



## 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 Becraft, 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

