



Achievement & Accountability Workgroup (AAW) ESSB 5491 Feedback Report from the October 9, 2013, Meeting

Overview

During this AAW meeting, members discussed ESSB 5491 via a morning 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, 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 ESSB 5491:

ESSB 5491 Discussion Topics	Feedback
ESSB 5491 Guiding Principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most members felt that Indicators should be disaggregated at the district level • One member stated that Indicators should be a snapshot for legislators • Interagency, P-20, and Index alignment is vital • Provide differentiated support to high need schools
Goal Targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal targets are unrealistic for the ELL student group • 50% improvement is unrealistic for any group • Changing goal targets due to transition to Common Core
Application of Goal Targets: Indicators and Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A few AAW members expressed concerns with reliability of WaKIDS assessment, alignment of WaKIDS with Common Core, and its use as a comparative indicator • Two members expressed positive comments on the potential for using WaKIDS to understand gaps at the start of education and understand the whole student rather than just the state assessment information • An AAW member stated that the goal target for WaKIDS is noble, but does not align with current pre-K resources

Presentation and AAW Feedback on ESSB 5491

ESSB 5491 tasks the State Board of Education, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, the Washington Student Achievement Council, and the Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee with submitting a report, by December 1, 2013, outlining “the status of each indicator,” and establishing “baseline values and initial goals” for the system. The legislation also allows for recommendations on “revised performance goals and measurements,” as the agencies go through the learning process of implementing the legislation.

AAW members were asked to provide feedback on:

Presentation on Guiding Principles

1. The state’s role is important, but also limited in important ways.
2. The goal is not always obvious.
3. Improvement takes time.
4. Improvements take resources
5. System alignment remains a goal.
6. Our first effort is a “Beta” version.

Feedback and Questions on Guiding Principles

- Many participants were concerned that the indicators would not be disaggregated at a district level.
- Some participants were concerned that too many indicators are only based on state assessments.
- “Totally agree with your comments about 5491 being an accountability tool for the legislature and not the district. The intent of the bill was to provide a "snapshot" of the educational health system - and not a "gotcha" mechanism for districts or schools”
- “How do these indicators fit in with the proficiency targets we had to set as part of our ESEA waiver requirements? Do they have to align? Should they?”
- “Isn't part of the point of these educational indicators to measure the entire system Pre-K through college entrance, not just K12 health?”
- “I think these goals are great... BUT, without any type of system alignment amongst the other agencies (legislature, governor, OSPI, DEL, WSAC, etc.) it's going to be increasingly difficult to get there. We need to seek adoption of these goals and milestones by all parties.”
- “I agree with the importance of alignment between 5491 and accountability index. The more alignment the better!”
- “2261 is cited as the primary vehicle for providing resources. 2261 does not really address putting more resources in to high need areas. So I think there is an equity in funding issue that is not really addressed.”

- “I agree that a lot can be done within current resources, but we must develop more effective ways of spreading effective practices to all schools with higher needs students.”

Presentation of “Realistic but Challenging” Goal Targets

Two guiding goals for Washington are for the implementation of ESSB 5491:

- Close the Achievement Gap within the PK-12 system
- Career and College-Readiness for All Students

While we use 2020 as the target for this initial set of indicators and measures, we fully realize this state is significantly changing the academic standards (what a child is expected to know and be able to do) for each grade level as we implement the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). CCSS will be implemented statewide in 2014-15. The first high school graduating class that will encounter CCSS for the duration of their K-12 experience will be the class of 2027 (Kindergartners in 2014-15).

For this initial 2020 Vision, application of these Goal Targets to the indicators is based on the overall “rule” of reducing the gap between the baseline and the target by one-half (50%) by 2020.

- For achievement, graduation rate, and post-secondary education or employment the target is 100%.
- For remediation, the target is 0% (no remediation).

Feedback and Questions on Goal Targets

- “Thank you for your comments about getting serious about closing the achievement gap by putting resources in Pre-K and differentiating resources for highly impacted schools. However, these need to be done without punishing the schools, teachers, and communities in which they learn and live by putting them on ‘lists.’”
- “Kids who do not speak English will not pass the test so that subgroup will never reach 100% unless the state will test them in their primary language. When will there be any realistic proposal about this subgroup?”
- “How do you propose to deal with the widely predicted significant decrease in MSP test scores when setting goals for 4th grade reading and 8th grade math?”
- “What evidence is there that the 50% goal has any basis in reality for any of the groups, especially for the ELL subgroup?”

Presentation of Proposed Application of the Goal Targets: Indicators and Goals

- Specific indicators and a discussion of its current state
- Its comparability with across the nation
- Two “baseline” data points: a 2-year average and the latest year result

- 5-Year Trend: using historical data (where available), the change per year as measured with a linear trend. This change is in “percentage points per year”.

Tables were provided with specifics of the application of the goal target to each indicator— showing the resulting 2020 endpoint and the first two steps (2013-14 and 2014-15).

Feedback and Questions on Proposed Application of the Goal Targets: Indicators and Goals

AAW members said the following about the WaKIDS indicator:

- “The state piloted the kinder assessments. I have been told that those who piloted did not support WaKIDS but other assessments that were piloted. The state selected WaKIDS in spite of the pilot testers' input. We were told that there was heavy pressure for WaKIDS from the Pre-K crowd. Let them do WaKIDS so they can better address the pre-K skills.”
- “The state should take this opportunity to revisit the WAKIDS assessment. Listen to the practitioners. Since there is no post-test with WaKIDS the progress Greg mentioned as a goal is not measured. But no one in K12 wants to post-test with WaKIDS. There needs to be a better assessment, and one that can actually measure growth. A new assessment should align with the CCSS.”
- “Please explain how K-12 districts have any control (resources) to impact the skill levels of entering kindergarteners when some communities in our state have little or no support for preK programs? Especially when applied to high poverty high ELL communities.”
- “WA Kids measures stuff that I would also like to see measured throughout the years of formal education. That is the Common Core is not all the ‘growing’ that we hope for.”
- “I agree with Ben on WaKIDS as indicator for achievement gap and funding for early learning.”
- “The guiding principles seem appropriate.
While I like the idea behind the WaKids targets (i.e. we all want all kids to be ready for K), I'm not sure they are reasonable for the following reasons:
1.) The targets should align with Results WA which indicates a 2% increase in K-readiness by 2015.
2.) While closing the gap by 2027 is noble, it does not align with current Pre-K resources. Even if ECEAP achieves entitlement by the 2018-19 school year, that only represents about 15-20% of incoming kindergartners. Our Early Achievers program for child care providers is growing quickly but is based on voluntary participation. I don't think it's fair to expect that we can close the K-readiness gap unless Pre-K is a state entitlement for all children.”

An AAW member said the following about the remediation indicator:

- “For the indicator that uses the percentage of students enrolled in precollege or remedial course, the SBCTC report includes data on recent HS graduates (within previous 3 years). Perhaps this should be specifically stated in the indicators, to exclude older, returning adult students in precollege courses.” This AAW member also stated that indicators on both recent graduates and older graduates should be requested.