

THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Accountability | Graduation Requirements | Math | Science

Special Board Meeting
August 10, 2010

MINUTES

Attending: Chair Jeff Vincent, Vice-chair Steve Dal Porto, Ms. Mary Jean Ryan, Dr. Bernal Baca, Dr. Kris Mayer, Ms. Phyllis Frank, Mr. Bob Hughes, Mr. Randy Dorn, Ms. Connie Fletcher, Ms. Amy Bragdon, Mr. Eric Liu, Dr. Sheila Fox (12)

Absent: Mr. Jack Schuster (excused), Mr. Warren Smith (excused), Ms. Anna Laura Kastama (excused), Mr. Jared Costanzo (excused) (4)

Staff Attending: Ms. Edie Harding, Dr. Kathe Taylor, Ms. Loy McColm, Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Ms. Sarah Rich (5)

Call to Order

Dr. Baca called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and facilitated the meeting as the member in attendance at the physical site of the meeting. Mr. Dorn was also in attendance at the meeting and the remaining members were connected via teleconference.

OSPI Criteria for Required Action Districts

Ms. Tonya Middling, Director, Project Development, Management and Implementation, OSPI

Ms. Middling briefed the Board on the following proposed process for identifying persistently lowest achieving (PLAs) schools for 2010-2011:

- Calculate list of PLA schools for 2010-11, using 2010 state assessment results.
- Identify schools based on Tier I and Tier II definitions.
- Consider excluding schools based on a case by case analysis, subject to the U.S. Department of Education approval.
- Consider schools with a small number of students per grade level tested (minimum N waiver).

Ms. Middling reviewed the definition of PLAs in Tier I and Tier II as follows:

Tier I schools are:

- A Title I school that has been identified as being in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is: a) among the lowest achieving five percent in all students group in reading and math combined for the past three consecutive years; b) a high school that has a weighted-average graduation rate that is less than 60 percent based on the past three years of data.

Tier II schools are:

- A secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that is:
a) among the lowest achieving five percent of secondary schools in the all students group in reading and math combined for the past three consecutive years; b) a high school that has a weighted average graduation rate that is less than 60 percent based on the past three years of data.

The U.S. Department of Education does not require that a new list of the bottom five percent lowest achieving schools be created each year. However, SB 6696 requires OSPI to create such a list each year.

Ms. Middling shared OSPI's latest draft proposal for which districts could be recommended for Required Action in 2011 using the following criteria:

1. School(s) must be on the PLA list.
2. District did not volunteer in 2010.
3. School did not make progress in reading and math in the "all students" category, based on combined proficiency in the past three years.
4. Federal funds are available.
5. Up to two school districts may be recommended.

The criteria for 2012, and annually thereafter, include:

1. School(s) must be on the PLA list.
2. School did not make progress in reading and math in the "all students" category, based on combined proficiency in the past three years.
3. Federal funds are available.
4. Up to two additional school districts may be recommended for designation.

The exit criteria are as follows:

1. A school district may be recommended for removal from required action after three years of implementation if the district has no school or schools on the list of persistently lowest achieving schools.
2. The school(s) on the list of persistently lowest achieving schools have a positive improvement trend in reading and math on the state's assessment in the "all students" category based on a three year average.

Board members had questions about the need for limiting the number for up to two districts to be identified for required action as well as more specificity in the exit criteria.

Cut Scores for Mathematics Measurements of Student Progress Grades 3-8 and Other Assessment Issues

Dr. Joe Willhoft, Assistant Superintendent for Assessment, OSPI

Dr. Thomas Hirsch, Co-founder, Assessment and Evaluation Services

The Board is required, under RCW [28A.305.130\(4\)\(b\)](#), to develop performance standards and levels for the statewide assessments in consultation with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). The Board and the Superintendent's National Technical Advisory Committee (NTAC) reviewed and approved the math standard setting process to be used for the 2010 math Measurements of Student Progress for grades 3-8.

Dr. Willhoft briefed the members on the systematic standard-setting process, and described the activities that enabled the three panels of practitioners (grade-level panel, articulation panel, and policy advisory panel) to arrive at agreement on the recommended cut scores.

The Board's approved cut scores will be used to report the 2010 results and will be used in future years until such time as the standards are revised or revisited.

OSPI is in negotiation with the U.S. Department of Education to discuss 2010 being a transition year for AYP calculations. Education Testing Service (ETS) has conducted a bridge study using 2009 WASL items that were embedded in the 2010 tests. ETS has been able to identify the 2009 "Met Standard" score on each of the scales for the 2010 tests. This bridge study will identify the extent to which the new standards are more or less demanding than the old standards. The calculation of AYP in 2010 will take this difference into account.

Motion was made to adopt the cut scores for Basic, Proficient, and Advanced on the grades 3-8 mathematics Measurements of Student Progress as forwarded by the Articulation Panel and the Policy Advisory Panel.

Motion seconded

Motion passed with 11 ayes and 0 nays

End of Course Mathematics Exams

Dr. Joe Willhoft, Assistant Superintendent for Assessment and Student Information, OSPI

The state and federal testing requirements for high school math (and science) present some policy challenges. Dr. Willhoft briefed the Board to alert them of the issues and inform them that possible approaches toward resolution were under consideration.

The federal requirements are as follows:

1. No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requires a state assessment program to use the same tests for all students tested in a NCLB grade/subject.
2. Schools/districts testing less than 95 percent of students in every subgroup will not meet AYP. Schools/districts are prohibited from excluding groups of students from testing.
3. When the state moves its high school tests to an End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment system, all students will be required to be assessed in common on the same EOC.
4. Though not finalized, the state's NCLB assessment for high school will probably be the Algebra 1/Integrated Mathematics I End-of-Course Assessment. This is a test the state can expect all students to have been assessed on by the end of grade ten.
5. If the state requires all students to be assessed on a test, accepted professional and ethical standards expect that all students will have had the opportunity to learn the content on the test.

The state requirements include:

1. The Board has established high school graduation requirements in WAC Chapter [180-51](#).
2. WAC [180-51.115](#) allows local determination of exemption from any requirements in WAC 180-51, if such requirement impedes the student's progress toward graduation and there is a direct relationship between the failure to meet the requirement and the student's limitation.

3. Many students with disabilities will not take Algebra 1/Integrated Mathematics I in high school. Testing these students on an EOC test when they have not had an opportunity to learn the content presents a fairness issue.

Public Comment

No public comment was requested.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 a.m. by Dr. Baca