Ron Saxton

A Conceptual Framework for Achievement Compacts

DISCUSSION DRAFT #3

1) Achievement Compacts
   - Required in exchange for receipt of state funds.
   - In effect for 2012-13. With existing appropriations for 2012-13.
   - Requires legislative approval; will specify parameters (see "Terms').
   - Between the OEIB and the state's educational districts and institutions.
   - To be discussed:
     - For early childhood: Outcomes-based contracts (separately designed).
     - For OUS: With the Higher Ed Board or with individual institutions?
     - OHSU: Medical, dental and nursing schools.
     - Workforce
     - OSAC

2) Terms of Achievement Compacts
   Each component implies measures of efficiency, includes equity measures.
   - Completion
     - Diplomas, certificates, degrees
     - What about pre-high school completion measures? By benchmarks and "learning stages?"
   - Quality
     - Validations of knowledge and skills
     - Must be uniform
     - Align with Common Core standards
     - Summative/adaptive/formative testing?
     - Assessments by teachers?
   - Connections
     - Workforce and economy
     - Civic society

   Also: Institutional role and responsibilities within the P-20 continuum

3) Relationship to Funding
   - Baseline funding for K-12 remains equalized and, ideally, stabilized and predictable for all districts
   - Funding for innovation and adoption of best practices in addition to the baseline
   - Later: Funding for outcomes? Funds targeted to learning stages?

4) Responses to Different Levels of Achievement
   - Based on comparisons of districts with comparable student populations and, in the case of post-secondary, comparable missions
   - Achievement compacts provide maximum flexibility (e.g. release from Division 22's state rules and reports)
   - Failures to achieve = diagnosis, interventions and support; potentially, more regulation and direction, e.g. more prescriptive state funding
   - To be discussed: Targeted support in 2012-13?
   - Exceptional achievement = ?

   Challenge of motivation to engage in continuous improvement

Note: This is Roger Bassett's personal view of the Oregon Education Investment Framework to date and has no other standing. 10/24/2011

0 – 20 — A student or personal success pathway

40-40-20 — An expression of the policy assumption that employment and the economy rise with education levels

State of Oregon's Investment Framework:

EIB Investment Focus	Funding Category (agree on terminology)
• Leadership/vision/new directions - This should become the Oregon version of national grants for break-through approaches/practices	Strategic Investment Grants (very small percentage of state funding)
• Targeted Investment in 0 – 20 Pathway thru key leverage points (see learner grps and selected leverage points for each) - Distinct (from achievement compact). Grants/funding for purpose of leveraged progress along 0-20. Funding to the trailblazers who commit to develop new practices that serve 0-20 success (recast 11-14, for example).	Proficiency/performance Payments (slightly larger and slowly growing percentage)
• Commitment to capacity - Lump sum payment learning Organization can count on.	Sustainable Block Grants with outcome-based achievement compacts (primary commitment of state funds)

Note: Emphasis on the state's role as investor changes, but does not eliminate its interest in how services are delivered. Achievement Compacts must address both (the "System" in OUS; ESD's are examples).

Achievement Compact *Note: applies to all, not just to K-12. Workforce delivery? Early childhood delivery?*

- Sole expression of state's ongoing expectations and vehicle for Sustainability Grants
- Three levels: (agree on levels and terms)
  - Performing
  - Improving
  - Intervention
- Primary expression of state and federal interest in school/institution/provider performance
  - Progress along the 0 – 20 pathway must be primary criterion for evaluation
  - Federal/state accountability rubrics must be collapsed into one (including workforce services)

Note: This is Roger Bassett's personal view of the Oregon Education Investment Framework to date and has no other standing. 10/24/2011

0 – 20 — A student or personal success pathway

40-40-20 — An expression of the policy assumption that employment and the economy rise with education levels

State of Oregon's Investment Framework:

EIB Investment Focus	Funding Category (agree on terminology)
• Leadership/vision/new directions - This should become the Oregon version of national grants for break-through approaches/practices	Strategic Investment Grants (very small percentage of state funding)
• Targeted Investment in 0 – 20 Pathway thru key leverage points (see learner grps and selected leverage points for each) - Distinct (from achievement compact). Grants/funding for purpose of leveraged progress along 0-20. Funding to the trailblazers who commit to develop new practices that serve 0-20 success (recast 11-14, for example).	Proficiency/performance Payments (slightly larger and slowly growing percentage)
• Commitment to capacity - Lump sum payment learning Organization can count on.	Sustainable Block Grants with outcome-based achievement compacts (primary commitment of state funds)

Note: Emphasis on the state's role as investor changes, but does not eliminate its interest in how services are delivered. Achievement Compacts must address both (the "System" in OUS; ESD's are examples).

Achievement Compact *Note: applies to all, not just to K-12. Workforce delivery? Early childhood delivery?*

- Sole expression of state's ongoing expectations and vehicle for Sustainability Grants
- Three levels: (agree on levels and terms)
  - Performing
  - Improving
  - Intervention
- Primary expression of state and federal interest in school/institution/provider performance
  - Progress along the 0 – 20 pathway must be primary criterion for evaluation
  - Federal/state accountability rubrics must be collapsed into one (including workforce services)

ACHIEVEMENT COMPACT (K12)

1. **Investment:** In the 2012-13 fiscal year, the State will invest $XX million with SCHOOL DISTRICT through the State School Fund.

2. **Outcomes:** In exchange for that investment, the Board of Directors of SCHOOL DISTRICT agrees to pursue continuous improvement on measures of the following outcomes:

	2011-12	2012-13 Target
Ready to Learn		
% students ready to learn at kindergarten enrollment		
% students ready to learn by age 7		
Achievement gap placeholder		
Numeracy/Literacy Fluency		
% of students proficient at age 9		
% of students proficient at age 11		
Achievement gap placeholder		
Ready for Rigor in Reading and Math		
% of students proficient at age 13		
% of students proficient at age 14		
% of student proficient at age 17		
Achievement gap placeholder		
Ready for College/Career Entry		
# of students who graduate with diploma		
# of students who graduate with diploma and proficient		
# of dropouts		
Locally/Globally Competitive		
# First-time postsecondary enrollees		

3. **Flexibility:** For the 2012-13 fiscal year, SCHOOL DISTRICT is granted the following flexibilities:

ODE developing list

4. **Consequence:** Those districts that show consistent progress on these measuring the next school year will be given the opportunity to petition for further flexibilities in the next Achievement Compact. Those districts that fail to show progress may be subject to tighter oversight and more prescriptive intervention by the State.

5. **Conditions:** This is a public agreement and can be amended by mutual consent.

SMALL DISTRICT

MATH

Students' Age at Time of Test	13	14	16
Share Meeting 2010-11 8th Grade Standard	43%	47%	53%
Expectation			
50th percentile district	45%	57%	71%
75th percentile district	46%	60%	74%
90th percentile district	50%	64%	76%

READING

Students' Age at Time of Test	13	14	16
Share Meeting 2010-11 8th Grade Standard	53%	60%	84%
Expectation			
50th percentile district	53%	68%	84%
75th percentile district	57%	72%	86%
90th percentile district	58%	74%	87%

MID SIZED DISTRICT

MATH

Students' Age at Time of Test	13	14	16
Share Meeting 2010-11 8th Grade Standard	54%	64%	75%
Expectation			
50th percentile district	55%	66%	75%
75th percentile district	57%	68%	77%
90th percentile district	60%	71%	79%

READING

Students' Age at Time of Test	13	14	16
Share Meeting 2010-11 8th Grade Standard	70%	78%	89%
Expectation			
50th percentile district	67%	76%	88%
75th percentile district	70%	79%	89%
90th percentile district	72%	81%	90%

Expectations projected using prior test scores and most state-observable characteristics.

SMALL DISTRICT

MATH

Students' Age at Time of Test	13	14	16
Share Meeting 2010-11 8th Grade Standard	43%	47%	53%
Expectation			
50th percentile district	45%	57%	71%
75th percentile district	46%	60%	74%
90th percentile district	50%	64%	76%

READING

Students' Age at Time of Test	13	14	16
Share Meeting 2010-11 8th Grade Standard	53%	60%	84%
Expectation			
50th percentile district	53%	68%	84%
75th percentile district	57%	72%	86%
90th percentile district	58%	74%	87%

MID SIZED DISTRICT

MATH

Students' Age at Time of Test	13	14	16
Share Meeting 2010-11 8th Grade Standard	54%	64%	75%
Expectation			
50th percentile district	55%	66%	75%
75th percentile district	57%	68%	77%
90th percentile district	60%	71%	79%

READING

Students' Age at Time of Test	13	14	16
Share Meeting 2010-11 8th Grade Standard	70%	78%	89%
Expectation			
50th percentile district	67%	76%	88%
75th percentile district	70%	79%	89%
90th percentile district	72%	81%	90%

Expectations projected using prior test scores and most state-observable characteristics.