



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

A high-quality education system that prepares all students for college, career, and life.

Educational Service District 113, Mason & Lewis Room
6005 Tye Drive SW, Tumwater, WA 98512

June 20, 2017

Minutes

Webinar Participants:	Acting Chair Kevin Lavery, Ms. Connie Fletcher, Mr. Jeff Estes, Ms. MJ Bolt, Ms. Mona Bailey, Ms. Holly Koon, Mr. Peter Maier, Mr. Ryan Brault, Ms. Judy Jennings and Mr. Ricardo Sanchez (10)
In-Person Participants:	Mr. Chris Reykdal, Ms. Janis Avery and Dr. Alan Burke (3)
Members Absent:	Ms. Patty Wood, Mr. Joseph Hofman and Ms. Lindsey Salinas (3)
Staff Attending:	Mr. Ben Rarick, Ms. Kaaren Heikes, Mr. Parker Teed, Dr. Andrew Parr, Ms. Linda Sullivan-Colglazier, Ms. Alissa Muller and Ms. Denise Ross (7)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:01 a.m. by Acting Chair Lavery. He gave presiding authority to Member Avery. Ms. Ross conducted a roll call and confirmed a quorum of members were present.

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Accountability Systems Workgroup/Technical Advisory Committee Update

Dr. Michaela Miller, Deputy Superintendent, OSPI

Mr. Chris Reykdal, State Superintendent, OSPI

Dr. Deb Came, Assistant Superintendent, Assessment and Student Information, OSPI

Superintendent Reykdal reported on the progress of the ESSA state plan and the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's (OSPI) path forward before submitting the plan to Governor Inslee in the coming weeks. In addition to working with local stakeholders, OSPI has collaborated with OneAmerica and the Tribal Leaders Congress to discuss targeted subgroups that have consistently been identified as having the largest opportunity gaps. Superintendent Reykdal believes the proposed changes to the Achievement Index would allow for critical conversations about student groups that have been historically underserved.

Accountability Measures

Board members reviewed the accountability indicators and measures for the School Quality or Student Success indicator that were settled upon in January. Dr. Miller reported that OSPI decided not to modify the work that had already been completed by the Accountability System Workgroup (ASW) on the School Quality or Student Success measures. These measures are consistent with what other states are

using and OSPI staff are monitoring events taking place at the federal level as other states receive feedback on their submitted plans.

Dr. Miller presented the work of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in making sure the business rules that have already been developed for the School Quality or Student Success measures were vetted by stakeholders and were fair and transparent. The Committee analyzed multiple measurement options for each indicator against five criteria to inform the final indicator recommendations.

Comprehensive Support and Targeted Support Framework

Dr. Came presented on the Comprehensive Support Framework, which included the following:

- School performance by measure using a 1-10 scale approach with an even spread of schools throughout the scale;
- Thresholds will be fixed for several years and schools could see what would be required to move up in the Index;
- A school's performance on a measure translates to a decile rating;
- The lowest five percent schools would no longer be identified as Priority Schools, but as Comprehensive Support Schools using a threshold of combined multiple measures; and
- New addition of Targeted Support using the same threshold of combined multiple measures to identify schools with subgroups that are consistently underperforming;

The weighting of growth, proficiency, and the other indicators will be finalized at the final meeting of the TAC.

Members reviewed OSPI's multiple measures framework, which would allow schools to identify measures in areas they face the most challenges. The measures could be seen collectively in one view or separated by content as well. Measures would be displayed for the individual content areas instead of being averaged.

Dr. Came presented the Achievement Index dashboard mockup that would provide schools data on their measures based on subgroups or All Students. The dashboard sets a threshold of combined multiple measures to include the lowest performing five percent and identifying low-performing subgroups. Schools that are in the Lowest Performing group would receive Comprehensive Support. However, if a school is high-performing, but has subgroups that are low-performing, those subgroups might be identified for Targeted Support. The primary difference between the current Index website and the OSPI dashboard mockup is highlighting the subgroup performances within each measure. OSPI also proposes to freeze the tier cut points and the indicator rating cut points for at least three years, the time period separating school identifications.

Board members discussed the following:

- Ability to compare a school with other "like" schools;
- The need for professional development to help schools use the dashboard data in their school improvement plan;
- Concern about the perception that the minimum level of performance is acceptable;
- Giving recognition to schools when a student's growth is evident after they've left the school;
- Concern about the weighting of proficiency and growth for the measures and how that will drive funds and resources to challenged schools; and
- Federal requirements for always identifying the lowest five percent schools.

Summative Score

Dr. Miller reported the ASW is considering the four-tier model over the current six-tier model. Superintendent Reykdal stated the new model would be more visually effective and believes the new dashboard is more transparent than a summative score.

Board members were concerned about how schools will adapt to a data dashboard without a defined summative score.

Extended Graduation Rate

Dr. Came reminded the Board about the description of the graduation indicator in the draft consolidated state plan that used the on-time and extended graduation rates of five, six and seven years in the accountability framework, but put more emphasis on the four-year rate. She presented on another method that gives higher rating values to schools which show the greatest increases in extended graduation rates.

Board members discussed the following:

- Ensuring students are receiving a meaningful diploma;
- Definition of graduation; and
- Flexibility for the subgroup of students identified during their freshman year as being on an extended graduation path without it impacting the school's base score.

English Learner Proficiency Progress Measure

Dr. Came reported that English learner progress will be included in the Comprehensive Support framework in addition to proficiency, growth, graduation rates and School Quality or Student Success. The Accountability Systems Workgroup and Technical Advisory Committee will be considering two options regarding the English Learner Proficiency Measure:

- English Learner indicator as a stand-alone measure to identify low-performing schools for targeted support and as a separate category of targeted support, in addition to consistently underperforming subgroups; and
- Proportionally adjust the weights of English Language Arts proficiency and English learner progress based on English Learner population size.

Board Discussion

Board members discussed the following:

- Current business rules for school-related absences for students and the various reasons why students are absent;
- The need for clear communication on the display of the dashboard data; and
- Participation rates on state assessments.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:05 p.m. by Member Avery.
