

AGENDA: AFWG MEETING #6

| ITEM | NOTES |
|---|--|
| Welcome | <p>Members present: Jeff Klein, Joe Jones, Donna Johnson, Sharon Digirolamo, Jason Conway, Ken Hutchins, Jay Owens, Chantel Janiszewski, Gerri Marshall, Penny Schwinn, Ryan Reyna. Members absent: Ed Emmett, Kevin Fitzgerald, Sally Maldonado, Heath Chasanov, David Ring, Theodore Boyer. Member-at-large: Mark Holodick.</p> <p>The AFWG welcomed Dr. Jason Conway from the Lake Forest School District to the team.</p> <p>Donna shared additional details around the professional development workshop to be hosted by the State Board of Education on 1/6/15 from 5-8 p.m. at the Duncan Center in Dover. The focus of the workshop will be to learn more about the implementation of Smarter assessments, the development of a new accountability system and ESEA renewal. The SBE would like to have a couple of AFWG members as part of a discussion panel. If you are interested or have additional questions, please contact Donna directly.</p> <p>Andrew Rice and Peter Witham from Education Analytics, Inc. were here to present options for consideration as the AFWG develops Delaware’s growth methodology. In its work nationwide, Ed Analytics has represented the Illinois Education Association, the Michigan Department of Education, the Los Angeles USD, Hillsborough County Public Schools, the National Institute for Excellent Teaching TAP Program Support, and IES.</p> |
| Survey Results | <p>Chantel shared survey respondent results as of 12/17/14. A breakdown of % population vs. % respondents by county is as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">New Castle County – 59.4% state, 66.5% of responses Kent County – 18.3% state, 17.2% of responses Sussex County – 22.3% state, 16.3% of responses</p> <p>A total of 3, 474 responses have been received to date. Click here and scroll down the page to access the survey results shared today. The survey closes on 12/31/2014.</p> |
| School Report Card aesthetics | <p>Tabled, however please send initial ideas and feedback to Chantel and/or Penny between now and the next meeting on January 14. This topic will be revisited next month.</p> |
| Accountability System Part A – business rules and methodology | <p>Ryan provided a recap of the proposed considerations for business rules as discussed during the last AFWG meeting (December 1) and asked for any additional general feedback (the agenda item details are attached). Gerri suggested that the AFWG consider academic achievement for selective enrollment in that the best measure of a high school’s effect on student learning is achieved by including students who were continuously present in that school from 9th -12th grade.</p> <p>Recommendations/concerns are as follows:</p> <p><u>Academic Achievement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern around using only TANF and/or SNAP data to determine low-SES as these data do not capture all students who are economically disadvantaged • Continue to pro-rate ELA and Math scores for grades K-2; pro-rate Science and Social Studies scores as outlined in the business rules document (attached). • Change language under “Participation Rate” to align with current business rules. • Define “valid” score. • Use December 1 as a deadline for inclusion of special education classification to build consistency between the accountability system and the special education audit conducted by the DOE Office of Exceptional Children Resources. • Include US History EOC and 10th grade Science summative assessments at the high school level; however, there are multiple issues with the current assessments such as misalignment with standards, low depth of knowledge levels, and lack of timely and actionable data. • Some LEA’s use the US History EOC and 10th grade Science summative assessments in lieu of final exams – could this be considered by all LEA’s? |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p><u>CCR</u></p> <p><u>From the December 1 meeting:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • 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>From today's meeting:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed change from "by senior year" to "by graduation" • Include additional measures for high schools <p><u>Chronic Absenteeism</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will move to Part B • Will not be measured until after the 2015-2016 school year pending further discussion statewide <p><u>On-Track</u></p> <p><u>From the December 1 meeting:</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 <p><u>From today's meeting:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed change to 9th grade on-track measure • Include 4-, 5- and 6-year graduation rate |
| <p>Growth Methodology presentation by Education Analytics, Inc.</p> | <p>Education Analytics, Inc. (EA) was selected through the RFP process to develop the growth methodology for individual student growth as well as student growth to proficiency based on the AFWG's parameters. The main objectives of today's presentation and discussion was to 1) create a common knowledge base and language around growth methodology, and 2) start highlighting key technical and policy issues unique to Delaware to provide EA with the focus moving forward. Details for this discussion are included in the attached "Business Rules Agenda" document.</p> <p>The slide deck from the presentation is attached and it was recommended that this resource be utilized by AFWG members as needed to build awareness and understanding with their stakeholders. Penny, Ryan and Chantel welcome initial thoughts and feedback about the presentation delivery as well as the content discussed today. Please send us any comments or concerns.</p> |
| <p>Next Steps</p> | <p>Homework prior to the next AFWG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the CCR and On-Track documents (attached) and please provide your feedback to Ryan by Friday, Jan. 9 to be shared with the group on January 14. • <u>From the December 1 notes:</u> 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. <p>Upcoming meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • January 14 12:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m., 3rd Floor Conf Room, Townsend Bldg • January 28 8 a.m. - 11 a.m., 2nd Floor Conf Room, Townsend Bldg (**location may change) |