

February 13, 2013

## Achievement and Accountability Workgroup Meeting Highlights

Note: By February 28, we will post a feedback report highlighting members' discussions. This feedback report, a meeting agenda, and other related materials are available on our [website](#).

On February 13, the State Board of Education (SBE) and the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) hosted the fourth meeting of the Achievement and Accountability Workgroup (AAW) in Renton, Washington. AAW members hosted a panel of teachers and parents who provided valuable input to members' discussions.

During the meeting, participants discussed the following questions:

1. Given that the federal Elementary Secondary Education Act (ESEA) flexibility waiver requires Washington to identify schools for recognition (Reward) as well as schools in need of improvement (Priority, Focus, and Emerging), what are the implications for the structure and function of the revised Index in order to establish a coherent system?

As part of their ESEA flexibility requests, states have an opportunity to replace federal accountability with their own state accountability system. One requirement for flexibility is that states identify Title I schools for recognition (Reward) as well as for support and intervention (Priority, Focus, and Emerging). States can either use a formula based on state assessment performance and specific parameters laid out in detail by the US Department of Education (USED), or use a particular performance level or score in their state accountability system.

Members reviewed the following ESEA categories, and discussed the implications of identifying Reward, Priority, Focus, and Emerging schools using Achievement Index calculations and allocating state resources to both Title I and non-Title 1 schools in need of greater support.

Category	Overview
Reward – highest performing	Highest-performing Title I schools that have met AMOs and have no significant gaps that are not closing
Reward – high progress	Highest-improving Title I schools that have no significant gaps that are not closing.
Priority	Lowest 5 percent of Title I schools on state assessments or < 60 percent graduation rate in Title I or Title I eligible high schools.
Focus	Lowest 10 percent of Title I schools based on subgroup performance.
Emerging	Next 5 percent up from the bottom of the Priority list and the next 10 percent up from the bottom of the Focus list.

2. How should the revised Index be used to establish Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) for schools and would this be preferable to the current AMOs?

States seeking ESEA flexibility must establish “new, ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) in at least reading/language arts and mathematics for the State and all LEAs, schools, and subgroups, that provide meaningful goals and are used to guide support and improvement efforts.”<sup>1</sup> These AMOs replace the Uniform Bar targets that existed in the Adequate Yearly Progress system.

In its initial application for ESEA flexibility, Washington defined AMOs so that schools must close proficiency gaps by 50 percent within six years for every subgroups in reading and math. Members discussed the option of keeping this calculation for ensuing years vs. creating new AMO calculations based on schools’ Achievement Index performance.

3. What relative weight should be assigned to each performance indicator for elementary, middle, high, and districtlevel calculations?

To meet the requirements of the ESEA waiver, the revised Achievement Index must clearly differentiate schools on the indicators of proficiency, growth, proficiency and growth gaps, and career- and college-readiness (including graduation rates)<sup>2</sup>:

In the January 2013 meeting, State Board of Education Members approved the use of proficiency, growth, proficiency and growth gaps, and multiple career- and college-readiness indicators for the revised Index.

At the February 13 meeting, AAW members explored how best to weight these indicators in Achievement Index calculations. Discussion questions included the following:

- Should achievement gaps within a school be weighted more heavily than that school’s overall assessment proficiency?
- How should graduation rates be weighted in relation to students’ enrollment in dual credit programs and/or completion of certificate programs?

**The next Achievement and Accountability Workgroup meeting will be April 10 in Renton, Washington, at the office of the Puget Sound Educational Service District.**

For additional information and meeting materials, go to: [www.sbe.wa.gov/aaw.php](http://www.sbe.wa.gov/aaw.php)  
or call the Board office at: 360-725-6025.

---

<sup>1</sup> ESEA Flexibility, <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>

<sup>2</sup> Summary of Considerations to Strengthen State Requests for ESEA Flexibility.  
<http://www.ed.gov/sites/default/files/considerations-strengthen.pdf>