

## Achievement & Accountability Workgroup (AAW) Recommendations to the State Board of Education Feedback Report from the April 10, 2013 Meeting

### Overview

Upon completion of each AAW meeting, SBE staff will generate a report of the members' discussions. Each member had the opportunity to review and contribute to this report prior to publication.

### Executive Summary

AAW members provided input on the following Index questions:

Discussion Questions	Feedback
Do you think growth should be weighted equally or more heavily in the scoring of primary schools (K-8)?	Most of the AAW supports weighting growth more heavily for primary schools.
Does the model Index data strike the right balance in scoring student growth, proficiency, and career and college-readiness (secondary only)?	AAW members provided less feedback on weighting of indicators for secondary schools. Most agreed that growth should not be weighted more heavily than graduation rates or proficiency.
What should the criteria be for exemplary schools?	AAW members tended to value high growth, high proficiency, and closing opportunity gaps (or no opportunity gap).
What additional data sources should the state invest in to improve future Index measures, and how?	Recurring suggestions included 21 <sup>st</sup> century "soft" skills as well as parent/teacher/student surveys to assess school climate.

### Question 1: Do you think growth should be weighted equally or more heavily in the scoring of primary schools (K-8)?

Options:

- A. Weight growth equally.
- B. Weight growth more heavily.

### Recommendation:

While a few AAW members preferred to wait and see how growth data impacts school ratings, the majority of the workgroup voiced a strong preference for weighting growth more heavily. These members see growth data as the most accurate measure of the work schools do and believe that weighting growth more heavily will lead to meaningful policy discussions about closing the achievement. Members also believe that growth will rate schools more

equitably – particularly schools with large numbers of low income, ELL, special education and historically disadvantaged minority students.

## Additional Considerations & Questions:

- Fundamentally, growth should be weighted more heavily. However, I need to see more data on the impact this would have.
- Growth should be weighted more heavily to minimize the effects of student demographics and to measure what schools do.
- We need some experience with the data compared to the real world before assigning weights.
- Weight growth more heavily, proficiency will take care of itself. If there is disproportionality it has to be corrected through efforts resulting in growth.
- Weight growth more heavily. It is the only way to make progress on the achievement gap, and it also changes culture at schools.
- Weight growth more heavily. It focuses schools on growth, which is measuring how much students are learning, which is the goal of schooling and what the school has the most impact on. I would feel more strongly this if it was adequate growth, which eliminates the potential shift of focus away from proficiency.
- Weighting growth more heavily will allow schools with high numbers of ELL and low socio-economic status to be acknowledged for the growth of their students. Parents of higher socio-economic status may be upset that schools of poverty are being acknowledged for their growth. Higher socio-economic communities may also be upset that communities of high poverty with large numbers of minority and ELL students would be acknowledged as “rewarded.”
- Growth should be weighted more heavily than proficiency.
- Weight growth more heavily – we need to shine the light on the opportunity gap so that more interventions can be targeted to those students.

## **Question 2: Does the model Index data strike the right balance in scoring student growth, proficiency, and career and college-readiness (secondary only)?**

### Recommendation:

AAW members provided less feedback on weighting of indicators for secondary schools. Most agreed that growth should not be weighted more heavily than graduation rates or proficiency, although some members preferred to weight growth more heavily at the secondary level as well.

### Considerations & Questions:

- Still have questions – what does career and college-readiness look like?
- Growth and graduation rates should be rated heavily.
- Still prefer to weight growth 50, graduation rates 25, and career/college-ready 25.
- The old tier descriptions don't fit with graduation rates. Demographics should be considered when looking at growth rate and graduation.

- I would be comfortable weighting growth more heavily if it was adequate growth. I understand the need to weight it less here to give space for focus on the end goal, proficiency at graduation.
- I have some concern that we aren't actually measuring the comparative size of growth gaps and judging a school on that gap size or the amount the gap is closed. Instead we are mostly double counting students we assume will experience a gap.

### **Question 3: What should the criteria be for exemplary schools?**

#### Recommendation:

AAW members tended to value high growth, high proficiency, and closing opportunity gaps (or no opportunity gap). Some members provided very detailed feedback on cut points in their handouts that has since been addressed by the technical advisory committee.

#### Considerations & Questions:

- School 1 and School 2 belong in the same tier.<sup>1</sup>
- All subgroups and data points should be in the exemplary range.
- Prefer just publishing the scores and not labeling schools.
- High growth.
- Please get rid of "cut" as a verb in this conversation. We cut budgets, positions, etc. - but not people or their learning.
- Weight growth more heavily. Growth equals achievement.
- Both high growth and achievement. I think the harder question is where to draw the line and how to differentiate the large middle.
- More weight on growth for primary schools and a realistic expectation for meeting standard (it's harder for students who come in with less to meet standard at the same rate). For secondary schools they should meet the graduation requirement in five years.
- Exemplary is high growth and high proficiency. Very good is high growth, medium proficiency. Good is high proficiency, average growth. Fair is average growth and average proficiency. Struggling is no or low growth and low proficiency.
- We should keep proficiency and growth scores separate. It provides a misleading number or score that will be difficult for the community and parents to understand. All of this information is great, but we still don't have a simple way to adequately/accurately provide it to the community without a lot of explanation. It is challenging to create a model that provides appropriate feedback to schools, yet is still understandable to the public – understandably, they will only read the biased view printed by the paper.
- No opportunity gap, high proficiency, high growth.

---

<sup>1</sup> References Primary Schools 1 and 2 from data exercise. A school with approximately 90 percent of students proficient and a median student growth percentile of approximately 50 percent should not be rated lower than a school with 75 percent of students proficient and a median student growth percentile of 72 percent.

## **Question 4: What additional data sources should the state invest in to improve future Index measures, and how?**

### Recommendations:

Many AAW members support investing in assessing for 21<sup>st</sup> century “soft” skills as well as parent, teacher, and student surveys to assess school climate. Members discussed at some length the validity of these surveys and whether or not they are an effective outreach tool for parents.

### Considerations & Questions:

- Extracurricular offerings.
- Attendance.
- College/career acceptance rates.
- SAT/ACT performance.
- Work readiness assessment for secondary.
- Post high school measure of employment and/or postsecondary.
- 21<sup>st</sup> century skills test.
- Student engagement survey (Renton).
- Robust data, sufficient to compare to U.S. census.
- Quality survey related to Maslow’s hierarchy (parents & students).
- Parent and student surveys.
- College Board sign-up.
- Is there a way to reward a broad curriculum (e.g. broad elective choices) that doesn’t punish small schools?
- School climate surveys.
- WorkKeys.
- Teacher evaluations.