

RECOGNITION AWARDS

BACKGROUND

Using the State Board of Education's Accountability Index, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) and the State Board of Education (SBE) recognized 174 schools through their new joint recognition program, "Washington Achievement Awards," on May 5, 2010. There were six possible awards – one for overall excellence as well as five special recognition awards: language arts (reading and writing combined), math, science, the extended graduation rate, and gifted programs. While we planned to recognize schools that closed the socioeconomic achievement gap, the criteria established to receive this award ended up being too stringent, so no schools met the criteria and no recognition was given.

SBE staff debriefed with OSPI and SBE members on the Washington Achievement Awards for 2009 as well as with the Systems Performance Accountability work group. Many people found the award ceremony and recognition very meaningful. They like the new Accountability Index and its measures. There were some concerns expressed about the timing for recognition at the ESD's while the main ceremony was going on. Unfortunately, the May date did not permit all building staff to attend the ceremony due to state assessment testing. Some changes to the schedule and ceremonies are outlined in Attachment A.

Additionally, suggestions were made to develop a more friendly way to look up a school's scores on the SBE or OSPI websites. SBE staff has created a new lookup tool, which allows individuals to type in a school code and more easily obtain their ratings on the SBE website: www.sbe.wa.gov.

Senate Bill 6696, from the 2010 Legislative Session, requires the State Board of Education to have ongoing collaboration with the Achievement Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee regarding measures used to compute the achievement gap and recognition for schools that close their achievement gaps. SBE staff, and its consultant, met with the Achievement Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee in May to discuss ways to recognize closing the achievement gap by income, race/ethnicity, and some of the proposed changes the Board reviewed at its May meeting:

1. Add special recognition for improvement, using the same criteria as other awards, i.e. two year average of at least 6.00.
2. Do not provide the overall excellence recognition award for schools that have a significant socio-economic or racial/ethnic gap.
3. Highlight schools that receive multiple year awards.
4. Add special recognition awards for achievement gap (SES and race/ethnicity), using a criterion based system.

The Achievement Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee supported the SBE recommendations. OSPI staff examined 2009 enrollment data to determine how many schools would have results that could be used for the race/ethnic achievement gap awards, using the SBE modified accountability

index for subgroup accountability and if the subgroups were combined. Some slight modifications to the criteria may be needed, once the results from 2010 are available, to ensure an appropriate number of schools receive recognition.

POLICY CONSIDERATION

Under Attachment B is a memo from Pete Bylsma with his final recommendations for changes to the SBE Accountability Index. The key revisions are:

1. Add special recognition for improvement, using the same criteria as other awards, i.e. two year average of at least 6.00, but include all schools regardless of their level of gifted students.
2. Do not provide overall excellence recognition award for schools that have a significant socio-economic or racial/ethnic gap¹.
3. Highlight schools that receive multiple year awards.
4. Add special recognition awards for reducing the achievement gap (SES and race/ethnicity) using a criterion based system.
5. Add a district summary of all schools and a statewide summary using the 2010 Accountability Index.

EXPECTED ACTION

The Board will consider approval of the above key revisions to the joint OSPI/SBE Washington Achievement Awards for 2010. Under revision # 3, staff recommends that the special recognition award for reducing the achievement gap for race and ethnicity use the third option recommendation in the Bylsma paper, which combines the detailed matrix under Option 1 to report results with the combined results under Option 2 for recognition purposes.

¹ Staff will need to determine at a later date what “significant” socio-economic or racial/ethnic gap means in terms of a specific number(s).

2010 WASHINGTON ACHIEVEMENT AWARD UPDATED JUNE 18, 2010
Program Timeline

TASK	DUE DATE	STAFF
Raw assessment data and cut scores available for index calculation and delivered to State Board.	September 30 2010	Sheri and Robin
Review data for anomalies.	October 2010	Sarah
Criteria for achievement gap selection established.	October 2010	Sarah, Aaron, Hilary, Edie, Alan (in collaboration with Student Information and CISL)
Complete 08 – 09 and 09 – 10 indexes and 2-year averages delivered to State Board (Sarah). File should include School, district, ESD.	December 10, 2010	Robin, Sherri
Complete list of award winning schools delivered to Hilary and Aaron. File should include school, district, ESD, principal name, principal email(?).	December 10, 2010	Robin, Sherri
Review data again for quality check.	December 2010	SBE
Share overall data with schools to review and ensure data is correct.	January 2011	Robin, Sherri, Sarah
Formatted and searchable index complete.	February 1, 2011	Sarah
Ceremony date and location set.	February 15, 2011	Hilary
Recognition at ESD meetings set (various dates following awards ceremony).	February 15, 2011	Hilary, Karen
List of award winning schools presented to State Board. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media Release. • Informational PDF. 	March 2011	Aaron, Hilary

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of schools by category. Invitation to event. Event information sheet for awards ceremony. 		
Award winning schools notified by Randy and Jeff via email. (simultaneous with board presentation)	March 2011	Hilary
Awards and banners ordered.	Mid March 2011	Hilary
Save the date email, request for personal stories and principal press packet (suggestions and tools for promoting the award in their communities).	Mid March 2011	Hilary
Print invitations mailed.	March 18, 2011	Hilary
Ceremony details set. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presenters Catering Performances Photography Site visit Staff support 	March 25, 2011	Hilary
Media advisory for award ceremony sent out and ceremony promoted through various social media. (?)	1 – 1 ½ weeks prior to awards ceremony	Aaron, Hilary
RSVP deadline for awards ceremony.	2 weeks prior to ceremony date	Hilary, Karen
Awards ceremony.	March or April 2011	Hilary, Aaron
Extra awards and banners shipped to ESD's.	One week after award ceremony	Hilary, Karen (additional help from State Board?)
Recognition for schools that did not attend awards ceremony at regional ESD meetings.	Various (following awards ceremony)	ESD's

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACHIEVEMENT GAP RECOGNITION

Pete Bylsma, EdD, MPA

BACKGROUND

In March 2010 OSPI and State Board of Education (SBE) provided recognition to schools in six areas based on the Accountability Index. The Outstanding Overall Performance award was given to schools whose 2-year Index average put them in the top 5% of schools in the four grade bands (elementary, middle/junior, high and comprehensive). Special Recognition awards were given to schools with consistently high performance (a 2-year average of at least 6.00) in four outcome areas. These five awards required fewer than 10% of the students to be designated as gifted each year.² To ensure that schools with a high concentration of gifted students were not excluded from the system, Special Recognition was given to any school with a gifted program that had a 2-year peer average of at least 6.00. The full criteria used for each type of recognition is shown below.

- The Outstanding Overall Performance award was given to schools whose 2-year Accountability Index average put them in the top 5%, based on the number of schools in each of the four grade bands.³ To be eligible for this award, a school must have at least 10 cells of the 20-cell matrix rated and fewer than 10% students designated as gifted. (Note: One additional criterion is recommended for 2010 as discussed below.)
- Special Recognition awards were given to schools with very high performance in four outcome areas: **language arts** (reading and writing combined), **math**, **science**, and the **extended graduation rate**. To receive this award, a school's overall (column) 2-year average for the outcome must be at least 6.00, at least 2 of the 4 cells in the column must be rated each year, and there must be fewer than 10% students designated as gifted each year.⁴
- The special recognition award for **schools with a gifted program** (i.e., those with at least 10% of the students designated as gifted each year) was given when the 2-year average peer (row) ratings was at least 6.00.⁵

The matrix used to calculate the Accountability Index is shown below. The green cells relate to areas where recognition was given based on results from 2008 and 2009.

² Statewide, roughly 3% of all students receive this designation, so schools with 10% or more gifted students have much higher concentrations of highly capable students. The exclusion criterion prevents a school from receiving recognition simply because of its student composition.

³ The "2-year average" refers to the average of data from 2008 and 2009. The top 5% is based on the total schools at the grade band in the 2009 index (the total N includes schools that did not receive an index).

⁴ For language arts, both reading and writing must have a 2-year average of at least 6.00 and at least 2 of the cells rated in each column each year.

⁵ Results for the peer indicators control for the types of students attending the school (the percent gifted, low income, ELL, special education, and mobile).

	Outcomes					
Indicator	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Ext. Grad. Rate	Average
<i>Non-low inc. achievement</i>						
<i>Low inc. ach.</i>						
<i>Ach. vs. peers</i>						6.00* for gifted
<i>Improvement</i>						
Average	6.00*	6.00*	6.00*	6.00*	6.00*	Top 5%*

* Minimum 2-year average rating to earn recognition

INDEX

The table below shows how many schools received recognition in 2009. A total of 108 schools received the Outstanding Overall Performance award, and different index scores were required at each grade level because this award was given to the top 5%. A total of 125 awards were given to schools that met the Special Recognition criteria. A total of 174 different schools received recognition in 233 areas, and 48 schools received recognition in more than one area.

Grade Band	# in top 5%	Index cut-off	Total awards
Elementary	53	5.280	70
Middle	19	4.875	26
High	20	4.910	52
Multiple	16	4.735	26
Total	108		174

Focus	Total awards
Lang. Arts	36
Math	10
Science	24
Grad rate	35
Gifted	20
Total	125

OSPI/SBE had planned to recognize schools that had closed the achievement gap. However, the criteria established to receive this award ended up being too stringent, so no schools met the criteria and no recognition was given.⁶ OSPI/SBE want to have a method to provide recognition next year to schools that have reduced or closed the achievement gap.

⁶ The initial criteria established to earn recognition for closing the achievement gap was rather complicated. It required a school to have at least 10 students in at least 2 of the 5 outcomes (columns) in both of the income-related cells (non-low income and low income), there could be no rating of 1 in any income-related cell or peer cell, there could be no more than a 1-point difference in the rating between the two income-related cells (e.g., if the reading non-low income cell is rated 5, the reading low-income cell could be rated no lower than 4 and no higher than 6), and there had to be fewer than 10% students designated as gifted each year. Each of the above criteria had to be met two years in a row. Original estimates found that less than 1% of schools met these criteria using 2007 and 2008 data.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Two types of Special Recognition are recommended that relate to the achievement gap. Both are criteria-referenced, so they are similar to the other types of Special Recognition.

- Use the Accountability Index matrix to measure the achievement gap in terms of performance by students with different *socioeconomic status* (SES).
- Use either the modified matrix created to examine subgroup results or the combined totals for the subgroups to measure the achievement gap in terms of performance by various *racial/ethnic groups*.

Details for each type of recognition are provided below.

For the socioeconomic gap, examine the difference in the averages of the non-low income and the low income rows (see yellow cells of the matrix below). ***Give recognition to any school that has a difference between the row averages of less than 1 in both years.***⁷ The following minimum criteria should apply:

1. The 2-year average for each row must be at least 4.00 (this ensures recognition is not given if performance is low);
2. The Accountability Index must be at least 4.00 each year;
3. At least 2 of the 5 cells in the row must be rated each year; and
4. There must be fewer than 10% students designated as gifted each year.

	Outcomes					
Indicator	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Ext. Grad. Rate	Average
Non-low inc. achievement						Compare ↑ ↓
Low inc. ach.						
Ach. vs. peers						
Improvement						
Average						

If the above criteria were used in 2009, 30 schools would have been recognized in 2009 (18 elementary, 2 middle, 7 high, 3 comprehensive). This represents 1.4% of schools statewide. This form of recognition has the advantage of relying on the same Index matrix that is used for the other awards. It also recognizes that the achievement gap is driven primarily by differences in socioeconomic status.

⁷ This includes when the low income row has a higher rating than the non-low income row.

There are two options to consider when giving recognition related to the racial/ethnic gap.

1. Examine the average size of the gap between the groups that have historically underperformed (American Indian, Black, Hispanic, Pacific Islanders, multi-racial) and the two groups that have historically performed at higher levels (Asian, White).⁸ This system of recognition uses concepts in the modified matrix that was developed to examine subgroup results for possible AYP use.⁹ A “row average” is calculated for each subgroup, as shown in the table below for a hypothetical high school.¹⁰ ***Give recognition to any school that has less than a .50 difference between the row averages in two consecutive years.*** The following minimum criteria are also recommended in order for a school to receive recognition:

- The 2-year average for each row must be at least 3.50;
- At least 4 of the 9 cells in the row must be rated each year; and
- There must be fewer than 10% students designated as gifted each year in the school.

Subgroup	READING			MATH			EXT. GRAD. RATE			Average rating	Change from previous year
	Met Std. (All stud.)	Peers	Improve.	Met Std. (All stud.)	Peers	Improve.	Met Std. (All stud.)	Peers	Improve.		
American Indian	4	4	4	1	5	4	1	4	4	3.44	0.33
Black	3	3	3	1	3	5	1	3	2	2.67	-1.00
Hispanic	3	4	4	1	4	4	1	4	4	3.22	-0.11
Pacific Islander	4	4	4	1	5	4	1	4	4	3.44	0.22
Multi-racial	4	4	5	2	4	4	2	4	4	3.67	-0.22
Average	3.6	3.8	4.0	1.2	4.2	4.2	1.2	3.8	3.6	3.29	-0.13
White	5	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	3.78	-0.22
Asian	6	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	6	4.78	0.56
Average	5.5	4.0	4.5	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.28	0.17

Compare these

A total of 1,445 schools (67% of all schools statewide) would have enough students to generate results that could be used for this form of recognition. In 75% of these schools, data would be available to examine the difference between only a few groups (e.g., Hispanic vs. White) instead of all seven student groups. However, this simply reflects the enrollment patterns in the school.

Results for the racial/ethnic subgroups have not yet been computed, so the number of schools that would have been recognized using these criteria is not yet known. The school shown in the example would not receive recognition because (a) some of the row averages fall below 3.5 and (b) the difference between the average ratings for the two groups is more than .50 (the difference in this year was 1.11, or 4.28 – 3.17). Once results are available for the subgroups, some of the criteria may need to change to ensure an appropriate number of schools are recognized. While this type of recognition is more complicated than option 2 noted below, it has the advantage of making transparent the size of the achievement gap that has existed among the various racial/ethnic groups. The results using this method also give each subgroup the same level of importance, regardless of the number of students served.

⁸ Looking at the results of the special education or ELL groups is not recommended because students in both of these groups are also included in the other groups.

⁹ This matrix uses the same concepts as the Accountability Index. For example, both use the same minimum N, benchmarks, and ratings, the results are combined across grades, and no margin of error is used. This matrix includes only the outcomes used for federal accountability (reading, math, extended graduation rate) and combines the two income-related indicators.

¹⁰ This example reflects at least 10 students in each subgroup. However, only 13 school in the state (0.6%) have at least 10 students in all seven subgroups.

2. The second option uses the same matrix and eligibility criteria as Option 1, but it combines the results of all the groups into two major groups, those that have historically underperformed (American Indian, Black, Hispanic, Pacific Islanders, multi-racial) and those that have historically performed at higher levels (Asian, White). Hence, only two row averages are calculated, as shown in the table below.

Group	READING			MATH			EXT. GRAD. RATE			Average rating	Change from previous year
	Met Std. (All stud.)	Peers	Improve.	Met Std. (All stud.)	Peers	Improve.	Met Std. (All stud.)	Peers	Improve.		
American Indian, Black, Hispanic, Pac. Islanders, multi-racial	3	4	4	2	3	3	1	4	3	3.00	-0.11
White, Asian	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.11	0.11

Compare these

When combining the groups together, more schools (1,658 or 77% of all schools statewide) would have enough students to generate results that could be used for this form of recognition. Again, results using this system have not yet been computed, so the number of schools that would have been recognized using these criteria is not yet known. The school shown in the example would not receive recognition because (a) one row average falls below 3.5 and (b) the difference between the average ratings for the two groups is more than .50 (the difference in this year was .99, or 4.28-3.29). This option is less complicated than Option 1 and has the advantage of including more schools. However, the size of the achievement gap that exists among the various racial/ethnic groups is not shown. Results using this method are “weighted” so they reflect the relative proportion of students in each subgroup.

3. A third option to consider is to report the results in the matrix from Option 1 but use the matrix in Option 2 for recognition purposes. This combines the best features of both options.

Using Achievement Gap Criteria When Identifying Overall Outstanding Performance

Another way to reinforce the importance of closing the achievement gap is to apply an additional criterion when determining schools that are recognized for *Overall Outstanding Performance*. Specifically, we recommend that in order to receive this type of recognition, a school must have a gap between the two socioeconomic groups that is no larger than 2. Of the 108 schools that were recognized this year for *Overall Outstanding Performance*, 25 had a gap between their non-low income and low income group averages that was larger than 2.