



Achievement & Accountability Workgroup (AAW) E2SSB 5329 Feedback Report from the October 9, 2013, Meeting

Overview

During this AAW meeting, members discussed E2SSB 5329 via an afternoon webinar. AAW members were asked to provide feedback and ask questions via the webinar chat tool, participate in polls, fill out a post-webinar survey, suggest revisions to draft rules for ESSB 5329, and were invited to participate in a follow-up teleconference if interested. Feedback from all of those sources was used in the creation of this report. Each member had the opportunity to review and contribute to this report prior to publication.

Executive Summary

During group discussions, AAW members provided input on the implementation of E2SSB 5329:

E2SSB 5329 Discussion Topics	Feedback
Issues with Support Provided to RADs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing successful school improvement support to RADs will be challenging • The support will result in “more of the same” because of limitations of resources and expertise in OSPI school improvement
Considering New RADs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI should look at more than just measures based on state assessments (particularly for ELL) and should consider demographic information
Issues with Timelines between Steps in the RAD Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For OSPI and SBE workload capacity, 20 day and 30 day timelines will be a very different amount of work for handling 5 districts than 20 districts
When will Districts Need the RAD Plan?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • February for staffing purposes • Preliminary by March with input April through June and final in July • If plan is resource-dependent, in time for budgeting
Developing Exit Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Align the use of AMOs to exit from RAD status with the use of AMOs to exit from PF&E list • Specify that exit can occur from meeting AMOs only for the all students group; • Very difficult to meet AMOs
Requesting Flexibility on Normative Measure of Bottom 5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will always be a bottom 5% no matter how much schools improve • Flexibility on this would be alright but not a priority

Issues with Transition to Common Core	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over the effect of the SBAC on the bottom 5% • Note that some districts will be field-testing the SBAC and will not have MSP/HSPE data in spring
Recognition and Replication of Successful Practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some priority schools are implementing many best practices, they should be recognized • Two members were more interested in successful practices than schools during recognition • Use an intentional process to replicate successful practices and school environments through a clearinghouse, a conference, analytical documents, or school visits

AAW members also offered general feedback on other policy issues. The general feedback table can be found on the last page of this document.

AAW Feedback on E2SSB 5329

Issues with Support Provided to RADs

- “An issue for the districts would be the quality and level of expertise and ‘help’ that would be provided by OSPI. It is both underfunded to do the work and it lacks expertise in the very issues that have put schools on the lists. There would probably be other challenges if we had a little more time to think about it.”
- An AAW member noted that successful support to RADs relies on the “willingness and capability of staff/district to adopt & implement multifaceted turnaround plan. Availability of resources. Establishing clarity of roles in a RAD II school between the district, OSPI and SBE.”
- “My concern is that a struggling district assigned to Level II will do ‘more of the same.’ So, even the state support ‘team’ needs to change personnel... have someone on site that is different from the person who has been there, etc.”
- “On the rigor of required action plans: I've sat through school improvement plan meetings that feel more like jumping through hoops - more like filling out a form to make somebody somewhere else feel like they're doing something to improve education rather than being able to sit down as a school leadership team and really addressing the specific needs of our school and our kids. In order to best meet the needs of our kids to help them get college and career ready, we need to focus on more variables than just reading and math - but it seems like that's all we're getting from the federal and state government.”

Considering New RADs

- “Having the state assessments in the major language would be great. But we thought that had been decided that it wouldn't be done. We use a normed referenced test in

Spanish. We know this won't count for accountability but were wondering if this would go toward the OSPI analysis for growth as they consider which schools/districts for RAD.”

- “So you are saying that OSPI will ONLY look at the state assessment data. The SGPs are based on the state assessments - MSP/HSPE/EOC. ELL students do not grow per Paul at OSPI until they reach a certain English proficiency. So basing this ONLY on state assessments will not capture the reality in schools with 80% ELL in their ALL category. This question goes with the question about primary language assessment data. Will anything else be considered in OSPI's analysis for growth when considering which schools would become RAD?” (Please see the primary language assessment issue in the general feedback section.
- “It seems that there should be some additional demographic considerations given to schools with district level programs. i.e. special ed. programs, highly capable, ELL, etc.”

Issues with timelines between steps in the RAD process

- When setting timelines of 20 or 30 consecutive calendar days for steps in the RAD process, breaks at the school or district could cause delays.
- For the workload capacity at SBE and OSPI, handling 20 schools in 30 days is going to be much more challenging than handling five schools in 30 days.

Webinar Poll: Timelines

Taking into consideration that schools must be ready to implement plans by the start of the school year after being designated Level II, do the draft rules allow sufficient time for the Oversight Committee and the Review Panel to perform their roles?

30 days for the Educational Accountability System Oversight Committee

20 days for the Required Action Review Panel

56% Yes

44% No

When Will Districts Need the RAD Plan?

- “February. Districts start staffing at that time.”
- “Preliminary plan by March; Input Apr.-June, consideration of other factors and adjust; Final plan by July”
- “I have question about REAL resources. If the plan is resource-dependent, then the plan needs to be done by April for resource allocation and budgeting. Certainly, would have to be in place by the time the budget for the year of implementation is adopted by the local board -- most do late June?”

Developing Exit Criteria

- Two AAW members noted that the use of AMOs to exit from RAD status should be aligned with the use of AMOs to exit from the priority, focus, and emerging list.

- Two AAW members noted that the rules on exit criteria should specify that a RAD could exit for meeting the AMOs for the all student group for two years and could not exit for meeting the AMOs for two years for a particular subgroup.
- An AAW member thought that the criteria for exiting the priority list should be the same as RAD status.
- “Out of 32 schools in our district we had NO school meet all AMO's and it gets harder to meet next year. Using AMO as the measure to exit makes it very difficult to exit.”

Requesting Flexibility on Normative Measure of the Bottom 5%

- “By definition won't there always be PLA schools? There will always be a bottom 5% no matter how much schools improve.”
- “I don't mind heading in this direction. I think there are too many questions -- and requesting future flexibility right now on this matter -- is not a priority.”

Webinar Poll: Requesting Flexibility on Normative Standards

Should we request flexibility from normative standards in the future?

78% Yes

22% No

Issues with Transitioning to Common Core

- “How will the transition to Common Core affect the bottom 5% of schools?”
- “Important to note that many districts including ours just applied to have all of our schools participate in SBAC field test...meaning we will never take MSP again, except for Science. As a result we won't have any scores this spring.”

Recognition and Replication of Successful Practices

- “We have priority schools that are implementing more best practices than even our reward schools. These schools should be recognized for their work and outstanding practices as well. (Even confirmed by BERC)”
- “It seems to me that we will all benefit from recognition of effective best practices -- I'm not into schools as much as best practices. That is, what is going on in school A that will help me improve my school's program. I'm thinking a ‘clearinghouse’ approach for best practices that schools/districts can cherry pick to improve their programs.”
- “I think the important part of recognition of schools is an intentional process to replicate the successful practices and school environments at challenged schools.”

GENERAL FEEDBACK FROM BOTH WEBINARS

In addition to the feedback that was requested on E2SSB 5329, AAW members offered feedback on other policy issues.

General Discussion	Feedback
Issues with State Assessments Offered in Only English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The comprehension of ELL students is not being understood because state assessments are in English • Students may be proficient when tested in another language
ELL Accountability Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are punished in the Index for having ELL students • ELL students will not demonstrate growth until reaching a certain English proficiency • Feelings of losing ground on the ELL issues • How will the Former-ELL cell impact the ELL subgroup?
Special Education Accountability Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be a Former-ELL cell to examine progress after exit from ELL, why not do this for SPED too?
Using SBAC as a Graduation Requirement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some don't support it, some support it with adequate time for the students to prepare • First cohort to have SBAC as a graduation requirement should have instruction based on Common Core from 6th grade onward
ESHB 2261 Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differentiated funding to high need areas is needed to successfully implement 2261; set class size requirements for high poverty schools
Negative Effects of the Transition to Common Core	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What will happen to the Index during the transition to Common Core? • What adjustments will be made to mitigate the negative effects during the shift to Common Core?