Standards & Assessment Workgroup: Where We’ve Been and Where We’re Going

Where We’ve Been
The Standards & Assessment Workgroup has been charged with considering how best to support districts in implementing the state’s rigorous content standards and how best to tailor our state’s assessment system to meet both the requirements under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and the needs of students and educators to improve student outcomes throughout students’ K-20 experience.

Work Group Progress
The Standards & Assessment Workgroup identified a long-term vision for how Oregon’s assessment system can best meet the needs of all students and reached a shared understanding of the purpose of different types of assessments. Additional information can be found in Version I of this document.

Ongoing Discussions
At the May 18th meeting, workgroup members continued to engage in the breakout groups formed at the previous meeting on April 26th. Workgroup member discussion incorporated perspectives and insights gleaned from the other Standards & Assessment breakout teams as well as the other workgroups. Workgroup members explored and discussed areas of standards implementation and resource needs, high school flexibility, summative assessment administration policies, as well as formative and interim assessment resource needs. Given the overarching impact and importance of accessibility across these areas, accessibility was discussed in each of the breakouts rather than as a stand-alone breakout group topic. The focus of the discussions were twofold, to continue previous conversation and build toward the development of initial
recommendations. Each section below highlights the breakout group discussion and actions that Oregon could explore to help move us as a state toward our long-term vision for Oregon’s assessment system.

At our May 18th meeting, this breakout group’s discussion expanded upon previous conversations and extended to new considerations for action around the following topics:

**Standards Implementation Resource Needs**
- Identified challenges as a result of the remaining implementation gap that exists for Oregon’s adopted standards to focus recommendations for action
- A variety of ways to increase stakeholder engagement in the creation, revision, and review of standards during the adoption process
- The importance of and suggestions for a supportive approach to adoption and implementation of new standards

**High School Flexibility**
- The purpose of assessing at the high school level, including measuring the success of students, schools, districts and state systems
- Implications for ensuring equitable opportunities (not just equal opportunities) and accessibility supports for all students, regardless of which assessment a school district administers
- Implications of offering flexibility to higher education entrance and/or placement determinations
- Implications for transparency and comparability across school districts
- Values we want to ensure are reflected in the evaluation process should Oregon decide to approve additional assessments for high school flexibility

**Summative Assessment Administration Policies**
- Implications of and a variety of suggestions for reducing the time spent on summative assessment testing
- Differences and similarities of the relevance and purpose of summative assessments across grade levels and content areas
- The need to ensure that test content is accessible and culturally appropriate for all students
- Considerations for a long-term vision of Oregon’s assessment system

**Formative & Interim Assessment Resource Needs**
- The need to build capacity and infrastructure for interim assessments to balance the role they play in relation to summative assessments in Oregon’s statewide assessment system
- The need for including educators in the local development and scoring of interim assessments
- Potential implications of incorporating interim assessments into Oregon’s accountability system
- Implications for students in poverty, students with disabilities, and English learners
Where We’re Going

At our June 28th meeting, the Standards & Assessment Workgroup will be focusing on recommendations for short- or near-term action in the following areas:

- Standards Implementation Resource Needs
- High School Flexibility
- Summative Assessment Administration Policies
- Formative & Interim Assessment Resource Needs

The full workgroup will have opportunities to share with one another across breakout discussion areas and as a whole group. By the end of the day, considerations will be formulated for how best to build out Oregon’s statewide assessment system through our State Plan and our implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).
Accountability Workgroup: Where We’ve Been and Where We’re Going

Where We’ve Been
The Accountability Workgroup has been charged with considering how to design an accountability and reporting system in order to support school improvement efforts and to effectively communicate school quality with Oregon parents and other stakeholders.

Work Group Progress
At our May 18th meeting, the Accountability Workgroup focused on which indicators could be added to the accountability and reporting system.

Review of Indicators Used by Other States
- The group reviewed non-academic indicators currently used by other states in their accountability systems. Many of the example indicators could be utilized in Oregon using existing data collections, while a few would require new statewide data collections.
- The group decided to address three broad categories of alternate indicators: college and career readiness, school climate, and equity. The workgroup broke into groups to discuss these separately.

College and Career Readiness
- The group felt strongly that college and career readiness was a K-12 issue and that early indicators of students being on-track should be considered.
- The group came up with a number of potential indictors, several of which were indicators reported on Achievement Compacts, such as chronic absenteeism and 9th grade on-track.
School Climate
- The group acknowledged school climate is a very important measure, but did not come to consensus about how the data should be collected, given those data will be disaggregated by student group.
- Several group members indicated school climate data should be reported, but expressed concern about its use as an accountability indicator.

Equity
- The group unanimously identified equity as a core value that should be addressed in the new accountability system, including the non-academic indicators. Equitable access, outcomes, and school climate are all critical elements to student success.
- Several members of the group expressed these data should come from surveys of parents and students. That said, additional work is necessary to identify these and other data elements that will spark the most valuable community conversations.

Ongoing Discussions
Workgroup members have identified additional topics for discussion. These include:

- **Designing a Dashboard**
  The group feels very strongly that a multiple measures dashboard needs to be created to better communicate with parents and other community members
- **Additional Indicators**
  At the end of the day the workgroup narrowed the list of potential indicators to a small set at each grade band. ODE staff will research and return with data on Oregon’s performance, where available.

On May 26 the U.S. Department of Education released draft regulation on the accountability system. ODE staff and the workgroup must review these regulations to determine whether they affect any of the existing leanings of the Accountability workgroup.

Where We’re Going
By the end of the June 28th meeting, the Accountability Workgroup plans to put forward considerations regarding:

- The use and design of a multiple measures dashboard
- School quality/student success indicators
- Methods for identifying low performing schools for supports and interventions
- Identifying modifications of an accountability system to fairly include alternative schools in the identification of low performing schools
- Determining the role that participation will play in the accountability system
The Educator Effectiveness Workgroup has been charged with the task of identifying possible supports for districts to better ensure that every Oregon student is taught by a high quality, effective teacher and every Oregon school building is led by a high quality, effective educational leader. This includes discussions regarding the implications of Senate Bill 290, considerations for improving how state and local districts might better determine the effectiveness of educators, as well as how best to infuse elements of the Equitable Access to Excellent Educators Plan into Oregon’s State Plan under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

The Educator Effectiveness Workgroup created a purpose statement and identified the essential elements of an Educator Evaluation System to guide revisions and implementation of Oregon’s educator evaluation system. The workgroup also engaged in a comprehensive review and analysis of Senate Bill 290 and the related OAR’s and determined that no significant changes are needed to improve the language in the statute. They also discussed potential revisions to the Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) to allow flexibility with regard to assessments used in educator evaluations.

At the May 18th meeting the work group continued discussions around the inconsistency of implementing educator evaluations and identified the need for support and culturally responsive professional learning for educators and administrators to implement an evaluation tool with fidelity.
During the May 18th meeting, workgroup members:

- Reviewed the features and function of the Oregon Matrix
- Discussed the pros and cons of implementing the Oregon Matrix as a summative evaluation model.
- Considered what an Oregon summative evaluation model should look like, including the potential to use a common rubric for evaluating educators statewide.

Where We’re Going
At the June 28th meeting, the workgroup will continue to focus on the Equitable Access to Excellent Educators Plan and the OARS related to Senate Bill 290, and state licensure requirements.

- Create a working definition for “excellent educator” and “excellent school leader” without the constraints of HQT (Highly Qualified Teacher).
- Identify key considerations in the areas of human capital management, ongoing professional learning, and teacher and principal preparation, consistent with the Equitable Access to Educator Plan to ensure access the excellent educators and school leaders for traditionally marginalized student populations.
- Finalize recommended revisions to the OARS regarding flexibility in the use of state assessments for evaluations, the Oregon Matrix, and other potential alternative rating tools.
- Consider guidance regarding state licensure requirements to meet ESSA requirements with the elimination of HQT.
School Improvement Workgroup: Where We’ve Been and Where We’re Going

Where We’ve Been

The School Improvement workgroup has been charged with developing a proposed framework of supports for schools identified for comprehensive and targeted improvement. Thus far, the group has established consensus recommendations pertaining to the various stages of the improvement process.

Work Group Progress

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) provides the option to set-aside up to 3% of the overall State Education Agency (SEA) Title I allocation to support direct student services. The workgroup reached clear consensus to maintain these funds as part of the larger statewide allocation for the following rationale:

- Little support for additional competitive processes
- Potential to see funds be used inefficiently or without quality control elements
- Unintended consequences for LEAs and Schools
- Inadvertently creates inequities

The group also discussed strategies for stronger support and engagement in the improvement process at the school district and school board level as well as the importance of establishing interim improvement indicators in the planning process, which is a departure from the summative measures states and systems have been historically reliant upon.
**Ongoing Discussions**

Vital to developing a proposed framework, the workgroup discussed the following key elements.

**Local Measures, Context and Control:** In each of the four stages of the improvement process – identification, diagnostic review and planning, monitoring, and exit – the workgroup emphasized the need to address local context and control. Frequent sentiments included:

- Students, schools, and LEAs in Oregon are incredibly diverse and supports should be differentiated accordingly; move away from the one-size-fits-all model
- Systems continue to replicate gaps - breaking the status quo requires comprehensive district systems and aligned investments
- Excitement around a peer-review process for improvement planning
- Agreement on the “What” regarding improvement strategies with autonomy given to Local Education Agency’s (LEA) and schools to establish the “How”

**Identification and Differentiation:** Continuing with the notion that “school improvement” should be more inclusive than minimum federal requirements, the workgroup discussed how Oregon might address the ESSA requirements while building a broader, more robust system. Frequent sentiments included:

- Improvement planning and measures need to be flexible; what makes sense for K-5 won’t work for high schools and what works for an urban school might not be effective in rural situations
- Allowing for more measures to determine academic achievement (not just Smarter Balanced)
- Inclusion of educator evaluation data in identification of schools and districts
- Review of district systems when reviewing school-level context
- External review of school and district context

**Interventions, Alignment of Data, and Timelines:** The workgroup capitalized on the experience and reflection around current processes. Knowing that improvement efforts take time to develop, implement and see results, the conversations focused on interim measures and the data and information LEAs and schools can use to keep improvement efforts on track. Frequent sentiments included:

- Emphasis on interim and leading indicators of success; less emphasis on outcomes to determine early improvement
- Establishing alignment and coherence with outcome data (achievement) and the need to change inputs (instruction, professional learning & growth, etc.)
- Deeper investment in teacher leadership and voice in the planning and implementation processes
- Stronger support (more than a workshop or “training”) for developing principals as turnaround leaders / change agents
- Systematic root-cause analysis
- Improvement and turnaround takes time – establish the interim benchmarks and make small adjustments to strategies, not measures
Where We’re Going

Moving forward, the workgroup has requested to review and revise a skeleton framework of the improvement process - from Identification to Exit - that captures the themes and principles shared thus far. Additionally, the workgroup requested a review of the Indistar indicators for considered revisions to align with the revised improvement processes.

Workgroup members expressed a desire to know what themes are emerging, nationally. Coincidentally, ODE staff will be participating in national conversations and workgroups focused on integrating the Equitable Access to Educators plan in school turnaround (improvement) efforts as well as a national workgroup on developing supports and interventions for schools in improvement status. These two events will happen before the final workgroup meeting on June 28 where themes, lessons learned, peer feedback and takeaways will be shared with the workgroup.

By the close of the day on June 28, work group members will propose a framework that reflects the principles discussed during the previous meetings and appropriately situates these shifts within each phase of the improvement cycle (from identification to exit). These shifts include earlier engagement with LEA personnel and schoolboards to support the diagnostic review and planning process, more focused planning on fewer improvement priorities, and establishing leading indicators of improvement at the beginning of the identification period.