December 9, 2021

TO: Members of the State Board; General Public
FR: State Board Committee on Accountability & Assessment

The D.C. State Board of Education (SBOE) adopted resolution SR20-11 on September 16, 2020, recognizing the bias and narrowness of the current state accountability system known as the School Transparency and Reporting (STAR) Framework, as well as its lack of connection to needed school assistance and resources.

The SBOE Committee on Accountability & Assessments met on December 8, 2021, to review twelve potential recommendations based on testimony, survey information, and information from ward based and citywide engagement sessions. The Committee approved ten of the recommendations unanimously (4-0). Two recommendations received split votes (2-2). All twelve recommendations are included below for discussion by the State Board and the public.

The State Board anticipates voting on final recommendations at its January Public Meeting.

1. Eliminate the single summative rating of schools. (*This recommendation did not receive consensus. Wattenberg and Reid voted in favor, Patterson and Sutter in opposition.*)

2. Rate, provide scores, or percentages for designated indicators on a dynamic display dashboard. Design features of the dashboard should allow users to make selections to reveal a more detailed explanation of each indicator. OSSE should maintain the design feature that allows users to sort and compare schools by selecting indicators of interest.

3. The dashboard should clearly indicate how a school performs in relation to a range of scores, percentages, etc. of other schools in the state. This will serve to highlight how a school performs in relation to average outcomes for schools across the state.

4. Clear definitions of every highlighted element should be included. The categories below will be displayed prominently on the dashboard:

   A. **School Climate** refers to a school’s ability to create a nurturing and challenging environment that typically leads students to strong academic growth in the future.

   B. **Academic Growth** encompasses students’ improvement in math and reading scores over a year.
C. **Equitable Student Growth** details the extent to which a school is providing needed attention to students who are designated at-risk, with disabilities, English-language learners, and from different racial/ethnic groups.

D. **Proficiency** refers to the percentage of students who have reached the designated “proficient” score on the state assessment.

5. The front page of the accountability report and dashboard should be designed to highlight the following indicators: academic growth in math and reading; equitable growth (average academic growth rate of key subgroups: at-risk, SED, ELL, racial/ethnic groups); a validated, research-
based school climate measure (including student engagement and satisfaction, teacher satisfaction with available support, and family satisfaction); proficiency rates in math and English. We understand that at this point, DC does not have a climate indicator that is used by or required for all schools in the city. We ask OSSE to make it a top priority to adopt (or develop) such a metric. School performance on all of the indicators required from the U.S. Department of Education will be reported, including disaggregations for all subgroups.

A. The way in which academic growth is currently measured needs to be adjusted, per the recommendations of the Auditor’s report (D.C. Auditor's Report, p. 85).

6. Secondary indicators that can further assist stakeholders with educational decision making and advocacy to be displayed less prominently but included on the dashboard, for example:

- Well-rounded education
- Teacher retention
- Teacher experience
- Teacher diversity
- Program offerings (i.e. STEM, NAF/CTE)

The Committee notes that the list above is not exhaustive and should be expanded based on additional engagement with the public and State Board.

7. The formula used to identify the bottom 5% of schools as indicated by ESSA should include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary and Middle Schools</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency (Math and Reading)</td>
<td>Proficiency (Math and Reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner Growth</td>
<td>English Language Learning Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress (Math and Reading)</td>
<td>Graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student perceptions of School Climate</td>
<td>Extended Graduation Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable Growth</td>
<td>Equitable Growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(This recommendation did not receive consensus. Wattenberg and Reid voted in favor, Patterson and Sutter in opposition.)

8. The SBOE is open to OSSE’s recommendations on how to weight the indicators listed above for the purpose of identifying the lowest-performing 5% of schools as required by ESSA.
9. In addition to the designation and funding for the 5%, the SBOE believes that additional assistance and resources should be available to schools from the state education agency based on their needs as revealed in the Indicators. (For example, a school with low climate scores due to students’ sense that their instruction is not challenging or that the environment is not safe would get support in those areas; a school with weak indicators for safety or well-rounded education would get support on those indicators.)

10. In addition, we believe that all schools in the bottom 25% of the state should receive a School Quality Review, leading to specific recommendations for improvement. An SQR is a report conducted by knowledgeable educators that reviews the strengths and weaknesses of schools, providing those schools and stakeholders with detailed diagnostic information and recommendations for improving student outcomes. Such a review would provide school leaders and stakeholders the basis for improving their schools and would alert District and LEA leaders to the particular resource needs schools have.

11. OSSE should use the following model for its monitoring and technical assistance efforts on a yearly basis, to analyze the recommended indicators and determine the level of equitable inputs and outputs of each school. This will be a multi-year process and will require the state to establish a set of expectations for equitable inputs each school should have as part of a high-quality education.

A. Inputs are considered resources and conditions that may be beyond the control of the school (i.e. funding, staff position allocations, programs). Outcomes are the products of school resources and efforts (i.e. growth scores, graduation rates, school climate).

| High Inputs | High Outcomes |
| High Inputs | Low Outcomes |

*These schools require corrective action to better serve students from focus sub-groups*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Inputs</th>
<th>Low Inputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Outcomes</td>
<td>Low Outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These schools require more equitable inputs AND deserve study for best practices in achieving outcomes*

**These schools need significant support**

12. In the future, OSSE should utilize its emerging longitudinal data system to include an indicator for employment, career readiness, and college graduation. The intention of this measure is to determine how schools are preparing students to be citizens who contribute to society in positive ways.