# THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Governance I Accountability I Achievement I Oversight I Career & College Readiness

| Title: | **Essential Elements of a High Quality High School and Beyond Plan** | |
|---|---|---|
| As Related To: | ☐ Goal One: Effective and accountable P-13 governance.<br>☐ Goal Two: Comprehensive statewide K-12 accountability.<br>☒ Goal Three: Closing achievement gap. | ☐ Goal Four: Strategic oversight of the K-12 system.<br>☒ Goal Five: Career and college readiness for all students.<br>☐ Other |
| Relevant To Board Roles: | ☒ Policy Leadership<br>☐ System Oversight<br>☒ Advocacy | ☐ Communication<br>☒ Convening and Facilitating |
| Policy Considerations / Key Questions: | • What are the essential components of a high quality high school and beyond plan?<br>• How can the Board help ensure all students have access to high quality high school and beyond plan processes? | |
| Possible Board Action: | ☒ Review ☐ Adopt<br>☐ Approve ☐ Other | |
| Materials Included in Packet: | ☒ Memo<br>☐ Graphs / Graphics<br>☐ Third-Party Materials<br>☐ PowerPoint | |
| Synopsis: | This section includes a proposed list of the essential elements of a high quality high school and beyond plan, based on conversations with a group of counselors, principals, and agency representatives. | |

**ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS FOR A HIGH QUALITY
HIGH SCHOOL AND BEYOND PLAN**

**Development Process**

Board staff met with counselors, principals, state agency representatives, and other stakeholders and practitioners to discuss the common components of high quality high school and beyond plans and planning processes. Future discussions will include how the state might assist more schools in implementing such plans.

**Definitional Components** *(in rule)*

- Identification of a career goal

- Identification of an educational goal related to the career goal

- Development of a four-year course plan

- Identification of assessments necessary to achieve goals

**Essential Components of High-Quality Plans**

*Plan Components*

- Identify a career goal *(in rule)*
  - Determine interests and skills
    - Interest inventory: who am I? What do I want to be?
    - Skills assessment: what skills do I have and where do I want/need to develop?
- Identify educational goals *(in rule)*
  - Research on career goal and what it takes to get there
    - Profession/technical program options, 2-year degree options, 4-year degree options, on the job training, apprenticeships, military, other postsecondary education and training
  - Research on postsecondary program to achieve career goal
    - Identify program requirements: courses, exams, extracurriculars
    - Identify financial aid options
  - Determine right fit of postsecondary program to reach career goal
    - Identify supports and services available in high school and postsecondary

- Determine four-year plan for coursework *(in rule)*
    - Consider graduation requirements—credit and non-credit
    - Consider postsecondary program admission requirements
    - Consider opportunities for dual credit
- Identify list of exams *(in rule)*
    - Exams for high school graduation (SBAC, HSPE, End of Course, exit exams)
    - Exams for postsecondary program admission (SAT, ACT, etc.)
    - Exams for postsecondary program placement (Accuplacer, etc.)
- Develop budget for life after high school
- Participate in work-based learning opportunity (e.g. job shadow, internship) to develop self-advocacy and other "soft skills"
- Participate in postsecondary program experience (e.g. site visit, virtual tour, meeting with representative)
- Complete postsecondary program applications
    - Program admission applications
    - Financial aid applications
- Complete career related documents
    - Resume or activity log
    - Job application
- Participate in volunteer service

*Process Components*
- Student presentation of plan to parent or guardian
- Parent engagement tailored to family and community needs (e.g. language, cultural competency, timing)
- Begin plan by at least 8th grade
- Frequently revise
- Use a customizable delivery model
- Connect with student information system
- Utilize a mentor and/or advisory structure
- Connect students with resources through partnerships with civic organizations and community groups (e.g. tutoring)
- Assess knowledge (e.g. what know about financial literacy at the beginning and the end of the HSBP process)

| Title: | **Charter Schools and the State Accountability System** | |
|---|---|---|
| **As Related To:** | ☒ Goal One: Effective and accountable P-13 governance.<br>☒ Goal Two: Comprehensive statewide K-12 accountability.<br>☐ Goal Three: Closing achievement gap. | ☒ Goal Four: Strategic oversight of the K-12 system.<br>☐ Goal Five: Career and college readiness for all students.<br>☐ Other |
| **Relevant To Board Roles:** | ☒ Policy Leadership<br>☒ System Oversight<br>☐ Advocacy | ☐ Communication<br>☐ Convening and Facilitating |
| **Policy Considerations / Key Questions:** | • How do charter schools fit into the state accountability systems?<br>• What is meant when the charter law specifies that charter schools are subject to the oversight of OSPI and SBE to "the same extent as other public schools?" How will this be implemented? | |
| **Possible Board Action:** | ☒ Review ☐ Adopt<br>☐ Approve ☐ Other | |
| **Materials Included in Packet:** | ☒ Memo<br>☐ Graphs / Graphics<br>☐ Third-Party Materials<br>☐ PowerPoint | |
| **Synopsis:** | This section includes a memo that summarizes the components of the current accountability and oversight systems and surfaces questions for further analysis. Questions include:<br><br>1. What is meant by accountability measures?<br>2. How do the state and authorizer oversight systems work together?<br>    a. Does the state system or charter contract take precedence in the event of a conflict?<br>    b. Are state accountability rules minimum requirements, upon which charter schools and authorizers may build?<br>3. How are state and federal performance indicators and targets included in charter performance frameworks and contracts? Should contracts be written to incorporate or ensure harmony with state accountability measures?<br>4. Can or should the state intervene in a low-performing charter school as it would in a district school?<br>    a. What would the relationship of state intervention be with authorizer corrective actions?<br>    b. Can a charter school request state assistance, like a district school?<br>5. Does the State Board of Education (SBE) need to write rules to incorporate charter schools into the Achievement Index and state accountability structure? Does it have the authority to do so? | |

**QUESTIONS REGARDING CHARTER SCHOOLS AND
THE STATE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM**

## Policy Considerations

RCW 28A.710.040 (5) states that:

> Charter schools are subject to the supervision of the superintendent of public instruction and the state board of education, including accountability measures, to the same extent as other public schools, except as otherwise provided in chapter 2, Laws of 2013.

The charter law also provides for charter schools to be held accountable by their authorizers, according to the performance frameworks and requirements in their charter contracts (RCW 28A.710.100 (1)(e)). This raises a number of policy and legal questions regarding how charter schools fit into the state accountability and oversight structures currently in place, including:

1. What is meant by accountability measures?
2. How do the state and authorizer oversight systems work together?
   a. Does the state system or charter contract take precedence in the event of a conflict?
   b. Are state accountability rules minimum requirements, upon which charter schools and authorizers may build?
3. How are state and federal performance indicators and targets included in charter performance frameworks and contracts? Should contracts be written to incorporate or ensure harmony with state accountability measures?
4. Can or should the state intervene in a low-performing charter school as it would in a district school?
   a. What would the relationship of state intervention be with authorizer corrective actions?
   b. Can a charter school request state assistance, like a district school?
5. Does the State Board of Education (SBE) need to write rules to incorporate charter schools into the Achievement Index and state accountability structure? Does it have the authority to do so?

The following memo is an outline of the current state accountability system with questions regarding the place of charters within each component. The purpose of this memo is to surface questions for further analysis.

## Achievement Index

The state Achievement Index provides an annual and a composite Index rating for schools based on student proficiency, student growth, and career and college readiness (for high schools only). The composite ratings are calculated using three years of data. Currently, the Index ratings and other criteria are used to designate a school into one of six Index tiers. The

bottom two tiers of the Achievement Index, 'lowest 5%' and 'underperforming,' represent the bottom 20 percent, or quintile, of schools. Index 'cut scores' to delineate the tiers are recalculated annually, though in the future the Board plans to make them static. Other future changes may include the phase-out of other criteria for determining tier classifications for schools, leading to tier classifications based solely on Index ratings.

*Questions Relating to Charter Law*

RCW 28A.710.200, concerning the nonrenewal or revocation of charter contracts states that,

> (2) A charter contract may not be renewed if, at the time of the renewal application, the charter school's performance falls in the bottom quartile of schools on the accountability index developed by the state board of education under RCW 28A.657.110, unless the charter school demonstrates exceptional circumstances that the authorizer finds justifiable.

- How would the "bottom quartile" be determined?
    - What Index rating will be used?
        - Annual Index rating – use the most recent year's Index rating and tier classification, which represents one year of data
        - Composite Index rating – use the most recent composite Index rating and tier classification, which incorporates three years of data
    - What tier criteria will be used?
        - Current tier criteria – the current tier criteria include considerations such as designation as a Priority or Focus school and three-year proficiency rates, in addition to Index ratings
        - Index cut score tier criteria – the Index cut score tiers rely solely on the Index ratings to designate schools

    The methodology for determining the bottom quartile will also need to contemplate future changes to the Achievement Index and tier system, such as those mentioned above. These may eventually impact whether schools could exist in the bottom 25% of schools according to an Index rating, but not be designated in the bottom tiers. For example, if tier cut scores become static, and all schools begin to score in the 'fair' tier or above, a school could still be in the bottom 25% of schools, but be in the 'fair' or 'good' tier.

- What will be used if the school's student population is too small to provide an Index rating?

## Priority and Focus Lists

Schools are identified as Priority or Focus based on criteria determined by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) and federal guidance. These criteria include reading and math proficiency, 5-year graduation rates, and Achievement Index ratings. Focus schools are identified by the graduation and proficiency rates of student subgroups.
Once a school has been identified as Priority or Focus it must work with OSPI to develop and implement an improvement plan, in alignment with the federal school turnaround principles and utilizing a state-specified online planning tool. Schools that are designated as Priority receive financial assistance and are assigned a Student and School Success coach.

If a school is identified as Priority or Focus it is automatically placed into one of the bottom two tiers (within the bottom quartile) of the Achievement Index.

*Questions Relating to Charter Law*

- Can or should a charter school be identified as Priority or Focus?
  - Does the Focus list in particular penalize charter schools for successfully enrolling their target "at-risk" populations?
- Could Priority or Focus status be used as grounds for revoking a charter contract? Corrective action? Nonrenewal?
- RCW 28A.710.180 (4) allows authorizers to require schools to develop a corrective action plan if a school is found to be deficient in academic performance or legal compliance. How would this plan relate to a school improvement plan developed as a result of Priority or Focus designation?
  - Would authorizers require a corrective action plan prior to school designation as a Priority or Focus school?
- Would charters be eligible for grant funds related to Priority status? RCW 28A.710.220 (2) states that charter schools are eligible for all grants district schools may receive.
- Would charters be eligible for the state technical assistance related to Priority status?
  - How would the authorizer and OSPI technical support interact, particularly the use of OSPI's approved planning tool?
  - How would the OSPI-assisted plan relate to the charter contract?
- Would OSPI be required to provide technical support to charter schools designated as Priority?

## School Improvement Grants

Local education agencies (LEAs) that oversee schools that are eligible for Title I funds and are identified as persistently low achieving, may apply to OSPI for a federal School Improvement Grant (SIG). If an LEA is selected to receive SIG funds, it must work with OSPI to implement one of the four federal turnaround models:
- Turnaround: replace the principal and 50 percent of the staff, increase learning time, use student data, change the governance structure, and provide social-emotional supports for students
- Restart: convert the school to a charter school
- School Closure: close the school and send students to other schools within the LEA
- Transformation: replace the principal; implement new staffing policies including mutual consent, evaluation that includes student growth, monetary incentives, job-embedded professional development, identification and rewarding of teachers and leaders that have contributed to student achievement and removal of those who have not; and instructional reforms that use data to differentiate instruction and the implementation of research-based instructional programs.
- Alternative Washington state plan, via OSPI

*Questions Relating to Charter Law*

- Can charter schools apply for SIG funds? Per RCW 28A.710.020 (5) charter schools are classified as LEAs, and per RCW 28A.710.220 (2) charters may apply for all grants available to district schools.
- Would a charter school be able to commit to a federal turnaround model and remain in compliance with their charter contract?
- Could district schools now choose the restart model and convert to a charter school?
  - How would that fit with the conversion process in RCW 28A.710?

- Would a charter be able to implement a school turnaround model, all of which bear resemblance to many charter principles, such as flexibility in staffing?
  - Do the school turnaround models contemplate a charter school being subject to them?
- Similar to school improvement plans under Priority and Focus status:
  - How would the authorizer and OSPI technical support interact?
  - How would the OSPI-assisted plan relate to the charter contract or corrective action plan?

## Required Action Districts

Districts that have at least one school that has been on the persistently low-achieving list and meeting other criteria may be recommended by OSPI to the State Board of Education (SBE) for designation as a required action district (RAD) (WAC 392-501-730). These schools are audited by an external team to identify areas for improvement. The OSPI Office of Student and School Success then works with the districts and schools to develop a plan to address deficiencies identified in the audit. Districts receive financial and technical assistance from OSPI to implement the required action plans.

*Questions Relating to Charter Law*

- Since a charter school is designated as an LEA, not a school district, could a charter school be designated as a RAD?

## Next Steps

Board staff will work with legal counsel, OSPI, the Washington Charter Schools Commission, Spokane Public Schools, and other charter stakeholders to discuss these and other questions that may be raised as the intersection of charter schools and the state accountability systems is further contemplated.

| Title: | **Achievement and Accountability Workgroup – June 2014 Meeting Update** | |
|---|---|---|
| **As Related To:** | ☐ Goal One: Effective and accountable P-13 governance. <br> ☒ Goal Two: Comprehensive statewide K-12 accountability. <br> ☐ Goal Three: Closing achievement gap. | ☐ Goal Four: Strategic oversight of the K-12 system. <br> ☒ Goal Five: Career and college readiness for all students. <br> ☐ Other |
| **Relevant To Board Roles:** | ☒ Policy Leadership <br> ☒ System Oversight <br> ☐ Advocacy | ☒ Communication <br> ☐ Convening and Facilitating |
| **Policy Considerations / Key Questions:** | The Achievement Index was designed with the intent of including a measure of adequate growth and a measure of Dual Credit and Industry Certification attainment to further the policy of ensuring all students are progressing towards college or career readiness. <br><br> • How should adequate growth be measured in the Index and for what should the measure be used? <br> • How should the dual credit indicator be measured in the Index? | |
| **Possible Board Action:** | ☒ Review ☐ Adopt <br> ☐ Approve ☐ Other | |
| **Materials Included in Packet:** | ☒ Memo <br> ☐ Graphs / Graphics <br> ☐ Third-Party Materials <br> ☐ PowerPoint | |
| **Synopsis:** | This section of the packet contains a feedback report that summarizes the recommendations, opinions, and concerns that were discussed during the June 20, 2014 Achievement and Accountability Workgroup (AAW) meeting. The discussion addressed: <br> • Inclusion of Adequate Growth Percentiles (AGPs) in the Index; <br> • Inclusion of Dual Credit and Industry Certification in the Index; and <br> • Next steps for analysis of Former-ELL Achievement Index data by Greg Lobdell. | |

# Achievement and Accountability Workgroup (AAW) Feedback Report from the June 20, 2014, Meeting

**Background on the Achievement Index**

The Washington State Board of Education (SBE) developed the first Achievement Index at the direction of legislation passed in the 2009 session. Chapter 548, Laws of 2009 (ESHB 2261), charged the SBE to develop a user-friendly school assessment tool that would do the following:

- Identify schools for recognition and differentiated supports
- Utilize fair, consistent, and transparent criteria
- Measure student performance on statewide assessments and College and Career Readiness
- Track graduation rates.

With the support of the Achievement and Accountability Workgroup (AAW), the SBE developed the Revised Achievement Index with the intent of including a measure of adequate growth and a measure of dual credit attainment to further the policy of ensuring all students are progressing towards college or career readiness.

**Executive Summary**

The AAW provided feedback and comments on two important Index-related topics:

- The AAW supported the idea of phasing in Dual Credit measures in the 2013-14 Index but was undecided as to whether Dual Credit ratings should contribute to the 2013-14 Index rating or should be presented for informational purposes.
    - The majority of the AAW members felt that (during phase-in) the Index should include a Dual Credit indicator based on participation in Dual Credit programs rather than Dual Credit attainment.
    - The majority of AAW members agreed that further investigation of Industry Certification is needed before including it in the Index.
    - SBE staff will provide an analysis of Dual Credit data to guide the phase-in.
- The AAW supported the idea of delaying the inclusion of an Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) measure in the Index until the transition to SBAC assessments is complete.

The AAW suggested the SBE conduct additional research on the educational attainment of Former-ELL students by:

- Disaggregating by native language and program type;
- Examining dropout information on Current- and Former-ELL students;
- Including students who have a former language other than English but did not qualify for ELL;
- Examining the outcomes for long-term ELL students who have not exited; and
- Comparing to a Never-ELL group.

## The Inclusion of Dual Credit and Industry Certification in the Achievement Index

OSPI staff summarized the following types of Dual Credit programs:
- Advanced Placement
- Cambridge International
- College in the High School
- Gateway to College
- International Baccalaureate
- Running Start
- Tech Prep

OSPI staff stated the following ways to measure Dual Credit and issues with measuring it:
- Percent of students enrolled in Dual Credit
- Percent of students earning credit in a Dual Credit Course
- Number of students reaching a threshold (e.g., score a 3 on an AP exam)
- Individual students counting more than once or an unduplicated count
- Denominator: All students in the school or students in 11th and 12th grade

**Majority Agreement: Use participation rate Instead of passing rate or credits earned.**
An AAW member raised this important question: Is the Dual Credit and Industry Certification Credit about acceleration or is it an indicator that students are ready for college and will not need remedial courses?

There was strong agreement among the majority of members that, during the phase-in of the Dual Credit and Industry Certification indicator, the participation rate should be used instead of the passing rate or credits earned. A couple of members noted research that shows participation in rigorous courses prepares students for performing well in college. Although the members agreed that participation rate should be used while the indicator is phased-in, two members stated that the passing rate would be an indicator that students were truly prepared to enter college without the need for remediation. A member raised concern that using the passing rate as an indicator would create an incentive for schools to only enroll students who are likely to pass the rigorous dual credits courses, particularly AP exams. Multiple members noted the financial and logistical barriers for low-income students, including transportation to Running Start and paying for AP exams or transcription fees for earned college credits. OSPI staff noted the federal fee waiver program for AP and IB courses for students eligible for or on Free and Reduced Price Lunch. Members felt that the use of participation rate would reduce the disparity between schools with low-income students and their wealthier counterparts. Furthermore, the participation rate was favored because some students simply do not register for college credit in the Tech Prep program.

Members provided the following written feedback:
- "I am concerned that "credit" has been the coin of the realm on the academic side forever. But some folks even in the academic world are moving to performance-based. If we look at time-

based and time-bound performance-based programs, does that alter the way we look at data/input to the indicator?"

- "Students who enroll in AP/IB/College in HS, etc. courses do better in college even if they don't earn college credit at the time, so enrollment in rigorous courses should be encouraged. Giving schools credit on the Index only for students who achieve college credit would have a chilling effect on rigorous course enrollments. The goal should be more students in more rigorous courses and more students with industry certifications."
- "Publish stories of how these measures are used to improve student outcomes."
- "Is it going to be another proxy for income level?"

**Mixed Opinions, Disagreement: Whether the denominator for the Dual Credit and Industry Certification measure should be the number of 11th and 12th graders or the number of 9th through 12th graders**

One member felt strongly that the denominator should be 9th through 12th graders because there are Pre-AP and Pre-IB courses available. There should be an incentive to offer Dual Credit and Industry Certification to 9th and 10th graders. SBE staff noted that including 9th and 10th graders would cause high schools to address why some Dual Credit programs are not offered in 9th and 10th grade. However, there were two members who stated that the denominator should be limited to 11th and 12th graders because the majority of Dual Credit and Industry Certification programs are offered in the 11th and 12th grades.

Members provided the following written feedback:

- "Is it fair across districts? At what age does participation matter? Would students in the 9th and 10th grades of high school be impacted?"
- Use the "Number of students enrolled in college credit. Number of students in grades 9-12. Number of students with Industry Certification. Number of students in grades 9-12."
- "Denominators represent different student populations. It will be much easier to enroll a higher percentage of students in a school with higher income – how to account for this disparity? When low income schools show a high percentage, does this account for higher ranking?

**Mixed Opinions, Disagreement: Whether Dual Credit and Industry Certification should be measured as one indicator for accountability purposes or as separate indicators and, if they are one accountability measure, whether the data should be reported as one indicator or separate indicators. Also, courses have different levels of rigor, should they be weighted equally?**

There was no consensus on these issues. Some members felt that the indicators should be separated so that the differences between programs are not masked. However, it was not clear if those members supported a separation for the accountability measure or a single indicator with separate reporting of the data in the Achievement Index. A member noted that Industry Certification benefits a smaller group of the population. One member stated that the programs are different concepts and should be separated in both the accountability measure and the reporting. Multiple members stated that it should be one indicator but those members did not object to reporting Dual Credit and Industry Certification separately.

Members provided the following written feedback:

- "Single indicator"
- "Use percentage of students enrolled"

- Should have a difficulty rating
- "One indicator – factored by balance of programs – folks know what go into theirs, but for Index purposes, keep it simple."
- "Kids should go into programs that best meet their strengths – that seems a single indicator no matter how it's reported."
- "Give credit for both."
- "Resources may not be available equally across the state. We should not endorse one being better than another."
- In response to a guiding question about unintended consequences, "Endorsement that one is better than the other."

**Majority Agreement, Some Dissension, and Need for More Information: Industry Certification may not be ready to be phased-in**

Due to the lack of clarity around the definition of Industry Certifications and possible data limitations, there was majority agreement that Industry Certification is not necessarily ready to be phased in. Most members felt that it was appropriate to phase in Dual Credit first then Industry Certification, but one member believed that Dual Credit and Industry Certification should be phased in together. There was general agreement that more information and analysis is needed. OSPI staff and members listed a variety of Industry Certification programs but were unable to arrive at a clear definition. There was no definitive understanding of what an Industry Certification course consists of and the range of offerings. One member noted that there is a difference between certificate programs and certification programs, stating that certificate programs are more closely regulated. Two members were concerned that Industry Certification may not include work experiences that are meaningful for students because they can lead to jobs upon graduation. In response to member concerns that there is not a standard for Industry Certification across states, OSPI staff stated that the variety of Industry Certification is mostly unique to the state and Industry Certification is used for federal reporting of CTE courses. Out of concern for the quality, rigor, and type of Industry Certification courses, members discussed a possible list of acceptable Industry Certification programs. A member voiced concern that an Industry Certification list would be too prescriptive and could narrow offerings. However, multiple members were concerned that there are varying levels of rigor depending on the program, some programs may not truly prepare students for the job area, and there may be an unintended incentive for a school to create Industry Certifications to raise their Index rating. One member voiced concern that there is a very long list of Industry Certification programs with a range of duration and difficulty, and that there is a regional difference in offerings. There was concern that this indicator could create an incentive for schools to offer certification programs that are not meaningful courses for students. Members also briefly discussed the differences in rigor of Dual Credit and Industry Certification courses, but did not reach consensus on whether they should be weighted equally.

Members provided the following written feedback in response to a guiding question about Dual Credit being phased-in before Industry Certification:
- "Phase in, first year while getting more info on Industry Certification"
- "No. Do it all at once. High schools will be adjusting – give them the whole picture right up front.""

- "Are we saying that all schools/districts should have X% International Baccalaureate, X% Running Start, X% Tech Prep, or that X% of kids should be enrolled in a program that best meets their ability/interest?"
- "Should have a difficulty rating"

**No Agreement, Limited Discussion: For the calculation of participation rate, whether the number of enrollments should be used for the participation rate or the percentage of students enrolled in Dual Credit or Industry Certification.**

**Concern: Do not create a disincentive to offer programs that meet student needs by preparing them for career and college. Be wary of a prescriptive list that limits course offerings.** One member raised concern that these may not be the right courses for all kids. One AAW member stated that the AVID program does a great job of making students career- and college-ready, yet it would not be included in this indicator. There was concern that creating a list of acceptable programs for this indicator would have the unintended consequence of limiting participation in programs that are successfully aiding children to become career- and college-ready.

Members provided the following written feedback:
- "Should consider other programs like AVID as an effective way to make students college ready."
- "Continuous improvement is not well-served by definitions that 'lock' delivery."
- "If there has to be a certification, are we eliminating other programs that are meeting student needs? Then we're definitely doing harm."

**Concern: Regional differences in course offerings**
A member raised concern that there are limited options for Dual Credit and Industry Certification in eastern Washington and the availability is very inconsistent. Two AAW members noted the availability of some Running Start programming in high schools and online courses for college credit.

---

## Adequate Growth Percentiles in the Achievement Index

Growth to proficiency over time is adequate growth. Under the adequate growth concept, making typical growth does not necessarily mean that students who started low are catching up. Based on reaching proficiency over a timeline, Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) targets provide an understanding of how much growth is expected of students to Catch Up (reach proficiency), Keep Up (maintain proficiency), Move Up (for students already proficient, reach the advanced level), and Stay Up (maintain at the advanced level).

**Majority Agreement, Some Dissent: Members agreed that AGPs should not be used in an accountability measure until 2015-16, but disagreed on whether AGPs should be reported for informational purposes in 2014-15. Concern voiced that SBE should wait until AGPs are mature before inclusion.**
In light of the SBAC field-testing in 2013-14 and the transition to the SBAC for 2014-15, members discussed whether AGPs should be included in the 2014-15 Index or the 2015-16 Index. OSPI staff recommended waiting until the 2015-16 Index. The majority of AAW members voiced concern about

prematurely including AGP during the transition to the SBAC. Some members were open to including the AGP targets in reporting in 2014-15, but not including them in the accountability measure for the first year so that people learn what AGPs are. Other members thought an informational, non-accountability release would sow confusion in Index users. Those members felt that a release of mature AGPs in 2016-17 was more appropriate. One member suggested that AGPs could be calculated immediately based on one year of SBAC data by simply calculating the growth needed to reach proficiency without using a multi-year baseline of SGPs.

Members provided the following written feedback:
- "In 2016-17 per Deb Came and Krissy Johnson recommendation"
- "Field-testing first before putting it into the Achievement Index. Needs to be mature before explaining it to people."
- "Delay AGP for at least two years until there is data."
- "These questions are premature given that we do not have data from the SBAC. I would recommend that 2014-15 be considered a baseline and after these data are available to understand use 2015-16 to set student growth."

**Majority Agreement: AGP targets should be calculated on the basis of being proficient in three years**
Three members stated that AGP targets should be calculated with three-year targets, one member stated that the target should be four years, and one member stated that the data should be studied to see the impact of three years versus four years.

**Suggestions: What should AGP mean for a school in terms of consequences or rewards in the accountability system?**
Members provided the following written feedback:
- "Isn't this moot?"
- "State needs to use the Achievement Index and Adequate Growth models to drive funding to schools in a meaningful way (i.e. large money amounts)"
- "No stakes until we know what the data are, and really mean. Student growth on what?"
- "Know it is going to 'bite' some folks. Address resources as well as rewards."

**Mixed Opinions, Limited Discussion: How should AGP be calculated for the Index? The percentage of students who met their AGP target? Whether the Median SGP for the school met the AGP school target (AMO-type target)?**
Due to limited discussion time on this topic, there was no consensus. AAW members provided the following written feedback:
- "The percentage of students who met their AGP target."
- "Not sure – would want to see it run both ways and then decide based on the data."
- "Calculate both, use what is more beneficial to a specific school/district improvement."
- "Keep it simple."

**Concern: Are scaled score proficiency targets more useful for parents than AGPs?**
Members, Mr. Damian Betebenner from the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, OSPI staff, and SBE staff discussed discontinuing the use of the Growth Model – AGPs and SGPs – in favor of using proficiency targets based on change in scaled-scores over time. Member

proponents of proficiency targets stated that scaled score targets provide a clear picture of how much improvement is needed to reach proficiency. Mr. Betebenner, OSPI staff, and SBE staff stated that AGPs do rely on meeting a proficiency target, but AGPs also provide an understanding of how much growth is needed compared to the growth of other students. AGPs allow schools and parents to target additional supports and intense interventions for students who need to grow more than what is typical for their academic peers. AGP uses normative data on academic peers to demonstrate how difficult it will be to reach proficiency. Proficiency targets only show how much the student will need to improve test scores in order to reach proficiency. However, staff suggested that it doesn't need to be an "either, or" scenario; both proficiency target and AGP target information will be available to parents and schools. Two members noted that strong growth results can be encouraging to students who have not yet reached proficiency.

## Next Steps for the Former-ELL Research by Greg Lobdell

The following are suggestions from members for further analysis:
- Utilize dropout information on Current- and Former-ELL students
- There is a similarity between the difficulties that ELL students experience on tests written in academic English and the difficulties faced by African American students who are not accustomed to academic English.
- Disaggregate the data by the number of languages
- Compare ELL and Former-ELL students by the type of instructional model
- Multiple members would like to see comparisons to Never-ELL students
- Examine dual-language programs
- Examine students with a former language other than English who did not test into the ELL program. These students may not be strong in either language and may speak street-Spanish and street-English. They do not test into ELL, but they have special needs because they do not have the academic language necessary to succeed. They are Level-3 on the WELPA but English is not spoken at home and they do not have the same supports as ELL students.
- Examine the outcomes of long-term ELL students. This is the group that plateaus at a certain level of language proficiency.
- Multiple members suggested that the middle school grades are important and further analysis should focus on that level.

Concerns raised during the discussion:
- Students who exited ELL in other states are not included in the data
- Older students will not have exit information due to data limitations
- Selection bias could have an impact on the research results
- Some ELL students exit due to spoken skill but they do not necessarily exit with writing skills and other essential language arts skills
- Members voiced concern that some ELL students do not qualify for Special Education because the students have to show that their learning problems are not simply caused by a language barrier.