1700 W Washington St Room 104

Phoenix, AZ 85007

MEETING MINUTES

Arizona State Board of Education Alternative Accountability Technical Advisory Committee

NOTICE AND AGENDA

Pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the Arizona State Board of Education, the Alternative Accountability Technical Advisory Committee and to the general public that the Committee will hold a meeting, open to the public, on Monday, May 13, 2024, at 09:00 A.M at 1700 W Washington St Room 104, Phoenix, AZ 85007. Members of the public will have physical access to the meeting location 10 minutes before the Committee meeting, at 8:50 A.M.

A copy of the agenda for the meeting is attached. The Committee reser ves the right to change the order of items on the agenda, with the exception of public hearings. One or more members of the Committee may participate telephonically.

Agenda materials can be reviewed online at http://azsbe.az.gov

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02 (H), the Committee may discuss and take action concerning any matter listed on the agenda.

Pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.03 (A) (2), the Committee may vote to convene in executive session, which will not be open to the public, for discussion or consideration of records exempt by law from public inspection.

Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation such as a sign language interpreter or narrator by contacting the State Board Office at (602) 542-5057. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Please see below on how to access the meeting and provide public comment on agenda items.

Methods on Accessing the Committee Meeting

This meeting is accessible to the public through in-person attendance at the address listed on this notice. This meeting is not live-streamed to any platform, or recorded. Accessing the meeting virtually through a link is not available at this time. Please refer to materials published on this agenda, procedure for submitting public comment, and minutes published online: https://azsbe.az.gov/public-meetings/committee-meetings.

Procedure for Submitting Public Comment:

For individuals wishing to submit public comment

Written Comment:

Written comments for the meeting will be accepted by:

- email inbox@azsbe.az.gov
- fax to (602) 542-3046
- USPS to 1700 W. Washington St., Executive Tower, Suite 300, Phoenix, Arizona 85007

The deadline to submit a written comment will be Friday, May 10, 2024 at 12:00 PM.

Written comments received after the deadline will not be posted and will not be provided to members.

Written comments will not be read into the record, however, staff will post all written comments received by the deadline on the Committee's agenda by Friday, May 10, 2024 at 5:00 PM.

DATED AND POSTED this 7th day of May, 2024.

Alternative Accountability Technical Advisory Committee

by:

Sean Ross, Executive Director State Board of Education (602) 542-5057

1. Operational

Committee Meeting commenced at 9:05am.

Attendees
Binky Michelle Jones, Chair
Sue Durkin, Committee Member
Wayne Tucker, Committee Member
Harriet Caruso, Committee Member

Jessica Mueller, Research and Data Analyst for the State Board of Education, took attendance. The Committee has a quorum.

A. UPDATED - Comments for the record - UPDATED

Jessica Mueller, Research and Data Analyst for the State Board of Education, provided an update on the public comments received. One comment was received requesting virtual attendance of the Committee Meeting. There are no members of the public observing the committee meeting.

Committee Members discussed how observers may attend the meeting in person. At a future meeting, the committee will discuss the possibility of allowing virtual attendance.

2. Technical

A. UPDATED - Presentation and discussion on indicator scoring: Introduction of possible methodologies for establishing expected standards of performance outlined in A.R.S. 15-241(G): Pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.03 (A) (2), the Committee may vote to convene in executive session, which will not be open to the public, for discussion or consideration of records exempt by law from public inspection - UPDATED

Sean Smith, Chief Accountability Officer for the Arizona Department of Education, presented to the Committee. The first recommendation was a worksheet to show the differences happening what ADE is doing in response. The purpose is to evaluate the changes made and calculate the new indicator grades by calculating the standard deviation, average, etc. This worksheet has been shared with the Committee. Almost all indicators are working almost the same. The real differences are related to the "scale score".

The Committee Members and Sean Smith discussed how to calculate Proficiency points via a live presentation of the created spreadsheet.

The Committee Members discussed the columns, points, and classification of minimally proficiency.

The Committee Members, Sean Ross, Executive Director for the State Board of Education, and Sean Smith discussed how the number of minimally proficient students does not impact the school's overall letter grade since these students are reflected as zero in the numerator. These students are included in the denominator and have zero points allocated in the numerator.

Sean Ross suggested the insertion of the column representing minimally proficient students. Otherwise, the media will jump on this topic.

Sean Ross and Sean Smith discussed how this tool will help schools and stakeholders with transparency and improve understanding. All of the provided data is already available via ADE Connect.

Sean Smith continued to present to the Committee regarding the scale score.

Jessica Mueller, Research and Data Analyst for the State Board of Education, and Sean Smith discussed the A bucket as it relates to proficiency. The top 30% of all schools are an A. This is how the cuts are set.

Sean Ross and Jessica Mueller discussed how schools will assume that having an A in proficiency directly correlates to having a student population who are highly proficient vs. being high performing.

Committee Member Kelly Powell joined 9:26am

Jessica Mueller stated that the data is norm referenced and is the comparison of schools to each other. Not sure of how schools will handle this difference in understanding.

Sean Ross added that year 1 will be norm referenced; however, everything following year 1 will be criteria based.

Sean Ross and Sean Smith discussed preparing for the widespread misunderstanding from the public regarding pass rates. Legislators will question whether the bar is being lowered. An alternative diploma should not be worth less than a diploma from a traditional school. Data via comparison to the rest of the state is already baked into the formula.

Sean Ross and Sean Smith discussed aligning the ideals of all circumstances by setting the criteria high. These methods are not very different from summative letter grades via cut scores. However, the Committee must also plan seeds abou the meaning of the data to tminimizehe pushback from stakeholders.

Committee Member Mary Berg arrived at 9:35am.

Sean Smith stated that the Committee is getting ahead of this issue by outlining the goals and the standard achievement so that schools may begin working towards that.

The Committee Members, Sean Ross, and Sean Smith discussed how alternative schools will struggle to earn an A due to the their need to be outstanding in all areas. Inclduing EL. It is true that certain schools will struggling with proficiency due to school population size. The new measurements will reveal the school's additional resrouces and programs thereby leveling the playing field.

Sean Ross and Sean Smith discussed the norm criteria scores. The norms can be reset every few years. Criterion will be used on the years following.

The Committee Members, Sean Ross, and Sean Smith discussed how schools will need to

trust that feedr schools are teaching students what they need to know. Schools do not have a lot of control of their students population. Additionally, increasing the standard every 4 years or so via the normative calculations does not mean that schools will be able to make these goals.

Sean Ross and Sean Smith discussed establishing a scale score based on the trend data. This can be re-examined every four years to raise the bar accordingly to ensure the goal is within the safety net of what an be realistically achieved. No on is interested in setting up schools for failure. The safety net will catch schools is no one achieves the identified goals since no school can change their incoming population from feeder schools. This way, the requirements will constantly be meeting students where they are.

Sean Ross and Brue DuPlanty left the Committee Meeting at 9:56am.

Jessica Mueller made comments about accountability appeals. The Committee must constantly ask oneself if the problem being considered is a school problem or a systematic one.

Committee Members discussed the data noise. The data noise can reduce the scale score metric, but the safety net will trigger instead to absorb a pandemic or other type of issues.

The Committee Members discussed the achievement of the top third of alternative schools as it relates to the proficiency points allocated.

The Committee discussed the proficiency scores as it relates to EL students and alternative schools.

The Committee discussed examples of how grades from certain schools would be in the new indicator system.

Committee Member Binky Michelle Jones left the meeting at 10:27am

- i. Exploration of performance expectations
- ii. Allocation of points to indicators
- iii. Establishment of indicator cut scores
- B. Study and discussion of AATAC member questions
 - i. Grades 6-8 students in alternative schools: Transitional readiness ("Go")

3. Future Meeting Dates and Items for Future Agendas

A Committee Member stated that they would appreciate pooling all alternative data scores vs. average or averages. There is an interest in the distribution of ACT, ELA, and Math and non alternative.

Committee Meeting adjourned at 10:35am.