



ESSA IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

ESSA Subcommittee Meeting – Accountability

Date, Time: Monday, June 27, 2016, 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Location: 135 South Union Street, Suite 215

ALSDE Facilitator: Shanthia Washington for Angela Martin

Members present: Christian Becroft, Holly Box, Ryan Cantrell, Margaret Clarke, Rep. Terri Collins, Martha Peek, Sheila Hocutt Remington

Members absent: N/A

Summary: Shanthia Washington moderated, in place of Angela Martin, and reviewed three handouts

- Key State Decisions Required Under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)
- Act 2012-402 A-F Report Card Law Proposed Indicators
- Comparison Chart of NCLB and ESSA, Category: Accountability Indicators

Discussion included decisions to be made on accountability as required by ESSA, review of the A-F Report Card Law, review of indicators, and comparison of the accountability measures currently in place and needed changes.

Next meeting: Friday, July 22, 11 a.m., 135 South Union Street, Suite 215

Detailed Notes

*Discussion surrounded “proposed regulations” as the final regulations will not be released until October 2016. Public comments will be accepted at the federal level until August 1st.

All notes below are comments with committee members and the ALSDE facilitator.

Notes on Handout 1: Key State Decisions Required Under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

- Discussion of “n-size” which previously was 40 and is now 20
 - ESSA does not allow states to go over 30
- School Quality Indicator: states can use a non-assessment indicator that takes into consideration the school culture and climate
 - Examples discussed: attendance, percentage of students college and career ready, safety/discipline
 - Must be an indicator that would show the diversity of the state; if every school has a 95% attendance rate, attendance as an indicator will not count
- For graduation rates, Alabama currently uses the 4-year cohort rate but can also use the extended rate
- English language learners, previously in Title III, is now in the accountability portion under Title 1
- The Accountability subcommittee will work with other subcommittees: School Improvement, Standards and Assessments
- Subcommittee will have to determine what happens when each subgroup, as well as the whole, does not meet the 95% (formerly referred to in NCLB with the AYP)
 - When districts/states opt-out of assessments, it creates a problem for subgroups (currently happening in New York and California)
 - To watch: review what happens in the proposed regulations for systems that opt-out of assessments
 - Q: what happens if systems opt-out, what are their choices? A: they rely on interim assessments and teacher-given grades
 - Colleges are also exploring moving away from ACT and SAT, but this is not currently happening in Alabama
- Schools identified as Targeted Support and Improvements
 - Accountability subcommittee will work with School Improvement subcommittee
 - Discussion of how early the state should intervene: ESSA allows districts three complete years to improve, and in the fourth year the state intervenes
 - The district will have the decision on how to intervene for improvement
 - Subcommittee will also need to define “improvement”, “consistently”, and “underperforming”



Notes on Handout 2: Act 2012-402 A-F Report Card Law Proposed Indicators

- Summary of the law (not mentioned, but added in these notes):
 - “to require the State Superintendent of Education to develop a school grading system reflective of school and district performance [...] Section 2 (a) In addition to any other labels or designations assigned to public schools and public school districts pursuant to a federal, state, school, district, or other assessment or accountability system, the State Superintendent of Education, consistent with the provisions of this act, shall develop a school grading system reflective of school and district performance. The grading system shall utilize the traditional A, B, C, D, or F framework.”
- **Question of the day (addressed to subcommittee):** how do we want to proceed since we have the A-F law?
 - Do we take the A-F law and include it into the federal state plan?
- Currently, Alabama has several lists and measures of accountability:
 - Have a failing list
 - Have list of schools needing support
 - A-F report card law
 - Federal report card
- Discussion of importance of aligning all accountability measures
 - Accountability was designed for transparency for parents
 - All measurements need to be fair and consistent
- The current A-F law does not include English Language Learners (ELL), and current indicators might not meet the School Quality Indicator
- Accountability subcommittee will work with the ELL subcommittee in defining the subgroup indicator
- Discussed the necessity of changing the perception of “targeted” as it currently has a negative perception

Notes on Handout 3: Comparison Chart of NCLB and ESSA, Category: Accountability Indicators

- Comparison between NCLB and ESSA to determine what Alabama might have in place and what needs to be added or changed
- Additional subgroups with ESSA include: homeless, foster care, and military
- For the report card, it is important to note both the graduation rate and college and career readiness, as the extra measures add credibility to the graduation rate



Next Steps:

- Review A-F Report Card Indicators
 - Review ESSA requirements and determine whether to use the A-F Report Card Law indicators for the ESSA state plan
 - Look at college and career readiness indicators
- Review other states' efforts in accountability
 - Recommendations for School Quality Indicators
 - Other states are using surveys combined with opportunities for parental involvement
- Sharing of Resources
 - Accountability subcommittee will have to meet more frequently than other subcommittees
 - Sharing of SREB resources as well as other state recommendations
 - Ask local stakeholders for feedback

