

MEETING MINUTES

Arizona State Board of Education Approved Online Instruction Accountability Technical Advisory Committee

NOTICE AND **AMENDED** 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 Approved Online Instruction Accountability Technical Advisory Committee and to the general public that the Committee will hold a meeting, open to the public, on **Thursday, November 21, 2024, at 10:00 A.M. at 1535 W Jefferson St, Room 208, Phoenix, AZ 85007**

Members of the public will have physical access to the meeting location 10 minutes before the Committee meeting, at 9:50 A.M.

A copy of the agenda for the meeting is attached. The Committee reserves 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 video conferencing is available by registering here: https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_ub0S-5snS16SFhKsuAq0ig. 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 Wednesday, November 20, 2024 at 5:00 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 **Wednesday, November 20, 2024, 5:30 PM.**

DATED AND POSTED this 20th day of November, 2024.

Approved Online Instruction Accountability Technical Advisory Committee

by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sean Ross". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Sean" and last name "Ross" clearly distinguishable.

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

1. Operational

Meeting commenced at: 10:03am

Mary Gifford, Vice Chair (absent)
Jessica Harrington (virtual)
Amanda Coronado (virtual)
Kelly Pinkerton, Chair (virtual)
Dr. Yovhane Metcalfe (absent)
John Kelly (virtual), *joined late at 10:04am*
Jaime Lopez (virtual)

Chair Pinkerton changed the meeting agenda order to move item 2.C. to be second.

A. Comments for the record

Jessica Mueller, Policy and Research Administrator for the Arizona State Board of Education, presented on this agenda item. No comments were received by the deadline.

2. Technical

A. Discussion on FAY (Full Academic Year) criteria (enrollment up until May 2nd)

Chair Pinkerton introduced this agenda item.

Jessica presented on this agenda item to discuss ideas on how to capture students that obtain their minutes after the testing window.

Yassin noted that the behavior of the students and the way they learn may need to be separated from the outcome we look at. For some late completer students, they may not be consistent with getting minutes throughout the year but ramp up leading to the test results but other students get minutes consistently throughout the year but there is not statistical significance in the different assessment outcomes for either behavior pattern of students.

Members noted that late completers are showing a significant gap to reaching their minutes. Members also allow students to do a summer school enrollment to allow them to reach their minutes by the end of the fiscal year not necessarily just by the end of the academic year.

Yassin asked if we would want to increase the number of students included within the FAY definition. Would we want to decrease the threshold of minutes needed to determine that a student is a full academic year student.

Members noted that increasing the students included is good but lowering the threshold to lessen the minutes needed means that students are being included but have accessed significantly less of the material. Members noted that doing so would appear to set the system up to show negative outcomes.

Yassin noted that when research was conducted on this, that is not the outcome that was found.

Members asked how many students were included using current FAY standards and how many additional students were brought in. Jessica stated that it brought in an additional 19% of students. Yassin clarified that early achievers met their minutes by the start of the testing window and late completers met their minutes by the end of the testing window.

Members noted that there wasn't significant difference found in SGPs and asked if there were similar findings in Proficiency. Members asked if there were ways to see if the inclusion of those late completer students would have impact on the 2023-2024 school year.

Jessica and Yassin agreed that analysis could be completed similarly to what is done for other proposals.

Members asked if there were any AOIs that were not eligible for a letter grade that could become eligible for a letter grade based on these potential changes.

Jessica noted that research would be done into how many AOI schools are not receiving a letter grade.

B. Presentation and discussion on English Learner (EL) students and EL FAY (Full Academic Year)

Chair Pinkerton introduced this agenda item.

Yassin presented on this agenda item. In ELFAY, eliminated the requirement of not having breaks in enrollment more than 10 days would bring in 19 additional students. This number was much higher for FAY but was lower for ELFAY. It is a very small percentage of students that meet the ELFAY requirement within AOI schools.

Jessica asked if this effect is similar in non-AOI schools as well. Members noted that for their traditional schools they do not see such a large discrepancy.

Yassin noted that to meet the criteria for ELFAY a student must be enrolled within the first 10 days of October, cannot have enrollment gaps more than 10 days, and must meet the minute requirements by the first day of the testing window. If moving the testing window to March 17th, double the number of students are included because they meet the requirements to be an ELFAY student. You can also see that decreasing the number of minutes required, brings in more than double of the students.

Jessica noted that the requirement that students be enrolled within the first ten days of October is eliminating a lot of students.

Members questioned how that business rule applies to AOI schools.

Yassin noted that a lot of the constraints within FAY were developed based on the academic year of non-AOI schools and that it might make sense to be based more on the way AOI

schools are run. However, that can differ greatly AOI to AOI.

Members noted that it depends on if the AOI is related to a traditional school.

Jessica noted that the requirement that an EL student be enrolled within the first ten days of a school's academic calendar is a difficult requirement for AOIs especially.

Members noted that there should be alignment to a degree between AOI FAY and EL FAY for AOIs. Members noted that EL FAY is the only place that the first ten school days are used.

Yassin stated that there should be a definition that meets the requirements of an AOI school but that the deadline for the EL testing window would significantly decrease the amount of time students have to meet their minutes to be included than the requirement for AOI FAY.

Members suggested that there should be consistency in FAY for AOI and that the minute requirements should be prorated to reflect that there are big differences in the time to earn the minutes between EL FAY and AOI FAY.

Members noted that there are huge differences for AOIs on enrollment and credit progression and that there are big enrollment jumps after the first ten days of the school year.

Members noted that they are more interested in considering changing the minute requirements rather than the testing window so that the AZELLA testing window does not back up to the state testing window. Members also noted that they would like to review data before making any decisions or recommendations.

C. Presentation and discussion on indicator methods plan and timeline. 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

Chair Pinkerton introduced this agenda item.

Jessica Mueller presented on this agenda item to address the letter that was drafted by the Chair of the ATAC regarding indicator scoring.

Yassin Fahmy, Director of Accountability for the Arizona Department of Education, echoed that the consensus has been that the summative system does not lend itself well to indicator scoring at that there is interest in exploring what other states are doing and how it serves stakeholders and decision-makers regarding accountability

Members asked how this discussion relates to the 2023-2024 grades. Jessica noted that this does not impact the 2023-2024 grades as those business rules have already been approved and published. The business rules for the 2024-2025 school year are still being worked out based improved understanding and learning regarding impacts to particular school types/models.

Members clarified that there were slight changes between the 2022-2023 grades and the 2023-2024 grades business rules and that similar changes are expected for the 2024-2025 business rules.

Yassin noted that the purpose of much of this work is striving for continuous improvement. The intention of component scoring was to refine and increase transparency in the system but in doing so, it has brought out issues in the existing summative system that need to be investigated further. For example, if a school is not eligible for a 7-year grad-rate they were not eligible for graduation rate points but that has been adjusted to be pro-rated to reflect their 4-year, 5-year, and 6-year graduation rates.

Jessica noted that changes are a balance of working out positive changes for the system and balancing the need to longitudinal data for schools.

Jessica noted that there will also be outreach to the ABC groups regarding this work as well.

D. Discussion on CCRI for AOI schools

Chair Pinkerton introduced this agenda item.

Jessica walked through the Traditional Schools CCRI spreadsheet.

Members noted that AOIs seem to be between Traditional and Alternative schools and asked if there could be a modified form that could be created for AOIs. Members gave an example that when using the Alternative CCRI they received many more points. Members noted that a lot of students that come to them do not have courses like CTE and if they are not on track, the focus is on getting them to the finish line not necessarily those additional courses. Members also noted it is difficult to track all the data regarding CCRI for students.

Jessica noted that the Alternative CCRI calculates to a different scale than the Traditional CCRI and asked if there are other things that are not captured on the sheet.

Members noted that they are interested in items like scholarship and postsecondary enrollment, and work/career and service could potentially be relevant for AOI students.

Jessica noted that not many states run accountability differently for AOI schools but research can be done to see if there are other examples.

Members asked if analysis can be done on AOI schools' CCRI points and the impact to letter grades. Jessica also noted that there can be analysis on where schools are earning points. Yassin noted that many schools do not continue to report points once a student has received the maximum points.

Jessica noted that there is also the consideration of if using a student's cohort for inclusion.

Yassin noted that Alternative schools wanted to include any students that were graduating because it accommodated the fact that their students are many times off-track.

Jessica noted that the Alternative TAC is looking into the requirements for certification as an Alternative school.

3. Future Meeting Dates and Items for Future Agendas

Chair Pinkerton introduced this agenda item.

Jessica shared that the AOI annual report deadline is coming up.

Next Meeting is December 19th at the Arizona Department of Education.

Adjourned at 11:09am