



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Governance | Accountability | Achievement | Oversight | Career & College Readiness

Title:	Educational System Health Indicators	
As Related To:	<input type="checkbox"/> Goal One: Effective and accountable P-13 governance. <input type="checkbox"/> Goal Two: Comprehensive statewide K-12 accountability. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Three: Closing achievement gap.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Four: Strategic oversight of the K-12 system. <input type="checkbox"/> Goal Five: Career and college readiness for all students. <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:	<p>The Board may want to consider revising the Adequate Growth and Language Acquisition Indicators as specified in the accompanying memo. The Board may also want to consider additional indicators broadly categorized as Equity of Opportunity, which could include specific indicators of Student Discipline, Access to Early Childhood Education, Teacher Data, and Family Characteristics. The Board may want to consider the role of an Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS) in the Educational System Health Indicators; the EWIS could possibly be a reform or an indicator.</p>	
Possible Board Action:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review <input type="checkbox"/> Adopt <input 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 type="checkbox"/> PowerPoint	
Synopsis:	<p>Under ESSB 5491 (2013), the SBE is tasked with identifying system-wide performance goals and measurements for the six statewide indicators, in addition to submitting biennial reports on the status of each indicator. In the 2013 initial report to the educational committees of the legislature, the SBE recommended revisions to the indicators.</p> <p>Accompanying this cover sheet is a memo containing important information about the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisions to the statewide indicators • Planned activities and expected outcomes • Recommendations for evidence-based reforms • Additional indicators. 	



EDUCATION SYSTEM HEALTH INDICATORS

Policy Consideration

Passed and signed into law during the 2013 Legislative Session, the ESSB 5491 authorized SBE to lead the effort in identifying system-wide performance goals and measurements for the six statewide indicators specified in the legislation. The legislation also requires that the SBE:

- Submit an initial and biennial reports beginning on December 1, 2013,
- Recommend revised performance goals and measurements, if necessary,
- Recommend evidence-based reforms as needed, and
- Compare Washington student achievement results with national data and to “peer states.”

Role of the SBE in the Statewide Educational System Health Indicators

ESSB 5491, codified in RCW 28A.150.550, identifies specific responsibilities of the SBE in the statewide indicators of educational system health. The statute directs the SBE to:

1. Work with state agencies and other entities to identify realistic but challenging system-wide performance goals and measurements.
 - a. The law specifies SBE will work with OSPI, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, the Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee, and the Washington Student Achievement Council (WSAC).
 - b. The SBE has engaged and is working with other agencies and organizations through the Achievement and Accountability Workgroup.
2. The SBE, OSPI, and the WSAC are directed to align their strategic plans and education reform efforts with the statewide indicators and performance goals.
3. The SBE, with assistance from OSPI, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, the Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee, and the WSAC have the responsibility to submit a biennial report on the status of each indicator and recommend revised performance goals and measurements. The first biennial status report is due in December 2014.
 - a. The report must recommend evidence-based reforms intended to improve student achievement in the area of any indicator if:
 - i. Educational system is not on target to meet the performance goals for that indicator; or
 - ii. Washington students are falling behind students in peer states; or,
 - iii. Washington is not within the top 10 percent nationally.
 - b. To the extent data is available, the performance goals for each indicator must be compared with national data to identify whether Washington student achievement results are:
 - i. Within the top 10 percent nationally; or
 - ii. Are comparable to results in peer states with similar characteristics as Washington.

Previous and Ongoing Work on the Statewide Educational System Health Indicators

In the initial report, the SBE articulated that the indicators specified in ESSB 5491 represented a good starting point, but ultimately were not the best set of indicators upon which to measure our educational system health. The SBE recommended revised measurements as permitted in ESSB 5491 Sec. 2 (5) (a) to five of the six indicators. The revisions are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Revisions to the ESSB 5491 Educational System Health Indicators

ESSB 5491 Indicator	Recommended Indicator
WaKIDS: Percentage of students who demonstrate the characteristics of entering kindergarteners in all six domains.	No Change to WaKIDS Indicator.
4th Grade Reading: Percentage of students Meeting or Exceeding standard on the 4 th Grade Reading MSP.	3rd Grade Literacy: Percentage of students Meeting or Exceeding standard on the 3 rd Grade Reading MSP. Adds: 3 rd Grade Language Acquisition: Percentage of students who have reached English language proficiency on the state language proficiency assessment.
8th Grade Math: Percentage of students Meeting or Exceeding standard on the 8 th Grade Math MSP.	8th Grade High School Readiness: Percentage of students Meeting or Exceeding standard on the 8 th Grade Reading, Math, and Science MSP. Adds: 8 th Grade Language Acquisition: Percentage of students who have reached English language proficiency on the state language proficiency assessment. Adds: Growth Gap Indicator: The percentage decrease in student growth gap in reading and math between the All Students group and Targeted Subgroup.
High School Graduation Rate (4-Year Cohort): The percentage of students graduating using the 4-Year graduation rate.	No Change to High School Graduation Rate (4-Year Cohort) . Adds: High School Graduation Rate (5-Year Cohort): The percentage of students graduating using the 5-Year graduation rate.
Quality of High School Diploma: Percentage of high school graduates enrolled in precollege or remedial courses in public post-secondary institutions.	No Change to Quality of High School Diploma Indicator. Adds: Percentage of students meeting or exceeding standard on the 11 th Grade SBAC College and Career Readiness Assessment.
Post-Secondary Engagement: Percentage of high school graduates who are enrolled in post-secondary education, training or are employed in the 2 nd and 4 th quarters after graduation.	Post-Secondary Attainment: Percentage of high school graduates attaining credentials, certificates, or completing an apprenticeship prior to age 26. No Change to Post-Secondary Engagement Indicator
New Indicator	Access to Quality Schools: The percentage of students at schools at or above the Good Tier of the Washington Achievement Index.

The SBE engaged a broadly representative group of stakeholders to provide feedback on the legislated and recommended indicators. Perhaps the most impactful change is the SBE

recommendation to revise the indicators on postsecondary education and training to be based on attainment rather than engagement. This change acknowledges and is aligned to the work of the Washington Student Achievement Council (WSAC), manifested in *The Roadmap: A Plan to Increase Educational Attainment in Washington*.

For the first time beginning with the upcoming school year (2014-15), students will be assessed using new instruments developed by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortia (SBAC). The shift to these new assessments will require resetting of baselines from which to develop annual goals. To comply with the ESSB 5491 requirements, the December 2013 report included initial goals with the understanding that additional time was needed to work on target-setting for the improved set of indicators with stakeholders.

Revised Indicator Refinements

Adequate Growth. In the December 2013 initial report to the education committees of the legislature, the SBE recommended the inclusion of a Growth Gap measure to the High School Readiness Indicator. The recommended measure was to be the percentage decrease in student growth gap (combined reading and math between the All Students and Targeted Subgroup). Upon further study, the SBE staff determined that a gap computation based on median percentiles derived from large population sizes would be poorly suited as a System Health Indicator.

To increase transparency for the general public, to enhance the meaningfulness of the growth model component, and to align the state Educational System Health Indicators to the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) strategic planning performance indicators, the SBE should consider revising the High School Readiness Indicator to be the percentage of 4th and 6th grade students meeting their individual adequate growth targets in reading and math. Whereas the median Student Growth Percentile (SGP) is a wholly normative or comparative measure, the use of Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) provides information about student growth in relation to proficiency, thereby providing both norm- and criterion-based references to the indicator. This revised statewide measure is amenable to disaggregation by subgroup and for annual target-setting. This measure is viewed as a leading indicator of high school readiness and a predictor of middle school academic performance. In revising this measure, the Board would be acknowledging that growth to a proficiency target is more important than growth alone.

Language Acquisition. In the current recommended indicators, language acquisition is included in the third grade and eighth grade indicators as the percentage of K-3 or K-8 students that score proficient in English on the Washington English Language Proficiency Assessment (WELPA). Staff have further explored the topic of language acquisition and considered alternate ways to include an indicator that provides a measure of how well our bilingual education programs are serving our students not only in acquiring English, but in acquiring academic proficiency as well. Because students requiring ELL services may enter the system at different points in their academic career, a measure at the time of graduation would capture students' transition out of ELL services and their academic attainment. The Board may want to consider revising the third and eighth grade indicators to remove WELPA proficiency and add a graduation rate goal for Former ELL students to the graduation rate indicator.

Similar concerns about the success of our Special Education programs may also be addressed in the future through a graduation rate goal or other indicator. The Legislature has requested a plan for forming a special education task force from the Office of the Education Ombuds, which may eventually establish goals and policy objectives that would aid the Board in incorporating such an indicator.

Over the next few months, the SBE staff will be engaging in a number of tasks to comply with the statutory requirements specified in ESSB 5491. The plan and expected outcomes are outlined in Table 2.

Table 2: Timeline of Activities for the 2014 Educational System Health Report

Date	Groups	Planned Activities and Expected Outcomes
August 15, 2014	SBE and EOGOAC	The SBE presented on the gaps identified through the educational system indicators. The SBE will receive feedback about the recommended indicators and additional indicators.
August 19, 2014	SBE Staff and AAW	The SBE staff provided the AAW with an update on the status of the System Indicators. The SBE received feedback on the recommended indicators, on goal setting, evidence-based reforms, and the development of additional indicators to be used to ascertain the Educational System Health.
September 9, 2014	SBE (Meeting)	The SBE staff will provide the Board with an update on the status of the System Indicators that includes feedback from the AAW. The SBE staff will seek feedback from the Board on possible revisions to the indicators.
October 20, 2014	SBE Staff and AAW	The SBE staff will present the AAW with a preliminary draft of the 2014 report for the education committees of the legislature. The report will provide an update on the status of each recommended indicator, national and peer comparisons, and recommendations for evidence-based reforms as necessary. The SBE will seek feedback from the AAW on the various elements of the report.
November 13, 2014	SBE (Meeting)	The SBE staff will provide the Board with a complete version of the 2014 report that includes the recommendation of evidence-based reform to improve system health, as necessary. The SBE staff will seek Board approval of the report (with revisions as deemed necessary by the Board).
December 1, 2014	SBE	The SBE will deliver the first biennial report to the education committees of the legislature on December 1, 2014.

Recommendation of Evidenced Based Reforms

The law (RCW 28A.150.550) requires the SBE, with the assistance of other agencies and organizations, to include in the biennial report recommendations for evidence-based reforms intended to improve student achievement if any indicator:

- 1) is not on target to meet a performance goal,
- 2) does not compare well with peer states, or
- 3) is not ranked within the top 10 percent nationally.

The achievement data based on the 2013-14 assessment year required for the national and peer states comparisons will be available shortly and will be included in the 2014 biennial report. At least one Educational System Health Indicator is expected to fall below the comparison criteria listed above, thereby requiring the SBE to recommend evidence-based reform for the purpose of improving the Educational System Health.

Additional Indicators

The Board may recommend to the Legislature additional indicators for inclusion in the educational system health indicators. These additional indicators should provide the Legislature with a snapshot of key issue areas that demonstrate the need for system-wide reforms and will inform policy changes. The system health indicator framework was not designed to be exhaustive, so the Board will need to consider what factors broadly define a healthy system and what the goals of tracking these factors would be. The following analysis provides staff recommendations for focus areas and potential indicators for initial consideration, though others may certainly be pursued by the Board.

Equity of Opportunity

The current indicators of educational system health focus on proficiency and attainment—the outputs of the system. However, the health of the educational system also depends on the inputs that impact student outcomes—and understanding these inputs will help to inform targeted reforms that address not only the achievement gap, but also the opportunity gap. The Board has been exploring the development of an indicator related to student discipline for potential inclusion, but there are others that the Board may also want to consider to better understand the health and equity of students' opportunity within the system. These other indicators will require more Board discussion, similar to the process undertaken in the consideration of a student discipline indicator, to ensure that they are thoughtful and meaningful indicators.

Staff have presented to and received feedback from the Achievement and Accountability Workgroup (AAW) on potential additional indicators that may provide a more holistic understanding of the system's health than the current indicators. These indicators included discipline, language acquisition (discussed above), teacher quality, access to pre-kindergarten, family economics and characteristics, and access to healthcare. There are a multitude of potential measures in each possible indicator area, so the Board will want to consider not only the topic area to be addressed, but also the measure that would best inform our understanding of the educational system and may be addressed through K-12 policy changes.

Of particular interest for the AAW were an early childhood education indicator; a family-related indicator, either family engagement or characteristics; and a teacher related indicator, such as a measure of the candidate pool.

Staff have surveyed the available research in these areas and the available Washington state data to craft recommendations on how potential indicators may be structured. Staff recommend a phase-in approach to this new category of indicators, beginning with a student discipline indicator.

Student Discipline. As previously discussed, the issue of student discipline is multi-faceted and an indicator could address various aspects. Due to current data availability and quality, there are three measures that could be developed: number of students suspended and expelled, the number of days lost, and a proportionality indicator, such as a risk ratio. All of the potential measures, like all 5491 indicators, would be disaggregated by student group. By choosing

number of suspensions and expulsions, the Board implies that disciplinary exclusions should be decreased and alternatives to exclusions employed. The number of days highlights the lost educational opportunity through exclusion, and a risk ratio highlights the disproportionality of discipline practices by measuring a student's risk of getting suspended or expelled compared to a student of a different group. Disproportionality may also be assessed by comparing the percentage of students suspended or expelled from each student group to their enrollment percentages, perhaps a more intuitive measure.

Staff recommend, similar to the revised grade level indicators, that a discipline indicator be developed for the 2014 report that includes multiple measures: proportionality of percentage of students suspended and expelled to enrollment, and number of days lost. These indicators would align with the Board's concerns about the lost educational opportunity and subsequent negative impact on student achievement caused by suspensions and expulsions, and the potential for such exclusions to contribute to the opportunity and achievement gaps if used disproportionately.

In the future, more nuanced indicators could be introduced or substituted, once data becomes available and reliable for the new data collection standards being developed by the Discipline Data Task Force, such as behavior categories and educational services provided.

Access to Early Childhood Education. Enrolling in pre-kindergarten has been shown to have a significant impact on a student's readiness to enter school and success in her academic career¹. Increasing access to early childhood educational opportunities has the potential to improve the health of the educational system by increasing kindergarten readiness (the WaKIDS indicator) as well as addressing one of the earliest gaps in the educational system that persists throughout a student's career. The American Community Survey (ACS) produced by the U.S. Census Bureau provides data on the enrollment of three and four year olds in pre-kindergarten. The data can be disaggregated by race/ethnicity and income level, but it may not be possible to disaggregate by English Language Learner or students receiving special education services.

Staff recommend that an indicator be explored using the ACS enrollment data to track progress towards providing every student with access to early childhood education for future inclusion.

Teachers. Teachers are the largest in-school factor that impacts student achievement² and are a critical piece of a healthy educational system. The distribution of quality teachers across the system, teachers teaching within their endorsement area, and the ability of the candidate pool to meet the needs of the system are potential areas to examine through an indicator. There are some promising data developments, such as the implementation of TPEP and collection of TPEP data, to be fully implemented in 2015-2016. These data could be used to examine the distribution of quality teachers across the system, though they are not currently available. The analysis of teachers working within their endorsement area is currently only available for high school subjects, though the Professional Educator Standard Board (PESB) is working on restructuring its analysis and creating new standards for middle school and elementary grades. The candidate pool's ability to meet the system demand would be the most difficult to measure, as the state does not currently collect information on position openings. PESB is working on

¹ Kay, N. & Pennucci, A. (2014). *Early childhood education for low-income students: A review of the evidence and benefit-cost analysis* (Doc. No. 14-01-2201). Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy

² Rice, J. (2003). *Teacher quality: Understanding the effectiveness of teacher attributes*. Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute.

analysis that uses the time it takes for a newly certified teacher to find a position as an indicator of market need.

Staff recommend that the Board continue to explore a way to measure this vital piece of the educational system, but that no indicator be developed at this time due to lack of data.

Family Characteristics. Family factors play an enormous role in a student's academic success. Family expectations, economic needs, and engagement can influence a student's persistence and achievement. Family factors are also difficult to measure and craft policy around. One potential indicator could be parental educational attainment. A parent's educational attainment impacts a student's readiness to learn when entering school³ and can be a predictor of a student's level of educational attainment⁴. A parent's education may also impact a family's earning potential⁵. The ACS collects data on the educational attainment of the head of households that could be used in a potential indicator. In the future, the Board may also want to consider an engagement survey tool that could be used at the state level to get at parent expectations and interactions with the school. That data and tool are not currently available, but staff are exploring tools used by regional cooperatives and districts, as well as the surveys used by SIG and RAD schools. An indicator based on surveys of family interaction with schools may be one that could lead to policy reforms regarding family engagement. An indicator based on external family factors, such as head of household educational attainment, may be more difficult to recommend reforms to address, particularly within the educational system.

Staff recommend that the Board continue to explore the development of a family engagement survey and indicator for future inclusion.

Other Suggestions

Other indicators were investigated from sources such as Early Warning Indicator Systems (EWIS). Many of these indicators are better suited for school or district level interventions. In particular student attendance, in which AAW members were very interested, is more useful at a school level where an administrator can examine the root cause of the attendance pattern for an individual student. There are many reasons for student absences, for which data are not readily available and collected by the state, and a state-level indicator of attendance would not likely provide a clear understanding of why students are absent, nor lead to a clear state policy reform. However, if the Board feels that such indicators are important for schools to track, an indicator or measure based on how many schools and districts utilize a EWIS or other student tracking and intervention system could be considered.

Action

The Board will consider whether to direct staff to incorporate a recommendation regarding additional indicators into the 2014 report to the Legislature.

Contact Andrew Parr (andrew.parr@k12.wa.us) or Julia Suliman (Julia.suliman@k12.wa.us) if you have questions about this memo.

³ Child Trends (2014). *Parental Education: Indicators on Children and Youth*.

http://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/67-Parental_Education.pdf

⁴ *Parental Educational Attainment and Higher Educational Opportunity*. Postsecondary Education Opportunity. Pp 1-19 (No. 79) January 1999. <http://www.postsecondary.org/last12/79199Parented.pdf>

⁵ Child Trends (2014). *Parental Education: Indicators on Children and Youth*.

http://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/67-Parental_Education.pdf



Achievement and Accountability Workgroup (AAW) Feedback Report
August 19, 2014

During the August 19, 2014 meeting, SBE staff presented on additional indicators and recommendations for evidence-based education reforms, the development of a district-level Index Rating, and the inclusion of Dual Credit in the Index. This report was written based on notes from the discussion, written feedback from AAW members in response to guiding question, and was sent to AAW members prior to publication.

Executive Summary

Table with 2 columns: Topic or Question, AAW Feedback or Recommendation. Rows include: Number of Indicators, Early Learning, Expanded Learning Opportunities, Teacher Indicator, Discipline, Language Acquisition, KIDS COUNT Indicators, Attendance.

Survey-Based Indicator	Agreement with no Dissent: All members were interested in a survey indicator, with some members focused on student voice and other members focused on parent voice. The suggested survey topics covered the full breadth of health, safety, economic, and family and community, thus overlapping with KIDS COUNT indicators.
-------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Inclusion of Dual Credit in the Index	
Topic or Question	AAW Feedback or Recommendation
Any problems with inclusion of Dual Credit in the 2013-2014 Index?	No Agreement: Members did not reach consensus around a major problem with reporting the 2013-2014 Dual Credit participation. Members raised concerns about funding inequities and regional differences in capacity.

Inclusion of District-Level Index Ratings	
Topic or Question	AAW Feedback or Recommendation
Were members in favor of a district-level Index Rating?	Majority Agreement: No, unless there is a clear purpose for doing so.

Additional Indicators and Recommended Reforms for ESSB 5491

Number of Indicators

Concern Raised: The Legislature identified indicators as snapshots of educational system health. Including too many indicators could defeat the purpose of having snapshots. SBE staff stated that it is important to have indicators that can have multiple policy influences, thus doing double-duty. One member cautioned that tension is created when expanding data and accountability because schools have to configure their rules to meet the expectations of too many masters within state and federal government.

Early Learning

Agreement with no dissent: Include a measure of early learning, either beyond WaKIDS or by enhancing the WaKIDS indicator, as an additional indicator, and recommend bolstering early learning as an evidence-based education reform in the 5491 report.

Among other 5491 data, SBE staff presented on Pre-K participation rates from KIDS COUNT, stating that Washington ranked low compared to other states in students enrolled in preschool programs. Members noted that WaKIDS is already an indicator of kindergarten readiness. They were interested in a measure of access to Pre-K learning opportunities. Members noted that WaKIDS is not yet representative of the entire population because it is still being phased in, but it is a good start. The suggestions on a measure beyond WaKIDS or the enhancement of the WaKIDS indicator were varied and included:

- Participation in Pre-K services.
- Disaggregating WaKIDS results by participation in Early Childhood Assistance Program enrollment and other early learning programs to understand the impact of preschool services on kindergarten readiness.
- “See that the data exhibits the haves and have-nots – poverty, English language proficiency, health insurance, et cetera.”

- “A focus on early learning for all of the family – parents too! Literacy/employability of parents; ability to help children learn, external learning.”

Members were in agreement that early learning should be recommended as an evidence-based reform in the 5491 report. Multiple members suggested that early learning become part of basic education, suggesting that it be an entitled afforded constitutional protection. One member cited a study that showed the effect size of Pre-K on student outcomes as greater than that of reduced class size. Another member stated that the Road Map districts include measures of early learning in their accountability system. The following written comments on expanded Pre-K overlapped with expanded learning opportunities, with the discussion revolving around increased access leading to reduced opportunity gaps:

- “So what do the students (target students) need? – Quality Pre-K? Longer school year? Extended HS time to graduate?”
- “More time and access to education for high need students = more opportunity.”
- “Early learning part of Basic Ed”
- “Pre-K, Full Day K for those in need”
- “Summer programs (prevent summer loss)”
- “Reform that could help address K readiness - Including high-quality early learning as part of Basic Education and improving the quality of our early care and learning system.”
- “Exploring extended school year and day models. Note: This reform is ideal but politically probably not feasible, at least as a state-wide reform.”
- Extended Learning opportunities funding
- “Do students have access to extended school year, extended graduation – How do these data correlate to gaps?”
- “Why should taxpayers pay for kids to be in Pre-k that are better off staying at home? A matrix needs to reflect those who could benefit.”

Expanded Learning Opportunities

Strong Interest with Limited Discussion: Recommend expanded learning opportunities as an evidence-based education reform in the 5491 report. One member stated that successful charter schools have used expanded learning opportunities to successfully improve student outcomes. Suggestions included afterschool programs, wraparound services, summer programs to prevent summer learning loss, and one member stated that expanded learning opportunities are inclusive of preschool early learning opportunities. Thus the written comments and discussion of early learning were closely related to expanded learning opportunities. The general theme was that more time and access equals more opportunity and improved student outcomes.

Why do you think the system is not improving on a particular indicator? What reform addresses that cause?

Varied topics, no decisive agreement: Written responses to this broad question of reform raised issues of teacher, leader, and school effectiveness most commonly.

- “Also the folks in the trenches. Trenches need more opportunities (probably more/better resources) to tell – and less being told”
- “The policy makers need to get serious if they want to close the gaps. Stop the rhetoric and punishment. Adequately fund programs and reduce the strangling red tape and directives from Olympia. Local districts know their kids and needs best. Example => new LAP law.”

- “We’re looking through a myopic lens. Student success is a factor of family experience/expectations, school effectiveness, access to health care, job stress/financial struggle. School effectiveness does not exist in isolation.”
- “Change schools (and teachers) not the kids. Institutional racism – cultural competency. High quality instruction where it is needed most {Strategic Staffing}! Student “data backpack” (to take with mobile kids).”
- “Evaluating how money is being spent – is it being spent on reforms that are research-based and that work. Figure out how we can spend money more wisely/strategically. Figuring out how to improve portability of student records (Ed history, IEPs, etc.), especially for mobile students who move from district to district, so that educators have the information they need to meet the needs of each student.”
- “Reforms that could help address achievement gaps – (A) how we train, support, and keep effective teachers and leaders; (B) how we measure and respond to teachers and leaders who are able to help students learn and grow; (C) how we exit ineffective teachers and leaders.”
- Percent of eligible children enrolled in select formal early learning programs. Percent of licensed childcare programs meeting quality criteria.

Teacher Indicator

Majority Disapproval of Teacher Effectiveness, Suggestions on Measuring Human Capital: Several members reacted with disapproval to using TPEP as a 5491 indicator, particularly before full implementation and vetting, and offered alternative ways of measuring human capital. Multiple members were against inclusion of any indicator of teacher effectiveness in the 5491 report. However, one member provided a written comment strongly recommending multiple measures of teacher effectiveness. Members cautioned against using TPEP as a measure of teacher effectiveness, stating that it has not been fully implemented and vetted, it is subjective, and teachers can appear effective by one indicator and not by another. As alternatives to TPEP, members considered the following measures:

- Ratio of endorsed teachers to the number of teachers needed in areas of the state.
- Ratio of endorsed teachers by content area to the number of teachers needed by content area.
- Teacher availability.
- Aggregate number of teachers incoming every year.
- A measure of equitable distribution of teachers by Highly Qualified status, placement, and content area. (A member noted that almost all teachers are Highly Qualified.)
- Cautioned against the movement of teachers in high poverty schools because the data may come to wrong conclusions when new schools open or transfer teachers.
- Retention rates of teachers.

Members provided the following written comments on teacher effectiveness:

- “Teacher quality has myriad variables – it’s probably a meaningless indicator. There is a double-edged sword to discipline – you don’t want kids out of the classroom, but you do want it to be safe.”
- “Strongly recommend teacher quality indicators especially ones that measure track teacher prep; distribution of high quality/effective teachers; when TPEP scores are available it would be helpful to have that data; teacher competency in licensure areas; teacher recruitment, promotion and retentions; number of effective teachers of color. Note: Some of the measures may be more useful at the district level.”

- “No to teacher quality – too subjective, but what about some objective data to show what IHE’s are producing and what our policies are reaping as a result of blaming teachers/principals. Candidate pools are thin. What are institutions of higher education doing?”
- “Teacher quality is in transition. I do not believe we need to add this until we know TPEP is an effective tool.”
- “No.”

Discipline

Limited Discussion with No Dissent: The limited discussion on discipline included some support and no opposition to the inclusion of a state-level discipline indicator, although members did have technical suggestions for how the measure should be calculated. Members provided the following written comments:

- “Discipline percent of districts implementing alternative discipline interventions (PBIS).”
- “Recommend including discipline as an indicator – same ways to measure: Number of exclusions, demographics of students, and attendance – could help identify disproportionality and help measure safety and school climate.”
- “If considering discipline – Those toxic behaviors i.e., weapons – is beyond an education system health indicator – There should be consideration for non-toxic behaviors to gauge effectiveness to be an indicator.”
- “For discipline, get quality data.”

Language Acquisition

Mixed Opinions, Limited Discussion: Members did not voice support for WELPA during the limited conversation, but did emphasize the importance of measuring language acquisition.

Members made the following comments:

- Language acquisition is important to track, but WELPA is probably not the best.
- “Supportive of language acquisition being a stand-alone indicator – although capacity wise – this may need to be phased in later. If there are capacity constraints, I rec. measuring language acquisition at specific grade milestones (cg 4th, 8th...) I also have concerns here about what assessments are used to measure students’ English proficiency and how students are exited out of traditional ELL programs.”

KIDS COUNT Indicators

Presentation Summary: KIDS COUNT includes nationally comparable data that is used for state comparisons on four domains comprised of a total of 16 indicators. The domains are: economic well-being, education, health, and family and community.

Broad Interest: Members were interested in the economic, pre-K indicator of education, health, and family and community indicators, but were not clear on whether they should be included in a concise set of snapshots for 5491. However, it was clear from the discussion on early learning that they were in support of the Pre-K participation indicator.

- “(1) Access to quality health care. (2) Mother’s level of educational attainment. (3) Consider the issue of undocumented students and their post-secondary work (college or work). High schools have no impact on this issue but will be rated on it. Students don’t always disclose and there is no way to calculate.”

- “Healthcare/Employment (employments stress)/School are intertwined in the health of a child – they cannot be separated, but I don’t know how to fit the puzzle pieces together.”

Attendance

Strong Interest: Multiple members noted the importance of attendance data as a window into student life and education reforms, but members did not provide a clear way for attendance to be used as a meaningful state-level indicator rather than a meaningful local-level indicator.

Multiple members stated the importance of attendance data to understanding the engagement of parents, health care, parent employment, resources, and other factors that affect students. One member said that students who are lacking clothing, hygiene supplies, and other basic resources may not show up to school. Members noted the importance of attendance to progress throughout the year, dropout rates, engagement, classroom morale, and requirements for physical space within the classroom. Essentially, the attendance rates offer information into non-academic supports that may improve student outcomes. In response to the idea of targeted assistance to remedy these challenges, a member cautioned that the state should not incentivize low attendance for districts to receive additional funding. Although members were enthusiastic about the importance of attendance data, they did not provide a clear way for it to be used as a meaningful statewide snapshot of educational system health rather than an important local-level indicator.

- “Attendance – dig deep- Address why is the kid not there? Disaggregate achieve data for effects of attendance/engagement.”

Survey-Based Indicator

Strong Interest: All members were interested in a survey indicator, with some members focused on student voice and other members focused on parent voice. The suggested survey topics covered the full breadth of health, safety, economic, and family and community, thus overlapping with KIDS COUNT indicators. Members emphasized the importance of student and parent voice in evaluating the education system.

Members provided the following comments:

- “Student voice – what do they have to say about themselves, family and the system? Access to tools they need to be proficient learners? Book, tech, etc. Parent voice -what do they have to say about themselves, family and the system? Access to tools they need to be proficient learners? Book, tech, etc. Timing is very important – not a 2 hour survey, or not during testing, etc. Do students have access to extended school year, extended graduation – How do these data correlate to gaps? Parents may provide reasons why it is difficult for them to support their child i.e. – many are working poor – working more than one job and children home on their own or with grandma most of the time.”
- “Some kind of at-risk student survey to identify kids who are in danger of dropping out from an attitudinal perspective, not just demographic. I’d base it on attitudes and self-perceptions of those who did not drop, those on the cusp, those who did.”
- “Family engagement, dropout, attendance, motivation, safety, engagement by teachers, best subjects, likes to read, likes to do math, something not taught/not time for in school”

Inclusion of District-Level Index Ratings

Were members in favor of a district-level Index Rating?

Majority Agreement: No, unless there is a clear purpose for doing so. Several members voiced strong opposition to a district-level Index Rating. The most vocal members in opposition work in districts, schools, or serve on school boards. However, all members were open to the idea of district-level Index Ratings as long as there was a clear, important purpose such as providing targeted support to districts. Most members were opposed to calculating a district-level Index Rating for information purposes only, raising concern that the district-level Index Ratings would be used by the media to publish a ranked list of districts. Members insisted that the decision to include a district-level Index Rating hinges on what it would be used for (i.e. supports and interventions).

Should the district-level analysis mimic the school-level analysis (proficiency, growth, and CCR)? If not, what other indicators be considered?

After staff raised the issue of growth becoming meaningless in large districts because it would average towards the 50th percentile, a member suggested that the Board report the range of growth values within the district. A member wrote that the Board would “probably need to ‘flight’ districts – kind of like WIAA” and staff interpreted this to mean that districts should be categorized into brackets or flights based on size or other characteristics so that the Index Ratings offer comparisons of similar districts. One member stated that district-level information could shed light on the use of alternative schools within the district. One member suggested that parent engagement could be measured in districts using a survey to ensure that all communities are being engaged. Multiple members were interested in a measure of opportunity and equity gaps at the district-level, but did not provide detail on how to measure equity. SBE staff stated that the sample size in districts would allow for a greater understanding of the performance of subgroup students because n-counts below 20 would not be suppressed in the data. OSPI staff stated that AYP is a district-level indicator, but the decision to include a district-level Index Rating should be based on a compelling need to understand a district-level issue.

- “Save measures that inform improvement, including strategies for improvement.”
- “No. Effective school characteristics have been published – would they not also serve as effective district characteristics?”
- “What is the purpose of a district rating? If the purpose is (1) unclear or (2) negative, then no rating.”
- “No – the district is held accountable already through school performance.”
- “The purpose or need must be very clear not only for the reasons already provided, but also because it would also be likely that leadership in a low-performing district might focus more on district performance than on school performance. That is, a district index could distract or divide district leadership in addressing student learning.”

What does an effective district look like?

- “Good question. WSSDA should answer!”
- “Improved graduation rates that also considers extended graduation rates. Is the district systemically effective? Are students given enough time to gain English proficiency to meet goal – graduation? Are feeder elementary; MS, preparing students for HS and graduation? Do all schools have systems to keep students in school, keep them safe, parent-engagement?”

- “One that supports a K-12 SYSTEM to ensure students leaving our system are choosing the next phases of their lives from positions [that] have academic and personal power. An individual school cannot accomplish this alone.”
- “One that is responsive in allocating resources to best meet the needs of all learners.”

Inclusion of Dual Credit in the Index

Presentation Summary

During the proposed phased-in approach, Dual Credit data would be reported first, and then included in the accountability measure during the following year. Tests of the relationship between Index scores with and without Dual Credit, between graduation rate and Dual Credit, and between Free and Reduced Price Lunch and Dual Credit, showed that it is working as desired. However, school size was moderately correlated with Index Ratings. Larger schools generally had higher Index Ratings from the Dual Credit programs.

Having analyzed the data, the reporting of 2013-2014 Dual Credit participation data is planned for the upcoming 2013-14 Index release, but would not contribute to the Index rating. Do you see any problems or unintended consequences with this plan?

No Agreement: Members did not reach consensus around a major problem with reporting the 2013-2014 Dual Credit participation data, but members did raise concern with funding inequities and regional differences in capacity. The bulk of the conversation revolved around the differences in capacity to fund Dual Credit offerings, with a particular issue being increased STEM funding that is going to particular parts of the state while other districts would not receive that financial support to develop Dual Credit offerings. OSPI staff suggested that there should be a way to account for that difference in funding. Members discussed an issue with some high schools offering College in High School courses but calling them Running Start due to a difference in funding. One member stated that WSAC is convening a Dual Credit workgroup to discuss the issue. A member suggested that, in addition to reporting the Dual Credit value, the Board should provide districts with a simulation of how the Dual Credit measure would affect the Index Ratings of their schools.

- “Access and resources are probably not equitable – Not sure how this would or could contribute to the index.”
- “Whoa. Too big a question for today.”
- “Can you aggregate by county? For participation? Are there financial limitations for some districts to not offer dual credit? It doesn’t sound like there’s consistency in how this will be applied, yet – is the cart before the horse?”