12-11-2012

Report to Best Practices and Innovation Sub-Committee from Practitioner Task Force

Practitioner Task Force Members: Jon Bridges (Beaverton); Drew Braun (Bethel); Colin Cameron (COSA); Tim Drilling (Gresham-Barlow); Steve Jupe (Scappoose); Margie Lowe (OEIB); Tony Mann (Molalla); Bill Stewart (Gladstone)

Task: The OEIB Sub-Committee charged a group of Curriculum/Assessment Directors and Superintendents to look at current OEIB outcomes and recommendations generated from the field over the past year and generate recommendations that would add clarity to currently forming OEIB District Committees to assist in the goal setting process.

1. A **pre-populated graphic** should be developed and provided to each district setting goals. The base year for each district will be 2011-12 and project through 2021 for K-12 districts. Three sets of data need to be presented for each goal area selected and represented longitudinally through 2025. They are the **District Trajectory Line** (methodology presented in White Paper 2012, calculator available). The second line is the **Actual State Average** for the same goal using similar methodology, and the third is the **District Trend** line as it is measured for the current year and all others after and including 2011-2012.
2. Goals for each measured outcome will be developed by district processes considering all three sets of data provided annually. In order to use the most current data available the submission of the Achievement Compacts should occur no later than November annually. LEA's may submit their Achievement Compact as soon as they have arrived at the goals and strategies they intend to pursue. District analysis and goal setting for Improvement will be required for each goal area. Improvement will be **measured by annual and cumulative growth** represented by the three lines of District Trajectory, Actual State Average, and District Trend lines.
3. Consistently defined outcome measures will be provided by ODE Assessment department in graphic format* and table format** for district analysis and goal setting. It is recognized that formative and summative data gathered by districts will also take place. The following measures will help keep districts focused on the overall systematic changes necessary to achieve 40/40/20.
    A. **KRA (Base Year 2013-2014) **** (targets for participation only in first two years)
    B. **3rd Grade Reading ***
    C. **5th Grade Math ***
    D. **6th Grade Reading ***
    E. **6th Grade Attendance ****
    F. **8th Grade Math ***
    G. **9th Grade Attendance ****
    H. **9th Grade Credits On track (6 Credits) ***
    I. **College Credit at Graduation (9 or more credits) **** (rules need to be agreed upon for consistency)
    J. **4 Year Graduation Rate ****
    K. **5 Year Completer ***
    L. **Year 1 retention (OUS, minimum) ****

4. Local Measures are encouraged and will be helpful to inform districts. Examples of goals that could be considered would be around, student growth relative to their academic peers, Essential Skill completion, ASPIRE, AVID, Community involvement, SAT, ACT, Student activity involvement.
5. Recognizing and acknowledging the necessity of a trajectory reset is essential. As policy impacts annual growth measures it will be important to reset the slope of the trajectory line. Three examples are: Anticipated reset will come about as we phase in the **conjunctive model for essential skills** requiring students to be proficient in the areas of Reading, Writing and Mathematics by 2013-2014. Additionally, it may be necessary to reset trajectories based upon the impact of the implementation of **Smarter Balance** assessment in 2014-15. The anticipated increase in opportunities for students to gain **college credit** during high school years should accelerate goal attainment and also cause a reset.
6. Reporting the performance of groups and subgroups of students, that is consistent with FERPA, should continue. While we recognize the importance of each district negotiating an Achievement Compact, at the same time, setting meaningful targets for student categories with 6 or 8 students is challenging whether it is the "all students" category or the "disadvantaged students" category for the state's smallest districts, or a sub-population categories for larger districts. Therefore, all groups or subgroups should have a statistically valid cell size to be an Achievement Compact target setting category. A statistically valid minimum cell size could be combined with alternative methods to assist districts in meeting the minimum cell size such as combining students across multiple years. We recommend that OEIB establish a minimum cell size for a target setting category for which districts are then accountable.

Immediate Needs:

- Template for required February 1st report regarding District Achievement Compacts
- Template for submission of District Achievement Compact
- Template for required report that accompanies District Achievement Compacts
- Decision on adjusting timeline (November 15 or earlier)
- Decision on Achievement Compact Data (A-L)
- Define local measures and process for submission
- Establish clear and consistent rules regarding the eligible 'college credit at graduation' measures
- Establish of minimum cell size for compact accountability
- Establish criteria for KRA targets for 2013-14 and 2014-15

Reference Documents:

- September 21, 2012 Recommended Changes to Achievement Compacts
- September 21, 2012 Achievement Compact Accountability Measures Survey
- September 11, 2012 OASE Vision and Policy Preliminary Report
- June 1, 2012 Recommendations for Setting Achievement Compact Targets
- June 7, 2012 ECO N.W. Projections

Support Documents:

- November 30, 2012 Oregon Education Return on Investment Model
- No Date State Data Availability Chart
- December 5, 2012 Achievement Compact Trajectory Calculator