State Board of Education
November 12, 2009

Proposed Subgroup Accountability and AYP Rules

Dr. Pete Bylsma
SBE Consultant

Background

- Accountability Index does not include subgroups required by US Education Dept
- Subgroup analysis is a strength of NCLB
- Need to add subgroups to determine AYP
- Consulted advisors and SPA work group

Guiding Principles

- Keep Accountability Index matrix unchanged
- Continue reporting all subgroup results for each grade (current policy)
- Use Index "rules" when making AYP decisions

  N=10, no margin of error, combine grades across schools, same benchmarks and ratings
- Make minor adjustments to indicators/outcomes for subgroup accountability
- Add more subgroups to aid transparency

Proposed Methods to Determine AYP

- Hold the "All" group accountable using the full Index

  Requires ≥4 rated cells in matrix when making AYP decisions (if <4, must submit improvement plan)

- **Schools and districts do not make AYP if they have a 2-year average Index below 3.00 <u>AND</u> an index that declines two years in a row.**

  If in place in 2009, 16% of all schools would not have made AYP

  16% elementary schools

  14% middle schools

  15% high schools

  15% multi-level schools

Subgroup AYP

- Add 2 more subgroups (Pac. Islanders and multi-racial) to make 10 total
- Adjust index and compute row averages

  Use only reading, math, and extended grad rate

  No separate results by income level

  Exited ELL and special education students count
- Compute overall average of all subgroups
- **Schools and districts do not make AYP if they have any subgroup average that declines two years in a row.**

Example

Ratings in **red** are less than the previous year.
Ratings in **green** are more than the previous year.

Hypothetical High School

2009	READING			MATH			EXT. GRAD. RATE			Average	Change from
Subgroup	(all st.)	Peers	Improve.	(all st.)	Peers	Improve.	(all st.)	Peers	Improve.	rating	previous year
American Indian	4	4	4	1	5	4	1	4	4	3.44	0.33
Asian	6	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	6	4.78	0.56
Pacific Islander	4	4	4	1	5	4	1	4	4	3.44	0.22
Black	3	3	3	1	3	5	1	3	2	2.67	-1.00
Hispanic	3	4	4	1	4	4	1	4	4	3.22	-0.11
White	5	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	3.78	-0.22
Multi-racial	4	4	4	2	4	4	2	4	4	3.56	-0.22
Special education	2	4	4	1	4	4	1	2	1	2.56	-1.22
ELL	1	5	5	1	4	4	1	3	3	3.00	-0.11
Low income	4	5	5	1	5	4	1	4	4	3.67	0.22
Average	3.60	4.10	4.20	1.60	4.20	4.10	1.70	3.60	3.60	3.41	-0.16

Six groups had a lower average rating than the previous year. If any of these have another decline the next year, the school does not make AYP in that group.

Alternative Method for ELLs

- Create an alternate method to make AYP for the ELL group by tying the results of the Washington Language Proficiency Test (WLPT) to the content assessments.
- **Schools and districts do not make AYP if the percentage of ELLs in WLPT Levels 2 and 3 who are "on track" to meet standard when reaching proficiency in English declines two years in a row.**
- If the ELL subgroup did not make AYP via the row average, it could make it this way instead.

Alternative Method for ELLs

Example of "Sliding Scale" Method

English Ability	Required Score to Be Proficient	
WLPT Level	**Reading**	**Math**
Level 4 (transition/exit)	400*	400*
Level 3 (advanced)	390	385
Level 2 (intermediate)	366	355
Level 1 (no/limited English)	**	**

* Required scale score for non-ELL students

** Not calculated; student can only be in Level 1 for one year

Summary

- Keep reporting all results on the OSPI Report Card.
- Use the Accountability Index to make AYP decisions for the “all students” group **AND** use a modified Index to make AYP decisions about subgroups (including two new ones).
- Create a backup method for ELL accountability.

Counting ELL Results

Current policy required by NCLB

- Reading & math results are used in 2nd year of enrollment in US public school; English language ability is irrelevant.

Problems

- Research has shown it takes 3+ years to achieve "academic" proficiency in English, so AYP is based on invalid ELL results.
- Repeated requests to change accountability rules to make AYP decisions more valid have all been denied by USED.
- No WLPT results are made available to the public, so we have no information about how well ELLs are learning English.

Counting ELL Results

Recommended Approach

- Exclude ELL results in the first 3 years of enrollment

  A majority exit the program within three years

- When data are available, adjust exclusion period based on initial English ability

  Level 1=4 years Level 2=3 years Level 3=2 years

- Link the WLPT and content tests for AYP purposes

  See slides 7-8 for alternative method that looks at whether students are "on track" to meet standard when they exit the program

- Post WLPT results on the OSPI Report Card