies – proficiency as measured in current tested grades, but not used for accountability in 14-15</li><li>○ Use nationally tested and vetted growth model</li><li>○ Science, Social Studies – placeholder for now; growth TBD once they are assessed each year</li><li>○ Continue to use the Full Academic Year business rule</li><li>○ Clarify how a change in special education status during the school year could be flagged, i.e. receiving serves for at least 50% of the year or status at time of testing.</li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clarify difference between EL and ESOL</li> <li>○ Keep similar schools measure</li> <li>○ Do not use a state average comparison</li> <li>○ Use rigorous yet attainable targets, i.e. reduce the % of non-proficient students by 50%, and report by subgroup, but aggregate to school level</li> </ul> <p><b>2. College and Career Readiness</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ High School - As measured by % of students who have demonstrated CCR by <u>senior year</u> as measured by SBAC proficiency <i>or</i> the new SAT (school/district choice)</li> </ul> <p>Recommendations/Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Use highest SBAC score from multiple attempts</li> <li>○ Define “senior” – who counts?</li> <li>○ How do we handle transfers into and out of the state? without prior SBAC scores?</li> <li>○ Will proficiency score be accepted by higher ed?</li> <li>○ Will alternate assessments be allowable for any subgroups?</li> <li>○ Is the CCR benchmark of 1550 truly valid?</li> <li>○ Could the ASVAB be included? TOEFL?</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Chronic Absenteeism</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ As measured by the reduction in the average days missed of the bottom 10% attendance (cutoff at 10 days)</li> </ul> <p>Recommendations/Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The team is still finding difficulty with this metric based on such examples as the variability of attendance policies between schools and districts, unexcused versus excused absences, student participation in sports, band, and or Academic Challenge, and the variability in reporting hours missed versus days missed.</li> <li>○ If absenteeism is going to be utilized, there needs to be consistency between the DPAS II Component V methodology and the Ed Insight Dashboard reporting system.</li> <li>○ Needs to be tracked in real time.</li> </ul> <p><b>4. On-Track</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ % of students on-track to graduate as measured by the reduction in the rate of off-track by cohort group</li> </ul> <p>Recommendations/Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Need attendance rule – how will retention data factor in? how will a school be accountable for retention? How will transient pops and transfers to alt schools and/or mental health facilities be handled?</li> <li>○ High School – credit acquisition with differentiation by IEP; if a student is prevented from dropping out, but takes 5 years to graduate does the first concern cancel out the second?</li> <li>○ Middle School – include promotion/retention rates; exclude promotion of 16 y/o students in 8<sup>th</sup> grade</li> <li>○ Elementary School – on grade-level in reading and/or math by 5<sup>th</sup> grade</li> </ul>
<b>Next Steps</b>	<p>Members were asked to complete the last page of the meeting notes, “Part B Ideas: Things we want to see on the surveys”. Remember, these are the metrics we value enough to be included in Part B of the accountability system. Please generate a couple of ideas for each of the following topics and send them electronically to Chantel or Penny before the close of business on Tuesday, August 12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Academic Achievement</li> <li>● Culture and Climate</li> <li>● Community and Families</li> <li>● Other Measures</li> </ul>
Summer Schedule	<b>Next Meeting Scheduled: August 13<sup>th</sup></b>