

The Washington State Board of Education

Governance | Achievement | Transitions | Math & Science | Effective Workforce

Title:	Achievement Index Revision – Preparation for April AAW Meeting	
As Related To:	<input type="checkbox"/> Goal One: Advocate for effective and accountable P-13 governance in public education. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Two: Provide policy leadership for closing the academic achievement gap. <input type="checkbox"/> Goal Three: Provide policy leadership to strengthen students' transitions within the P-13 system.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Four: Promote effective strategies to make Washington's students nationally and internationally competitive in math and science. <input type="checkbox"/> Goal Five: Advocate for policies to develop the most highly effective K–12 teacher and leader workforce in the nation. <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Relevant To Board Roles:	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy Leadership <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> System Oversight <input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy	<input type="checkbox"/> Communication <input type="checkbox"/> Convening and Facilitating
Policy Considerations / Key Questions:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposed letter to the AAW accurately reflect SBE priorities and intentions for next steps in the Index revision process? What have other states done to build their own accountability system that could inform these questions? 	
Possible Board Action:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review <input type="checkbox"/> Adopt <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve <input type="checkbox"/> Other	
Materials Included in Packet:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Memo <input type="checkbox"/> Graphs / Graphics <input type="checkbox"/> Third-Party Materials <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PowerPoint	
Synopsis:	<p>SBE will review and approve a proposed letter to the AAW to guide the discussion at the April AAW meeting.</p> <p>SBE will also review and discuss the questions presented in the AAW letter which include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the model Index data, as presented by SBE staff, reflect the appropriate values and performance indicator weighting? How should the Index data be combined into a district and state level Index? How should alternative schools be considered in regards to Index calculations? 	

ACHIEVEMENT INDEX REVISION – PREPARATION FOR APRIL ACHIEVEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY WORKGROUP (AAW) MEETING AND NEXT STEPS

Policy Consideration

The Board will consider approving the AAW letter, which directs the AAW to focus on specific topics at the April meeting. These topics are presented in this memo for discussion.

1. Does the model Index data, as presented by SBE staff, reflect the appropriate performance indicator weighting?
2. How should the Index data be combined into a district and state level Index?
3. How should alternative schools be considered in regards to Index calculations?

Summary

In early March, the SBE contractor will have compiled all data necessary to begin to model performance indicator weighting scenarios. The AAW will be asked to examine sample Index data to determine if the results reflect the appropriate emphasis on performance indicators.

Performance Indicators

Several decisions have already been made as the performance indicators were selected. First, three major performance indicators were selected. The first is proficiency, which is the percent of students who meet or exceed state standards in reading, math, science, and writing on the state tests. These tests include the Measurements of Student Progress in grades 3-8, the High School Proficiency Exams in grade 10, and the End of Course tests for math and science in high school. The second performance indicator is growth using the Student Growth Percentile (SGP) growth model, also sometimes referred to as the Colorado Growth Model. These data will be available for reading and math at grades 4-8 and high school. Finally, career and college readiness will include three elements: high school graduation rates within 4 or 5 years using the nationally accepted method of calculating graduation rates known as the adjusted cohort methodology. Additional elements of the career and college readiness performance indicator are the percent of students who meet a career and college ready cut score on the 11th grade Common Core State Standards tests in English/Language Arts and Math (2014-15) and the percent of students who are earning high school credit in a dual credit course¹ or earn a state or nationally recognized industry certification. Table 1 summarizes the performance indicators.

Table 1: Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Proficiency	Growth	Career and College Readiness		
			Graduation Rates	Dual Credit/Industry Certification	11 th Grade Career and College Readiness
Description	% of students meeting or	Student Growth	% of students graduating	% of students earning high school credit in at least	% of students meeting or

¹ The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction collects data on dual credit coursework. Dual credit includes Tech Prep, Running Start, Advanced Placement, College in the High School, International Baccalaureate, Early College High School, the Cambridge Program, and others.

	exceeding state standards on MSP/HSPE/EOCs in Reading, Math, Writing, Science	Percentiles (SGP) in Reading, Math MSP/HSPE	within 4 and 5 years	one dual credit course (including Advanced Placement, Running Start, College in the High School, International Baccalaureate) OR earning a state or nationally recognized industry certification	exceeding a career- and college- ready standard on 11 th grade Common Core State Standards tests
--	---	---	----------------------	--	---

Opportunity Gaps

In July 2012, the SBE passed a resolution which formally signaled the beginning of its work on Index revision. In alignment with SBE’s strategic plan goals, the resolution noted the “persistent achievement and opportunity gaps among English Language Learners, students of color, students with disabilities, and students in poverty” and the belief 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.” In January, as the SBE provisionally approved the ‘Prototype Index’, which includes the disaggregation of every performance indicator into students subgroups. The Index will both identify schools and districts with persistent gaps and those that are closing them. Table 2 illustrates this disaggregation.

Table 2: Student Subgroups Across Each Performance Indicator

Performance Indicator	Proficiency	Growth	Career and College Readiness		
			Graduation Rates	Dual Credit/Industry Certification	11 th Grade Career and College Readiness
“All Students”	Rating for the ‘All Students’ group				
“Gaps”	Ratings for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American Indian/Alaska Native • Asian • Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian • Black/African American • Hispanic • White • Two or More Races • English Language Learners • Low Income • Special Education 				

District and State Level Index

The original Index was produced at the school level and resulted in tier designations and awards. Rolling the Index data up to the district level was desired by stakeholders but there were several barriers, including the Peers indicator and data suppression rules for compliance with student privacy laws. These specific issues will be partially resolved by eliminating the Peers indicator and the data suppression can be resolved at a technical level.

These issues aside, there are several meaningful policy questions regarding district and state level Index calculations. For example, at the school level the students who are included in the data for school accountability will be those students who were present from October through the spring assessment. These students are referred to as “continuously enrolled,” a concept that carries over from Adequate Yearly Progress calculations. At a district level, should a student be considered continuously enrolled at the district even if the student has moved from one school to the next within the district?

A second question refers to a small number of schools in the state whose student level data are not rolled up to a district level because they enrolled at least half of their students from other districts. These students are counted in accountability at the school and state levels, but are not attributed to a district. Should districts containing these schools continue to have these students excluded for accountability purposes?

Alternative Schools

In the 2012 Achievement Index, 351 schools, or 16% of all schools, are considered “alternative”. These schools include parent partnership programs, online schools, dropout reengagement programs, special education programs, and others. Forty-nine percent of all districts (146 districts) have one or more alternative schools. All grade bands are represented, but most schools are high schools or “comprehensive” schools serving multiple grade bands.

Alternative schools range in size. The three largest alternative schools are online schools: Washington Virtual Academy in Steilacoom School District (1152 students tested), the Columbia Virtual Academy in Valley School District (939 students tested), and Washington Virtual Academy in Omak School District (705 students tested). On the opposite end of the spectrum, 142 schools (40% of all alternative schools) have fewer than 20 students tested and therefore will not be included in the accountability system due to low N size.

Some stakeholders have argued that using an Index to assess the performance of alternative schools is not fair, given that many alternative schools are enrolling students who may have academic challenges or who may have previously dropped out. On the other hand, there is no definition of or criteria for alternative schools, so many schools that call themselves ‘alternative’ may not be serving students at risk but are simply different from regular schools by design. Additionally, schools that are identified by the Index as needing additional assistance will go through a process of identifying needs through a needs assessment. The Index itself does not serve this purpose, nor is it designed to. With this in mind, the AAW will discuss how these schools should be considered in relation to the Achievement Index.

Background

To receive Elementary and Secondary Education Act flexibility, states are required to commit to several principles for improving student achievement². There are four principles in all, but two of them in particular are related to the development of our revised Index, including:

1. College and Career Ready Expectations for All Students.
 - Adopting CCR standards in reading/language arts and math.
 - Administering annual, aligned assessments that correspond to those standards.
 - Measuring student growth.
2. State-Developed Differentiated System of Recognition, Accountability, and Support.
 - State-developed system must include student achievement in at least reading/language arts and math.
 - Include all students and all subgroups of students identified in ESEA graduation rates for all students and all subgroups.
 - Track school performance and progress over time, including all subgroups.
 - Must take into account student growth.

² ESEA Flexibility, June 7, 2012. <https://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>

- Set new ‘ambitious but achievable’ annual measurable objectives (AMOs) in at least reading/language arts and math for all districts, schools, and subgroups.
- Provide incentives and recognition for “reward schools.”
- Publicly identify “priority schools” and ensure that districts meaningfully intervene.
- Work to close achievement gaps by identifying “focus schools” with the greatest achievement gaps or in which subgroups are furthest behind.
- Provide incentives and support for other Title I schools that are not improving or narrowing gaps.

Washington has received a conditional waiver of ESEA, pending the submission of a revised Achievement Index by June 30, 2013. SBE is partnering with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction to this end. SBE has convened a stakeholder workgroup to provide input at each step of the Index revision process. This group is known as the Achievement and Accountability Workgroup, which meets every other month. The AAW will meet one final time on the topic of the Achievement Index revision, and then will turn its focus to the development of a statewide accountability framework, as envisioned in E2SSB 6696.

Action

Consider a motion to approve the proposed AAW letter.

The Washington State Board of Education

Governance | Achievement | High School and College Preparation | Math & Science | Effective Workforce

Old Capitol Building, Room 253
P.O. Box 47206
600 Washington St. SE
Olympia, Washington 98504

March 14, 2013

TO: Members of the Achievement and Accountability Workgroup

FROM: The Washington State Board of Education

RE: Input on the Revision of the Achievement Index: April

Thank you for devoting your time and expertise to providing ongoing input through the Achievement and Accountability Workgroup. Your feedback has been critical in the development of a prototype Achievement Index. At the April AAW meeting we will focus on reviewing modeled data to ensure that the Index reflects appropriate weighting of performance indicators.

For the next meeting of the AAW, we ask that you provide input on the following list of specific questions. As with previous AAW meetings, SBE staff will write a feedback report to reflect your input on these questions, which we intend to consider in next steps for Index revision.

This fourth in-person meeting will be the final meeting which we devote solely to Index revision. Future meetings will focus on the statewide accountability framework; specifically, what should be the state system of supports and interventions for lowest achieving schools?

Focusing questions for April AAW meeting:

1. Does the model Index data, as presented by SBE staff, reflect the appropriate performance indicator weighting?
2. How will the Index data be combined into a district and state level Index?
3. How should alternative schools be considered in regards to Index calculations?