**July**
- Work group meeting in Renton

**October**
- Joint EOGOAC, SBE, OSPI meeting
  - Review current and additional metrics and get LEA feedback
- Joint EOGOAC, SBE, OSPI meeting
  - Agree on final Phase II methodology

**December 3**
- SBE task
  - Identify and notify schools after WSIF public release

**September**
- SBE mtg/discussion
- EOGOAC meeting
  - Review plan and discuss metrics

**November**
- SBE mtg/discussion
- EOGOAC meeting

**January**
- SBE meeting
- EOGOAC meeting
  - Final approval or Phase II metrics and methodology

**Spring**
- SBE task
  - Recognition event
Phase 2 Considerations and Discussion
§ The workgroup discussed the Phase 1 methodology and the schools identified via the three routes.

Assumption 1: no changes will be made to the Closing Gaps or Achievement routes for Phase 2.

§ The workgroup discussed the suitability of other metrics in the school recognition system

Assumption 2: the decision to add other metrics will form part of the Phase 3 work.

§ The workgroup discussed the possible manners in which to differentiate schools.

Assumption 3: the decision to the differentiate schools will be further explored as part of the Phase 3 work.

The desired outcome for today is to agree on the Phase 2 school recognition methodology.
Phase I Combined Quantitative Model:

Schools Can Demonstrate Being Exemplary in Several Ways via Multiple Measures

Nearly all of the measures used for the Phase I school recognition rely on the All Students group.
Revision to Growth Route:

Trial Requested by the School Recognition Workgroup
Aside from other criteria, an identified school would have at least one student group performing in the top 20 percent of schools on at least 60 percent of the reportable measures for the student group.

Examples: English Learner group at two elementary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA Proficiency</th>
<th>Math Proficiency</th>
<th>ELA SGP</th>
<th>Math SGP</th>
<th>Regular Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, not in Top 20%</td>
<td>Yes, in top 20%</td>
<td>No, not in Top 20%</td>
<td>Yes, in top 20%</td>
<td>Yes, in top 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3/5 measures (60 percent) are in the top 20 percent, so this school would be identified for recognition for a high performing English Learner group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA Proficiency</th>
<th>Math Proficiency</th>
<th>ELA SGP</th>
<th>Math SGP</th>
<th>Regular Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, not in Top 20%</td>
<td>Yes, in top 20%</td>
<td>No, not in Top 20%</td>
<td>Yes, in top 20%</td>
<td>No, not in Top 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2/5 measures (40 percent) are in the top 20 percent, so this school would not be identified for recognition for a high performing English Learner group.
Route 4 Trial 6 identified 355 schools with at least one high performing student group.

104/355 schools were identified through at least one of the Phase 1 recognition routes

### Identified Schools:

How many schools identified for how many groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 Groups</th>
<th>1 Group</th>
<th>2 Groups</th>
<th>3 Groups</th>
<th>4 Groups</th>
<th>5 Groups</th>
<th>6 Groups</th>
<th>7 Groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comb</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comb HS</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2204</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Route 4 Trial 6 identified 355 schools with at least one high performing student group.

Hispanic students at 93 schools would be identified as high performing.

### Identified Schools:

Which student groups are identified at which schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
<th>English Learner</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Special Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comb</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HS</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comb HS</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
156 student groups were identified on the basis of performing in the top 20 percent of only one reportable measure – most often this is the regular attendance measure.

### Identified Schools:

**How many measures are reportable for identified student groups?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Two or More</th>
<th>English Learner</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Special Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Measure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Measures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Measures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Measures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Measures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Measures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identified Schools:

What is the distribution of identified schools across the state?

The 355 schools are distributed in 144 districts across Washington.
Identified Schools:

What is the distribution of identified schools by ESD?

33/355 schools (37 percent) of the identified schools were in EDS 121, which is home to 31 percent of Washington public K-12 schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESD</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Two or More</th>
<th>English Learner</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Total Schools</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESD 101 Spokane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD 105 Yakima</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD 112 Vancouver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD 113 Tumwater</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD 114 Bremerton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD 121 Renton</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>37/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD 123 Pasco</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD 171 Wenatchee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD 189 Anacortes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Percent is shown as the percent of identified schools situated in the ESD/percent of all Washington public schools in the ESD.
Route 4 Trial 6 identified 355 schools with at least one high performing student group.

39/355 schools (11 percent) were identified for Tier 2 or Tier 3 supports in the winter 2018 Washington School Improvement Framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 3 Comprehensive</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Comb</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>Comb HS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2 Targeted &gt;2 or Low EL Progress</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1 Targeted 1-2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identified Schools:

Does the demography of schools differ by identification status?

The demography of the schools identified is very similar to the demography of schools not identified and to the Washington public schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Two or More</th>
<th>English Learner</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Special Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How would the possible revisions impact the number of identified schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1 Closing Gaps</th>
<th>Phase 1 Growth All Students</th>
<th>Phase 2 Growth Student Groups</th>
<th>Phase 1 Achievement</th>
<th>Total (Unique Schools)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 – Growth Route 4, Trial 6A</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 – Growth Route 4, Trial 6B</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 – Growth Route 4, Trial 7A</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 – Growth Route 4, Trial 7B</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference between “A” and “B”
- “A” applies the same Top 20 percent cut point (All Students) to every student group.
- “B” applies a different Top 20 percent cut point to each student group.

Difference between Trials 6 and 7
- Trial 6: student group may be identified on the basis of high performance on one or more measures.
- Trial 7: student group must be identified on the basis of high performance on two or more measures.
1. What comparison group should be used in defining the Top 20 percent performance?

2. Should a school be recognized for growth on the basis of SQSS measures only?

3. Should a school be recognized for growth on the basis of one reportable measure or multiple reportable measures?
Decision Point 1: What should the comparison group be?

The All Students threshold cut applies the same cut to each student group. The performance of each student group (e.g. FRL) is being compared to the performance of the All Students groups across the state.

A different threshold cut may be applied to each student group. The performance of a student group at a school (e.g. FRL) is compared to the performance of FRL student groups across the state.
### How would the possible revisions impact the number of identified schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase 1 Closing Gaps</th>
<th>Phase 1 Growth All Students</th>
<th>Phase 2 Growth Student Groups</th>
<th>Phase 1 Achievement</th>
<th>Total (Unique Schools)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 – Growth Route 4, Trial 6A</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 – Growth Route 4, Trial 6B</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 – Growth Route 4, Trial 7A</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 – Growth Route 4, Trial 7B</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Difference between “A” and “B”**
- “A” applies the same Top 20 percent cut point (All Students) to every student group.
- “B” applies a different Top 20 percent cut point to each student group.

**Difference between Trials 6 and 7**
- Trial 6: student group may be identified on the basis of high performance on one or more measures.
- Trial 7: student group must be identified on the basis of high performance on two or more measures.
Decision Point 2: Should a school be recognized on the basis of SQSS measure(s) only?

The Phase 1 Achievement route specified that high performance be attained in ELA proficiency, math proficiency, or four-year graduation rate rolled up over three years.

This requirement could be added to the revised Phase 2 Growth route or could be deleted from the Phase 1 Achievement route.
Decision Point 3:

Should a school be recognized on the basis of only one reportable measure?

Some student groups at schools have only one reportable measure and the performance on that measure is in the top 20 percent of schools.

If multiple measures are to be required, how many measures should be required? 2? 3?
How would the possible revisions impact the number of identified schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase 1 Closing Gaps</th>
<th>Phase 1 Growth All Students</th>
<th>Phase 2 Growth Student Groups</th>
<th>Phase 1 Achievement</th>
<th>Total (Unique Schools)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 – Growth Route 4, Trial 6A</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 – Growth Route 4, Trial 6B</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 – Growth Route 4, Trial 7A</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 – Growth Route 4, Trial 7B</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Difference between “A” and “B”**
- “A” applies the same Top 20 percent cut point (All Students) to every student group.
- “B” applies a different Top 20 percent cut point to each student group.

**Difference between Trials 6 and 7**
- Trial 6: student group may be identified on the basis of high performance on one or more measures.
- Trial 7: student group must be identified on the basis of high performance on two or more measures.
## Phase II
### General Work Plan and Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March/April</th>
<th>Spring 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBE meeting</td>
<td>Joint EOGOAC, SBE, OSPI meeting</td>
<td>SBE meeting</td>
<td>Joint EOGOAC, SBE, OSPI meeting</td>
<td>SBE meeting</td>
<td>SBE Task</td>
<td>SBE Task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and discussion</td>
<td>EOGOAC meeting</td>
<td>EOGOAC meeting</td>
<td>EOGOAC meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOGOAC meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review work plan and discuss metrics</td>
<td>Review current and additional metrics &amp; get LEA feedback</td>
<td>Agree on final Phase II methodology</td>
<td>Final approval of Phase II metrics and methodology</td>
<td>Identify and notify schools after WSIF public release</td>
<td>Recognition event(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase II**

**General Work Plan and Timeline**
### Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBE</th>
<th>OSPI</th>
<th>EOGOAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Randy Spaulding  
360-725-6024  
Randy.Spaulding@k12.wa.us  
Website: www.SBE.wa.gov  
Facebook:  
www.facebook.com/washingtonSBE  
Twitter: @wa_SBE  
Email: sbe@k12.wa.us  
Phone: 360-725-6025  
Web updates: bit.ly/SBEupdates | Lance Sisco  
360-725-0421  
Lance.Sisco@k12.wa.us  
http://k12.wa.us | Maria Flores  
Phone: 360-725-6359  
Email: Maria.Flores@k12.wa.us  
https://tinyurl.com/EOGOAC |