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| **Recommendation Number** | **Item** | **ESSA Citation** | **Discussion** | **Change to Current Practice** | **Recommendation(s)** | **Minority Opinion** | **Decision of Members** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RC001 | N-Size for display | 1111(h) (1)(C)(i)(I) and 1111(h) (1)(B) | The group reviewed background information and data related to the minimum number of students that can be (a) shown for reporting purposes, and/or (b) used for accountability. ESSA requires a specified N for accountability, but the group discussed that as well as non-accountability presentation of information. | Yes.  Current N-size is consistent (minimum of 10) for all report card information. “Bundling” would be a different approach, allowing more data to be displayed. | All non-accountability information (Report Card data) should have a minimum N-size of 10 students in order to be displayed, in accordance with state law.  The Report Card should if possible, instruct and allow users to ‘bundle’ sub-groups until the minimum N-size is achieved. |  | Consensus |
| RC002 | N-size for Accountability | 1111(c) (3)(A)(i) and 1111(h) (1)(C)(i)(I) | The group reviewed and discussed WA data and how different N-sizes for Accountability would include more or fewer students. | Yes. N-size under AYP was 30 (although it was temporarily 20 under the ESEA waiver) | N-size design for Accountability may be determined by the ESSA accountability workgroup. However, the Report Card Workgroup reviewed the topic and makes this recommendation to the Accountability Systems Workgroup for consideration:  *“ESSA requires states to establish the minimum number of students to be included for accountability purposes. To balance student inclusion with reliable results, we support using a minimum n-size of 20 for accountability calculations for the ‘all students’ category and for student subgroups.  For schools with fewer than 20 students in a given subgroup, we recommend combining the most recent two or three years of data if that results in reaching the 20 student minimum****.”*** |  | Consensus |
| RC003 | Design and usability | 1111(h) (1)(B) | Reviews of current report card site for Washington as well as several other states. Presentations and reviews of multiple other information presentation sites both public and private sector.  Workgroup discussions on design and presentation principles. | No | The workgroup recommends the Washington Report Card website be developed and improved with the following underlying principles. Report Card should be:  ***Rich.*** *Provide access to meaningful and relevant data with different levels of detail. This would include having disaggregated information, longitudinal data, drill-down capacity, and downloadable data files.*  ***Timely.*** *Updated regularly, such that it contains the most recent information.*  ***Easy-to-use.*** *Simple and intuitive navigation that is ADA compliant, and multilingual.*  ***Understandable.*** *Information is clearly labeled. Definitions and documentation are readily available and easily understood.*  ***Interactive.*** *Information is accessible in a variety of user customizable presentations that allows users to consume information in a manner that suites them best. User experience should be customizable and provide search and help features.*  ***Actionable****. Contextual documentation is easily accessible that enables users to fully understand the information viewed.* |  |  |
| RC004 | Customer and Stakeholder Input | 1111(h) (1)(B)(ii) | The group discussed possible mechanisms for getting parent and LEA feedback on Report Card, particularly during usability testing. | No | The workgroup recommends the following regarding customer and stakeholder input for Report Card:   1. Leverage parental input activities initiated by other ESSA workgroups to gather as much parental input as is possible. 2. Leverage District and Stakeholder activities initiated by other ESSA workgroups to gather as much input as possible. 3. Design and implement a feedback survey.  * Incorporate feedback survey into current Report Card website for the purpose of influencing design of new Report Card. * Incorporate feedback survey into new Report Card for the purpose of continues product improvement. |  | Consensus |
| RC005 | Civil Rights Data | 1111(h) (1)(C)(viii) | Presentation of current Civil Rights LEA collection and overlap between SEA data collections and LEA OCR submissions. Discussion related to ability and value of expanding current SEA collections to include all LEA OCR reporting. | No | The workgroup recommends that the ESSA requirement to display the Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) shall be met by providing a clearly labeled and defined link to the federal data site (<http://ocrdata.ed.gov/>). The site already contains a variety of data displays, using the data submitted directly by districts.  The workgroup recommends that OSPI continue to review elements that are reported in CRDC and already collected in CEDARS. Where appropriate and possible report those elements directly on Report Card when it would be valuable to have them integrated with other Report Card information. |  |  |
| RC006 | Functions, Features and Data | 1111(h) (1)(B) | Presentations and review of other ‘Report Card’ sites. The group had work sessions to identify missing or priority information that could or should be contained in report card. The group also prioritized features and functions as well as layering of information to focus on tier 1- Parents, tier 2- Educators/Administrators, tier 3- Researchers. | Yes – the recommendation is a significant deviation from the current presentation practice of report card. | The workgroup made a collection of recommendations regarding prioritization and the structure of Report Card. The recommendations are specifications and will help guide the actual development of the revised Report Card. The attached documents outline:   1. workgroup prioritization for features and functions. 2. workgroup recommendations for layering of data and data groupings. 3. example of workgroup recommendation of data presentation style. |  |  |
| **ESSA Consolidated Plan Team Feedback** | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| **Federal Programs Workgroup Feedback** | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
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