State Board of Education - Accountability Committee January 30, 2013 Meeting Minutes

Open and Welcome

Chair Tom Gunlock opened the meeting 1:08 p.m., extending a welcome to all Committee members and guests. He said that while the Committee has a huge task before them, he has great confidence in Tina Thomas-Manning and the entire team.

Introductions

Tina Thomas-Manning introduced herself and thanked the State Board of Education members for their trust. Tina then introduced Kevin Duff, Beth Juillerat, Matt Cohen, Chris Woolard and John Richard as ODE staff supporting the work of the Committee.

Review of Documents

Mrs. Thomas-Manning reviewed the agenda and other documents for consideration today, then deferred to Mr. Cohen for a discussion of simulations for letter grades.

Performance Indicators / Letter Grades

Mr. Cohen began by explaining performance index scores and how they are calculated. The Committee considered three simulation versions, discussing merits of each. Questions were raised about whether rounding was used and whether changes could be made yearly. Superintendent Sawyers said that no rounding was used, and confirmed that other than A, C and F, they can be changed yearly. Superintendent Sawyers said the ODE staff recommendation is to choose the most rigid of the three because it is important to establish a high standard.

Mr. Smith motioned and Mrs. Dodd seconded the motion to adopt the following scale:

A = 90% - 100%

B = 80% - 89.9%

C = 70% - 79.9%

D = 50% - 69.9%

F = Below 50%

Chair Gunlock called for a verbal vote and all voted in favor.

Weighted Performance Indicators for Accelerated Students

Committee members discussed the impact of creating a new weight for students who are accelerated a grade and who score "advanced" on state assessments. The committee suggested ODE staff run simulations showing the impact of several potential weights for review at the February 6th meeting.

Letter Grades / Percentages for Indicators Met

Mr. Cohen said the current system looks at 24 assessments and 26 performance indicators, even though many schools and community schools have fewer than 24 indicators possible. In fact, only five schools in the state have 24 indicators. Last year 700 schools only had 10, about 1000 only had 7. After a lively discussion, Mr. Williams motioned to adopt the same grading scale that was chosen for the performance index (above). Mr. Collins seconded the motion, and all Committee members voted yes. The motion passed.

Defining a System of Combining Metrics

Mrs. Thomas-Manning asked for feedback on the weighting on each of the six components to get the composite score. A number of elements make up each component, for example six different elements make up the Value Added component, two in Achievement, two for Graduation Rate, and so on. After much discussion, the Committee agreed that Index versus Indicator comparisons of 60-40, 75-25, 80-20 and 50-50 would be helpful for review at the February 6th meeting. ODE staff will provide these comparisons.

Report Card Design and Stakeholder Feedback

Chair Gunlock explained that by December 31, 2013 the State Board of Education must produce a list of items that may appear on the Local Report Card as information-only items. He asked for stakeholder feedback on this effort. He also asked for input as to what should be "highlighted" in the Local Report Card. Options discussed included going deeper into the data, comparisons with other states, comparisons against the State Report Card, and showing historical data. A web portal will be established for stakeholders to provide feedback.

Preview of New LRC Page

Superintendent Sawyers previewed a new Local Report Card page that will go live soon on the ODE website. This page will offer resources for districts to have more access to information and updates.

Address from the Audience

Mr. Tom Ash of BASA addressed the Committee, distributing a handout describing Oklahoma's letter grade system. Mr. Ash said less weighting is desired for those components over which districts have no control. He advised that the design of the report card depends on the answer to questions such as who is our audience and is the report card meant to be formative or summative. Mr. Ash thanked the Committee for the opportunity to address the room.

Planning for Next Meeting – Graduation Rate and Safe Harbor

Mrs. Thomas-Manning asked the group to review Graduation Rate information and the Safe Harbor requirement in preparation for the next meeting,

Adjournment

Mr. Smith moved to adjourn. Mr. Collins seconded. Chair Gunlock adjourned the meeting at 4:22 p.m.

Next meeting - February 6, 2013 in the SBOE meeting room at ODE from 2:30 to 4:30 p.m.