HOUSE BILL REPORT
HB 1714

As Reported by House Committee On:
Education

Title: An act relating to the achievement index rating system.

Brief Description: Concerning the achievement index rating system.

Sponsors: Representatives Manweller and Bergquist.

Brief History:
  Committee Activity:
    Education: 2/9/15, 2/17/15 [DPS].

Brief Summary of Substitute Bill

- Requires that the identification of schools and school districts for recognition must be based on separate performance indicators, such as proficiency or growth beginning August 1, 2015.

- Provides that the State Board of Education may not combine performance indicators into a single index rating, or score, except for accountability purposes under the No Child Left Behind Act.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Majority Report: The substitute bill be substituted therefor and the substitute bill do pass. Signed by 21 members: Representatives Santos, Chair; Ortiz-Self, Vice Chair; Reykdal, Vice Chair; Magendanz, Ranking Minority Member; Muri, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Stambaugh, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Bergquist, Caldier, Fagan, Gregory, Griffey, Hargrove, Hayes, S. Hunt, Kilduff, Klippert, Lytton, McCaslin, Orwall, Pollet and Springer.

Staff: Megan Wargacki (786-7194).

Background:

No Child Left Behind.

This analysis was prepared by non-partisan legislative staff for the use of legislative members in their deliberations. This analysis is not a part of the legislation nor does it constitute a statement of legislative intent.

The 2001 federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act was designed to hold public schools accountable for improving the education of all children. The NCLB Act created a system of quality ratings for schools and sanctions for schools that do not meet specific goals for student achievement. Schools and school districts are required to make "adequate yearly progress" by meeting established annual goals for scores on state assessments in mathematics and reading, graduation rates, and unexcused absence rates.

Achievement Index.
History. The 2005 Legislature directed the State Board of Education (SBE) to "implement a standards-based accountability system of academic achievement." The System Performance Accountability Advisory Committee of the SBE met between 2007 and 2010 to develop the accountability system.

In January 2009, the SBE adopted a resolution to develop a fair, consistent, and easily understood Achievement Index (AI) for the purposes of providing feedback to schools and districts to: self-assess, recognize schools with exemplary performance, and identify schools with poor performance.

As part of the 2009 legislation, Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2261, the SBE, and the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) were directed to seek approval for use of the AI for federal accountability purposes under the NCLB Act. In mid-2012 Washington received a waiver to use the AI for federal accountability.

In July 2012, the SBE and the OSPI began to revise the AI to include student growth data and college and career readiness indicators.

Summary of Performance Indicators and Weighting. The revised AI uses three performance indicators: proficiency, student growth, and career and college readiness. The composite AI is the three-year average of the three most recent annual AI values for each performance indicator.
- The Proficiency Indicator is a combination of the percent of students who earned a passing score on state assessments in reading, writing, mathematics, and science, weighted equally.
- The Growth Indicator is a combination of median student growth percentiles in reading and mathematics, weighted equally.
- The Career and College Readiness Indicator is a combination multiple measures of college and career readiness, including graduation rates, dual credit attainment, industry certification, and student proficiency.

Each indicator is rated on a scale from one to 10, then the indicators are weighted as follows:

	Proficiency Indicator	Growth Indicator	Career and College Readiness Indicator
Elementary & Middle Schools	40%	60%	Not applicable
High Schools	33%	33%	33%

Summary of Substitute Bill:

Beginning August 1, 2015, the identification of schools and school districts for recognition must be based on separate performance indicators, such as proficiency or growth, so the SBE may not combine performance indicators into a single index rating, or score, except for accountability purposes under the NCLB Act.

Substitute Bill Compared to Original Bill:

The requirement that the SBE use an alternate model for weighing various performance indicators in the AI is removed. Instead, beginning August 1, 2015, the identification of schools and districts for recognition must be based on separate performance indicators.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Available. A new fiscal note was requested on February 18, 2015.

Effective Date of Substitute Bill: The bill takes effect 90 days after adjournment of the session in which the bill is passed.

Staff Summary of Public Testimony:

(In support) The state grades schools by the number of students passing the statewide assessments and by how much better students are doing each year. This bill creates a statistical pivot: as the school does better, the growth component counts for more of the score. The bill uses the existing model up to a 60 percent proficiency rating. This makes the statistical mechanism to measure the quality of a school more appropriate, but also incentivizes schools to continue to improve. The substitute bill prevents any school from being harmed by requiring the SBE to use its current model and the alternate model, but to only post the higher score. Large schools are not affected by a small number of students passing or improving. But in small schools, a few students doing better or worse changes the rating of the school dramatically. A highly proficient school with very little growth should not be penalized.

(Neutral) The SBE weakened the elementary and middle schools by adding student growth to the AI and weighting it so heavily. In other states that have done this, proficiency in the schools have gone down due to schools focusing too much on growth. In this current version, fewer schools are scored and there is less transparency. The accountability system to the federal government.

(Opposed) The bill would apply the new AI differently to different schools. The timeline in the bill is too soon to get any change made. Federal law requires the state to submit an accountability workbook each year for every school in the state. If the AI is changed, the state's accountability workbook would have to get reapproved. There is a chance the federal

government might not approve this new AI. The AI is a fluid document in process. There has not been a year over the past four years where there has not been a change. Changing the AI in statute would make improvements very difficult. The SBE could add explanations to its website about the AI to show how the pivot points are currently working. There are already considerations in the AI that get at the concerns addressed in the bill. There is a minimum student count for each school; a school without 20 students does not get an AI rating. There is no school in this state that has such a high level of proficiency that it cannot also improve in its student growth rating.

Persons Testifying: (In support) Representative Manweller, prime sponsor.

(Neutral) Liv Finne, Washington Policy Center.

(Opposed) Ben Rarick, State Board of Education; and Gil Mendoza, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Persons Signed In To Testify But Not Testifying: None.