

A Comparison of 2008 K-12 Education Stakeholder Proposals to the Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force – by Barb Billinghamurst 07/2008

Accountability System			
	OSPI	LEV	FFC
Principles	Waiting for SBE proposals.	Local decision makers have flexibility to determine the best use of money to meet local needs. In return for broader local flexibility, the state demands results and expects implementation of a disciplined set of policies and measurable objectives. Use state’s existing data systems but more needs to be done to link spending decisions at school, district and state levels to student outcomes.	Accountability is a two-way street. Schools are held accountable for achieving specific education goals. The degree to which schools are expected to meet goals is aligned with the level of resources allocated to basic education. Districts exercise local control over how to best meet the state’s performance objective and accountability requirements.
Who sets the goals?		Districts and states together agree to set achievement goals for given level of funding. <i>(sounds like each district would set its own achievement goals)</i>	Commission for Quality Education in Washington determines the proportion of the student population that can be expected to achieve any given performance standard The commission takes into account the students who for physical limitations or other reasons are not expected to completely meet the goal. <i>(sounds like the Commission would apply the same set of performance goals to all districts; but a district’s specific level of achievement would depend on the district’s demographics)</i>
What are the goals		“quickly move underachieving students of all racial and income groups toward Washington’s standards”	Ensure all students meet state’s basic education standards. If state is serious about <i>all</i> students achieving state educational goals, then state must have the knowledge to consider capacity, technical issues, existing research, and resource-needs of different student populations in setting goals. (Part of rationale for new Commission)

A Comparison of 2008 K-12 Education Stakeholder Proposals to the Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force – by Barb Billinghamurst 07/2008

<p>Who plays a role in accountability system?</p>		<p>System of accountability should include students, parents, teachers, principals, districts, OSPI and legislature.</p>	<p>In order to achieve broader state goals, state should consider whether the 8 major constituent groups have each established certain conditions or demonstrated appropriate performance in various areas.</p> <p>8 Major Constituent Groups: Students, Classroom Practices, Teachers, Schools, Central Administrations, Local School Boards, Executive Branch, & Legislative Branch.</p>
<p>How goals are measured.</p>		<p>Achievement targets would use value-added measures to illustrate the gains of cohorts over time rather than comparing test scores across cohorts.</p>	<p>Developed desired conditions or measures for each constituent group above.</p> <p>Develop performance indicators for Basic Education goals that include but are not limited to student performance.</p> <p>Specifically, school performance is based on multiple measures such as assessment results, on-time graduation rates, grade progression, and attendance.</p>
<p>What is the process?</p>		<p>Districts and states together agree to set achievement goals for given level of funding.</p> <p>Achievement targets would use value-added measures to illustrate the gains of cohorts over time rather than comparing test scores across cohorts.</p> <p>The analysis of this achievement data should part of the process for evaluating teachers.</p> <p>Evaluation of teachers using student achievement data must be tempered by students' socioeconomic factors.</p>	<p>Commission for Quality Education would be accountable to legislature and governor.</p> <p>Commission's role is to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine annually the resources necessary to ensure prototype school models achieve all basic education goals at their specified levels. • Help legislature determine fiscal impact of proposed legislation on prototype schools. • Identify performance indicators that can be quantified and tracked over time for schools. • Determine expected performance levels for a given level of funding; adjust performance goals accordingly. • Review the results from the data collected on each of the performance indicators and issue a report assessing the performance of Washington schools relative to basic education goals. Assessment would take into account the resources provided in relation to the performance achieved.

A Comparison of 2008 K-12 Education Stakeholder Proposals to the Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force – by Barb Billinghamurst 07/2008

<p>Data collection needs</p>		<p>The state has recently linked student achievement records to individual teachers.</p> <p>Use state’s existing data systems but more needs to be done to link spending decisions at school, district and state levels to student outcomes.</p> <p>Principles, teachers and district leaders should have access to better achievement data.</p> <p>A revamped accounting structure is needed to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report all forms of staff compensation • Delineate spending on key functions including K-3, 4-5, 6-8, 9-12 regular instruction, special education outside regular classrooms, special education within regular classrooms, professional development and other noninstructional programs. <p>Build an integrated P-20 data system to track student progress.</p>	<p>Commission needs to be able to connect funding to staff & resources by program by school or teacher to school-wide or individual student performance on selected measures.</p> <p>Commission tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine data needs to develop model that shows the relationship between funding and achievement of basic education goals. Develop the model. • Issue annual technical report to governor and legislature showing impact of various levels of funding on the performance of education system. Use model to run the various scenarios possible for different funding levels. • Issue nontechnical report to public showing the degree to which different performance goals were attained and reasons why some goals may not have been fully met.
<p>Awards for meeting goals</p>		<p>\$100 or more per full-time students target entire school that meet or exceed achievement targets.</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>
<p>Consequences of not meeting goals.</p>		<p>State deploy external inspectors to chronically underperforming schools to assess school’s process for setting goals, developing plans, monitoring student performance, and building the skills & knowledge of its instructional staff.</p> <p>Inspectors also evaluate district support.</p> <p>Inspectors make recommendations for improvement.</p>	<p>Struggling schools or districts receive progressive levels of support and assistive measures after a thorough diagnosis is undertaken to determine the reasons they are struggling.</p>