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 16<sup>th</sup> 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:
  - o English Language Arts and Math Proficiency
  - English Language Arts and Math Growth
  - Graduation Rate (4-Year, with credit for increasing extended graduation rates)
  - o English Learner Progress
  - o Chronic Absenteeism
  - Advanced Coursework (including dual credit in the first phase, and industry certifications in the second phase)
  - o 9<sup>th</sup> 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 16<sup>th</sup>, 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