

## **REVISED ACHIEVEMENT INDEX INDICATORS**

### **Policy Consideration**

The Board will consider approving the following staff recommendations for inclusion in a revised Index:

1. Measure student performance and achievement gaps using both proficiency (meeting state standards) and student growth (student growth percentiles) for all students and for subgroups.
2. Incorporate a career and college readiness performance indicator that includes high school graduation rates (including extended graduation rates) as well as additional career and college readiness indicators.
3. The use of improvement in the identification of schools for recognition but not factored into a composite Index score.
4. A performance indicator for student proficiency, which includes equally weighted math, science, reading, and writing assessments.

Staff recommends further exploration of disaggregation by subgroups for measuring achievement gaps.

### **Summary**

Performance indicators are major accountability measures aligned with the goals of the system. As an example, the current Index is primarily an “academic proficiency” – based Index – looking mostly at objective levels of student performance on state assessments.

Washington’s Elementary and Secondary Act flexibility waiver will require the revised Index to also include student growth measures and data disaggregated by student subgroups.

With assistance from the Achievement and Accountability Workgroup (the AAW), SBE and OSPI will revise the Achievement Index and incorporate the required changes including additional indicators to better support a statewide accountability framework.

During this discussion, members will review AAW members’ input and staff recommendations on performance indicators for the revised Index, including the following:

- How should achievement gaps be measured in the new Index? For example, should achievement gaps be measured by proficiency, growth, or some combination?
- What indicators should be included as part of career and college readiness? The current Index only utilizes graduation rates. Should the revised Index incorporate additional measures?
- Should we continue to include “improvement” as an indicator in the new system? Should improvement focus on proficiency or growth?
- What weight should the revised Index give to the subjects tested? The current Index weighs all tests equally. What would be the rationale and implications for shifting allocations?

- How should subgroups be delineated in the Index? The current Index uses combined subgroups (also known as super subgroups) to address race/ethnicity gaps in the Index. However, the U.S. Department of Education requires that the revised Index disaggregate data using Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) subgroups. ESEA is approving the use of combined subgroups (super subgroups) only if the combination results in the inclusion of more students in the accountability system. What are the merits of developing an Index that disaggregates subgroup data by ESEA subgroups, super subgroups, or by ESEA subgroups except where the low N size masks in a subgroup prevents those students from being included in the accountability system? This question will be explored more fully on day two of the November SBE meeting and at the December AAW meeting.

Revised Index Question	Staff Recommendations	AAW Input
How should the Achievement Index measure achievement gaps?	Account for both growth and proficiency gaps	Agreed
What indicators should be included under career and college readiness?	High school graduation rates plus sub-indicators	Agreed
Should Improvement be measured in the Achievement Index?	Improvement should not be factored into a school's Index score, but should be used by the state for the purposes of reward and recognition.	Mixed. Some AAW members wanted to continue to measure improvement by either student growth or schools' performance against the Learning Index.
How should tests be weighted in the Index?	Equal weights for all tests	Agreed.
How should student subgroup data be disaggregated in the revised Index?	Further study needed.	Some AAW members were in support of super subgroups, but also wanted to add new groups for students who were former ELL, catch-up students, the lowest 25 percent, etc.

## **Background**

SBE will be working in 2012 and 2013 on the development of a revised Achievement Index. To better inform the work, the Achievement and Accountability Workgroup, comprised of 22 representatives from a wide variety of stakeholders, will be meeting multiple times in 2012 and 2013 to provide feedback to SBE on Index principles and design issues. The first AAW meeting was held in Renton, Washington, on October 10. Board members were briefed on that meeting during a October 17 special Board meeting via webinar.

Workgroup members' discussions focused primarily on Achievement Index design options related to the following:

- The selection of performance indicators for the revised Achievement Index (including proficiency, growth, and career and college readiness indicators).

- The assigned weights of tested subjects in a revised Index.
- The disaggregation of data by student subgroup.

For each AAW meeting, SBE staff will produce a feedback report summarizing AAW member's discussions. Available on the SBE website three weeks after the AAW session date, the feedback report will assist the Board as they progress to the November Board meeting and an anticipated adoption of performance indicators for the revised Achievement Index.

Board members expressed appreciation for the important work of the AAW representatives.

### **Action**

Consider a motion to approve the staff recommendation noted in the "Policy Consideration" section on page one.