Standards of Learning Innovation Committee

Meeting Minutes

Accountability 2.0 Subcommittee Teleconference

Jefferson Conference Room, Monroe Building

March 3, 2015 – 10:00am – 1:00pm

Attendees

Present Committee Members:

Kelly Booz, President Chris Braunlich, Dabney Carr, Karen Cross, Dr. Kim Paddison Dockery, Deborah Frazier, Meg Gruber, Dr. Sue Magliaro, Dr. Brian Matney, Dr. Laurie McCullough, Dr. Stewart Roberson, Dr. Alan Seibert, Karen Thomsen, Dr. Chriss Walther-Thomas, Bill White, and Ben Williams

Absent Committee Members:

Dr. Shawnrell Blackwell and Dr. Steve Staples

Scribe

Lisa Jackson

Agenda

- **Introductions of Participants**
- **Discussion of Themes**
    - Consensus of Themes
    - Recommendations, suggestions, changes
- **Next Steps of Subcommittee**
    - Presentation to Full Committee
    - Additional Work of Subcommittee
    - Next Meetings

- **Business Items**
- **Adjourn**

Introduction of Participants

- **10:04am** – Lisa Jackson opened the call by asking everyone to place their call on mute unless they wanted to speak to avoid any interference or background noise.
- Laurie McCullough started by doing a roll call of subcommittee and committee members.

Discussion of Themes (recommendations can be found in the Appendix section of this document)

- Committee members discussed the Introduction Section.
  - It was noted that it was helpful that the recommendations were broken into purpose, content, and design.
  - There were questions about who the targeted audiences were in the introduction, whether it was an educational audience, a general public audience, etc.
- The discussion on Recommendation 1focused on clarifying and expanding the second bullet under this recommendation.
  - It was suggested that there be three bullet points to parse out the descriptor ratings portion and the multi-year cycle portion of the text.
  - Members suggested that there be parenthetical ratings included as examples in the second bullet for clarification purposes.
- Discussion on Recommendation 2
  - Committee members expressed concern regarding the requirement to have on-site reviews; believed that this process could be punitive and would be detrimental to districts that lack resources to do the reviews.
  - Committee members suggested having more discussion around this recommendation and to research other organizations that participate in on-site reviews for clarification of the process.
  - Members suggested moving this recommendation for later discussion and further research.

- Discussion on Recommendation 3
  - The committee members expressed concern with the examples that were listed under the recommendation.
  - Suggested that the third bullet point be removed because many of the school districts do not have control over the "indicators" that were suggested.
  - Subcommittee decided that the examples listed should be saved for later discussion.
- Discussion on Recommendation 4
  - Suggested deleting the examples because of lack of clarification, and desire to do further research.
  - Subcommittee would like to see more contextual factors added to this recommendation.
- Discussion on Recommendation 5
  - There were no suggested changes for this recommendation.
- Discussion on Recommendation 6
  - Suggested that language should be added to emphasize the need for accessible, understandable and real-time report card data that can be updated consistently.
- Discussion on Recommendation 7
  - There were no suggested changes for this recommendation.
- The subcommittee also discussed the ending portion of the text.
  - Suggested that "sufficient" be added to the text, to read "The Subcommittee understands that making these changes requires <u>sufficient</u> investments in research, design, and development."
  - Subcommittee members discussed the importance of reemphasizing and restating that recommendation process (i.e. school report card) will be on going and "in or under construction;" important to recognize and acknowledge that this will be a multi-year effort.

Next Steps

- The subcommittee discussed the importance of recognizing the lack of emphasis on children with disabilities and English as a Second Language (ESL).

- o Noted that this should be discussed fairly soon to acknowledge changes that may be needed for these learners in the accountability system, while still keeping in mind the federal regulations and requirements.
- Laurie discussed the next steps for the recommendations and subcommittee.
  - o A memo will be drafted to include notes on the background of the subcommittee, presentations had by the subcommittee, and issues that may require further work and study; this document will be sent out next week.
  - o Subcommittee will be expected to report to the full SOL Innovation Committee on their recommendations in March.

Next Meeting

- March 24, 2015, 10:00am – 1:00pm. Patrick Henry Building, 1111 E. Broad St., Richmond, VA 23219

Adjournment

- **11:47am –** Meeting was adjourned by Laurie McCullough.

Appendix A

The Accountability 2.0 Subcommittee's work has focused on the criteria and process for accrediting Virginia schools and on the information provided as part of the school performance report card. It is understood that accountability extends beyond the accreditation process to include additional federal requirements. Since accreditation ratings and the school report card are impacted by recent legislation and under review by the Board of Education, it seems reasonable to give our attention to these areas. The Subcommittee's discussion to date has focused on determining ways in which a more comprehensive picture of school quality can be defined and communicated. This includes not only a redefinition and possible expansion of the accreditation ratings for schools but also consideration of what additional information about the school might be reported beyond that used in accreditation.

A school's accreditation rating and the supporting data provided as a part of the school performance report card are messages to the community about the school's quality. Therefore, it is essential that the system support the vision of inspired, engaged, personalized learning for every student in the Commonwealth. This requires a reexamination of the **purpose** of the accountability system.

The Innovation Committee's work over the past eight months has made clear a need to expand the definition of school quality, reducing the reliance on SOL test data and encompassing a broader range of elements. Choosing these elements, determining how they will be measured, and deciding which will impact accreditation and which will be reported on the report card but not included in accreditation are challenges that must be undertaken with care. The resulting **content** of the system should align with its purpose, be relevant to a variety of audiences, and be supportive of school improvement efforts.

The school report card's **design** is an important consideration once purpose and content have been determined. Report card data should be easily accessible, current, readily understandable, and effectively communicated to meet the information needs of a variety of stakeholders.

Keeping in mind these three areas of purpose, content, and design; the Subcommittee offers the following preliminary recommendations to the Innovation Committee for consideration.

Regarding the Purpose of Accreditation

1. The accreditation system should be designed and implemented to support continuous improvement of schools at every accreditation level and reduce the negative impacts of sanctions.

- **Accreditation data should be timely, accessible and reported in ways that are actionable, in order to drive improvement and address gaps in achievement.**
- **A continuum of accreditation ratings expressed as descriptors should be created and tied to timelines that allow for multi-year accreditation cycles for fully accredited schools.**

2. The accreditation process should include periodic on-site reviews by external trained experts who meet reliability standards for observation and data collection. The purpose of these reviews should be to supply actionable feedback and valuable support to the school's improvement efforts. The school's accreditation status should determine the frequency of these reviews (annual or multi-year) and selected data collected through the reviews should be considered in determining the school's accreditation status.

Regarding the Content to be Included

3. Accreditation should include:

- **valid and reliable academic indicators of a school's progress over time and its performance against student achievement benchmarks.**
- **one or more measures that document growth of individuals, reporting groups, and aggregate groups; in areas and at grade levels where this is most valuable and can be done reliably.**
- **additional indicators of school quality not directly measured by test scores or pass rates (e.g. graduation rate, attendance, school climate*)***

4. In order to provide a balanced and more comprehensive picture of the school, consideration should be given to reporting selected data elements that are important but not included in a school's accreditation rating (e.g. school climate, data from on-site reviews),

5. The reporting system should include an opportunity for schools to study and self-report areas of strength and those they are working to improve.

Regarding the Design of the School Report Card

6. School report card data should be accessible and understandable to the public. A dashboard format presenting information "at a glance" with easy access to more detailed supporting data allows users to view data at a variety of levels.

7. Data should be displayed in formats that provide context (e.g. demographics, peer group comparisons, trends over time, etc.)

Adjustments to the current accreditation system are needed so that more meaningful and relevant information about schools can be gathered, interpreted and reported to the public. The Subcommittee understands that making these changes requires investments in research, design and development, training, technology applications, communications, and system maintenance. This is certain to be a multi-year effort, and it requires both an immediate infusion of resources as well as a long-term commitment.

Subcommittee members have received information on aspects of the existing accountability system and school report card, and on models and examples from national groups and other states. Members of the Subcommittee look forward to sharing and discussing these preliminary recommendations as well as selected information sources with the Innovation Committee.