



Draft August 27, 2015

Achievement and Accountability Feedback Report

How should lower-than-usual Index Ratings, due to low participation rates, be framed in communications to the public?

AAW members were in agreement that a transparent, honest approach should be taken in communicating lower-than-usual Index Ratings to the public. They stated that there should be a clear explanation of how the Achievement Index is effected by low participation rates. Two participants stated that the public should be given information about how many students opted out of the 11th grade test, reasons why the test should be taken, and that the tests should be further incentivized.

A member offered the following quote:

"I recommend that the participation rates be captured in the Index to provide some context. I also think that there should be a strategic communications plan in place to explain what the scores mean. For example:

- These scores are a new baseline;
- The results provide a better measure of how well the students are mastering the new learning standards.

There should also be some guidance on how to interpret the results."

What communication channels should the Board use to frame this issue with lower-than-usual Index Ratings? Please provide details about those communication channels (i.e. Who? When? Where? How?)

Members considered ways to make the information useful to educators, parents, and the community. One member stated that policy makers and the public should understand the dynamic of the data due to low participation rates but, beyond that, that the issue should not be communicated widely. Another member warned that OSPI and the Board should not get into district-level evaluation work in their communications to the public.

The following are suggestions from AAW members on how to communicate the issue:

Who?

- State agencies
- Educational associations (WASA, WSSDA, AWSP, WEA, etc)
- Community partners
- Advocacy groups
- Parent groups
- Ready Washington
- Not-so-obvious partners (i.e., PTA, Equity-focused advocacy groups, Rural Alliance, et cetera)

- Ready Washington

When?

- Ongoing throughout the year
- Heavy emphasis, strategic concerns during make or break points during the year

Where

- Statewide
- Regional
- Local

How

- In-person meetings and video
- Parent-teacher meetings
- Parent-friendly, translatable, concise information
- Online
- Trainings on how to frame the issue
- Support by key messengers
- Social media
- Print
- Radio
- Delivered in multiple languages
- All communications should be in plain speak, not jargon
- Multi-modal communication channels
- Pre-recorded webinar
- Provide structures for groups to host community conversations
- Analysis to provide helpful information to educators (statistics, data interpretation, et cetera)

How can we use the next Index to show the importance of high participation rates? Is there other policy work we can initiate to improve participation rates?

The majority of members stated that communications will be important to helping parents and students understand the benefits taking the test and the consequences of opting out of the test. Two participants stated that the incentive of entering college-level coursework with a level three or four score on the Smarter Balanced assessment should be emphasized. Members did not suggest policy changes.

Would you recommend Model Two (32/32/32/4) for Index indicator weightings? If there is a future problem with the meaningfulness of Student Growth Percentiles at the high school level, how would you deal with that problem?

The majority of members suggested Model Two (32/32/32/4). One participant preferred Model One because it gave more weight to Dual Credit and that would incentivize providing traditionally underserved populations with greater access to dual enrollment programs. One member preferred Model Two but with proficiency weightings of 50% ELA, math 25% and science 25%.

DRAFT