

ESSA Advisory Committee Notes
Meeting #2, July 7, 2016

Standards & Assessment: Should Oregon pilot interim assessments that result in a single assessment score for accountability purposes?

Responses

Districts should have support from ESDs when they are small and unable to invest in interim assessment or professional development.

Not sure. Better measure of growth and more useful for educators potentially. But high cost, and need to use for statewide accountability purposes creates limitations that may limit value to educators. Better investment would be developing an assessment literacy and expertise among educators.

How much time for interim assessments? WG discussion/unintended consequences of interim vs. single summative?

Always for multiple data points throughout the year

+ (Yes): Used to support intervention and teachers & historically underserved students (+ yes)

- (No): Time infrastructure, capacity building

Yes & No

Are statewide interim assessments replacing district benchmarking? Or can we ever have no summative?

If there is little flexibility with use or choice, then no, but if teacher can choose from strands and timing and delivery, then yes.

Yes! If it is used as a formative assessment model.

This could be valuable if separated from accountability structure.

Benefits do not seem to justify additional time, effort, cost for schools.

Building capacity in assessment literacy seems more meaningful and powerful than adding in mandated interim assessments for the purpose of accountability. Formative and interim should be used for instructional purposes.

Ask an educator. I'm very concerned about adding yet another layer of statewide assessment at the sacrifice of instructional time.

The district level choice and implementation seems more meaningful, but state guidance and support is crucial! This will be especially true for districts without the capacity to implement.

Not yet. Need a completely different state structure to support this very difficult and costly work. Need to build assessment literacy test.

No way!

State needs to commit to comprehensive system and support that.

State can fully commit to K-2 formative assessment pilot.

What will replace Easy CBM to align with Common Core?

How are we aligning with Pre-K assessment system?

No, we need money to invest elsewhere.

Possible pro's: allow for CK-pts that inform institutions in a timely matter (helps assess prevention/intervention)

Allows for a focus view in a student/like-peer group look into programs and whether end if growth targets will be met.

Allows flexibility in multiple languages

What have we learned from yes of summative testing for historically underserved students? Can we start K-5, K-8 MS or HS

All assessment should inform universal. St successes and have value to instruction

ESSA Advisory Committee Notes
Meeting #2, July 7, 2016

Standards & Assessment: Should Oregon pilot interim assessments that result in a single assessment score for accountability purposes?

Responses
<p>Recommendation: These interim assessments should be, in addition to, the state summative assessment.</p>
<p>If we do explore this route, we need to make sure that these assessments are aligned to the standards, valid reliable and comparable. We also need to make sure that districts and schools have the capacity to administrate the assessments and that we are getting useful information on growth over the year to inform school improvement.</p>
<p>Smaller districts will need financial help to support supplemental assessments. ESDs? Like the idea of ODE helping build local capacity and knowledge for local assessments.</p>
<p>Food for thought: External validation of the assessment. Reliability? Alignment? Capacity to administer the assessment Audit of district assessment system?</p>
<p>Pilot: Yes, if it truly replace summative, and results are timely and meaningful to students and teachers</p>
<p>No, if the intent becomes accountability only not fur the true purpose which is to inform instruction. Timing of results-access to results will be important to consider Will this replace semester exams too – or just the summative assessment? How will this be delivered? Technology? Paper-based? Could be scheduling issues Student mobility-data collection and reporting MUST be in place prior to implementing statewide One vender created or flexibility in vendor selection? (state vs. local choice)</p>
<p>The focus should be on providing a system of accountability that provides instructional/classroom assessments to result in student achievement outcomes. The “con” for this is the time it will take to collect, clean and report the data.</p>
<p>Would accommodation-based interim assessments guide instruction? Time taken to administer assessment multiple times per year.</p>
<p>Must build capacity towards informed student growth and learning > accountability should be separated from this if necessary to be true to this process. Districts must have flexibility for statewide summative assessment!</p>
<p>I think possibly yes. I like the idea of testing 2-3 times a year to measure growth and potentially intervene with a child earlier if the child scores low. However, I know that children of color typically don't perform well on standardized tests for a variety of reasons and wish there were other ways to measure children rather than through testing.</p>
<p>Input from the work groups – evident that members are focused on student and learning rather than just a state accountability system. Focus the state system on balance and demonstrate leadership and support for the system. Accountability should be based on: formative, interim, summative, not just interim. And clarity of purpose.</p>
<p>Select assessment that measure growth for all students using a tool that adjust to student skill (up and down).</p>

ESSA Advisory Committee Notes
Meeting #2, July 7, 2016

Standards & Assessment: Should Oregon pursue offering flexibility for the statewide summative high school assessment?

Responses	
I'm curious if the choice will provide disequilibrium to start viewing some tests as lesser...will one than be viewed as the GED of testing? Not quite as valuable?	
Yes! If essential skills are still in place work sample.	
Is it possible to allow alternative assessment and adjust to make comparable to statewide assessment? Very difficult to ensure equitable access/comparability	
Equity issue access Students need access to advanced courses to be college and career ready. Single test denies access to a variety of courses that help all students (a variety) prepare for college!	
Accommodation/accessibility options on SAT/ACT differ from common accessibility on IEP/504	
Yes, I think offering flexibility to high schools would be beneficial.	
With the choice being at the district level, it seems we would need quite a bit of information about comparability, access, and purpose. While the choice at a student level sounds nice, the infrastructure needed is overwhelming.	
Yes. Let's view this through a student-centered lens as much as possible.	
Yes – but the fed approach – “all or none” does not work. FED strategy – forced choice! Schools should ensure students pass one of several options. IB schools test – those scores should count for accountability AP scores should count. ACT scores SAT scores	
I have more questions: Have the alt assessments been externally validated? Comparability? Accessibility supports?	
High school: Assessments that are content and class based, e.g. reading and writing in the social studies; math in science classes. Create performance tasks that are classroom based. Does it have to be a test?	
HS Flexibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External validation would be essential • Agree it would be better at student rather than district level if an option • Discussion of performance-based/portfolio model, whether that is an option • Which other assessments meet criteria, have aligned purpose. How to ensure match between purpose and use. • Comparability issue is huge • If at district level, huge infrastructure issue, but little utility • Observation that highest needs students are also tested the most • Concern about comparable accessibility supports across assessments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost a barrier for mandate

ESSA Advisory Committee Notes
 Meeting #2, July 7, 2016

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity issue • Opportunities for choice to “life” all students • Value of state assessment to students is questionable • Connected to student gives better data to use for program improvement
<p>Interim Assessments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed because another set of required assessments and restrictions tied to accountability use • Some desire to multi-task – how to leverage tools to meet multiple purposes, find efficiencies
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No, but develop capacity for prep to summative assessments • Needs to be part of holistic system and useful to educators • Logistics concerns • Reflection process – assess lit. • Time on testing would be more • Way we assess is disengaged from teaching/learning and drives poor practice. Hard do balance equitable outcomes with options for individuals • One time in HS or is it “at least” one time in HS > leave out assessment? Tasks to course

ESSA Advisory Committee Notes
Meeting #2, July 7, 2016

Educator Effectiveness: Should Oregon have a common system for identifying a summative score for teacher and administrator evaluations?

Responses

Yes, but this is hard. Why?
Leaders change, and sometimes they will rate a principal excellent one year and below proficient the next (not including student data).
Too variable for measures of growth...to develop teacher and admin capacity!
NBCT approach

In response...revisit the standards for effective teachers

What is the purpose of a number?
The purpose of an evaluation system is to help educators grow and develop in practice, not just a number.

If there is a summative score, it should be based on a common system (apples to apples).

If Oregon does identify a summative score for teacher and administration evaluations, it should be based on a common system.

Uniform implementation and focused structure for support – professional learning as goal

Common system (yes!) but you could make a report do multiple domains rather than single summative score (e.g. score in 3-4 domains)

The number score holds very little meaning.
All approved rubrics are aligned to the same set of INTASC standards and should be comparable.
If this is true, there should not be a need to have a common rubric.
Calibration

Food for thought:
PD and coaching to implement
Use of Title II funding
Need for shared rubric/framework for teachers and leaders – student growth must be part of both.
Use of teacher and principal evaluation info to inform PD, professional learning and growth opportunities
Recommendation: Yes, keep the common system for identifying a summative score and improve implementation.

To what purpose? No! Not what will really drive improvement.

Yes, we need a common system for evaluating teachers and administrators. Need more time and discussion for determining the rubric and administrators need capacity/training in order to implement effectively.

Need consistent measures within a common system.
Nuanced
More than one score would provide greater utility
Thoughts: Shared rubric for both teachers and leaders
Assumption that leaders are adequately trained and equitably administer evaluations.
Questions from group: what are the measures in the matrix community?
Five we equitably calibrated across lead us? No.

Does it have to be boiled down to a number?
Yes, other measures should be considered.
Can we reach the same goal if we offer multiple ways for staff to meet these requirements? (Like the way students can through work sample or portfolio?)

ESSA Advisory Committee Notes
Meeting #2, July 7, 2016

Educator Effectiveness: Should Oregon have a common system for identifying a summative score for teacher and administrator evaluations?

Responses

ODE can support common standards
Collect scores in consistent manner
CAEP – Higher ed need to report effectiveness of their completers.
Commodity in alignment
Defining “effectiveness” from school to school (effective in that setting)
Rubric

How do we include measure around attendance, behavior, participation as well as grades, growth
Specific attention on language learners and students of color

Timing about making a change – time/effort into current matrix
It is now our state question.
Doesn't reflect multiple measure system we are trying to develop in Oregon Department of Education If summative score for teachers
Purpose of getting to a number?
Based on national standards – how evaluation against those standards
Above will ODE build capacity? Focus on that invite in
Rigor of goals – keep high ... of bad score. Question about system.
Rubric affected the decision about goals – change the rigor.

Yes, common system
Not working
Go beyond what are we currently measuring, not all about test score or graduation rate
Spend quality time with this process
Using Title II funding for growth: development
Enter rates reliability
Differentiate between teachers
Student growth in addition to other measures
Administrator skill in doing evaluation – capacity calibration

Could common system positively impact preservice programs ability to train/prepare teachers?
National Board Standards would open collaboration among teachers/principals across and within state lines in the same way Common Core opened up educational practices around content.

ESSA Advisory Committee Notes
Meeting #2, July 7, 2016

Educator Effectiveness: Aside from academic measures, should educator evaluations include other student achievement measures? If so, what should be the guidelines?

Responses

Yes

For PreK-2 teachers in public schools, how are we factoring in social-emotional development? PreK and emerging K-2 formative assessments can inform this.

Also, ensure PreK teachers are embedded in support for teacher sin addition to evaluation system. 55 school districts have district-run preschools. How are we supporting those educators?

Considering factors when writing goals is essential, but I'm not sure a student learning and growth goal should be non-academic.

The rubric is an issue that is affecting the writing of goals and the scoring of teachers.

Yes. The other guidelines should be based on measures within the teachers'/schools' control.

Student impact is worthwhile to collect and may need student training on word choice when students are younger.

Community responsiveness/access to support systems/parent/family communication.

Feedback from parents and students' school climate surveys, random sampling

Incorporate best practices for gathering user feedback.

Cultural competency.

Disproportionate discipline measure.

It's 2016. Many methods exist for collecting and analyzing feedback.

Yes, need other areas considered!

Yes, and we also need to make sure that student growth continues to be part of the evaluation.

Need more time to discuss the other measures and how that gets operationalized.

This feeds into a score similar to student improvement.

WG optional that state score, but need student achievement

60% in special education in some schools

Keep academic measure

Student/parent voice

Climate list of questions to choose from

Like NSCT approach

Peer review between teachers

Multiple ways for teachers to show skill

Culturally responsive

Educator evaluation mirror school accountability measure that are monitored (8th grade on track absenteeism)

Concern what "evenness" across teachers uniform

ESSA Advisory Committee Notes
Meeting #2, July 7, 2016

Educator Effectiveness: Aside from academic measures, should educator evaluations include other student achievement measures? If so, what should be the guidelines?

Responses	
Educator Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should incentivize and instructional practices • Is teacher effectiveness enhanced when they have strong assessment practices, opportunities, more directly impacts • Concerns about resistance to educator effectiveness tied to state assessment • Should include measures of student achievement/evidence on standards closest to the classroom control.
Summative Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If use of summative score should have common elements to be equitable
Other Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be within control of teacher • Current system unpredictable, needs standardization • NTSB reflection based on evidence using list of questions teacher address 3 (teacher gets to pick) • Would be more meaningful to teacher to lift practice
Common Tool/Summative Rating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to break down the question • Balance benefit of centralized support with honoring existing district tools • Implications for higher ed/teacher prep • Need to at least report “domain scores” across district • For both teachers and admin, at least provide list of tools/set of rubrics from which districts choose comparability and system of centralized support • Still support for summative rating • Capacity building, communication, and inter-rater reliability are needs • Title II funding – how maximizing to impact teachers and pipeline • Certification, supporting evidence to ensure comparability. How to calibrate across schools? Districts? • Cultural awareness measures for teachers and admin • SB 290 implementation varied, not just the tools used • Not all tools created equal, some are harder to get a 4 on • What does state support look like?
Multiple Measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support! • Alignment with accountability good, focus on academic measure

ESSA Advisory Committee Notes
Meeting #2, July 7, 2016

School Improvement: Should districts receive identification when schools are in need of comprehensive or targeted supports?

Responses
No. But districts should be engaged in internal capacity building, rather than relying solely on external supports. Small school capacity at district level?
Holding Districts accountable for intervention. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is local capacity and relationship to ESD for help with professional development? - Provide incentives for joint funding and sharing of federal resources
School improvement in high turnover schools. Huge problem with mobile students and families.
Districts must be accountable for supporting improvement & examining policies and structures.
Be considerate of how districts in improvement are communicated to public- (Specifically when districts compete for students.)
YES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify districts with one or more schools. And identify schools within the district. • Also identify specific district responsibilities for supporting improvement. • Question: how do we identify?
Individual Schools should be identified. Districts should be required to submit an improvement plan which outlines targeted supports. Districts with more than ½ of its schools in focus on priority status should be targeted as well
How can we prioritize resources to truly support deep improvement processes and capacity to ***
Yes -Need to be aware of unintended consequence for small dist. Where parents may select neighboring district if they know about idealification. -How do we ensure dist. do provide supports? (Big Dists like PPS with many schools on the list.
It seems that placing more responsibility for engagement that the district feel may remove some of the stigma and defeating feeling amongst the staff of individual schools. Staff often get caught in the middle of district priorities and the improvement requirements. The decision makers and practitioners must all be at her table and involved in the process
Yes, districts and schools need to be identified when schools are in need of targeted supports, for accountability purposes this makes sense. It's a systems issue and the district needs to be accountable to engage & support the school I need of supports.
Seems difficult to make this meaningful for larger districts Are there ways to set criteria for larger districts?
Positive move to targeting goals & supports based analysis of district IEPs for schools/districts
If districts are identified the flexibility can be used to apply funding to the 5-10% or 10-15% We need to refine "School Improvement" The district focus may retain teachers at comprehensive/target schools.

ESSA Advisory Committee Notes
Meeting #2, July 7, 2016

School Improvement: Should districts receive identification when schools are in need of comprehensive or targeted supports?

Responses

Food for thought

- Distribution of funding & supports.
- Capacity to intervene
- Distribution of school improvement leadership & talent
- Maintenance of effort after exit
- Accountability @ district & school level

Recommend having two levels both school identification and district identification and district identification this is imperative for sys improvement and accountability.

District decisions absolutely affect what happens at the school level. When a school is designated as needing improvement efforts *Must build sustainable systems!*

District decisions absolutely affect what happens at the school level. When a school is designated as needing improvement, there must be some requirements at the district level to engage in the process and support improvement efforts. Must build sustainable systems!

Reallocation of budget-tie into budget cycle

Support Services

Instructional Practices

School culture

Family Involvement

I'm greatly concerned about labeling a district as needing improvement. This could cause quite a public relations issue, and abandoning the district rather than supportive for improvement.

When the measures are valued by the staff- the designated becomes less of the focus-it is when the single measure or compliance based system (us. Support-continuum based growth model system) is "forced" perceptually-that identification becomes a negative connotation.

Should focus on opportunities for capacity building-through a continuous plan of improvement for all schools.

Support for improving professional practice (Sipps-includes district, local & state partners Epp, ESD, etc.

Drivers for change are important-but must be comprehensive in nature-not silos of support-(targeted-based on needs)

Rather than "identification" what are the supports district should provide. District needs to be supportive & fully engaged in improvement.

Yes. The district needs to be identified and be actively engaged in assisting schools in need of comprehensive or targeted supports?

The buck should stop at the district level.

What would the district accountability look like?

What are the designations @ district level?

School Improvement: Should districts receive identification when schools are in need of comprehensive or targeted supports?

Responses

Ensure Pre K access, Kinder entry, and learning and other data in K-2 are a part of data looked at in :
-diagnostic process
-leading indicators
-"exit"

Need supports for districts that implement Pre K/early learning approach from ODS on standards, assessments, instruction, PD, educator eff, etc.

SI-Identify bottom 5% for comprehensive supports, 67% grad also identified 10% for targeted supports.

District identification:

- system evaluation
- reduces stigma/protects schools
- Resource allocation

Thoughts:

- Identify school & hold both schools & districts accountable
- Identify both.-Can't be either/or
- Need teachers to address dist. responsibility

Questions:

- How would parents know if school is on the list?
- Would that still be on the R.C?
- How does ODE plan to ensure funds are distributed equitably& for the most impact if multiple schools identified in one Dist.?
- Could we look at critical mass w/in a district & weight intervention accordingly?
- How can gender accountability at the district level help ensure equitable systems & resources?

Pros to this is it forces the collaboration to address under performance through a list of mutual accountability-w/that said it is critical for dist. to have a plan to address as district and move w/greater intentionality into various schools.

Goal- align the syst. To HB3199

Support from state-should be how progress is achieved instead of providing direction that may not be aligned to district.

Status of inactive- once met, continues for 3-5 yrs.

School Improvement: Should districts receive identification when schools are in need of comprehensive or targeted supports?

Responses

- Resources-agreement that having districts deeply engaged in improvement is critical
 - How can we ensure whole system of support (state, regional, district, school level)
 - District policies are huge impact levers
 - How to involve community members and families?
 - Stigma with identification; district involvement can incentivize positive response/action as opposed to labeling as a failure and looking for excuses. "All in this together" mindset rather than isolation.
 - District involvement can also facilitate implementation strategy/funding decisions
 - Need top-down support to sustain cultural changes
 - Onus has to lie at district level, but labelling is still a concern
 - Sometimes districts/schools need a person from the state
 - Investments/adjustment of practice at what level? What should the role of the ESDs be?
 - How to prioritize what's working vs. what's not? How to use data to drive decision-making?
 - Deploy strong leaders teachers where they're needed the most
-
- Holding district accountability to outcomes for identified school
 - Buck stops at district – parent analogy
 - Could hurt community if district identified
 - Policy change – IB school and require district to take lead on improvement with support and accountability
 - District couldn't sustain in old model
 - Need to figure out how to get there
 - Might be a motivator if district has label

ESSA Advisory Committee Notes
Meeting #2, July 7, 2016

Accountability: Should Oregon move to an accountability system based on evaluating schools on multiple measures, without an overall rating?

Responses
Reflection: Produce a list of question that teachers can use to survey students. Yes. Reflection on growth and evidence that supports their statements... Student data used if state and classroom connected Triangulate in eval too! (State, student service, class)
Yes, should have some aligned with the accountability measures and some that are flexible.
Yes. Guidelines should be flexible enough to meet needs in a variety of conditions/situations.
CTE: yes, could include # of completers in programs – competency tests – pass rates Counselors, professional learning goals Educators, non-tested grades and subjects – “established” student learning goals (SLG) Using early warning system data – responsiveness to students EWS movement (fewer absences, etc.) Principals – TELL data improvement (growth) climate – working conditions
If you can teach students you must set academic measures! Build away to link (Weight qualitative and quantitative)
Student achievement measures must remain equitable!
Accountability: Yes – no overall Yes – dashboard Yes – pared inputs and outputs Yes – District not school
Need accountability for creating condition of teaching and learning Access to advanced content Investment in professional development Instructional quality Teacher planning time jointly on a regular basis (weekly) Differential class size Intentional over-invest in low-income schools
What are the measure? Are we gamifying our school evaluations? Redesign the current data!
What about student perception of school climate and educators conditions (TEL)?
Context matters! Growth model is key! Poverty, ELLS, district-focus and support for struggling schools There could be a place for districts/schools to put information about meaningful measures for them in addition to the state reported indicators on the report card. One key thing is to incorporate pieces into a comprehensive reporting system and not have multiple reporting requirements that overlap or are redundant.
Yes, with an equity focus

ESSA Advisory Committee Notes
Meeting #2, July 7, 2016

Accountability: Should Oregon move to an accountability system based on evaluating schools on multiple measures, without an overall rating?

Responses

I don't see anything wrong with giving schools an overall rating, for community and parents, it's easier to read and make sense of.

I do think we need to be intentional about whatever measures/rubric we need to get to that number. We need to not be afraid of holding schools and districts accountable. We have some of the worse graduate rates in nation. We have got to do better.

Yes, there should be an overall rating that reflects 3-5 major areas (e.g. attendance, ninth grade on track achievement) and could be presented as a range of performance across the district.

Is one the issue a reading of the report card for the district?

Push back on "overall rating" to feds!

Too much weight on certain indicators has a negative...

Although it should be viewed as a support...it's hard to get schools to view it as such. How can we make sure that it is indeed looked at as supportive?

Multiple measures is a must!

We need both an overall rating and multiple measures for our school accountability system to identify schools that are doing well (and reward them and to identify schools who need to improve (and make sure that there are appropriate interventions). How accountability system ties to school improvement and how we provide support/push schools & districts will be imperative.

What does accountability mean: having several measurable points would be helpful. Academic outcomes – wrap around services type of outcomes as well. The ability to have info that is important to educators but also helpful for the parents and community.

Don't get rid of the Oregon growth model! Brings great context to the summative assessment data.

Maybe, but no more than 3 or 4.

Keep Oregon growth model as driver of "accountability system"

Possibly disaggregate reporting of the sub-components and give each of those a score?

Ask more parents – provide them models to see what makes the most sense.

Provide additional data on the back of "report card", provide additional info, i.e.: chronic absenteeism, starting in Kinder, 3rd grade reading and math, Kinder assessment, possibly pre-K access of incoming kids.

Improve demonstration of existing data with great graphic designer

If folks don't meet the standard, then we need to hold them accountable.

What are "we" doing after they don't meet the standard?

Thoughts:

Report cards designed for parents

How do we also provide enough local context with the requirement to disaggregate?

Support for multiple measures but with an overall score. Need the simplicity for comparisons and messaging. All 3 in the group shared this view.

Community input.

Who is the audience for there? If parents, we need them in the conversation early.

How do you reflect other valuable measures, such as wrap around services in an accountability system?

How do we include the next level of detail down?

How do we balance Title I indicators with the more ... indicators we value?

Do we move Title I indicators to a secondary position on the public report?

ESSA Advisory Committee Notes
Meeting #2, July 7, 2016

Accountability: Should Oregon move to an accountability system based on evaluating schools on multiple measures, without an overall rating?

Responses

Big question is whether final regulations will require summative rating. Oregon should advocate flexibility under ESSA.

Multiple measures at district level?

That would provide a broader view of data.

The notion of multiple measures is a strong approach. The key may be in the way it is communicated. Reducing to a number/rating does not provide an accurate picture of the school and district. Even if summative measure is required, multiple measures are valuable: more meaningful to parents, provides way for school to target areas for improvement.

Not necessarily a single rating, but yet on clear scores/ratings/compassing within key areas (1. Achievement, 2. Growth, 3. Equity, 4. Engagement, 5. College ready)

HB 3499, pledge students of color, qualitative/quantitative

What is the intersection and alignment of both?

Weight measures differently

Multiple measures – How do we use it to measure success or retention(?) supports.

Yes. Push back on federal regulations.

We are “re-imagining” right? So let’s create the system we think is best for our kids. All of our kids. No overall rating.

We need to change the definition of accountability and school improvement.

School quality indicators show teachers/districts that more than tests matter

Early warning system for school (if TELL survey results are moving +) concept for school/district

How schools use data to self-analyze and support needs of educators and students

Movement of school on continuum

Growth measures: Attendance, AP/dual credit (HS), access to technology, access to CTE programs (MS/HS), faculty attendance rates, certification of faculty, retention of educators, equity efforts, discipline referrals, partnerships with EPPs, partnerships with external entities

Indicators/report info regarding implementation of research practices

Yes – multiple measures

More weight to school climate indicators.

Need to include indicators parents care about.

- There should be an app (e.g. infographic) for that; think outside the box on delivery
- Simplify how we communicate to make it comprehensible
- All schools will have areas of strength and areas of weakness
- Need to contextualize score for parents, not just a rating
- Maybe include info, not necessarily for accountability (resource and talent allocation, make key takeaway clear, comparability is still important)
- Potentially include TELL survey/student perception data
- Community reaction is also important (school climate/culture)
- How to intentionally engage communities of color in design decisions?
- How to streamline redundant reports?
- We’re data rich, but what do we do with that data? Not just at state/district level but in the classroom?

ESSA Advisory Committee Notes
Meeting #2, July 7, 2016

Accountability: Should Oregon move to an accountability system based on evaluating schools on multiple measures, without an overall rating?

Responses

How should we communication with community about schools?

- Redesign how data presented?
- Need voice of people on receiving end w/ what they want/need
- How to do w/o demoralizing schools, educators
- Accountability defined as student outcomes and school practices, student acct. use as context for forming teacher practice
- How does instruction factor in
- Push back on overall rating
- If we don't create a rating, someone else will
- Connected parts, t/school work > student outcomes