Hub Input for Accountability Spoke Committee September 12, 2016

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Decision Points and Areas of Misalignment** | Green font represents comments submitted by more than one group or person | | |
| Considerations Recommended for  the Spoke Committee | Data or Information That Would  Help Decision-Making | Questions |
| **English learner progress measure(s) and English learner assessment policy (1st year in US)**  In collaboration with assessment spoke | * Would like to see where we are. * Baseline is first year and growth in future years * What data do we have on each district re when they engage in testing?  Options A or B? * Consider an additional subgroup of these students; consider common arguments | * How many do not complete assessment due to frustration? * Which districts have the most/highest percentage of these students? * How many district opt not to test these students in the first year and why? * Is it beneficial to separate 1st year El kids to see growth & achievement faster? * How many districts have a high # of newly arrived ELs? * How many districts opt out of first year? | * What data loss do we have with each racial group? * What would be the additional cost of requiring all students to take? * What would a sub-subgroup of these students looks like? * Is this feasible? |
| **“Other indicator” of school quality or student success** | * Student & parent satisfaction * Attendance/chronic absenteeism * Certificates / Industry credentials, AP, Concurrent enrollment – might have to be phased in as a flexible package (like grad guidelines) * What measures we already have? * Consider ways to incorporate parental satisfaction * Consider ways to incorporate parent and student satisfaction surveys | * Other states considering or using this data (precedent)? * Cost of survey work annual in each district * Satisfaction research in other educational fields & over seas | * Are there funds available to do surveys? |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Decision Points and Areas of Misalignment** | Green font represents comments submitted by more than one group or person | | |
| Considerations Recommended for  the Spoke Committee | Data or Information That Would  Help Decision-Making | Questions |
| **Participation requirements**   * Parent excuses counted as non- proficient and non-participants * 95% participation (including parent excusals) included as an impact in accountability ratings | * Consider Colo’s current law & SBE policy * Consider positive incentives for 95% participation * Require student posting of scores on transcript * What are the pieces / waivers we can go after with USDE? * Kids should be counted even if they do not test to avoid incentivizing systematic encouragement of opt out * Is there a way to turn high participation into a positive incentive instead of a punitive issue? * Kids who don’t take tests have to be counted. | * Success stories in reducing opt out percentages at the district level? Salida? Jeffco? * Any districts that have turned around low participation rates? | How do we address contradiction in statute itself?  §1111(b)(2)(K): “Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as preempting a State or local law regarding the decision of a parent to not have the parent’s child participate in the academic assessments.”   * What wiggle room does the state have? * Is there a way to get valid/reliable data at a lower percentage? * Can we prove it to USDE? * Is a waiver here possible? * How might that work? * How could we sell it? * Is there a % other than 95 that would allow/satisfy the validity to calculate data,   achievement, etc. |
| **Long-term goals and interim measures** | * Justify current policy * Should consider raising expectations * How is grad rate calculated? 4? 5? 6? 7? | * Possibility of formative assessments as interim measurements? | * What are other states doing here? * Is there a way to tie these goals to AGP? Or is that already the case? * Can we measure growth goals? |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Decision Points and Areas of Misalignment** | Green font represents comments submitted by more than one group or person | | |
| Considerations Recommended for  the Spoke Committee | Data or Information That Would  Help Decision-Making | Questions |
| **N size and reporting rules** | * Should stick to 16 * Impact on small rural districts on reporting? what is the impact on reporting for 16 v. 20? * Stick with 16 | * Impact analysis – show the # of schools that would have data suppressed if minority group is divided up into each major race/ethnicity. * How we can maximize into to the public | * How does this affect data suppression? * What are the effects of increasing/decreasing this number on privacy & district/school ratings? |
| **Method for identifying and exiting comprehensive and targeted support schools**  In collaboration with school improvement committee | * When public reporting, use easier to understand ratings * Summative rating that is easy to understand   + this should be an additional consideration * Do we need 5 levels to id accountability? Do we need to change SB 163? Do we need another criteria to consider: External factors, migration, FRL, EL, etc. * Parent friendly / public facing easier to read ratings |  |  |