
2012-13 Achievement Compact

POLICY ISSUE/SITUATION

Under Senate Bill 1581, all districts in Oregon are required to submit a completed Achievement Compact prior to the start of the next fiscal year.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

At the April 23rd Board Work session, the Board reviewed the Achievement Compact requirements, measures, and baseline data. The degree of alignment between the Achievement Compact measures and the District's Strategic Plan measures was discussed. The Board expressed support for the collaborative work by the Beaverton, Eugene, Portland, and Salem-Keizer School Districts to provide statewide leadership in this first year of the implementation of Achievement Compacts.

Since the meeting, the four districts have continued to collaboratively work through issues. A White Paper provides guidance for districts in collecting baseline data and proposes methodologies for establishing targets for the 2012-13 school year aligned with the state's 40-40-20 goal. The four districts will propose to each Board targets for 2012-13 using the goal setting methods outlined in the White Paper. The White Paper also identified issues that the Oregon Education Investment Board [OEIB] should consider revisiting prior to issuing the permanent rules for the achievement compacts.

Under the temporary rule, 705-010-0035 Completion and Execution of Achievement Compacts, The OEIB "may waive the requirement to identify both a target number and percentage of students and require either a number or percentage for specific outcome measures, depending on the specifications of the compacts it approves". Staff recommends the Board request a waiver from establishing numeric targets for each outcome. Numeric targets for 2012-13 can be established by applying the percentage target proposed in the Achievement Compact to the size of the group once the size of the group is known. To establish numeric targets now for 2012-13 requires prediction of group sizes for next year. Numeric targets established on these predictions are meaningless as soon as the actual group size diverges from the predicted group size.

RECOMMENDATION:

(12-185) The Board adopts the proposed outcome targets in the 2012-13 Achievement Compact and directs the Superintendent to submit the completed compact to the Oregon Education Investment Board with a request for a waiver from completing the numeric targets.

K-12 / ESD Achievement Compact
Beaverton SD - 2243 6/12/12

College and Career Ready: Are students completing high school ready for college or career?										
	9th graders of 2006-07	Dis-advantaged	9th graders of 2007-08	Dis-advantaged	9th graders of 2008-09	Dis-advantaged	9th graders of 2009-10	Dis-advantaged	9th graders of 2012-13	Dis-advantaged
4-Year Graduation Rate	76%	62%	77%	65%			78%	67%		
5-Year Graduation Rate	80%	67%			81%	69%	83%	71%		
5-Year Completion Rate	86%	77%			87%	79%	89%	82%		
Post-Secondary Enrollment	74%	61%			75%	63%	77%	65%		
Earning 9+ College Credits			25%	18%			25%	19%		

Disadvantaged is aggregate of disadvantaged student groups (details on pp. 2-4)

Gray shaded boxes are district-provided projections and goals **2012-13 goals are optional

Progression: Are students making sufficient progress toward college and career readiness?										
	2009-10 All	Dis-advantaged	2010-11 All	Dis-advantaged	2011-12 All*	Dis-advantaged	2012-13 Goal All	Dis-advantaged	4-Year Goal (2015-16)**	Dis-advantaged
Ready for School	Kindergarten readiness assessment under development									
3rd Gr. Reading Proficiency	70%	57%	72%	59%			75%	63%		
3rd Gr. Math Proficiency	64%	52%	74%	61%			77%	65%		
6th Grade On-Track	87%	83%	89%	85%			89%	85%		
9th Grade On-Track			73%	58%			76%	62%		

*Estimate based on most recent available data **2016 Goals are optional

Equity: Are students succeeding across all buildings and populations?										
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13 Goal	4-Year Goal (2015-16)**					
Priority & Focus Schools*	0	0	4%	4%						
DISAGGREGATED DATA AND GOALS FOR EACH DISADVANTAGED STUDENT GROUP LISTED ON PP 2-4										

*Prior to 2012-13, school in federal AYP "Need Improvement" status **4-year Goals are optional

Local Priorities: What other measures reflect key priorities in the district? (optional, up to 3)										
	Year	Dis-advantaged	Year	Dis-advantaged	Year	Dis-advantaged	1-Year Goal	Dis-advantaged	4-Year Goal**	Dis-advantaged

**4-year Goal optional

Investment: What is the public investment in the district? (does not include capital investments)					
	2010-11	2011-12*	2012-13*	2012-13 QEM recommended	
Formula Revenue	\$260,397,891	\$271,317,069	\$280,593,419	\$378,041,402	District Share
Local Revenue not passed through formula	\$27,137,992	\$13,039,121	\$10,167,500		District Official
Federal Revenue	\$43,945,882	\$28,606,200	\$25,572,564		
State Grants not passed through formula	\$3,923,961	\$968,984	\$989,984		

The tan fields are optional. Districts will fill the blue fields with their targets, the gray fields with estimates of current/past data (if available).

OEIB Chief Education Officer

K-12 / ESD Achievement Compact
Beaverton SD - 2243 6/12/12

Equity: Are students succeeding across all populations?									
9th Graders of 2006-07									
	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	Hispanic origin	American Indian / Alaska Native	Pacific Islander	Asian	TAG (not included in aggregate)
4-Year Graduation Rate	60%	55%	58%	70%	51%	47%		89%	92%
5-Year Graduation Rate	66%	63%	64%	74%	58%	53%		92%	95%
5-Year Completion Rate	77%	68%	81%	82%	65%	59%		95%	>95%
Earning 9+ College Credits									
Post-Secondary Enrollment	60%	54%	47%	81%	51%	73%		80%	88%
2009-10									
3rd Gr. Reading Proficiency	51%	45%	53%	51%	46%	71%	-	83%	>95%
3rd Gr. Math Proficiency	46%	45%	47%	42%	44%	64%	-	81%	>95%
6th Grade On-Track	81%	88%	79%	84%	85%	67%	-	>95%	92%
9th Grade On-Track									
9th Graders of 2007-08									
	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	Hispanic origin	American Indian / Alaska Native	Pacific Islander	Asian	TAG (not included in aggregate)
4-Year Graduation Rate	64%	59%	53%	66%	59%	67%	79%	90%	94%
5-Year Graduation Rate									
5-Year Completion Rate									
Earning 9+ College Credits	19%	14%	8%	18%	17%	31%	8%	37%	55%
Post-Secondary Enrollment									
2010-11									
3rd Gr. Reading Proficiency	54%	47%	47%	57%	52%	92%	57%	82%	>95%
3rd Gr. Math Proficiency	56%	52%	46%	62%	53%	69%	52%	87%	>95%
6th Grade On-Track	84%	89%	82%	87%	88%	78%	83%	>95%	>95%
9th Grade On-Track	55%	51%	53%	59%	52%	35%	58%	94%	91%

The tan fields are optional. Districts will fill the blue fields with their targets, the gray fields with estimates of current/past data (if available).

K-12 / ESD Achievement Compact
Beaverton SD - 2243 6/12/12

9th Graders of 2008-09									
	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	Hispanic origin	American Indian / Alaska Native	Pacific Islander	Asian	TAG (not included in aggregate)
4-Year Graduation Rate									
5-Year Graduation Rate	68%	66%	66%	76%	61%	56%		93%	>95%
5-Year Completion Rate	79%	71%	83%	84%	68%	63%		>95%	>95%
Earning 9+ College Credits									
Post-Secondary Enrollment	62%	56%	48%	83%	54%	77%		80%	89%
2011-12									
3rd Gr. Reading Proficiency									
3rd Gr. Math Proficiency									
6th Grade On-Track									
9th Grade On-Track									

9th Graders of 2009-10 Goals									
	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	Hispanic origin	American Indian / Alaska Native (2)	Pacific Islander (2)	Asian	TAG (not included in aggregate)
4-Year Graduation Rate	66%	62%	54%	67%	62%	71%	81%	91%	95%
5-Year Graduation Rate	70%	69%	67%	77%	64%	60%	(1)	93%	>95%
5-Year Completion Rate	82%	74%	85%	86%	72%	66%	(1)	>95%	>95%
Earning 9+ College Credits	20%	15%	8%	18%	18%	33%	8%	37%	55%
Post-Secondary Enrollment	64%	59%	49%	85%	56%	82%	(1)	81%	89%
2012-13									
3rd Gr. Reading Proficiency	59%	52%	52%	61%	57%	93%	61%	84%	>95%
3rd Gr. Math Proficiency	60%	57%	51%	66%	58%	72%	57%	88%	>95%
6th Grade On-Track	84%	89%	82%	87%	88%	78%	83%	>95%	>95%
9th Grade On-Track	60%	56%	58%	63%	57%	42%	62%	95%	92%

The tan fields are optional. Districts will fill the blue fields with their targets, the gray fields with estimates of current/past data (if available).

K-12 / ESD Achievement Compact
Beaverton SD - 2243 6/12/12

9th Graders of 2012-13 (Optional 4-Year Goals)									
	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	Hispanic origin	American Indian / Alaska Native	Pacific Islander	Asian	TAG (not included in aggregate)
4-Year Graduation Rate									
5-Year Graduation Rate									
5-Year Completion Rate									
Earning 9+ College Credits									
Post-Secondary Enrollment									
2015-16									
3rd Gr. Reading Proficiency									
3rd Gr. Math Proficiency									
6th Grade On-Track									
9th Grade On-Track									

(1) No baseline data. 2012-13 targets for the Pacific Islander group 4 year College and career Ready measures use "disadvantaged" students growth rate.

(2) Caution: Native American and Pacific Islander goals are based on fewer than 30 students in the group.

The tan fields are optional. Districts will fill the blue fields with their targets, the gray fields with estimates of current/past data (if available).

K-12 / ESD Achievement Compact
Beaverton SD - 2243 6/12/12

College and Career Ready: Are students completing high school ready for college or career?										
	9th graders of 2006-07	Dis-advantaged	9th graders of 2007-08	Dis-advantaged	9th graders of 2008-09	Dis-advantaged	9th graders of 2009-10	Dis-advantaged	9th graders of 2012-13	Dis-advantaged
4-Year Graduation Rate	2217	922	2260	980						
5-Year Graduation Rate	2315	1000								
5-Year Completion Rate	2505	1144								
Post-Secondary Enrollment	1746	636								
Earning 9+ College Credits			836	307						

Disadvantaged is aggregate of disadvantaged student groups (details on pp. 2-4)

Gray shaded boxes are district-provided projections and goals **2012-13 goals are optional

Progression: Are students making sufficient progress toward college and career readiness?										
	2009-10 All	Dis-advantaged	2010-11 All	Dis-advantaged	2011-12 All*	Dis-advantaged	2012-13 Goal All	Dis-advantaged	4-Year Goal (2015-16)	Dis-advantaged
Ready for School	Kindergarten readiness assessment under development									
3rd Gr. Reading Proficiency	2012	920	2090	942						
3rd Gr. Math Proficiency	1847	838	2139	983						
6th Grade On-Track	2485	1209	2586	1293						
9th Grade On-Track			2066	824						

*Estimate based on most recent available data **2016 Goals are optional

Equity: Are students succeeding across all buildings and populations?									
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13 Goal	4-Year Goal (2015-16)				
Priority & Focus Schools*	0	0	2	2					
DISAGGREGATED DATA AND GOALS FOR EACH DISADVANTAGED STUDENT GROUP LISTED ON PP 2-4									

*Prior to 2012-13, school in federal AYP "Need Improvement" status **4-year Goals are optional

Local Priorities: What other measures reflect key priorities in the district? (optional, up to 3)										
	Year	Dis-advantaged	Year	Dis-advantaged	Year	Dis-advantaged	1-Year Goal	Dis-advantaged	4-Year Goal**	Dis-advantaged

**4-year Goal optional

Investment: What is the public investment in the district? (does not include capital investments)						
	2010-11	2011-12*	2012-13*	2012-13 QEM recommended		
Formula Revenue	\$260,397,891	\$271,317,069	\$280,593,419	\$378,041,402	District Share	
Local Revenue not passed through formula	\$27,137,992	\$13,039,121	\$10,167,500		District Official	
Federal Revenue	\$43,945,882	\$28,606,200	\$25,572,564			
State Grants not passed through formula	\$3,923,961	\$968,984	\$989,984			

The tan fields are optional. Districts will fill the blue fields with their targets, the gray fields with estimates of current/past data (if available).

OEIB Chief Education Officer

K-12 / ESD Achievement Compact
Beaverton SD - 2243 6/12/12

Equity: Are students succeeding across all populations?									
9th Graders of 2006-07									
	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	Hispanic origin	American Indian / Alaska Native	Pacific Islander	Asian	TAG (not included in aggregate)
4-Year Graduation Rate	645	226	239	70	263	9		332	463
5-Year Graduation Rate	710	258	258	75	297	9		342	472
5-Year Completion Rate	826	279	329	84	332	10		353	*
Earning 9+ College Credits									
Post-Secondary Enrollment	449	129	139	62	147	8		271	419
2009-10									
3rd Gr. Reading Proficiency	574	332	222	47	314	10	-	353	*
3rd Gr. Math Proficiency	517	329	199	39	295	9	-	343	*
6th Grade On-Track	890	449	309	65	502	8	-	*	419
9th Grade On-Track									

9th Graders of 2007-08									
	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	Hispanic origin	American Indian / Alaska Native	Pacific Islander	Asian	TAG (not included in aggregate)
4-Year Graduation Rate	693	237	212	61	325	8	19	338	446
5-Year Graduation Rate									
5-Year Completion Rate									
Earning 9+ College Credits	60	54	47	81	51	73	2	80	88
Post-Secondary Enrollment									
2010-11									
3rd Gr. Reading Proficiency	625	333	210	48	354	12	13	309	*
3rd Gr. Math Proficiency	645	363	202	52	359	9	12	330	*
6th Grade On-Track	966	523	358	67	587	14	19	*	*
9th Grade On-Track	600	116	199	45	305	6	14	341	403

The tan fields are optional. Districts will fill the blue fields with their targets, the gray fields with estimates of current/past data (if available).

K-12 / ESD Achievement Compact
Beaverton SD - 2243 6/12/12

9th Graders of 2008-09									
	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	Hispanic origin	American Indian / Alaska Native	Pacific Islander	Asian	TAG (not included in aggregate)
4-Year Graduation Rate									
5-Year Graduation Rate									
5-Year Completion Rate									
Earning 9+ College Credits									
Post-Secondary Enrollment									
2011-12									
3rd Gr. Reading Proficiency									
3rd Gr. Math Proficiency									
6th Grade On-Track									
9th Grade On-Track									

9th Graders of 2009-10 Goals									
	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	Hispanic origin	American Indian / Alaska Native	Pacific Islander	Asian	TAG (not included in aggregate)
4-Year Graduation Rate									
5-Year Graduation Rate									
5-Year Completion Rate									
Earning 9+ College Credits									
Post-Secondary Enrollment									
2012-13									
3rd Gr. Reading Proficiency									
3rd Gr. Math Proficiency									
6th Grade On-Track									
9th Grade On-Track									

The tan fields are optional. Districts will fill the blue fields with their targets, the gray fields with estimates of current/past data (if available).

K-12 / ESD Achievement Compact
Beaverton SD - 2243 6/12/12

9th Graders of 2012-13 (Optional 4-Year Goals)									
	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	Hispanic origin	American Indian / Alaska Native	Pacific Islander	Asian	TAG (not included in aggregate)
4-Year Graduation Rate									
5-Year Graduation Rate									
5-Year Completion Rate									
Earning 9+ College Credits									
Post-Secondary Enrollment									
2015-16									
3rd Gr. Reading Proficiency									
3rd Gr. Math Proficiency									
6th Grade On-Track									
9th Grade On-Track									

The tan fields are optional. Districts will fill the blue fields with their targets, the gray fields with estimates of current/past data (if available).

Recommendations for Setting Achievement Compact Targets

This is a pivotal moment for education in Oregon. For the first time in over a decade, state and federal leaders are overhauling the way Oregon schools are held accountable and supported. As Oregon seeks a waiver from the No Child Left Behind legislation, we are presented with the opportunity to set aside the misleading and counterproductive aspects of the federal law and replace them with better, more accurate tools to measure school and district success.

We want to build a system that will motivate educators and community members around a new way to support student achievement. This system should increase capacity across the schools and districts to share best practices, learn from each other, and ultimately ensure that our students are successful. Oregon's new accountability system needs to focus on this collaboration and continuous improvement in order to propel student achievement forward.

The achievement compacts are an opportunity for the state and districts to define ambitious, yet achievable goals for performance on such outcomes as third grade reading proficiency, high school graduation rates, and the closing of the achievement gap. The compacts will allow us to identify the schools that are "beating the odds" and those that are in need of additional supports. Without the punitive measures required under NCLB, there is the opportunity to raise achievement by providing individualized interventions for schools and districts tailored to meet their students' needs.

Through the achievement compacts and a complementary new state report card, we need to take a deeper look at how schools are doing in terms of proficiency, student growth, graduation, and college readiness when we are assessing whether we are meeting student needs. It is essential that we quickly define what measures are better suited going forward in the report card to ensure that the achievement compacts remain focused on identifying and aligning the resources necessary for improvement on a few key indicators.

We are pleased with the positive gains that many of our districts have continued to make even in these tough economic times, and are excited by the prospect of a strong vision for education in Oregon. Through the achievement compacts, districts will be able to focus on common goals, and leverage resources to have the greatest impact on student success as we move forward toward the destination of 100% of students graduating from high school or completing the equivalent of a diploma in 2025 (40/40/20).

Over successive years, our districts have faced a significant gap between our ability to maintain current service levels and our revenue. As a state, we have a moral obligation to expect better outcomes for our students and to prepare them to be college and career ready, but the reality of that expectation is called into question when K-12 education continues to receive a smaller portion of the state budget.

Our districts' targets must be focused on meeting the needs of our students to ensure they make continuous progress over time. However, we also must consider the dramatic impact that declining budgets are having on our ability to achieve these targets. There must be a greater investment in education in order to prepare our students well and enable them to be capable and competitive in an

ever more challenging economic future. Without adequate funding, districts will not be able to make the improvements necessary to continually raise achievement to reach that 40/40/20 goal.

We recommend that 2011-12 data be viewed as the baseline for going forward. Many of our districts had already developed their budgets for 2012-13 by the time the achievement compact metrics were finalized. We anticipate that in coming years, we will be able to better align resources to the indicators and create greater opportunities for our communities to participate in the consideration of targets and the alignment of budgets to achieve those targets.

Below is a recommended methodology that we have developed for setting the achievement compact targets for this first year. We have also included a number of questions and concerns that arose as we began to fill in the compact targets with district data.

Recommended Methodology for Setting Achievement Compact Targets:

1. **Timing:** We are currently setting targets for the 2012-13 school year with only the 2010-11 data. As we will not receive final data for this current year from the Oregon Department of Education until August, this will continue to be a concern every year if districts are expected to complete their achievement compacts as part of the budget process in the spring. Additionally, we will not receive 9th grade credit data (as it includes summer school) or graduation rate data until the fall or even later in the following year. Unless a different timeline is implemented for either the Achievement Compact targets or receiving data from the ODE, targets and data will always be based on at least one year-old data. We will be setting targets for two years ahead of our last data points and accountability for those targets will be delayed for two years. This timeline makes the Achievement Compact less useful for making program or budget adjustments. **Recommendation:** Districts will set their targets based on the data currently available and will review and potentially revise targets using the recommended methodology on the updated data when they are available.
2. **College and Career Readiness Outcomes:**
 - a. **5-Year Completion Rate:** We are pleased that the 5-year completion rate indicator is included on the Achievement Compacts. There are a number of students within our districts who receive GEDs and Extended and Modified Diplomas as appropriate completions for high school. We also appreciate that a 5-year cohort is included on the Achievement Compacts. Data across the districts demonstrate that a 5-Year graduation rate more fully captures the achievements of all of our students. **Methodology:** Looking at the 40/40/20 goal, districts will determine the annual growth rate necessary to reach 100% on the 5-year completion rate for 9th graders entering high school in 2016-17 through a back mapping process. We also recommend applying this same process (determining necessary growth rate to reach 100% by 2021 for 5-year completion) to the “disadvantaged group” and the subgroups. An Achievement Compact Target Calculator is available for this purpose.

- b. **Cohort Graduation rates, 9+ College credits, Post-secondary enrollment:** Given the interrelated nature of these outcomes to the 5-year completion rate outcome and the State's 40-40-20 goals, we recommend applying the same annual growth rates calculated for the 5-year completion outcome to the other college and career readiness outcomes and for the "disadvantaged" and subgroups.

3. **On Track Outcomes (3rd Grade Reading and Math Proficiency, 6th Grade on Track, 9th grade on Track):** For each of these indicators, as well as those for the subgroups, we recommend setting targets for a 10% decrease in students who are not proficient. We will utilize the following methodology to set targets:

- a. identify the percentage of students (in 2010-11) who are not meeting the outcome (if 70% of students are meeting the outcome, then 30% are not meeting)
- b. Take 10% of students not meeting the outcome (10% of 30% is 3%)
- c. Apply that 10% to identify the target (70% + 3% is 73% as the target)

This growth model sets targets that:

- Require greater gains the lower a district's starting percentage
- Close of the achievement gaps with the subgroup targets
- Are realistic for higher achieving districts

An Achievement Compact Target Calculator is available to assist districts with the calculations.

4. **Priority & Focus Schools:** Because the state has yet to provide us with a list of current priority and focus schools, we are unable to recommend a 2012-13 goal. The number of priority and focus schools statewide in 2011-12 will be approximately the same as the number of schools that are identified for Title I school improvement in 2011-12. Our understanding is that this information will be made available to school districts in August.

5. **Considerations:**

- a. **6th Grade On-Track:** Attendance may be appropriate for an indication of health and stability and should be tracked. However, without substantial resources devoted to school health and attendance services, it will be challenging to move this measure forward. In addition, this indicator does not track academic progress. Depending on the baseline data, districts may wish to consider setting more conservative targets for this indicator. **Recommendation:** We recommend the inclusion of an academic measure for middle school rather than attendance for a 6th Grade On-Track indicator.
- b. **9th Grade On-Track:** We are excited to see that the definition for the 9th grade on track indicator included an entire calendar year in which to earn credits as many of our students are able to enter 10th grade with 6 credits because of summer school

opportunities, however this does present timing challenges as these data will not be complete until September. Additionally, as mentioned above, attendance can be variable from year to year and difficult to improve. We believe that even in cases where we have increases in students entering 10th grade with 6 or more credits, we will see less growth in this data point because of the inclusion of attendance.

Recommendation: We recommend that these two data points, attendance and credits, be separated.

- c. **Earning 9+ College Credits:** We have received guidance from ODE that districts will be responsible for collecting these data on their own. A number of districts do not have processes in place to collect these data and so for this year there will be disparate levels of reporting on this indicator. Statewide comparisons of districts would be inappropriate in this first year. Given that the data comes from multiple sources that are not centrally stored in most districts, the requirement for reporting baseline data and targets for this outcome poses a significant time commitment for districts. **Recommendation:** We recommend that:
- 1) districts make clear as a part of their achievement compact how they have defined and calculated this data point during this compressed timeline
 - 2) collective work must be done to put systems in place to collect and report the highest quality data possible in subsequent years.

Additionally, colleges and universities have different requirements for college credit attainment (e.g. some schools accept a 3 on the AP exam for college credit while others require a 4 or 5 and different schools may give 2 or 3 credits for the same score). Please see the attached tables for AP and IB test scores and college credits. We are proposing that this indicator be based on the Oregon University System.

Recommendation: We would recommend that the OUS and Oregon Community Colleges and all postsecondary institutions in Oregon maintain consistent policy and practice in accepting and awarding college credit that was obtained by high school students during their high school years.

- d. **Disadvantaged Subgroup:** We are pleased to see that achievement compacts will disaggregate data for students. However, as a team, we are uncomfortable with the term “disadvantaged” to describe students of color, ESL and students with disabilities. Titles such as this continue to reinforce a deficit model.

Recommendations:

- 1) We recommend using the term, “historically underserved”.¹

¹ New England Comprehensive Center provides the following definition: underserved students are students who do not receive equitable resources in the same manner that other students do and as a consequence are less likely to achieve to high levels of academic performance. Another way of thinking of underserved students is to consider the quality and degree of access they have to programs, services,

- 2) In keeping with the original intent of the achievement compacts to identify a few key indicators, we recommend that districts should identify a single aggregate subgroup or an individual subgroup measure, whichever has the most significant gap based on a sufficient number in the sample.
 - 3) There are other racial groups that must be included in the subgroup data. It is imperative that white student data are also included for reporting purposes (not as an indicator for setting targets). In order to truly be able to identify the opportunity and achievement gaps within our districts, we must have the data for the white students as a point of comparison.
 - 4) Multi-racial students should also be included for reporting purposes.
- e. **Student Numbers Per Cell Recommendation:** The permanent rule on Achievement Compacts should align the cell size that triggers the requirement for goal setting by districts with the cell size for ratings in other accountability reports (generally 30-40 student). Requiring a district to set achievement goals for student groups comprised of 6, 8, or 10 students undermines the face validity of the compacts and in some instances will violate ODE's rules about protecting student confidentiality.
- f. **Numerical Targets:** Under the temporary rule, 705-010-0035 Completion and Execution of Achievement Compacts, the OEIB “may waive the requirement to identify both a target number and percentage of students and require either a number or percentage for specific outcome measures, depending on the specifications of the compacts it approves.” **Recommendation:** We recommend that districts not be required to set numeric targets for the indicators. Numeric targets can be established by applying the percentage target proposed in the Achievement Compact to the size of the group once that size has been identified. To establish numeric targets requires districts to predict group sizes from year to year. These numeric targets are meaningless as soon as the actual group size diverges from the predicted group size.
- g. **Ready for School Recommendation:** An academic measure should be identified for this indicator.
- h. **4-Year Goals and Local Priorities Recommendation:** At this point, we recommend delaying the establishment of 4-year goals and local priorities to provide districts time to reflect on the goal setting process and obtain an additional year of data on the measures, particularly for measures that are new to districts (e.g., graduates with 9+ college credits). With continued budget reductions this year, we believe it

and resources that offer them the support to succeed in school. In other words, do they show an “achievement gap” as a result of “opportunity gaps” in their educational experience?

will be important to see how districts prioritize resources and develop strategies to meet the current indicator targets prior to expanding the scope. A number of districts already have established measures reflecting local priorities that are in support of the Achievement Compact and will continue to be reported to local boards and communities.