# Accountability Funding in Legislative Budget

For the August 16, 2017 Special Board Meeting regarding Washington's Revised Draft ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act) Plan, as the Board gives further consideration to the elements of the Plan that relate to the Board's statutory responsibilities, staff would like to highlight new funding directly related to the Revised Draft ESSA Plan.

**Persistently Failing Schools**

The Legislature wishes to fully fund an accountability system. This encompasses sufficient funding for all the levels of school support, including RAD (Required Action Districts).

Section 513(14) of SSB 5883 provides funding to OSPI (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction) to implement chapter 159, laws of 2013 (E2SSB 5329) during the 2017-2019 biennium as follows:

FY 2018: $9,352,000

FY 2019: $9,352,000
+ $5,000,000*
$14,352,000

*Contingent upon legislative approval of OSPI's plan for additional school accountability supports; OSPI must submit a plan to the legislature by January 15, 2018, outlining the additional school accountability supports that will be implemented as a result of the additional $5.000.000.

In essence, the Legislature has allocated an additional $5,000,000 which it will "release" if it – the Legislature – approves the state ESSA Plan.

**Chronic Absenteeism**

The 2017 Legislature is prioritizing chronic absenteeism, for the following reasons, per Section 901 of EHB 2242, the omnibus K-12 policy bill:

- Chronic absenteeism is a solvable problem.
- Relationship between chronic absenteeism and academic achievement, including graduation rates.
- Inclusion of chronic absenteeism in the state Draft ESSA plan (although, it is noteworthy from a political/procedural angle that this language existed in legislation early in the 2017 session, and the ESSA language was added at the end of session)

SSB 5883, Section 501(47), allocates $600,000 to OSPI ($150,000 in FYI 2018, $450,000 in FY 2019) to "*develop and implement a statewide accountability system to address absenteeism and improve student graduation rates. This system must use data to engage schools and districts to identify successful strategies and systems that are based on federal and state accountability measures. Funding may also support the effort to provide assistance about successful strategies and systems to districts and schools that are underperforming in the targeted student subgroups*." Section 901 of EHB 2242 expands on the legislature's intent that *"some of the state funding provided to facilitate a statewide accountability system to improve student graduation rates by, among other things, providing assistance to school districts about successful strategies to address chronic student absenteeism."*

During the September retreat, staff will provide you comprehensive information regarding all new K-12 funding in the budget enacted by the Legislature and signed by the Governor.

If you have questions regarding this information, please contact Kaaren Heikes at Kaaren.heikes@k12.wa.us.

| ESSA Element Described in Letter to Supt. Reykdal | Requested Documentation or Materials | Status to Date<br>*Questions and Comments are Italicized* |
|---|---|---|
| The measure of chronic absenteeism should provide for the exclusion of certain school supervised activities. | • Copy of draft rule (WAC) change<br>• Copy of draft changes for the CEDARS Guidance doc. | • *The definition of absence is not included in the ESSA plan and the reference to WAC and RCW are also not included. Specifically, will out-of-school, school-related events (e.g. FFA or sports events) be considered an absence?* |
| The exclusion of science assessment data in this version of the Achievement Index should be made explicitly temporary. | • Explicit statement of "temporary removal" in the Draft ESSA plan pending further federal guidance.<br>• Placeholder in new Index design in the ESSA plan | • *(pg. 30-31) No statement about or placeholder showing the potential inclusion of science in the Index.* |
| The proposal to identify nearly half of the state's schools as part of the school improvement process poses resource and policy challenges for the state that requires additional discussion. | • Description of the OSPI plan to support schools in the Draft ESSA plan<br>• Transition plan to support Priority and Focus Schools. | • *An Index simulation run by the SBE using the weighting scheme, measures, and school ID methodology described in the ESSA plan shows that 893 distinct schools would be identified for either Comprehensive or Targeted support.*<br>• (pg. 53) the ESSA plan states that WA 'plans to reevaluate the school ID process after three years, ensuring the data reflects the state's priorities.<br>• (pg. 58) Under ESSA, LEAs are responsible for supporting Targeted schools – the OSPI will provide new LEA technical assistance opportunities.<br>• (pg. 57-77) description of how the OSPI will support and serve schools identified for Targeted and Comprehensive Support. |
| Your proposal relative to long-term goals (including goals for the English Learner progress measure) remains unclear to us relative to the original goals proposed in the November 2016 draft plan and the goals required to be set by the | • Partial description in Draft ESSA plan<br>• Need to finalize the EL progress measure and include in a PPT for the SBE<br>• Description of what happens when schools do not meet goals in plan | • *(pg. 23-24) the minimum N for goal setting is not specified*<br>• *Achievement goals are described in terms of proficiency. The ASW and SBE supported the addition of AGPs in this metric.*<br>• *(pg. 24-26) tables do not specify grade spans. If ES and MS spans are included, do the measures include students meeting AGPs?*<br>• *What happens in 2017 after the 10-year period concludes?*<br>• *(pg. 26) What happens if a school/subgroup does not meet interim target or endpoint goal?* |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Board under RCW 28A.305.130 (4). | | • *(pg. 29) What is the rationale for the English Learner long term goal not being associated with the ELP Index measure?* |
| The number of tiers and names or number rating system associated with the tiers in the Index still needs resolution. | • Should be described in ESSA plan<br>• Results of beta-testing that include the numbers and types of schools in each tier or label. | • *The ESSA plan describes schools identified for Targeted Support, Comprehensive Support, and Required Action. No other school identifications are described.* |
| The types of schools identified by the proposed Index weights requires some analysis by the Board to understand the true impact of the new methodology. Understanding the proposed definition of 'targeted school' is critical to this discussion. | • Describe Targeted Schools in ESSA plan. Two types? (multiple low perf. groups) and some Challenged (single low perf. group) – need definitions in plan.<br>• Business rule doc for identifying schools for Targeted and Comprehensive Support. | • (pg. 47-51) definition of school IDs for<br>o Targeted Support (one low performing group)<br>o Additional Targeted Support (two or more low performing student groups)<br>o Targeted Support – low ELP program performance<br>• *SBE staff was not provided with all of the data needed to answer the question about the types of schools identified for support or possible awards for high achieving schools.* |
| The Board wishes to have a better understanding of how the Achievement Index will display and operate in the context of the Report Card, including how summative scores will be displayed on the front page. | • Mock-up of potential web displays<br>• Commitment "on the record" as to the future SBE role in "look and feel" of the Index on the Report Card. | • *The OSPI has not provided mock-ups of potential web displays other than those in previous presentations to the SBE.* |
| The Board wishes to receive results from beta-testing of Index models in advance of the August 2017 special board meeting. | • Updated data sets requested in writing<br>• Documentation and preliminary business rules provided to the SBE on or before August 11th. | • *The OSPI provided most of the data requested and provided one Index simulation using the measures described in the Revised Draft ESSA plan, but utilizing a weighting scheme different from that described in the Revised Draft ESSA plan.*<br>• *The OSPI has yet to provide documentation or business rules on the Index computations, graduation bonus, or school identifications.* |

ESSA Plan – Other Observations or Questions – These Notes

- Long Term Goals (23-26) – Achievement goals are described for high school only (90% proficient in 10 years). This is part of what was included in the Draft ESSA plan from a year ago. The goals for non-high schools that include the Pro + Met AGP as recommended by the ASW and supported by the SBE are not discussed.
- Long Term Goals (29) – ELP – increase in the percent of students transitioning by 1% per year for the next three years may not be considered long-term and may not be considered ambitious by federal peer reviewers.
- Graduation Bonus (33) – Graduation bonus is not described in Section 4v as stated in the text.
- English Learner Progress (34-35) measure differs from that which was discussed at the July SBE meeting – the Board has heard nothing about this change
- Index (41) the ESSA plan consistently refers to "combined multiple measures score" rather than the Index. Not sure why this is.
- The Revised Draft ESSA plan includes several passages of highlighted text that represents sections that have been changed or reflect a new decision. In some cases these sections will be updated (added to) pending SBE decisions. These highlights can be found on:
    - Page 29: Long-term goals for EL Progress
    - Page 33: Graduation Rate indicator and Graduation Bonus
    - Page 40-42: System of annual meaningful differentiation
    - Page 47: ID for Targeted Support
    - Page 150: Long-term and interim goals for the EL Progress measure in Appendix A

**State Board of Education Analysis of the Achievement Index Described in the ESSA Revised Draft Plan**

The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) delivered a data file to the State Board of Education (SBE) in early August containing the measures included in the Revised Draft ESSA Plan the OSPI posted to its website on August 7 for public review. The SBE simulated the school Index ratings and school identifications following the methodologies described in the plan. The analyses were undertaken to answer questions from Board members that include the following.

1. What is the total number of schools that would be identified (as Targeted) under the ESSA Draft proposal?
2. What is the breakdown of the reason these schools are identified: school-wide low achievement *vs.* low subgroup performance?
3. What is the breakdown of these schools by number of subgroups identified, e.g. 1, 2, 3, 3 or more?
4. When school identification lists generated under the ESEA and ESSA methodologies are compared, how are the lists similar and how do the lists differ?
5. Is the new Index fair to all schools, or does the methodology result in hidden or subtle biases?

**Summary of Findings**

- The new Index methodology results in a substantial increase in the number of reportable student groups at schools and generates separate Index ratings for individual student groups that is more transparent and has not been made a part of the current Index.
- Schools identified for the highest levels of support (Comprehensive) would increase from approximately 230 under the old ESEA methodology (simplified) to 277 under the ESSA methodology, a 20 percent increase.
- There is a high rate of agreement between the ESSA and ESEA generated school lists identifying schools for Comprehensive Support.
- Of the nearly 587 schools identified for Targeted Support and Additional Targeted Support, 331 schools (56 percent) are identified on the basis of one low performing student group and 137 (23 percent) schools are identified on the basis of two low performing student groups. The remaining 119 schools (20 percent) are identified on the basis of three to seven low performing student groups
- The combination of school FRL rate, percentage of ELL students, and percentage of SWD students accounts for about 25 percent of the variance found in the Index rating, which is similar to the old Index methodology.

**Analysis of the Findings**

The OSPI provided the SBE with a data file simulating Index results using 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16 data that would be used in an ESSA compatible Index.

- The file included the currently used continuously enrolled (CE) filter for proficiency and growth but not for the EL Progress measure. The ESSA requires a CE filter for the EL Progress measure, and this is now reflected in the Revised Draft ESSA plan. Changes to the Index ratings would be expected when the CE filter is applied. However, the EL Progress measure carries a weighting factor of only 0.05 which would be expected to change Index ratings by only a minor amount.
- The results presented here are based upon the weighting scheme (Table 1) broadly framed in a recommendation from the Accountability Systems Workgroup (ASW) and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to the Superintendent. The weighting scheme depicted in Table 1 was included in the Revised Draft ESSA plan.
- The file included participation rates separately for ELA and math but the neither the analyses nor the identifications make adjustments for low participation rates.

Table 1: shows the weighting factor for each of the indicators used to compute Index ratings.

| Groupings | Proficiency* | Growth | Graduation | EL Progress | SQSS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| K-12 Schools | 30.0% | 25.0% | 25.0% | 5.0% | 15.0% |
| Elementary and Middle Schools | 30.0% | 60.0% | 0.0% | 5.0% | 5.0% |
| High Schools | 30.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 5.0% | 15.0% |
| *Note: Measure is for ELA and math proficiency (excludes science). When indicators are absent or are not reportable, the weights of the other indicators are increased per the Revised Draft ESSA plan. | | | | | |

The structure of and elements not included in the data file complicated some of the analyses and made a few analyses impossible to carry out.

- The file included de-identified school codes, meaning these results could not be compared to the live Index results.
- The file did not include school type, meaning it is impossible to differentiate a brick and mortar school from a virtual school, a traditional high school from a re-engagement center, etc.
- The file did not include district identifiers, meaning it was impossible to determine the geographic setting (e.g. I-5 corridor) of the school or whether the school is situated in an urban, suburban, or rural setting.
- The file did not include the counts of students by student group or by school enrollment, so the connections between sample size and outcomes can only be generalized.

The new Index methodology aggregates the results for students at a school over three years and generates an Index rating for each subgroup separately instead of a Targeted Subgroup average. The

methodology increases the student count which improves the validity and reliability of the analysis and increases the number of reportable student groups at schools and across the state (Table 2). The new methodology provides a much more transparent comparison between subgroups on individual measures and summative performance.

Table 2: shows the number of schools with a reportable subgroup in the indicators required to generate an Index rating.

| | New Index Rating* (Average) | Schools with and Index Rating | | Percent Increase |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | New Index | Old Index | |
| All Students | 5.59 | 1992 | 1910 | 4 |
| American Indian | 3.03 | 119 | 52 | 129 |
| Black | 3.95 | 484 | 250 | 94 |
| Hispanic | 4.46 | 1445 | 1120 | 29 |
| Pacific Islander | 3.53 | 125 | 36 | 247 |
| Asian | 7.89 | 716 | 446 | 61 |
| White | 6.21 | 1870 | 1728 | 8 |
| Two or More | 6.01 | 971 | 526 | 85 |
| | | | | |
| Low Income (FRL) | 4.28 | 1828 | 1683 | 7 |
| English Learners (ELL) | 3.17 | 838 | 538 | 56 |
| Special Education (SWD) | 2.84 | 1506 | 1000 | 51 |

*Note: the new methodology provides a more transparent comparison of subgroup performance by providing separate Index ratings for every reportable subgroup.

**Schools Identified for Comprehensive Support under the ESSA**

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires the state to identify schools for Comprehensive Support based on two separate criteria;

1. All high schools graduating less than 67 percent of students as measured by the Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR).
2. The Bottom 5% of Title I-served schools based on the system of meaningful differentiation derived from the indicators specified in the ESSA. State law also requires the state to identify all schools meeting the criteria, regardless of Title I status.

Schools identified for Comprehensive Support under the ESSA are generally comparable to the Priority schools under the ESEA NCLB, in terms of school turnaround requirements. Under the ESEA methodology, approximately 230 schools would be annually identified for Priority school support. If schools were to be identified for Comprehensive support under the ESSA and based on the current file, 277 schools would be identified (Table 3). So, the accountability shift required under the ESSA would result in at least a 20 percent increase in the number of schools identified for the high level of support.

Table 3: shows the manner in which and the number of schools identified for Comprehensive Support in the Index simulation.

| | Identification | Description | Unique Schools |
|---|---|---|---|
| Comprehensive Support | Lowest Index Ratings | Bottom 5% of schools based on the Index rating. | 78 |
| | Low Graduation Rate | Any high school with a four-year graduation rate less than 67%. | 178 |
| | Lowest Index Ratings and Low Graduation Rate | School meets both of the criteria above. | 21 |
| | | Total* | 277 |
| *Note: total does not reflect 10 schools that were also identified for Low English Learner Program results. | | | |

The 99 schools that would be identified for Comprehensive Support due to a low Index rating (78 + 21) span all school levels and are fairly representative of the statewide distribution of schools (Table 4).

Table 4: shows the percentage of schools identified for Comprehensive Support (low Index rating) to the percentage of schools with an Index rating, by school level.

| School Level | Percentage of Total Identified Schools | Percentage of Schools Across the State |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary Schools | 42 | 52 |
| Middle Schools | 24 | 18 |
| High Schools | 21 | 18 |
| Combined Schools (not a high school) | 5 | 4 |
| Combined High Schools | 7 | 8 |

There are well-documented relationships between educational outcome measures and student poverty (Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) Program status), English language (EL) proficiency, and special education (SWD) program status. As such, it should come as no surprise that schools identified for Comprehensive Support on account of a low Index rating serve higher than average percentages of FRL, ELL, and SWD students (Table 5). In a general sense, the identified schools are those with poor educational outcomes and serving a large percentage of students facing the challenges of poverty, language barriers, and other health/disability issues. The pattern observed in this simulation that follows the new methodology is consistent with the previous school identifications.

Table 5: shows the number of schools (by school level) identified for Comprehensive Support with basic school characteristics.

| | ID* | ES | MS | HS | Comb | Comb HS | Enroll | % FRL | % ELL | % SWD | Unique Schools |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Comprehensive Support | Lowest Index Ratings | 42 | 24 | | 5 | 7 | 390 | 72.1 | 24.4 | 17.9 | 78 |
| | Low Grad. Rate | | | 116 | | 56 | 132 | 49.2 | 3.2 | 12.2 | 178* |
| | Low Index and Low Grad. | | | 11 | | 10 | 220 | 60.0 | 10.1 | 15.5 | 21 |
| *Note: total reflects 6 schools with no grade span reported in the data file. School identification corresponds with the description in Table 2. ES = Elementary School, MS = Middle School, HS = High School, Comb = K-8 (for example), Comb HS = K-12 (for example). | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Differences between ESEA and ESSA Lists of Identified Schools**

Under the ESSA, Washington identified Priority schools separately on the basis of two criteria:

1. Title I-served high schools graduating less than 60 percent of students as measured by the Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR).
2. Title I-served schools with an average ELA and math proficiency rate (combined average) less than 40 percent, although this value was later updated to reflect the transition to the Smarter Balanced assessment system.

When the ESEA identification methodology was broadly applied to the simulated data set, 101 schools were identified on the basis of low proficiency rates in ELA and math, and 129 additional schools were identified on the basis of a graduation rate below 60 percent, which differs significantly from the 67 percent threshold required under the ESSA (Table 6). The ESEA methodology would have identified a total of 230 schools based on either low proficiency rates and or low graduation rates. 201 of the 230 schools identified under the ESEA methodology were identified under the ESSA methodology, representing a match rate of 87.4 percent.

When the data are examined more closely by excluding the schools identified for low graduation rate, a more curious finding emerges. When the ESEA-identified low graduation rate schools are excluded, a match rate of only 32.7 percent is calculated. The low match rate can largely be explained by examining in detail the performance on the individual indicators by school level.

Of the 68 schools not matching,

- 19 do not generate an Index rating under the new methodology, so none of these 19 schools would be identified with a low Index rating. The old methodology relied solely upon school proficiency rate.
- Of the 49 remaining schools not matching,

- 42 are high schools and 38 were identified for Comprehensive Support because of a low graduation rate rather than a low Index rating
- Of the 42 high schools, 22 of those earned the Graduation Bonus of one or two points that bolstered the schools' Index ratings above the threshold cut point

- Of the 11 schools not identified under ESSA but would have been identified under the ESEA methodology,
  - The Index rating for 6 schools are bolstered by a Growth Index ≥ 3.50. The high weight for the Growth indicator moved the Index rating above the threshold cut point.
  - The Index rating for four schools are bolstered by a Grad Index ≥ 4.00. The high weight for the Graduation Rate indicator moved the Index rating above the threshold cut point.
  - For the remaining school, a Growth Index of 2.50 and moderate to strong performance on the ELP Index and SQSS Index generated an Index rating a little above the cut point. This school was identified for Additional Targeted Support.

Table 6: comparison of ESEA and ESSA lists of schools identified for Comprehensive Support.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="2">ESEA Methodology<br>(Low Proficiency & Low Grad)</td><td colspan="2">ESSA Methodology<br>(Lowest Index Ratings & Low Grad)</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="5">230 schools identified for Comprehensive Support under ESEA</td><td>129</td><td>High schools with a graduation rate of less than 60 percent</td><td>129</td><td>129 schools matched</td><td rowspan="4">200 or 219 schools matched or not able to match under the ESSA</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">101</td><td rowspan="4">Schools identified for a low proficiency rate regardless of whether the computation of an Index rating is made</td><td>33</td><td>33 schools matched</td></tr>
<tr><td>38</td><td>38 schools identified for Comprehensive Support (graduation rate < 67 percent)</td></tr>
<tr><td>19</td><td>19 schools cannot match (too few indicators to compute an Index rating.</td></tr>
<tr><td>11</td><td>11 schools not matched because of change in weights for growth and graduation indicators</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2">230</td><td colspan="3">87% Match Rate (if Non-Index schools considered No Match)</td><td>200</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">95% Match Rate (if Non-Index schools considered a Match)</td><td>219</td></tr>
</table>

At the end of the analysis, only 11 schools (less than 5 percent of the ESEA list) appear on the ESEA list for Comprehensive Support identification but are not identified under the ESSA, and this possibly the result of different weighting factors between the Old and new Index methodologies. One would not expect a 100 percent match given different identification methodologies and different measures. Over 95 percent of the ESEA identified schools are matched by the ESSA list or explained by other factors such as the Graduation Bonus. Without additional school identifiers, it is impossible to state with any degree of certainty, whether the handful of schools not identified should have been identified.

**Schools Identified for Targeted Support under the ESSA**

The ESSA requires the state to identify schools with consistently low performing subgroups for Targeted support. To that end the ASW recommended to the Superintendent a methodology to make such school identifications. The Revised Draft ESSA plan specifies the identification of three distinct types of schools identified for Targeted support.

- Targeted Support Low English Learner (EL) program
- Targeted Support – schools with one, consistently low performing, student group
- Additional Targeted Support – schools with two or more, consistently low performing, student groups

Schools identified for Targeted Support (Table 7) exhibit school demographic characteristics that would generally be considered typical. The schools identified for Additional Targeted Support serve slightly higher than average percentages of FRL, ELL, and SWD students, but the percentages would still be characterized as the high side of typical.

Table 7: shows the number of schools (by school level) identified for Targeted Support with basic school characteristics.

| Targeted Support Identification | ES | MS | HS* | Comb | Comb HS | % FRL | % ELL | % SWD | Schools |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Targeted (one low performing student group) | 207 | 97 | | 11 | 16 | 51.4 | 13.0 | 14.1 | 331 |
| Additional Targeted (two or more low performing groups) | 172 | 73 | | 6 | 5 | 61.4 | 18.5 | 14.3 | 256 |
| Targeted Low ELP | 14 | 17 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 63.9 | 17.0 | 19.4 | 52 |
| | | | | | | | | Total Unique Schools* | 627 |

*Note: schools identified for Comprehensive Support are not considered part of the Targeted Support identification process. The low performing student groups in high schools are captured through the Comprehensive Support identification process. 12 of the 52 schools identified for Targeted Low ELP were also identified for Targeted Support or Additional Targeted Support.

Approximately one-half of the schools identified for Additional Targeted Support (137 schools) were identified on the basis of two low performing student groups (Table 8). Schools with the greatest number of low performing student groups tend to serve higher percentages of students participating the FRL program and participating in bilingual education programs.

Table 8: shows the number of schools (by school level) identified for Additional Targeted Support with the number of low performing groups identified with basic school characteristics.

| | Low Performing Groups | ES | MS | HS | Comb | Comb HS | % FRL | % ELL | % SWD | Schools |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Additional Targeted Support | 2 Groups | 97 | 36 | | | 4 | 60.2 | 18.6 | 14.4 | 137 |
| | 3 Groups | 35 | 18 | | 3 | 1 | 60.4 | 15.7 | 14.9 | 57 |
| | 4 Groups | 28 | 12 | | 2 | | 61.5 | 21.0 | 13.7 | 42 |
| | 5 Groups | 10 | 4 | | 1 | | 71.7 | 21.7 | 13.6 | 15 |
| | 6 Groups | 2 | 2 | | | | 71.6 | 20.8 | 14.4 | 4 |
| | 7 Groups | | 1 | | | | 74.2 | 11.9 | 13.1 | 1 |

Table 9: shows the frequency of identification of each student group as part of a school identified for Targeted Support or Additional Targeted Support. Each school may have more than one low performing group.

| | Group | ES | MS | HS | Comb | Comb HS | % FRL | % ELL | % SWD | Total Schools |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Targeted Support | Native American | 9 | 12 | | 1 | | 60.5 | 10.7 | 15.8 | 22 |
| | Pacific Islander | 7 | 13 | | | | 63.8 | 14.8 | 12.7 | 20 |
| | Black | 48 | 21 | | 3 | 1 | 65.1 | 19.7 | 14.2 | 73 |
| | Hispanic | 71 | 24 | | 3 | 4 | 60.8 | 18.2 | 14.3 | 102 |
| | Asian | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| | White | 5 | 1 | | | 1 | 73.2 | 23.3 | 13.9 | 8 |
| | Two or More | 11 | 9 | | 1 | | 71.4 | 17.6 | 15.5 | 21 |
| | FRL | 73 | 29 | | 8 | 4 | 57.8 | 14.9 | 14.8 | 114 |
| | ELL | 131 | 44 | | 3 | 1 | 60.7 | 22.7 | 13.4 | 179 |
| | SWD | 325 | 156 | | 14 | 16 | 56.1 | 15.0 | 14.3 | 511 |

**Identification of the Highest Performing Schools**

As part of the Washington Achievement Awards, the highest five percent of school based on the Index rating are recognized as Exemplary High Performing Schools. A simulated identification was undertaken to examine the demographics at the highest performing schools. The simulation was designed to identify the top five percent of performers and the next ten percent of highest performers on the Index rating (Table 9). After establishing percentile cuts on the Index ratings,

- Schools with an Index rating ≥ 9.250 were identified as excellent schools
- Schools with an Index rating ≥ 8.200 and < 9.250 were identified as very good schools

Table 9: shows the number of schools by school level identified as the highest performers on the Index ratings with school characteristics.

| | ID | ES | MS | HS | Comb | Comb HS | Enroll | % FRL | % ELL | % SWD | Schools |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Highest Performing Schools* | Excellent | 80 | 11 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 515 | 17.4 | 7.1 | 10.7 | 98 |
| | Very Good | 139 | 30 | 20 | 8 | 5 | 549 | 27.0 | 7.6 | 11.7 | 202 |
| *Note: the highest performing schools are defined here as having the highest Index ratings. | | | | | | | | | | | |

Schools that would be identified as the highest performing serve lower than typical percentages of students participating in the FRL program, receiving bilingual education services, and receiving special education services. Elementary schools form the bulk of the the identifications as they represent approximately 82 percent of the top performers and 69 percent of the next ten percent highest performers. The general pattern and characteristics of the highest performing schools in this new Index is similar to that found in the old Index.

**Correlation to School Poverty Rate**

An analysis was undertaken to examine the correlations between the summative Index ratings, the separate indicator Index ratings, and school poverty rate (Table 10). When all schools with an Index rating are collectively considered, the following conclusions are drawn.

- The correlation between the Proficiency Index and school FRL rate (*r = -0.640*) is negative and moderate to strong. This provides evidence that schools with higher FRL participation rates tend to perform lower on the Proficiency (Achievement) Index indicator.
- The correlation between the Growth Index and school FRL rate (*r = -0.212*) is negative and weak. Schools with higher FRL rates have a mild tendency to perform lower on the Growth Index indicator.
- The correlations between the Grad Index (*r = -0.347*) and ELP Index (*r = -0.370*) and school FRL rate are weak to moderate and negative. Schools with higher FRL rates tend to perform lower on the ELP and Graduation Rate indicators.

- The correlation between the SQSS indicator and the school FRL rate (*r = -0.548*) is negative and moderate to strong. This provides evidence that schools with higher FRL participation rates tend to perform lower on the SQSS Index indicator.

Table 10: shows the correlation coefficients for the Index rating values and school poverty rate.

| | Percent FRL | PROF INDEX | GROWTH INDEX | ELP INDEX | GRAD INDEX | SQSS INDEX | NEW INDEX | EVER ID | V GOOD SCH |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PROF INDEX | -.640 | | | | | | | | |
| GROWTH INDEX | -.212 | .546 | | | | | | | |
| ELP INDEX | -.370 | .498 | .413 | | | | | | |
| GRAD INDEX | -.347 | .702 | .123 | .331 | | | | | |
| SQSS INDEX | -.548 | .562 | .325 | .362 | .407 | | | | |
| NEW INDEX | -.591 | .839 | .624 | .472 | .909 | .547 | | | |
| EVER ID | .346 | -.435 | -.282 | -.252 | -.627 | -.312 | -.609 | | |
| V GOOD SCH | -.282 | .422 | .331 | .259 | .324 | .300 | .471 | -.233 | |
| EXCELLENT SCH | -.283 | .351 | .329 | .252 | .155 | .281 | .411 | -.176 | -.076 |

Note: all correlation coefficients are based on results for 1992 schools, except for the ELP INDEX measure that is based on 1030 schools and the GRAD INDEX measure that is based on 489 schools.

The combination of these indicators that have a negative, weak to strong correlations with school FRL rate collectively contribute to the moderately strong and negative correlation (*r = -0.591*) between the Index rating and school FRL rate. Approximately 35 percent of the variance found in the Index rating is explained by the school FRL rate. School characteristics (percentage of FRL students, Percentage of ELL students, and percentage of SWD students in combination) accounts for about 25 percent of the variance found in the Index rating, which is similar to the old Index methodology.

**Questions the Board Might Consider or Discuss**

1. Approximately 565 schools have a reportable graduation rate. How many schools should earn the Graduation Bonus and how should the Bonus be normative or criterion based?

2. Approximately 1050 schools have a reportable EL Progress measure. How many schools should be identified for Targeted Support Low EL Program?

3. The proficiency rates for many high schools are derived from low rates of participation, which could lead to a lower than expected Proficiency Index. Should school identifications made in the future take the low participation rates into account?

Contact Andrew Parr at andrew.parr@k12.wa.us if you have questions about this information.

Exhibit B

July 13, 2017

Dear Superintendent Reykdal:

Thank you for attending the July meeting of the Board in Spokane, and for collaborating on those aspects of the state's ESSA plan that impact on the State Board of Education's statutory responsibility for creating an accountability framework and an achievement index for Washington's schools.

With this letter, the Board intends to identify those areas of policy agreement that would be appropriate to reflect in the state's draft ESSA consolidated plan, and identify those areas where we believe additional work is necessary to come to a collaborative solution. Our intent would be to convene a special meeting of the Board on August 16th for this purpose.

The Board offers its support for the following elements of the Achievement Index for incorporation into the plan:

- Achievement Index indicators as follows:
    - English Language Arts and Math Proficiency
    - English Language Arts and Math Growth
    - Graduation Rate (4-Year, with credit for increasing extended graduation rates)
    - English Learner Progress
    - Chronic Absenteeism
    - Advanced Coursework (including dual credit in the first phase, and industry certifications in the second phase)
    - 9th graders on track (course completion/failure rates)
- As it relates to the definitions of these indicators and the associated business rules, the Board would require the following stipulations:
    - The measure of chronic absenteeism should provide for the exclusion of certain school supervised activities so as not to discourage enrichment activities that research tells us benefit students.
    - The exclusion of science assessment data in this version of the Achievement Index should be made explicitly temporary.
- As it relates to school identification and service, the Board supports:
    - The definition of 'comprehensive schools' that comprises the lowest 5% of schools on the summative score index rating, plus schools with graduation rates less than 67%.
    - The definition of 'targeted schools' based on low performing subgroups on the same summative index rating, and separately for the English Language Progress indicator.

The following items require additional discussion:

- The proposal to identify nearly half of the state's schools as part of the school improvement process poses resource and policy challenges for the state that requires additional discussion.

- Your proposal relative to long-term goals (including goals for the English Learner progress measure) remains unclear to us relative to the original goals proposed in the November 2016 draft plan and the goals required to be set by the Board under RCW 28A.305.130 (4).
- The number of tiers and names or number rating system associated with the tiers in the Index still needs resolution.
- The types of schools identified by the proposed Index weights requires some analysis by the Board to understand the true impact of the new methodology. Understanding the proposed definition of 'targeted school' is critical to this discussion as well.
- The Board wishes to have a better understanding of how the Achievement Index will display and operate in the context of the Report Card, including how summative scores will be displayed on the front page. The Board wishes to receive results from beta-testing of Index models in advance of the August 2017 special board meeting.

Our intent will be to reach consensus with you prior to the August 16th, allowing for adoption of an index at this meeting. Although we believe we have identified most of the important policy issues that remain to be resolved, we will be in communication if other issues arise in discussion among members.

On behalf of the Board,

Kevin Laverty, Acting Chair