

## Achievement & Accountability Workgroup (AAW) Recommendations to the State Board of Education Feedback Report from the December 12, 2012, Meeting

### Overview

Upon completion of each AAW meeting, SBE staff will generate a report of the members' discussions.. Each member had the opportunity to review and contribute to this report prior to publication.

### Executive Summary

AAW members provided input on the following Index questions:

Discussion Topics	Feedback
Career & College Readiness (CCR) Indicators	Mixed: In addition to graduation rate, most want percent students meeting CCR standard on SBAC and earning credit in dual enrollment coursework or earning an industry certificate.
Subgroups	Mixed – most want to use the federal subgroups PLUS new subgroups: former ELL and former Special Education.
English Language Learners (ELL)	Unanimous: Add English language acquisition data to the Index.
Performance Targets	Mixed: Most want targets to be both norm and criterion referenced, some want targets to be only criterion referenced.

### Question 1: What performance indicators should be included in the revised Achievement Index to measure Career & College Readiness (CCR)?

Options:

- A. 4 and 5 year graduation rates.
- B. 4, 5, 6, and 7 year graduation rates.
- C. Percent of students passing the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) assessments aligned to the Common Core Standards at a CCR level.<sup>1</sup>
- D. Percent of students earning at least one high school credit in dual credit courses.
- E. Percent of students earning high school credit in dual credit courses OR receiving an industry certificate.
- F. Postsecondary remediation rates.
- G. 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade drop out data.

### Recommendation:

There was general agreement among the AAW that the Index should include as sub-indicators of CCR the percent of students who passed the SBAC at a CCR level and the percent of students who earn high school credit in dual credit courses or receive an industry certificate. The members discussed graduation rates at length, and there was no consensus on whether or not to include graduation rates beyond 5 years.

<sup>1</sup> USED requires states' accountability systems to include four year graduation rates and the percent of students passing SBAC at a CCR level.

The AAW reached consensus that postsecondary remediation rates should not be included as accountability measures for schools for a variety of reasons. Members pointed out the lack of alignment between high school academic standards and higher education placement tests, and they were also concerned about the redundancy of measuring both postsecondary remediation rates and the percent of students passing at SBAC at a CCR level. In theory, the SBAC 11<sup>th</sup> grade test results should be the definitive indication that remedial coursework will be required in the future. Incorporating remediation rates in the Index might essentially amount to measuring the same factor twice.

## Additional Considerations & Questions:

- Members discussed the distinction between school and system accountability. A suggestion was made to include systemic performance indicators for legislative funding of K-12 education, while others saw value in including indicators purely for the purpose of setting system-wide goals and monitoring system performance, without regard to identifying individual low performing schools. Accordingly, some workgroup members were interested in defining accountability for the K-12 system (rather than schools) that might include Kindergarten readiness, K-12 indicators, and post-secondary indicators. It was suggested by a few committee members that WAKids, 3<sup>rd</sup> grade reading, and 8<sup>th</sup> grade math assessments should be considered as CCR “dipsticks” on the P-20 continuum.
- College remediation, enrollment, and/or completion rates could be included as a K-12 system accountability measure, along with the percent of students who secure a job.
- Members favorably discussed career readiness tests such as ACT WorkKeys, but acknowledged the associated costs as a practical constraint.

## **Question 2: Should the revised Index include English language acquisition data (Washington English Language Proficiency Assessment) in addition to content proficiency (MSP, HSPE) data?**

Options:

- A. Do not add English language acquisition data to the Index.
- B. Add English language acquisition, currently measured by WELPA, as an accountability measure.

## Recommendation:

The AAW unanimously supported including English language acquisition for English Language Learners as an accountability measure. Measuring language acquisition in addition to content proficiency could mitigate the impacts of testing ELLs in English when they are at a beginning level of language acquisition. However, members acknowledged that including language acquisition data results in creating a more complex Achievement Index.

USED is already requiring states to measure ELL proficiency and growth in the content areas of reading, math, writing, and science using MSP assessments. Choosing to include English language acquisition data requires decisions about how to measure language acquisition growth and proficiency in a revised Index.

In order to prevent conflicting state and federal accountability systems, it would be necessary to review Washington’s current Title III funding accountability measures for ELLs and determine whether those measures should be included in their current form, or if they should also be revised.

In the current ESEA framework, Washington's first Title III accountability measure is the percent of students whose WELPA score increased by one scale score point. For accountability purposes, progress is different than growth, which the Index will measure with student growth percentiles. The second Title III accountability measure is the percent of ELLs who attain English language proficiency, which is defined as scoring a level four on the WELPA.

### Additional Considerations & Questions:

- Is the WELPA a valid assessment of English language proficiency?
- The state should consider offering assessments in students' native languages, perhaps in the five most prevalent foreign languages.

### **Question 3: How should subgroups be (dis)aggregated for the purpose of accountability in the revised Index?**

Options:

- A. Use federal subgroups only. No change to current system.
- B. Use federal subgroups PLUS add new subgroups: former ELL and former Special Education.
- C. "Super overall" combining all at-risk race/ethnicity.
- D. "Super as needed" combining at-risk race/ethnicity.
- E. "Super as needed" combining all at-risk race/ethnicity, income, ELL, Special Education.
- F. Federal subgroups plus greater disaggregation than current.

### Recommendation:

The majority of AAW members supported using the federally required subgroups with the addition of two new subgroups: former ELL and former Special Education. The group discussed at length the distinction between reporting disaggregated data and using disaggregated data for accountability purposes and the trade-offs associated with both further disaggregation as well as creating "super" combined subgroups.

Some AAW members who initially advocated for further disaggregation ultimately preferred to use the federal subgroups plus former ELL and former Special Education for accountability; however, there was broad stakeholder agreement that data needs to be further disaggregated and made more readily available for reporting purposes.

Several AAW members preferred to use super subgroups combining racial/ethnic subgroups on an as needed basis for schools with small minority "N size." Although this would include more students for accountability purposes, AAW members acknowledged that this option would create additional complexity.

### Additional Considerations & Questions:

- If we adopt a "super as needed" approach, how would the Index deal with schools that experience fluctuations in their minority populations' N size?
- How long after exiting will former ELLs and Special Education students be tracked?
- Instead of creating a former ELL subgroup, ELLs should remain in the ELL subgroup after they have transitioned.
- The N size should be further reduced (was 30, now 20).
- Federal subgroups will create a system in which students are counted more than once.

- The non-low income subgroup should be carried forward into the revised Index.
- Some AAW members did not like using the term “at-risk” in this context.

## **Question 4: Should performance targets be criterion or norm referenced, or both?**

Options:

- A. Proficiency – Criterion or both
- B. Growth – Criterion or both
- C. Graduation Rates (CCR) – Criterion or both
- D. Other CCR Indicators – Criterion or both

### Recommendation

All AAW members want the Index to include criterion referenced performance targets, but frequent changes to assessments and our assessment system caused many AAW members to support using criterion and norm referenced performance targets as a provision measure. AAW members agreed that most targets should be criterion referenced but that in normed data should be taken into consideration as we transition to new assessments.

### Additional Considerations & Questions:

- The Index should only use criterion referenced performance targets when there is a clear standard. There may not be a clear standard for some of the other CCR indicators.