



The Center for Educational Effectiveness



TO: AAW Members Date: 3 October, 2013

FROM: Greg Lobdell, Center for Educational Effectiveness
Ben Rarick, Linda Drake: State Board of Education

RE: Considerations for Statewide Indicators of Educational Health (SB5491)

CC:

Discussion and Feedback from the AAW

Members of the AAW are asked to:

- Provide feedback on the *Guiding Principles* outlined in this memo
- Provide feedback on the *Goal Targets* outlined in this memo
- Provide feedback on the *Application of Targets- Indicators and Goals*

A forum/mechanism will be provided as part of the 10/9/2013 AAW meeting for collection of feedback.

Introduction

In Chapter 282, Laws of 2013 (ESSB 5491), the legislature tasked the state board of education to work with various state entities – including the office of the superintendent of public instruction, the workforce training and education coordinating board, the student achievement council, and the educational opportunity gap oversight and accountability committee -- on establishing goals for improvement for the statewide indicators of educational system health established in the bill.

Specifically, the law tasks the agencies with submitting a report, by December 1, 2013, outlining “the status of each indicator,” and establishing “baseline values and initial goals” for the system. The legislation also allows for recommendations on “revised performance goals and measurements,” as the agencies go through the learning process of implementing the legislation.

The following represent our initial goal recommendations and a set of suggestions for amending the legislation as we move forward.

Details of the bill’s requirements for the indicators can be found in Appendix A.

Guiding Principles

Any rigorous goals-setting process has to start with some basic assumptions about the purpose of the process, some basic parameters about how to define goals which are ambitious yet achievable, and some understanding of the sorts of interventions, supports, and resources necessary to actually achieve the goals in question.

In establishing the goals for ESSB 5491, we operated from the following guiding principles:

1. **The state's role is important, but also limited in important ways.** The state does not “run” local schools from an operational standpoint, nor should it, and this has important implications for a state agency’s role and influence in improving performance of students on these indicators. The state does, however, have a primary role in making ample provision for our system of schools, and for developing the tools to assess our progress –establishing academic standards and assessments. Without question, these two roles play a significant role in shaping the obstacles, resources, and incentives which drive teaching and learning in the system.
2. **The goal is not always obvious.** How you construct your goal has important implications for points of emphasis in the system, and the goals are not always obvious. For example, choosing ‘closing the achievement gap’ as a policy focus may lead you to slightly different policy solutions and points of emphasis than ‘closing the growth gap’ or ‘career and college readiness for all students’. A major benefit to goals-setting is sending a powerful message to those in the field; those who are actually delivering programs and services. Slight differences in points of focus can have significant consequences for implementation.
3. **Improvement takes time.** For the goals to have legitimacy, it’s important to think through the actual system changes that would plausibly occur, and how long those changes would be expected to actually produce changes in the experiences of individual students. Expecting student performance changes in next year’s test scores, for example, represents a disconnect in that most of the actual student learning that is measured may already have occurred. In this respect, it’s important to think through what your metrics are actually measuring, and what the sequence of events are that lead to changes in that metric, over what period of time. Key considerations include: how long does full implementation of Common Core standards take? How long does it take for increased state funding to actually impact program improvements at a classroom level?
4. **Improvements take resources.** As a system, our assumption is that we can make incremental educational improvements without major changes in funding; however, it is our collective belief that we cannot achieve ambitious goals without a significant investment in our education system. Implementation of ESHB 2261 remains the primary vehicle for complying with the state’s Constitutional responsibility for ample funding of public schools, and we therefore see it as appropriate to view these goals in concert with those funding targets.
5. **System alignment remains a goal.** A variety of alignment issues became apparent during the discussion of these goals – in particular, how these goals relate the goals of the executive branch as currently being constructed in Results Washington, how they relate to the goals established by the Washington Student Achievement Council as part of their Roadmap Project, and how they align to the goals required for compliance with federal ESEA regulatory guidance with regards to setting Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). System alignment for this project means at least two things – alignment with existing goal structures, but also alignment internally so that leading indicators align with lagging indicators, and that rates of change align when one indicator is predictive of another.
6. **Our first effort is a “Beta” version.** In our initial look at the data, it is immediately clear that some data is incomplete, whereas other data will be substantially impacted by the transition to common core, where upon interim benchmarks will likely need to be recalibrated. We also believe that change is inevitable. Our tools, the metrics resulting from the tools and our techniques for analyzing the metrics will continue to improve.

Goal Targets

The goal targets build upon these guiding principles and set “realistic but challenging” (ESSB5491, page 2, line 36) goals over the 2013-14 to 2019-2020 academic years.

Two guiding goals for Washington are for the implementation of ESSB 5491:

- Close the Achievement Gap within the PK-12 system
- Career and College-Readiness for All Students

While we use 2020 as the target for this initial set of indicators and measures, we fully realize this state is significantly changing the academic standards (what a child is expected to know and be able to do) for each grade level as we implement the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). CCSS will be implemented statewide in 2014-15. The first high school graduating class that will encounter CCSS for the duration of their K-12 experience will be the class of 2027 (Kindergartners in 2014-15).

For this initial 2020 Vision, application of these Goal Targets to the indicators is based on the overall “rule” of reducing the gap between the baseline and the target by one-half (50%) by 2020.

- For achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary education or employment the target is 100%.
- For remediation, the target is 0% (no remediation).

The following section, ***Proposed Application of the Goal Targets: Indicators and Goals***, contains,

- Specific indicators and a discussion of its current state
- Its comparability with across the nation
- Two “baseline” data points: a 2-year average and the latest year result
- 5-Year Trend: using historical data (where available), the change per year as measured with a linear trend. This change is in “percentage points per year”.
- The specifics of the application of the goal target to each indicator—showing the resulting 2020 endpoint and the first two steps (2013-14 and 2014-15).

Proposed Application of the Goal Targets: Indicators and Goals

			2-year Baseline	1-Year Baseline	5-Year Trend				
Indicator	Current State	Comparative across states or Nation?	2011-12 & 2012- 13	2012- 2013 results	Change per year (percentage points per year)	Application of Goal Strategy	2013- '14 Goal	2014- '15 Goal	2020 Endpoint
WA-KIDS: Percent of students who demonstrate the characteristics of entering Kindergartners in all 6 domains	2012 first non-pilot administration. N=20,700 students in 118 schools. Biased toward high-need schools.	No	N/A	37.20%*	N/A	By 2020, reduce by ½ the gap from 100% for All-Students and each subgroup. Results in a +5.2% increase per year for All-Students. Largest step for ethnicity is Hispanic at 6.3%. ELL step is 6.8% and 7.0% for Students with Disabilities.	42.4%	47.7%	68.6%
4 th Grade Reading	Stable with extensive historical data.	No	71.95%	72.40%	+0.19 percentage points per year	By 2020, reduce by ½ the gap from 100% for All-Students and each subgroup. Results in a +2.3% increase per year for All-Students. Largest step for ethnicity is American Indian at 3.8%. ELL step is 5.5% and 4.8% for Students with Disabilities.	74.3%	76.6%	85.8%
8 th Grade Math	Stable with extensive historical data.	No	54.35%	53.20%	+0.87 percentage points per year	By 2020, reduce by ½ the gap from 100% for All-Students and each subgroup. Results in a +3.9% increase per year for All-Students. Largest step for ethnicity is American Indian at 4.6%. ELL step is 6.9% and 7.3% for Students with Disabilities.	58.3%	62.2%	77.8%
High School Graduation Rate- 4 Year Cohort	Stable with extensive historical data	Yes	76.9%	77.2%	+1.35 percentage points per year	By 2020, reduce by ½ the gap from 100% for All-Students and each subgroup. Results in a +1.9% increase per year for All-Students. Subgroup steps are TBD awaiting data from OSPI.	79.1%	81.1%	88.5%

*The 2012-13 baseline for WA-KIDS is significantly biased toward high-need schools (those receiving funding for all-day kindergarten). As WA-KIDS assessment expands to become more representative of the state, it is anticipated that the rate will rise due to the sample being more representative.

Indicator	Current State	Comparative across states or Nation?	2-Yr Base (2011-12 & 2012-13)	2012-2013 results	Change per year (percentage points per year)	Application of Goal Strategy	2013-'14 Goal	2014-'15 Goal	2020 Endpoint
Percents of graduates enrolled or employed in 2 nd and 4 th quarter after graduation **									
Postsecondary Education	All students	Yes	61% *	60% *	-0.10 percentage points per year	By 2020, reduce by ½ the gap from 100% for All-Students and each subgroup. Results in a +3.3% increase per year for All-Students. Subgroup steps are TBD.	63.3%	66.7%	80.0%
Postsecondary Employment	Approx. 50% of graduates (those with SSN in ERDC)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Percentage of students enrolled in precollege or remedial courses ***	Currently, needs to be reported separately for graduates attending 2-year and 4-year schools	Limited				By 2020, reduce by ½ the gap toward 0% (needing remediation) for All-Students and each subgroup.			
Attending 2-Year			57.5%	57.0%	-0.20 percentage points per year	Results in a 4.79% decrease per year for All-Students. Subgroup steps are TBD.	52.7%	47.9%	28.8%
Attending 4-Year			11.5%	11.0%	-0.20 percentage points per year	Results in a 0.96% decrease per year for All-Students. Subgroup steps are TBD.	10.5%	9.6%	5.8%

Postsecondary educational enrollment data does not differentiate 2nd-quarter and 4th quarter after graduation. SBE is waiting for both the 2nd-quarter and 4th-quarter data and the Class of 2012 data from ERDC (expected mid-October). Additionally, the legislation calls for education **OR employment. The postsecondary education data includes all students, the postsecondary employment data only includes those students where ERDC has a SSN, which is approximately 50% of graduates. Thus, this Indicator may need to be separated into sub-indicators since it is impossible to achieve with today's data.

***The legislation calls for "The percentage of students enrolled in precollege courses..." whereas ERDC reports the "For graduates who enrolled in postsecondary education..." and "enrollment in any precollege coursework" (underline emphasis added). While not specific in the legislation, we are interpreting this indicator to be "the percent of graduates".

Appendix A: Requirements in the Legislation

The bill requires us to look at 6 indicators which are detailed below.

Source: <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/documents/billdocs/2013-14/Pdf/Bills/Session%20Laws/Senate/5491-S.SL.pdf>
Page 2, lines 10 - 31.

- (1) The following statewide indicators of educational system health are established:
 - (a) The percentage of students demonstrating the characteristics of entering kindergartners in all six areas identified by the Washington kindergarten inventory of developing skills administered in accordance with RCW 28A.655.080;
 - (b) The percentage of students meeting the standard on the fourth grade statewide reading assessment administered in accordance with RCW 28A.655.070;
 - (c) The percentage of students meeting the standard on the eighth grade statewide mathematics assessment administered in accordance with RCW 28A.655.070;
 - (d) The four-year cohort high school graduation rate;
 - (e) The percentage of high school graduates who during the second quarter after graduation are either enrolled in postsecondary education or training or are employed, and the percentage during the fourth quarter after graduation who are either enrolled in postsecondary education or training or are employed; and
 - (f) The percentage of students enrolled in precollege or remedial courses in college.
- (2) The statewide indicators established in subsection (1) of this section shall be disaggregated as provided under RCW 28A.300.042.

Disaggregation

The bill requires disaggregation in the following subgroups.

RCW 28A.300.042

Student data-related reports – Disaggregation of data by subgroups.

*** CHANGE IN 2013 *** (SEE 5946-S.SL) ***

All student data-related reports required of the superintendent of public instruction in this title must be disaggregated by at least the following subgroups of students: White, Black, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Pacific Islander/Hawaiian Native, low income, transitional bilingual, migrant, special education, and students covered by section 504 of the federal rehabilitation act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. Sec. 794).