

AGENDA: AFWG MEETING #5

December 1, 2014

10:00 a.m. -1:00 p.m.

ITEM	NOTES
Welcome	<p>Members present: Heath Chasanov, Jeff Klein, Sharon Digirolamo, Ed Emmett, Kevin Fitzgerald, Ken Hutchins, Sally Maldonado, Jay Owens, Chantel Janiszewski, Gerri Marshall, David Ring, Penny Schwinn, Ryan Reyna. Members absent: Mark Holodick, Theodore Boyer, Joe Jones, Donna Johnson.</p> <p>The AFWG welcomed Jay Owens from the Indian River School District and Ryan Reyna of DOE to the team.</p>
Survey Results and Feedback from Town Halls – current landscape	<p>Chantel shared survey respondent results as of 11/25/14 as well as a summary of common themes of feedback heard during the 4 Town Hall events held statewide (this document is provided as an attachment). A breakdown of % population vs. % respondents by county is as follows:</p> <p align="center">New Castle County – 59.4% state, 65.5% of responses Kent County – 18.3% state, 14.1% of responses Sussex County – 22.3% state, 20.4% of responses</p> <p>Surveys in other languages: 74 Spanish; 1 Haitian Creole.</p>
Developing shared commitments on decision-making process	<p>Penny led a discussion around general trends in survey responses as well as a discussion around norming how the AFWG will approach disparities among responses to survey questions. The AFWG were asked to consider such questions as “Who is the primary end user of the accountability system? The report card? Who are secondary end users for both?” and “Is there a minimum differential that must be in place if there is a discrepancy between stakeholder groups?” (document attached). Gerri recommended that we standardize decision making around each survey question on a question-by-question basis.</p> <p>The goal is to have at least 5000 statewide responses for reliability purposes. When the AFWG convenes in January, we must be at a place to come to consensus about the final survey results. Please continue to think about and discuss with your colleagues how to best standardize our approach.</p>
ESEA Renewal Application	<p>Ryan shared ESEA renewal guidance provided by the USDOE. A couple of key changes in the guidance include states not being able to give a school the highest rating possible if the school is not closing the achievement gap (in terms of graduation rate and proficiency), and states being required to allocate additional resources toward turnaround efforts. The deadline for Delaware to submit its ESEA Renewal Application is March 31, and more Town Halls and online opportunities for engagement are planned. With a short timeline, AFWG decision-making will need to be expeditious.</p>
Accountability System Part A – business rules and methodology	<p>Ryan reviewed the 4 Part A metrics as well as initial brainstorming results around the methodology for each of those 4 metrics (from AFWG Meeting 3). Student growth: RFP posted, 4 applications received and are currently under review (AIR, Mathematica, Ed Analytics and SAS). The AFWG will be tasked with setting parameters for individual growth as well as growth to proficiency.</p> <p>Members were split into 3 groups (Academic Achievement and College and Career Readiness, Chronic Absenteeism, and On-Track to Graduate) to review methodology considerations (documents attached) and provide initial recommendations. The results of the small group discussions are as follows:</p> <p><u>Academic Achievement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are many moving parts in the system this year, so should not change the business rules for assessments unless there is a very clear problem (i.e., prorating data to K-2 as currently stands seems to make sense) • Use the beginning or end of testing window for special education classification <p><u>CCR</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No consensus on what “senior” means, need more conversations to define • Potentially could use combined SBAC score of 6 or more across the two subjects i.e., similar to how score on SAT works), but that may be setting an even higher, unequal bar for students • Allowing the use of the higher score on SBAC or SAT may benefit higher income students and schools because they can retest on the SAT

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: How does the system account for 11th grade graduating students (i.e., those off track or reassigned classification) if they do not have multiple opportunities to take the SAT? <p><u>Chronic Absenteeism</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No resolution on using as a metric • Debate remains on whether to include both excused and unexcused absences in “days missed” • Need true, common definition of attendance if using for accountability • 90% attendance seems more relevant than 95% <p><u>On-Track</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough consistency in grading between schools and districts • Difficult to measure in-year improvement because schools have different course schedules (i.e., 4x4) that may not accommodate easy comparisons of in-year grading • To truly account for improvement, need to lag the data so that it accounts for summer school • If required to also report/calculate on graduation rate, then this measure likely double counts performance (on both high and low ends of the spectrum) • 11th and 12th grade is where students are able to catch up, so any improvement metric would need to capture, and at that point it is unlikely to be much different than the 4-year cohort graduation rate • Question: Could Part A include 5- or 6-year cohort graduation rate?
Next Steps	<p>Members were encouraged to share the Part A methodology ideas with district colleagues to solicit additional feedback.</p> <p>Homework prior to the next AFWG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review all of the business rules included in the packet (attached) and come to the next meeting with your choices, feedback, and proposed revisions • Review examples of other states’ online accountability systems from multiple stakeholder perspectives for aesthetics. Please make sure to review the following states: Ohio, Illinois, Washington D.C. • Review ESEA one-pager (attached) and email any questions or clarifications you would like us to ask at the state conference in a few weeks – focusing on the accountability system. <p>Upcoming meetings based on Doodle Poll results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • December 19 11 a.m. -2 p.m. • January 14 12:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m. • January 28 8 a.m. - 11 a.m. <p>Locations will be identified as soon as possible.</p>