



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

A high-quality education system that prepares all students for college, career, and life.

Title: 2014 Achievement Index and Washington Achievement Awards

As Related To:

| | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Goal One: Develop and support policies to close the achievement and opportunity gaps. | <input type="checkbox"/> Goal Three: Ensure that every student has the opportunity to meet career and college ready standards. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Two: Develop comprehensive accountability, recognition, and supports for students, schools, and districts. | <input type="checkbox"/> Goal Four: Provide effective oversight of the K-12 system. |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Relevant To Board Roles:

| | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Leadership | <input type="checkbox"/> Communication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> System Oversight | <input type="checkbox"/> Convening and Facilitating |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy | |

Policy Considerations / Key Questions:

The 2014 Washington Achievement Index (WAI) was not subjected to any methodological changes but ratings and assessment results for the Non-Targeted student groups were added to the data file.

Changes to the College and Career Readiness (CCR) indicator are proposed for Board discussion and will likely be required for U.S. Department of Education approval.

The SBE staff met with stakeholder groups and the EOGOAC to discuss possible changes to some award criteria.

Key Questions would include:

1. Should the CCR indicator be changed to reflect a greater portion of the HS Index rating, should the HS Proficiency indicator be weighted more heavily, and should the HS Growth indicator weighting be reduced?
2. Will any of the Washington Achievement Awards be changed for the 2014 awards ceremony?
3. Did the additional analyses made possible by the enhanced data file identify biases not previously identified?

Possible Board Action:

| | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| <input 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 type="checkbox"/> PowerPoint |

Synopsis:

The accompanying memo will address three main ideas involving the 2014 Washington Achievement Index: preliminary analyses of the Index, changes to the indicator weighting factors for high schools, and changes to two of the Washington Achievement Awards. The memo will show that:

- None of these analyses conducted on the preliminary WAI data indicate a bias that would bring the validity of the WAI ratings into question.
- The weightings of the Proficiency, Growth, and CCR Indicators for high schools should be modified to reflect the SBAC assessments.
- One minor change to the English Language Acquisition Award and a redesign of the Performance Gap Reduction Award are proposed.



2014 WASHINGTON ACHIEVEMENT INDEX

Policy Considerations

At the March 2014 State Board of Education (SBE) meeting, the SBE adopted the Achievement Index for the purpose of meeting state and federal accountability requirements. This action was taken after SBE found the Index to provide valid and reliable school ratings which could be used for recognition and differentiated supports.

Since that meeting, the SBE has received and processed stakeholder feedback on possible improvements to some of the Washington Achievement Awards. At the time of Board actions at this meeting, the Board will consider whether to adopt proposed changes to some of the Achievement Award qualifying criteria.

As the Board responsible to the creation and implementation of the Washington Achievement Index, the Board may choose to discuss and approve new weightings to the Achievement Index to account for changes related to implementation of the SBAC assessments.

Summary

As Washington moves forward with full implementation of SBAC assessments, changes to the WAI indicator weighting for high schools are warranted. The SBE staff and the OSPI propose that the Proficiency and CCR Indicators be weighted more heavily than the Growth Indicator and that the graduation measure be equal to or greater than the proficiency measures. The proposed indicator weightings for high schools are:

- 35% Proficiency (equally weighted for Reading/ELA, Math, and Science)
- 20% Growth (equally weighted for Reading and Math)
- 45% CCR (40% weighting for Graduation and 5% for Dual Credit Participation)

The SBE staff received feedback from stakeholders regarding the Washington Achievement Awards, and the SBE staff is working with stakeholders to change some of the award criteria to make the awards more meaningful. This work is ongoing at the time of this writing, but the proposed changes will include the following:

- Using a two- or three-year average to compute the highest performing schools for the English Language Acquisition Award instead of a one-year measure.
- Establishing the criteria for the Gap Reduction Award to identify the schools which have made the most progress in reducing gaps based on race/ethnicity and FRL status.

The preliminary 2014 Washington Achievement Index was subject to a review by district assessment and accountability staff from February 17th to March 2nd. The statistics presented here are based on a preliminary data file and are subject to change. Regarding the 2014 WAI:

- The WAI output file was enhanced to provide more information about schools for stakeholders.
- The relationships between school characteristics and the 2014 AI rating are similar to those communicated to the Board last year and do not indicate any serious bias for schools.



Potential Changes to the 2015 Index

Indicator Weightings

The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) is preparing materials for the U.S. Department of Education (USED) in anticipation of seeking reinstatement of Washington’s ESEA Flexibility Waiver. Almost certainly, any reinstated Waiver for Washington would include modifications from that which was previously granted. With respect to the WAI, the current weighting of the indicators (Table 1) and the individual CCR measures are not expected to be approved by the USED as currently written. In particular, the OSPI does not anticipate the USED would approve any school accountability framework where graduation rate is not a substantial contributor to the identification of a high school. As currently described (Table 1), the graduation measure would account for only 11.1 percent of the Index rating for a high school.

Table 1: Weighting of Indicators and Measures (current and proposed) for high schools.

| Indicator | Weighting in the Index | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|
| | Total | | Reading/ELA | | Math | | Science | | Writing | |
| | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed |
| Proficiency | 33.3 | 35.0 | 8.3 | 11.7 | 8.3 | 11.7 | 8.3 | 11.7 | 8.3 | |
| Growth | 33.3 | 20.0 | 16.7 | 10.0 | 16.7 | 10.0 | | | | |
| | | | Graduation | | Dual Credit | | HS SBAC | | | |
| CCR | 33.3 | 45.0 | 11.1 | 40.0 | 11.1 | 5.0 | 11.1 | | | |

The SBE staff participated in a series of discussions with the OSPI on the possible changes necessary to gain USED approval of the Achievement Index for federal accountability. The OSPI and the SBE staff believe that the USED would approve the Index with the proposed indicator weightings for high school as shown in Table 1. The proposed weightings would be aligned to the following principles or ideas:

- Proficiency is valued over growth for high school students
- The HS SBAC will necessitate the computation of a three-year SGP (8th to 11th grade) and the meaningfulness of such a measure has yet to be determined or discussed.
- For the high school AI rating, the weighting of graduation should be equal to or greater than the proficiency rates.

As shown on Table 1, the weighting of the indicators as proposed:

- The Proficiency Indicator weighting will increase to 35 percent as compared to the current 33 percent. Reading, math, and science will be equally weighted. The HS SBAC results will be reported in the Proficiency Indicator and will reflect the national cut points.
- The weighting of the Growth Indicator will be reduced to 20 percent from 33 percent and the reading and math measures will be equally weighted.
- The weighting of the CCR Indicator will be increased to 45 percent from the current 33 percent. The graduation measure will be weighted at 40 percent (of the total WAI), while



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

A high-quality education system that prepares all students for college, career, and life.

the Dual Credit participation measure will be weighted at five percent of the high school Index.

High School Growth Model Data and the WAI

Currently, the OSPI computes high school growth model SGPs based on the 10th grade High School Proficiency Exam (HSPE) and the Math End of Course (EOC) assessments that are typically completed in the 8th through the 10th grade. This means that the current high school SGPs are (at most) a two year growth measure. With the full implementation of the HS SBAC and elimination of the 10th grade HSPE for the current 10th grade students, the high school SGPs will become three-year growth measures beginning in the 2015 Index.

In recent correspondence with Dr. Damien Betebenner, the developer of the SGP growth model, it was confirmed that computing three-year SGPs is possible. In a separate discussion, the OSPI student information staff stated that the decision to compute (or not) high school SGPs for 2015 has not yet been made, citing Dr. Betebenner's statements at a 2014 SGP user group meeting. Also, it is not entirely clear if the USED would approve the use of a three-year SGP in the WAI because no state has done so at the time of this writing.

The current Index business rules include only records for students who are continuously enrolled (CE) at a school from October to the time of testing. This is done for the purpose of attributing only the student scores to a school that would be expected to have an impact on the student outcomes. In other words, the component reduces the negative impact of high mobility or transiency rates. Some consideration has been given to applying a three-year CE business rule to correspond with the three-year SGP but the practicality and ability to actually apply this business rule is not yet fully known. The OSPI student information staff indicates that such a computation can be made but the impact to schools is uncertain at best.

Washington Achievement Awards

Last year, the identification of the 2013 Washington Achievement Award (WAA) recipients and April awards ceremony resulted from a collaborative effort between the OSPI and the SBE to ensure that the awards were aligned with and met state and federal requirements. Since the WAA ceremony in April 2014, the SBE received some stakeholder feedback about some of the awards and, as a direct result, participated in several meetings to share ideas and solicit feedback about ways to improve the awards. In particular, stakeholders and the SBE staff explored opportunities to enhance the English Language Acquisition Award and the Special Recognition - Gap Reduction Award.

English Language Acquisition Award

The SBE staff developed the English Language Acquisition Award after several discussions with the AAW, after listening to Board discussion at the regular SBE meetings, and following guidance from the Board. After announcing the recipients of the inaugural English Language Acquisition Award in April 2014, the SBE staff received mixed comments about awards in general and the English Language Acquisition Award in specific.

To explore possible enhancements to the English Language Acquisition Award, the SBE staff made a presentation to the Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program (TBIP) Task Force in late-January and to the Bilingual Education and Advisory Committee (BEAC) after the time of this writing. The SBE staff is committed to continuing this dialogue in an effort to improve the



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

A high-quality education system that prepares all students for college, career, and life.

award and will base the 2014 English Language Acquisition Award on the same criteria as the 2013 award, but with one change pending Board approval.

Based on stakeholder feedback, the SBE staff recommends that the 2014 English Language Acquisition Award be based on a two- or three-year average of student assessment (WELPA) data. This methodology enhancement will make the award criteria consistent with other Washington Achievement Awards and ensure that the award recipients have demonstrated marked improvement over time. So to qualify for the award, a school must meet the following criteria:

- Have at least 20 reportable and matched cases for each year on the WELPA
- The school met Title III AMAO 1 for each assessment year
- The school met Title III AMAO 2 for each assessment year
- The school is in the top five percent of school based on the median point gain on the WELPA (two- or three-year average) by
 - Program size (small program = 20 to 99 matched records and large programs ≥ 100 matched records)
 - School level (elementary, middle, high school, or combined school).
- Approximately 42 schools are expected to qualify for the English Language Acquisition Award (Table 2).

Table 2 shows the approximate number of schools to be identified for the award.

| | Small Programs | Large Programs | Total Schools |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Elementary Schools | 20 | 7 | 27 |
| Middle Schools | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| High Schools | 6 | 1 | 7 |
| Total | 30 | 12 | 42 |

Gap Reduction Award

Around the time of the January 2015 SBE Board Meeting, the SBE staff began to investigate the Special Recognition –Gap Reduction Award. In early February, the SBE staff requested and was granted the opportunity to present to and collaborate with the Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee (EOGOAC) on enhancing the Gap Reduction Award. With the understanding that the Gap Reduction Award may require changes on account of the new SBAC assessment, the EOGOAC provided some general feedback about enhancing the 2014 award, which included the following:



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

A high-quality education system that prepares all students for college, career, and life.

- If possible, disaggregate student groups to a greater degree than the ESEA student groups (for example, disaggregate the Asian student group into Korean, Japanese, Vietnamese, Chinese, and other student groups).
- If possible, report gap reductions based on a student group n-count of ten rather than 20 students.
- To the extent possible, be sure that any underperformance by a subgroup is not masked by other groups.

The EGOAC supported the idea of examining the performance gap reductions based on disparate proficiency rates between student groups. The SBE staff conducted two trial analyses using student proficiency as the basis. The only substantive difference was that Trial 1 compared the gap reductions between the Targeted Subgroup and the All Students group for each school, while Trial 2 compared the gap reductions between individual student groups (White-Black, White-Hispanic, and NotFRL-FRL for example). Trial 2 was favored by the EGOAC and the SBE staff as the methodology compares mutually exclusive groups and is less likely to mask the underperformance of a group of students.

The 2014 Special Recognition - Gap Reduction Award would be based on the following proposed criteria:

- The measure will be the gap reduction over three assessment years based on reading and math (combined) proficiency
- The school must have reportable subgroup data (≥ 20 students in each group being compared) for reading and math for each of the three years being analyzed
- The proficiency rates for both groups must not decline in any of the three years
- The total gap reduction for the three years of data must be equal to or greater than 10 percentage points
- The school may not be a newly identified Priority or Focus School.

The number of schools qualifying for this award is not available at the time of this writing due to the preliminary status of the WAI but information about the approximate number of recipients will be presented at the board meeting. While considering these criteria, the Board may wish to discuss and direct the SBE staff to develop criteria for a Special Recognition - Gap Closure Award for future years to recognize schools that have closed performance gaps.

Board Actions

Possible Board actions might include:

- Approve the proposed changes to the Achievement Index indicator weightings for high schools as recommended by SBE staff.
- Approve the use of a two-or three-year average for the English Language Acquisition Award.
- Approve the criteria for the Special Recognition –Gap Reduction Award as proposed by SBE staff.



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

A high-quality education system that prepares all students for college, career, and life.

Achievement Index Evaluation

As a Board responsible for approving the WAI for identifying schools for differentiated supports and recognition, you want to be sure that nothing has changed about the Index that might negatively impact the validity of the Index results. The paragraphs below explain the changes that were made to the Index data file, and that no changes to the computations or methodology were put into place.

Changes to the 2014 Index

No changes to the Index methodology were implemented for the 2014 WAI. However, several changes to the data file were made (Table 3), which provides more information to school staff and stakeholders. The paragraphs below discuss how the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortia (SBAC) Field Test schools were measured through the WAI and how the changes to the WAI file enhance what we can learn about Washington schools.

Table 3. Data elements reported in the enhanced Washington Achievement Index.

| | Proficiency | Growth | Graduation | Student Counts | Proficiency | Growth | Graduation | Student Counts | Proficiency | Growth | Graduation | Dual Credit | Student Counts |
|------------|-------------|--------|------------|----------------|--------------------|--------|------------|----------------|------------------------|--------|------------|-------------|----------------|
| | All | | | | Targeted Subgroups | | | | Non-Targeted Subgroups | | | | |
| | 2013 Index | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | |
| 2014 Index | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

During the 2013-14 assessment year, approximately one-third of Washington schools (and students) participated in the SBAC Field Test in place of the Washington Measurement of Student Progress (MSPs). As was done for the NCLB AYP analyses conducted by OSPI in the fall 2014, the 2012-13 assessment and growth model data were rolled forward for the SBAC Field Test schools to represent the 2013-14 assessment data in the 2014 WAI. This means that for the SBAC Field Test elementary and middle schools, the 2012-13 and 2013-14 assessment results and growth model data are the same, unless the students at those schools participated in the MSP Writing and Science assessments. The 2014 WAI will be the final Index analysis that exclusively uses MSP, HSPE, and EOC assessment results as the 2015 Index analyses will use a combination of MSP, HSPE, EOC and SBAC assessment results.

Dual Credit participation will be displayed as part of the College and Career Readiness (CCR) indicator in the 2014 WAI and will factor into the school Index ratings beginning with the 2015 WAI. At the August 2014 Accountability and Achievement Workgroup (AAW), the SBE staff presented the findings on a simulation study that included Dual Credit participation in the 2013 WAI scores, which was generally viewed as favorable by the AAW. The SBE staff is working with the OSPI to develop the business rules necessary to fully integrate Dual Credit participation into the WAI. In the coming months, the SBE staff will conduct and report on an analysis that simulates the inclusion of Dual Credit participation in the 2013 and 2014 AI ratings at a future Board meeting.



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

A high-quality education system that prepares all students for college, career, and life.

The 2014 WAI data file that will be available through the WAI website includes the proficiency rates, growth percentiles, and graduation rates and Index ratings for the Non-Targeted Subgroup race/ethnicities (White, Asian, and Two or More student groups). This information will allow school staff and stakeholders to better understand how the academic performance of the Non-Targeted student groups compare to other student groups. The 2014 WAI file also includes the count of students for each of the measures which is necessary to compute other measures such as how Non-FRL, Non-ELL, and Non-SWD perform on academic measures.

Relationship to School Characteristics

At last year's March Board meeting, the SBE staff explained that the relationship of the Index to school characteristics could not be fully ascertained because the required data elements were not included in the WAI output file. However, the required data elements were included in the 2014 WAI and the relationships between school characteristics and the WAI can be further investigated. For example:

1. What is the relationship between the percent of students qualifying for FRL who tested on the MSPs to the 2014 AI rating?

A correlation coefficient (Pearson R) of -0.430 for 1706 schools resulted from the analysis which indicates a weak to moderate negative correlation. This means that schools with higher percentages of FRL students tend to be associated with lower AI ratings, but the relationship is not well developed.

2. What is the relationship between the percent of students with a disability (SWD) who tested on the MSPs to the 2014 AI rating?

A correlation coefficient (Pearson R) of -0.237 for 1338 schools resulted from the analysis which indicates a negative and weak correlation. This means that schools with higher percentages of SWD students are associated with lower AI ratings, but the relationship is very poorly developed.

3. What is the relationship between the percent of English Language Learner (ELL) students who tested on the MSPs to the 2014 AI rating?

A correlation coefficient (Pearson R) of -0.239 for 188 schools resulted from the analysis which is considered a negative and weak correlation. This means that schools with higher percentages of ELL students are associated with lower AI ratings, but the relationship is very poorly developed.

4. What is the relationship between the percent of Former ELL students who tested on the MSPs to the 2014 AI rating?

A correlation coefficient (Pearson R) of -0.287 for 966 schools resulted from the analysis which is considered a negative and weak correlation. This means that schools with higher percentages of ELL students are associated with lower AI ratings, but the relationship is very poorly developed.

None of these measures indicate a bias that would bring the validity of the WAI ratings into question and the correlation coefficients observed here are similar to those computed and communicated to the Board last year. Please be advised that additional analyses are being conducted by the SBE staff at the time of this writing and the analyses presented here are subject to change due to the ongoing district review.

Contact Andrew Parr at andrew.parr@k12.wa.ua if you have questions regarding this memo.