THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Accountability | World-Class Math and Science Standards | Meaningful Diploma/CORE 24

SYSTEM PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM: NEXT STEPS

BACKGROUND

Since 2006, the State Board of Education has been considering the components of a statewide accountability system, one essential to ensuring our students receive an excellent and equitable education. A comprehensive accountability system must address the core challenges in our persistently low achieving schools.

Washington's laws currently prohibit the state from intervening in persistently low achieving schools. Thus school districts may choose whether or not to participate in state supported assistance. Our students deserve better.

The Board created a Systems Performance Accountability (SPA) work group to review staff work on developing proposals for an accountability system. Dr. Kristina Mayer has served as lead for the SPA work group, which consists of stakeholders from a variety of educational groups. The meeting materials can be found at: http://www.sbe.wa.gov/spa.htm. The Board has also conducted many outreach sessions statewide. The Board has incorporated the feedback received, which included: a state partnership with the local districts (no state unilateral action), and one system of accountability (both federal and state).

At its January 2009 meeting, the Board passed a resolution outlining its Accountability Framework (see Attachment A). There are three components to the Accountability Framework:

1. An Accountability Index to recognize schools that are successful and those that need additional assistance.
2. Targeted state programs to assist districts.
3. Required action, if there are no improvements.

The 2009 Legislature's approval of the Board's Accountability Framework is reflected in sections 501-503 of ESHB 2261 (part of the new basic education funding system). The legislature asked the SBE to present its report by December 1, 2009 (see Attachment B). The System Performance Accountability (SPA) work plan may be found under Attachment C.

Board and staff have continued to work on the details of the Accountability Framework over the last nine months.

POLICY CONSIDERATION

Due to the recent federal activity; feedback from policy experts on the Provisional Accountability Index; our SPA work group; and OSPI input, staff has outlined detailed next steps for the Board's Accountability Framework. See the Background and Policy Consideration Details in the following pages.

EXPECTED ACTION

The Board gave feedback to staff at the September 2009 meeting. Staff and Board members will make revisions to the detailed Accountability Framework and share with stakeholders this fall. Then the draft final report and proposed legislation will be submitted to the Board for discussion and approval at its November 2009 meeting. The report is due to the legislature December 1, 2009.

BACKGROUND AND POLICY CONSIDERATION DETAILS

The State Board of Education's Work to Date

Accountability Index

At the May 2009 meeting, the Board approved a Provisional Accountability Index to identify successful schools and districts as well as those in need of improvement. The purpose of this index is to give credit to schools that are improving and or closing the achievement gap in the state identified outcomes below. The Provisional SBE Accountability Index criteria form a 20-cell matrix that measures five outcomes in four ways. The results for each cell are rated on a scale of one to seven. The ratings are then averaged to create one final number that averages the rating of all the cells: an Accountability Index. Averages for the outcomes and indicators are also computed to provide more relevant feedback to educators.

Table 1: Matrix of Accountability Measures for Index

	OUTCOMES					
INDICATORS	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Ext. Grad. Rate	*Average*
Achievement of non-low income						
Achievement of low income						
Achievement vs. peers						
Improvement from previous year						
Average						*INDEX*

The Board intends to have one accountability system. Thus, the Board will work with OSPI and the federal government to adopt a new index either through a U.S. Department of Education waiver or revisions to No Child Left Behind (NCLB).

The Board has received feedback from Washington stakeholders as well as from Washington D.C. policy experts. Though the Board's proposed index has some very desirable features, many education stakeholders informed us that we should include student data by race, ethnicity, ELL, and special education. The Board's consultant, Pete Bylsma, is working on changes that will include a subgroup analysis.

The Provisional Accountability Index will; however, be used with some modifications for the Joint OSPI/SBE School Recognition Program in the fall of 2009.

System for Voluntary Action

OSPI has briefed the Board on its District and School Improvement Programs under Title I. OSPI has shifted from working with individual schools to building district capacity. At the August 2009 SPA meeting, OSPI provided an update on its continuum of voluntary services. Please see the SPA Notes in Attachment D. New federal regulations on the Title I School Improvement Program were published in late August and may have a significant impact on how OSPI provides services to districts and schools in the future.

Required Action

At the August 2009 SPA meeting, the work group discussed criteria beyond Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) that could be used to examine districts with schools that are chronically struggling. These districts would then be notified that they were being considered for state Required Action. The steps for Required Action were also discussed. Please see the SPA August Notes in Attachment D. Based on the feedback from this meeting and further discussions with OSPI, a set of conditions for identifying schools and districts and steps for Required Action are identified below.

Federal Direction and Discussion of Need for State Alignment

Recent federal initiatives including the state stimulus funds, the competitive grant for Race to the Top,[1] and proposed School Improvement guidelines under Title I[2] require states to change dramatically the way states will assist persistently low achieving schools both in terms of the interventions as well as the data collected.

In particular, the Board must consider the proposed guidelines for Title I School Improvement as part of its work to ensure some uniformity in the accountability system. The federal government has provided a significant increase in school improvement funding to serve Title I schools. Washington State may receive $45 million over the next two years, which is almost double the amount it currently receives. The U.S. Department of Education is looking for a significant investment in the lowest performing schools in each state to dramatically transform school culture and improve student academic outcomes. Since Title I disproportionately supports elementary schools, there will be an opportunity to allow states to intervene in low performing middle and high schools that are eligible for Title I but not currently funded.

The new draft regulations for the School Improvement Program may require a significant shift in how OSPI now provides services. The essence of the proposed rules will require that OSPI identify the lowest performing Title I and Title II eligible schools. Performance is defined as: those schools that have not made similar gains to the state average of all schools performance in the “all student” category for both math and reading.

OSPI must identify the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools and equally low-achieving secondary schools eligible but not receiving Title I funds. Lowest performance is defined as little or no progress over a number of years in the “all student” category in reading and mathematics compared to average state performance in these same categories.

[1] Federal Register Volume 74, No 144/Wednesday July 29,2009 See page 37810 for turning around struggling schools
[2] Federal Register Volume 74, No 164/Wednesday, August 26, 2009 pages 43101-14.

In the selection process, OSPI will consider greatest need, strongest commitment, and mix of Tier I, II and III schools: Initial identification will be based on the following:

Tier I. Lowest achieving five percent of Title I schools in a step of NCLB improvement.
Tier II: Equally low-achieving Title I eligible secondary schools.
Tier III: Remaining Title I schools in a step of NCLB improvement.

OSPI will also consider additional criteria to determine a final list.

States will be expected to eliminate laws and rules that limit:

1. The state's authority to intervene in low performing schools.
2. The number of charters that may operate in a school.
3. Impediments to recruit and retain effective teachers and principals in low performing schools.

Districts will be allocated up to $500,000 per school each for three years, if they choose to participate, to implement one of the following models:

1. **Turnaround:** Replace the principal and at least fifty percent of the staff. Adopt new governance structure. Implement a new or revised instructional program.
2. **Restart:** Close failing school and reopen as a charter or through an education management organization.
3. **Closure:** Close school and transfer to higher performing schools in the districts.
4. **Transformation**: Implement a comprehensive transformation strategy that develops teacher school leader effectiveness, implements comprehensive instructional reform strategies, extends learning and teacher planning time, creates community oriented schools, and provides operating flexibility and intensive support.

A. Accountability Index , Proposed Federal Matrices and State Additional Criteria for Identification of Persistently Low Achieving Schools and Their Districts

At the August SPA work session, the Board staff acknowledged that permission from the federal government (or reauthorization of NCLB) might take several years. While the Board will continue to improve its Provisional Accountability Index and work with the federal government, it is important to move ahead using the current NCLB accountability system and the proposed new federal school improvement guidelines for Voluntary Assistance and Required Action for persistently low achieving schools. In addition to the federal guidelines, staff recommends adding some factors identified by the state be used to examine improvement and other criteria to develop a process for determining which districts are eligible for Voluntary Action and Required Action.

B. Voluntary Action for Priority Districts

OSPI will create the tiers of lowest achieving schools identified using the new federal matrices under the proposed school improvement guidelines plus additional state defined criteria to determine which districts should be encouraged to participate in Voluntary Action. These districts will be identified as Priority Districts. All schools, not just Title I schools will be included in the initial review although only federal funding will be available to Title I schools.

The following ideas/criteria have been discussed at the SPA work group for state criteria. In deciding which criteria to pursue, the state will need to ensure that the information used is legally defensible (objective, quantitative, and fair) particularly if the state and local district enter into the Required Action Process. The following criteria have been discussed, some of which may not meet our need for legally defensible criteria:

- Numbers and percentages of persistently low achieving schools in districts.
- Numbers and percentages of schools not making AYP in districts.
- Number of students in each school not meeting standards in math and reading.
- Little or no growth in closing educational and achievement gaps.
- Whether improvements were made in reading, math, and high school graduation over a three year period by each school.
- Types of schools and programs.
- Changes in demographic profile of students in the last three years.
- How performance compares to similar schools.
- Washington Language Proficiency Trends and percent of students exiting the ELL program.
- Staff/Leadership turnover and equitable distribution of quality staffing.
- Alignment of curriculum and instruction to standards in math and reading.
- Use of data to inform instruction.
- Equitable allocation of resources.
- Contextual information specific to the schools and district community.
- Provisions in collective bargaining agreement that might affect student achievement.
- Climate surveys (staff, parents, and students).

OSPI will examine ways to provide services as outlined in the proposed new federal school improvement guidelines for Title I or Title II eligible schools. The state will need to decide how to serve non Title I schools that are also identified as persistently lowest achieving schools. Districts with the lowest achieving schools will be designated Priority Districts and may use one of the four models listed. At this point it is unclear what other potential programs, such as OSPI's Summit District or the Board's Innovation Zone may be available. However, it will be up to the local school districts to decide if they want to participate in any state assistance.

Required Action Process for Academic Watch Districts

Several Priority Districts may be designated as candidates for Required Action. The SPA work group, OSPI, and the Board will discuss whether some Priority Districts become Academic Watch Districts immediately for Required Action or after a two year period. OSPI will then notify the local school board and SBE of the districts it determines should become Academic Watch Districts. It is expected that no more than one to three districts would be selected for a cohort each year.

- Local school boards may appeal this designation to the SBE with supporting evidence that addresses each of the criteria used to designate them in Academic Watch.
- SBE directs OSPI to conduct an independent Academic Performance Audit of Districts on Academic Watch. The audit will be completed and communicated to the district and the SBE.
- OSPI will manage the Academic Performance Audit. Audit findings and recommendations will be provided to the local school district and may include one or more of the following items:
    - ✓ Improvement of the comprehensive instructional program.
    - ✓ Reorganization of instructional time.
    - ✓ Requirement to select new personnel and/or revise personnel practices.

- ✓ Requirement to change school structures to improve learning opportunities.
- ✓ Requirement to strengthen family and community engagement.

- Academic Watch Districts receive a grant and OSPI assistance to develop an Academic Watch Plan and estimated budget. The local school board works with its staff and community to prepare the Academic Watch Plan. The Plan will select one of the models outlined in the federal school improvement guidelines that best fits their conditions:
  - ✓ **Turnaround**. Replace principal and fifty percent of staff; adopt new governance and other requirements.
  - ✓ **Restart**. Open under new management.
  - ✓ **Closure**. Send students to other schools in district.
  - ✓ **Transformation**. Develop teacher and school leader effectiveness, comprehensive instructional reforms, extended learning times, community based schools, and provide operating flexibility.

- The legislature provides the resources and authority (including the ability to change provisions in the collective bargaining agreements that are cited as impediments to student achievement in the audit) to the Academic Watch District enacting its plan.
- SBE approves local district Academic Watch Plan and ensures resources/changes in state policy are available and that the plan becomes binding between the SBE and the local school board.
- The Academic Watch District implements the plan and provides updates to its community and the SBE on a regular basis.
- OSPI provides technical assistance as needed and determines when a district has made sufficient progress necessary to leave Academic Watch.
- OSPI notifies SBE annually of a district's Academic Watch status.
- SBE approves release from Academic Watch or, if no progress, requests the district reassess its current plan and make revisions.

Attachment A

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY RESOLUTION
JANUARY 15, 2009

WHEREAS, the State Board of Education believes that all students deserve an excellent and equitable education and that there is an urgent need to strengthen a system of continuous improvement in student achievement for all schools and districts; and

WHEREAS, the legislature charged the State Board of Education to develop criteria to identify schools and districts that are successful, in need of assistance, and those where students persistently fail, as well as to identify a range of intervention strategies and performance incentive systems; and

WHEREAS, the State Board of Education affirms the call for stronger accountability must be reciprocal between the state and local school district and accompanied by comprehensive funding reform for basic education that demonstrates “taxpayer money at work” in improving student achievement; and

WHEREAS, the State Board of Education will work with its education partners to create a unified system of federal and state accountability to improve student achievement; and

WHEREAS, the State Board of Education recognizes the need for a proactive, collaborative accountability system with support from the local school board, parents, students, staff in the schools and districts, regional educational service districts, business partners, and state officials to improve student achievement; and

WHEREAS, the State Board of Education believes that schools and districts should be recognized for best practices and exemplary work in improving student achievement; and

WHEREAS, the State Board of Education recognizes the critical role of local school boards in addressing student achievement in developing a new state accountability system as well as the need to create a new collaborative mechanism to require certain school district actions if student achievement does not improve;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board of Education will develop an Accountability Index to identify schools and districts, based on student achievement using criteria that are fair, consistent, transparent, and easily understood for the purposes of providing feedback to schools and districts to self-assess their progress as well as to identify schools with exemplary performance and those with poor performance; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the State Board of Education will work with its education partners to build the capacity of districts to help their schools improve student achievement. Programs will be tailored to the magnitude of need. As part of this system of assistance, the Board will ensure that all efforts are administered as part of one unified system of state assistance including the Innovation Zone – a new effort to help districts dramatically improve achievement levels; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that after a time set by the State Board of Education where there is no significant improvement based on an Accountability Index and other measures as defined by the Board, the district will be placed on Academic Watch and the State Board of Education will:

- Direct the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction to conduct an academic performance audit using a peer review team.

- Request the local school board, in collaboration with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, to develop an Academic Watch Plan based on the review findings, which would include an annual progress report to the local community.

- Review, approve, or send back for modification the local board Academic Watch plan, which once approved becomes a binding performance contract between the state and district.
- Ensure that the local school board will remain responsible for implementation.

- Request the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction to monitor implementation of the plan and provide updates to the State Board of Education, which may require additional actions be taken until performance improvement is realized.

- Declare a district is no longer on Academic Watch when the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction reports to the State Board of Education that the district school or schools are no longer in Priority status; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the State Board of Education believes this accountability framework needs to be a part of the revisions made to the basic education funding system and that the legislature will provide the State Board of Education, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the local school boards with the appropriate legal authority and resources to implement the new system; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board will continue to refine the details of the accountability system by working with its education, parent, business and community partners over the next year.

Adopted: January 15, 2009

Attest:
Mary Jean Ryan, Chair

Attachment B

ESHB 2261 Accountability Language

Summary:

Legislative intent is to create a proactive, collaborative system of accountability based on progressive levels of support and with a goal of continuous improvement in student achievement. The State Board of Education (SBE) and the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) has been directed to seek approval for use of the system for federal accountability purposes.

Requires the SBE to continue refining an accountability framework that includes:

- An accountability index to identify successful schools and those in need of assistance.
- A proposal and timeline for a comprehensive system of voluntary support and assistance to be submitted to the legislature before being implemented.
- A proposal and timeline for a system targeted to those that have not demonstrated improvement that takes effect only if authorized by the legislature and that includes an academic performance audit; a school board-developed corrective action plan, which would be subject to SBE approval and become binding; and progress monitoring by OSPI.
- Report due to legislature December 1, 2009.

ESHB 2261 Language

SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY FOR SCHOOL AND DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT

NEW SECTION. **Sec. 501.** (1)(a) The legislature intends to develop a system in which the state and school districts share accountability for achieving state educational standards and supporting continuous school improvement. The legislature recognizes that comprehensive education finance reform and the increased investment of public resources necessary to implement that reform must be accompanied by a new mechanism for clearly defining the relationships and expectations for the state, school districts, and schools. It is the legislature's intent that this be accomplished through the development of a proactive, collaborative accountability system that focuses on a school improvement system that engages and serves the local school board, parents, students, staff in the schools and districts, and the community. The improvement system shall be based on progressive levels of support, with a goal of continuous improvement in student achievement and alignment with the federal system of accountability.

1 (b) The legislature further recognizes that it is the state's responsibility to provide schools and districts with the tools and resources necessary to improve student achievement. These tools include the necessary accounting and data reporting systems, assessment systems to monitor student achievement, and a system of general support, targeted assistance, recognition, and, if necessary, state intervention.

(2) The legislature has already charged the state board of education to develop criteria to identify schools and districts that are successful, in need of assistance, and those where students persistently fail, as well as to identify a range of intervention strategies and a performance incentive system. The legislature finds that the state board of education should build on the work that the board has already begun in these areas. As development of these formulas, processes, and systems progresses, the legislature should monitor the progress.

Sec. 502. RCW 28A.305.130 and 2008 c 27 s 1 are each amended to read as follows: The purpose of the state board of education is to provide advocacy and strategic oversight of public education; implement a standards- based accountability framework that creates a unified system of increasing levels of support for schools in order to improve student academic achievement; provide leadership in the creation of a system that personalizes education for each student and respects diverse cultures, abilities, and learning styles; and promote achievement of the goals of RCW 28A.150.210. In addition to any other powers and duties as provided by law, the state board of education shall …(language continues from current law)

NEW SECTION. **Sec. 503.** A new section is added to chapter 28A.305 RCW to read as follows:

(1) The state board of education shall continue to refine the development of an accountability framework that creates a unified system of support for challenged schools that aligns with basic education, increases the level of support based upon the magnitude of need, and uses data for decisions.

(2) The state board of education shall develop an accountability index to identify schools and districts for recognition and for additional state support. The index shall be based on criteria that are fair, consistent, and transparent. Performance shall be measured using multiple outcomes and indicators including, but not limited to, graduation rates and results from statewide assessments. The index shall be developed in such a way as to be easily understood by both employees within the schools and districts, as well as parents and community members. It is the legislature's intent that the index provide feedback to schools and districts to self-assess their progress, and enable the identification of schools with exemplary student performance and those that need assistance to overcome challenges in order to achieve exemplary student performance.

Once the accountability index has identified schools that need additional help, a more thorough analysis will be done to analyze specific conditions in the district including but not limited to the level of state resources a school or school district receives in support of the basic education system, achievement gaps for different groups of students, and community support.

(3) Based on the accountability index and in consultation with the superintendent of public instruction, the state board of education shall develop a proposal and timeline for implementation of a comprehensive system of voluntary support and assistance for schools and districts. The timeline must take into account and accommodate capacity limitations of the K-12 educational system. Changes that have a fiscal impact on school districts, as identified by a fiscal analysis prepared by the office of the superintendent of public instruction, shall take effect only if formally authorized by the legislature through the omnibus appropriations act or other enacted legislation.

4)(a) The state board of education shall develop a proposal and implementation timeline for a more formalized comprehensive system improvement targeted to challenged schools and districts that have not demonstrated sufficient improvement through the voluntary system. The timeline must take into account and accommodate capacity limitations of the K-12 educational system. The proposal and timeline shall be submitted to the education committees of the legislature by December 1, 2009, and shall include recommended legislation and recommended resources to implement the system according to the timeline developed.

(b) The proposal shall outline a process for addressing performance challenges that will include the following features:

(i) An academic performance audit using peer review teams of educators that considers school and community factors in addition to other factors in developing recommended specific corrective actions that should be undertaken to improve student learning;
(ii) A requirement for the local school board plan to develop and be responsible for implementation of corrective action plan taking into account the audit findings, which plan must be approved by the state board of education at which time the plan becomes binding upon the school district to implement; and
(iii) Monitoring of local district progress by the office of the superintendent of public instruction. The proposal shall take effect only if formally authorized by the legislature through the omnibus appropriations act or other enacted legislation.

(5) In coordination with the superintendent of public instruction, the state board of education shall seek approval from the United States department of education for use of the accountability index and the state system of support, assistance, and intervention, to replace the federal accountability system under P.L. 107-110, the no child left 31 behind act of 2001.

(6) The state board of education shall work with the education data center established within the office of financial management and the technical working group established in section 112 of this act to determine the feasibility of using the prototypical funding allocation model as not only a tool for allocating resources to schools and districts but also as a tool for schools and districts to report to the state legislature and the state board of education on how the state resources received are being used.

Attachment C

SPA Work Plan
August 2009

Objectives:

- Approve the provisional state Accountability Index and proposed recognition system by May 2009.
- Finalize OSPI/SBE recognition program(s) by July 2009 for 2009-2010 school year based on provisional Accountability Index.
- Work with OSPI and stakeholders to refine continuous improvement model processes, which includes OSPI voluntary support programs (and the Innovation Zone) and Academic Watch for Challenged Schools, June-November 2009.
- Develop proposed new rule on school improvement planning by March 2010.
- Work with OSPI (and national groups) to request the U.S. Education Department to use the provisional state Accountability Index when making AYP decisions, beginning with results generated in the 2010-2011 school year (we realize we may need to adapt our Accountability Index to meet federal expectations).
- Submit report and proposed legislation to legislature by December 1, 2009.

Revised Timeline for System Performance Accountability (SPA)
Work 2009

Dates	Activities
January 14-15	Board meeting to review: • Draft resolution for action. • Feedback on Accountability Index and Pete Bylsma's revisions. • Work Plan for 2009. • Achievement Gap Data Overview for Commissions' Work. • ELL Issues for state oversight by Howard DeLeeuw, OSPI.
January- March	Edie and Pete will meet with superintendents at nine ESD meetings statewide to review the Accountability Index, Innovation Zone and Academic Watch proposals. Pete will meet with technical advisers from school districts and OSPI at least twice regarding refinements to the index.
February 17	SPA Work session: • Kris and Edie will frame our work for year. • OSPI will give brief update on NCLB status and federal funding. • OSPI will present lessons learned from Summit Districts and sustainability and thoughts on programs to serve continuous improvement for schools and districts. • SBE consultant will discuss refinements to Accountability Index, as presented to Board at January Meeting. • SBE consultant will discuss recognition program using Accountability Index.
March 12-13	Board meeting: • Hear update from SPA work session. Pete will seek input from several national experts from OSPI's National Technical Advisory Committee on March 13 to review the SBE proposed Accountability Index.
April 21	SPA Work session: • Review continued refinements on Accountability Index (focus on

Dates	Activities
	alternative education, ELL), deeper analysis for struggling schools and recognition program.
May 14-15	Board meeting to review: • Update from SPA work session. • Approve Provisional Accountability Index Plan A (we will also work on a Plan B) and SBE and OSPI recognition program(s).
May-July	Develop strategy and outreach to different stakeholder groups and work with OSPI and the U.S. Education Department on Accountability Index for improved (and unified) system for determining AYP. Work with OSPI on recognition program(s).
June 16	SPA work session on OSPI voluntary state programs of continuous improvement for all schools as well as deeper analysis of struggling schools. Discuss ways to incorporate dropout data and achievement gap recommendations into our work for overall report card tracking.
July 15-17	Board meeting: • Begin discussion on OSPI voluntary state programs of continuous improvement and key indicators for deeper analysis.
August 11	SPA work session on feedback on Accountability Index and Next Steps for Voluntary Action and Required Action, Professional Learning Communities, and Data in Motion.
September 17-18	Board meeting: • Continue discussion on provisions for OSPI voluntary school for continuous improvement and Academic Watch process.
October 13	SPA work session: • Discussion of recommendations and timeline on state voluntary support programs and Academic Watch process. • Examine options for school and district improvement plans. • Feasibility of using prototypical funding allocation model to report on how state resources are being used. • Discuss draft overall accountability report card.
October - November	OSPI/SBE recognition of schools under new program. Discussions with U.S. Education Department on proposed unified accountability system.
November 12-13	Board meeting: • Review draft school improvement plan rule revisions (look at nine effective school characteristics) and approval of proposals and timeline for OSPI voluntary state support programs for struggling schools under Academic Watch. • Present overall accountability report card.
December 1	Report to legislature December 1 on proposal and implementation for: 1) Recommendations for state voluntary program. 2) “Academic Watch” for challenged schools and districts that have not demonstrated sufficient improvement through the voluntary system--Legislature must approve this in statute or appropriations bill. 3) Use of prototypical school model to report on how state resources are used (this last provision does not have a December 1 date).

Attachment D

Systems Performance Accountability (SPA) Notes
August 11, 2009

Attendees: Kris Mayer, Phyllis Bunker Frank, Warren Smith, Mack Armstrong, Gayle Pauley, Janell Newman, Tonya Middling, Gary Kipp, Karen Davis, Roger Erskine, Martha Rice, Pete Bylsma, Edie Harding

Recap of Last Meeting

Kris Mayer summarized the last SPA meeting, where we discussed the recent research and achievement gap reports. In addition, the group reviewed data for in-depth analysis after districts are identified by the Accountability Index. The three key categories are: context, student learning trends, and teaching and learning data. SBE staff also discussed the Accountability Framework from: 1) identifying schools and districts in need of improvement; 2) providing voluntary assistance for districts in improvement under voluntary assistance; and 3) requiring state/local action if there is no improvement. The SBE would like to see the opportunity for an Innovation Zone under voluntary action to encourage districts to try a variety of innovations in terms of quality teaching, personalized education supports, and ways to engage parents and families. OSPI and SBE are moving ahead with a joint recognition program this fall based on the SBE Provisional Accountability Index. SBE is discussing ways to move ahead with the Innovation Zone next year, if federal funding is available.

Feedback on SBE Provisional Accountability Index

SBE staff asked a variety of experts in D.C. to review the SBE Provisional Accountability Index. In short, many of the reviewers said the SBE Accountability Index makes some significant improvements over the current NCLB provisions, to identify schools and districts for improvement, but we must find a way to include the subgroup analysis. SBE staff met with Ricardo Sanchez and some of the LEAP (Latino Education Achievement Project) members and they want to ensure that districts are still held accountable for their English Language Learner (ELL) populations under our new Index.

Pete shared some ideas he had to incorporate subgroups into the Accountability System. He will continue to refine his concepts to bring revisions to the Board in November. Pete also laid out a recommendation for addressing ELL learners, which would: a) exclude results for ELL in their first three years of US public school enrollment or until achieving Level Three on the Washington Learning Proficiency Test (WLPT); b) use performance on the WLPT to provide feedback about whether ELLs are on track to meet standards; and c) require OSPI to develop detailed results of the WLPT on the OSPI Report Card.

Next Steps on Voluntary Action and Required Action

Janell Newman and Tonya Middling outlined the continuum of voluntary services that OSPI provides to schools and districts in improvement. These services have shifted from focusing on the school level to the district level over the past several years in an effort to build internal capacity for a district to address all of its schools. OSPI provides intensive assistance to districts and schools through its Washington Improvement and Implementation Network as well as through targeted programs such as the Summit District. The lowest districts with the lowest performance and gains will receive the greated targeted services. These services focus on specific outcomes in four areas:

- Effective Leadership.
- Quality Teaching and Learning.
- Support for System-wide Improvement.
- Clear and Collaborative Relationships.

Once a district is in Step Two of AYP, it would be notified that it has two years to make improvements in student achievement. If there is no improvement, they would be moved into Required Action (no longer voluntary assistance). Edie Harding discussed the options for identifying districts for potential Required Action. Options include additional detail from:

a) AYP data on math, reading and graduation rates.
b) The SBE Provisional Accountability Index, which has additional content areas (math and science) and includes a set of improvement measures.
c) SBE proposed in-depth analysis of district context issues, student trends, and teaching and learning data.

The group discussed their preference for AYP data, unless the Index is approved (districts are used to this system now under No Child Left Behind combined with an in-depth analysis to go beyond strictly test scores and understand some of the other key data in a district affecting student achievement).

Edie also outlined potential steps for Required Action as follows:

1. Priority Districts in Step Two of AYP, under current NCLB, for two years (as of effective date of state legislation) will be notified by OSPI that they are under Academic Watch, based on criteria and the process discussed in the document titled "Options for Identifying Districts for Potential Required Action." OSPI will then notify the SBE.

2. Local school boards may appeal this designation to the SBE with supporting evidence that addresses each of the criteria used to designate them in Academic Watch.

3. SBE directs OSPI to conduct Academic Performance Audit of Districts on Academic Watch. The audit is to be completed within two months and communicated to the district and the SBE.

4. OSPI will conduct the Academic Performance Audit. Audit findings[3] may include the following items (list is not exhaustive). The need for:

    a. An improved comprehensive instructional program.
    b. Reorganization of instructional time.
    c. Ability to select new personnel.
    d. Ability to change school structures to improve learning opportunities.
    e. Measuring teacher and principal effectiveness.
    f. Rewarding effective teachers and principals.
    g. Ongoing family and community engagement.

5. Local school district receives grant and OSPI assistance to develop an Academic Watch Plan with their local school board. Action steps and concrete measures will be developed to

[3] The components are a modified version of those listed in the Race to the Top Guidelines from the US Department of Education (which also included new leadership, new governance, charter schools, contracting out to an educational management organization, control local school budget).

determine progress, based on the Academic Performance Audit within three months of report's receipt.

6. SBE approves local district Academic Watch action steps and ensures resources/changes in state policy are available and that the plan becomes binding between the SBE and local board school.

7. District implements the plan and provides updates to its community and the SBE annually.

8. OSPI provides technical assistance as needed and determines when a district has made sufficient progress as defined in the district's plan for Action Steps and concrete measures, as well as an improvement of .50 of the SBE Accountability Index to leave Academic Watch.

9. OSPI notifies SBE annually that the district is no longer on Academic Watch or that they will remain on Academic Watch.

10. SBE approves release from Academic Watch or refinement Academic Watch plan.

Professional Learning Communities

Lisa Kodama, from the WEA, provided a briefing on how schools are creating Professional Learning Communities of teachers and administrators to meet regularly and collaborate on student learning. Each team must focus on four foundational questions:

1. What do we want our students to learn?
2. How will we know they are learning?
3. How will we respond when they don't learn?
4. How will we respond when they do learn?

This school model reinforces the need for teachers and administrators to meet in teams and collaborate, rather than work in isolation. Lisa gave some examples of schools that have been able to improve student achievement as measured by the WASL in math, reading, and writing over the last five years. WEA, AWSP, and WASA are working in partnership to implement this program all over the state.

Data in Motion

Todd Johnson showed how ESD 113 has used a concept of growth to look at performance over time on the WASL, based on student demographics. He presented sample graphs of schools with balls that mark their performance and show how they moved over time. He also shared a District Dashboard that uses Student Achievement, Student Enrollment and Financial Data.

Attachment E

What is Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)?[4]

- Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is one of the cornerstones of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) signed into law January 2002, as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. In Washington, it is primarily a measure of year-to-year student achievement on the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) in reading and mathematics. One of the requirements of NCLB is that states develop a baseline or starting point for students to achieve proficiency as measured by WASL math and reading scores (science will be added). Each year the state must "raise the bar" in gradual increments so that by 2013-2014, all (100%) students will achieve proficiency in each subject area.

- In addition to measuring academic achievement in reading and mathematics, NCLB requires an additional indicator of student performance be measured. For high school students the on-time graduation rate must be used. The additional indicator for middle and elementary schools in Washington is the unexcused absence rate. See OSPI Bulletin 25-03 for guidance on reporting unexcused absences.

- Each school and district must meet the yearly AYP goals as a whole and by disaggregated student population groups. These groups are specified by the law to be race/ethnicity, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, and students who are economically disadvantaged. These groups must contain enough students to be statistically reliable and not permit personal identification of individual students. In Washington a group must contain at least 30 continuously enrolled students to be considered statistically reliable and at least 10 to protect personally identifiable information. To be considered "continuously enrolled" a student must be enrolled without a break in service from October 1 through the testing period.

- AYP applies to each school in the state that serves students in grades four, seven, and ten. School totals for these grades are aggregated up to the district and state totals.

How is AYP determined?

- AYP is calculated separately for reading and mathematics.

- There are two ways a school can make AYP:
  - By demonstrating all students and required groupings meet or exceed the established WASL proficiency goals in both mathematics and reading.
  - By meeting the "safe harbor" provision. This provision permits schools with one or more subgroups not making the goals to still make AYP if the percentage of students not making AYP in that school declined by at least ten percent in each student category and the other indicator (graduation rate for high school or unexcused absences for elementary and middle schools) is met.

[4] http://www.k12.wa.us/ESEA/AdequateYearlyProgress.aspx

What happens if AYP is not met?

- The law specifies consequences for schools and districts receiving Title I, Part A funds which do not meet the AYP targets for two or more years in a row. While the results of WASL testing are reported for all schools and districts, the consequences apply only to those schools receiving Title I, Part A funds.

- After two consecutive years of not meeting AYP targets, a school enters Step one and is subject to the related consequences (see below). If AYP is met the next year the school or district stays at Step one, if AYP is not met, it moves to Step two. If AYP is met for two consecutive years, the school exits school improvement.

What are the school consequences and when are they applied?

- ***Step 1—Schools not making AYP for two years****:*
  - Are identified for school improvement and must notify parents of their status.
  - Will receive technical assistance to improve performance and may be eligible to receive federal funds for school improvement activities.
  - Must develop or revise the school improvement plan not later than three months after being identified for improvement; must cover a two-year period.
  - Must offer parents the opportunity to transfer their student(s) (Public School Choice) to another public school within the district, which has not been identified for school improvement, if one exists.
  - Must pay for transportation if transfer is requested. They may use up to five percent of their Title I funds for this purpose, unless a lesser amount is needed. Under certain circumstances, districts may use an additional ten percent of Title I funds, if necessary, to provide Public School Choice. If requests exceed the amount of Title I funds available for this purpose, priority is given to the lowest-achieving students from low-income families.

- ***Step 2—Schools not making AYP for three years*****:**
  - Are identified for their second year of school improvement and must notify parents of their status.
  - Must continue to offer Public School Choice as described above.
  - Must offer parents the opportunity to request Supplemental Educational Services, such as tutoring, to low achieving students. A list of OSPI-approved supplemental educational service providers is available from the OSPI website at http://www.k12.wa.us/title1/. As with transportation above, districts use up to five percent of their Title I funds for Supplemental Educational Services, unless a lesser amount is needed. If needed, an additional ten percent of Title I funds may be used to cover the costs of Public School Choice, Supplemental Educational Services, or both. No more than twenty percent of Title I funds may be used for Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services.

- ***Step 3—Schools not making AYP for four years:***
  - Are identified for corrective action and must notify parents of their status.
  - Must continue to offer Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services as described earlier.
  - Must select options from the following list:
    - Replace certain school staff.
    - Implement a new curriculum and provide additional professional development.
    - Significantly decrease management authority.
    - Appoint an outside expert to advise on school improvement plan.
    - Extend the school year or school day.
    - Restructure the internal organization of the school.

- ***Step 4—Schools not making AYP for five years:***
  - Are identified for restructuring and must notify parents of their status.
  - Must continue to offer Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services as described above.
  - Must begin planning for restructuring (see below).

- ***Step 5—Schools not making AYP for six years:***
  - Must implement restructuring.
  - Must select options from the following list:
    - Replace all or most of relevant school staff.
    - Contract with outside entity to operate school.
    - If the state agrees, undergo a state takeover.
    - Undertake any other major restructuring of school.