MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PREPARING WORLD CLASS STUDENTS

Feedback- Stakeholder Groups
Accountability Recommendations

Introduction: Between February and July 2016, the State Superintendent of Schools and the Assistant State Superintendent for the Division of Academic Policy and Innovation, along with other Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) staff, attended approximately 40 meetings with stakeholders to discuss the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Maryland's Consolidated State Application/Plan and gather feedback from interested constituents. Seven of these specific groups: Assistant Superintendents for Instruction, Multicultural Network, External Stakeholder Committee (consisting of representatives of multiple stakeholder groups), English/Language Arts Supervisors, Gifted and Talented Advisory Council, Gifted and Talented Supervisors, and English Learner Stakeholders submitted written feedback with approximately 83 recommendations. All groups were offered the opportunity and encouraged to provide input to/recommendations for Maryland's Plan. MSDE has also met with other groups, including (but not limited to) the Special Education Community, Title I Supervisors, Teachers, Curriculum Coordinators, and LEA Superintendents to engage in dialogue about the plan and the groups' recommendations. Overall, MSDE continues to seek input and schedule stakeholder meetings for all interested parties.

Below is a summary of the accountability recommendations. Please note, these are summarized for brevity and the actual documents are available upon request.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATORS

• Include Science – reconfigure <u>integrated</u> courses • Consider using attendance and discipline data • Flexibility is paramount!!! LEAs need options • LEAs should be able to identify their own school quality indicator – state could provide exemplars but not mandate any • Growth is fine but minimize overall • Avoid School Performance Index (SPI)-like measures thru combined tests into one formula • School progress should be measured against themselves - i.e., not an arbitrary target for all schools - trajectory vs growth varies - make a starting point • Support reclassified ELs being kept in accountability for 4 years • Keep n size large enough not to be a burden on small districts • Compare subgroups by race and then compare EL vs. non-EL, Spec Ed vs. Non-Spec Ed, etc.	Assistant Superintendents for Instruction (24)
• For the non-academic indicators, have students answer questions on inclusion, equity, and cultural competency. • Consider the EL dropout rate and the concern that students will be "pushed out." • Consider coordination between accountability assessments to reduce burden on students, especially ELs. For instance consider PARCC, WIDA, HSAs, and CCRCA. It's too much. • Ongoing crosswalk needs to be in place between ESSA and the Equity Plans.	Multicultural Network (24)

• Measures of proficiency between and among student groups should be disaggregated with specific attention to the intersection of student group identification i.e. disability vs. disability, FARMS, and race. Then, reporting should be directly linked to MSDE Equity Plan.	

• Focusing separately on elementary and middle schools;
• Consider weighted accountability indicators
• Consider Dual enrollment for 12th grade year
   • Dual enrollment – credits earned not taken
   • Potentially look at dual enrollment
• Keep n size smaller;
   • Don't change N to 10 – keep it at 5
   • Keep n size low – maybe 10
   • Determine the impact on n-size from 5-10 as it may be higher for small schools
   • Look at the number of schools eliminated when moving from 5-10
• Include science in EL/MS
• Consider an Index
• Make sure indicators are Measurable, Actionable, and Meaningful
• Parent choice to "opt" out of assessment (95%) impact
• Decide whether it is 95% PARCC + alt assessment or 95% PARCC + 95% alt-assessment
• Include Waivers for students who have experienced trauma
• Determine definition for proficiency/vs advance students that shows growth of each student over time
• Incentivize school/districts growth
• Include Teacher quality and class size/case load
• Advanced coursework/specials (above core subjects)
• A social-emotional climate and culture index
• Chronic absence
• Suspension
• Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Skills
• Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA) data by performance levels – (particularly emerging level)
• Consider more than one school quality indicator
• Survey climate
• Related arts access and availability to advance coursework
• Advanced certification and teaching in area of certification
• It is critical that access to rigorous classwork is included as an indicator as well as accessibility to STEM programs
• Consider whether reporting groups (homeless, foster, military) should also be accountability groups
• Postsecondary enrollment should include military
	External Stakeholder Committee (26)

• Worried about no highly qualified teachers • There needs to be some level, some standard	English/ Language Arts (ELA) Supervisors (24)
• Consider Gifted and Talented students as a separate student group • Ensure above grade-level testing is an option • Give schools extra credit for getting students to the advanced level	Gifted and Talented Advisory Council (43)

• Use computer adaptive assessments • Require subject matter assessments at the beginning and end of year to determine growth	
• Include multiple pathways and entry points for GT identification, promoting diversity while maintaining program integrity. • Include longitudinal monitoring of GT student performance, including course selection and advanced opportunities (e.g., internships, dual-enrollment, AP, IB, etc.) in high school. • Dropout rates • Indicators should be LEA developed and driven. • AP course work with 3 or higher AP test scores, • Number of students in pull out GT services, • # of students in advanced classes in middle school, • # of students with advanced grade placements, • # of CTE completers • Accountability for direction of some funds towards GT education (professional learning, programming costs, identification tools, etc.) • Per-pupil expenditures should include specific funding for students with special needs, including gifted.	Gifted and Talented Supervisors (24)
• Cohort graduation rates- 5 year is preferred (multiple times) • Provide an alternative pathway for students who will age out or will meet a set criterion	English Learner Supervisors (29)
• Extend growth measure through middle and primary education • Increase n size from 5 • N size should remain small, keep it at 5 • Recognize bilingual students as a student subgroup	English Learner Advisory Council (20)

Summary: Overall, stakeholders are very interested in the new accountability system. Some themes that rise to the top include (parenthesis indicate the number of times it is recommended across stakeholder groups):

- Keep the n-size (5/10) low (8)
- Include measures of dual enrollment (5)
- Include science in accountability (4)
- Include data other than proficiency, example, attendance, discipline, etc (23)
- Support for growth measures (6)
- Include 5-year cohort graduation rate (9)
- Keep measures to a minimum (4)

In these seven groups represented here, there are approximately 214 individuals that contributed to these recommendations. The groups met in person and/or used their list serves as a way to solicit feedback. MSDE will continue to request, collect recommendations and share with the workgroups.

Some areas to address that may be contrary to each other (Note: Since we have collected recommendations and have not shared a specific plan to date, the collection did not call attention to areas of differences):

- Index/summative vs dashboard
- Choices provided to LEAs vs same measures for each school per level