

---

# CORE 24 ITF Communications Packet

September, 2009

---

**This packet includes:**

The materials needed to help guide your outreach regarding the work of the Implementation Task Force.

1. Talking Points
2. CORE 24 Key Tenets
3. ITF Considerations (you may want to make two copies of this so your audience can keep a copy and turn the second one in with their feedback).
4. Matrix of ITF/SBE/QEC Work (optional)
5. Summary Feedback Form (please complete and send to Kathe one week prior to the next ITF meeting)

## CORE 24 ITF Talking Points – September 2009

### What is CORE 24, and where did it come from?

- CORE 24 is the proposed graduation requirements framework approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) in July 2008, with implementation conditional upon funding by the legislature.
- CORE 24 emerged after almost two years of State Board of Education (SBE) research and discussion, informed by hundreds of public comments. The SBE considered such issues as: 1) postsecondary education preparation and alignment, 2) workforce/career-ready requirements, 3) national trends in graduation requirements, 4) Washington's district requirements, 5) applied, 21<sup>st</sup> century skills, and 6) international comparisons in conceptualizing the breadth and depth needed for a well-rounded high school education.

### What is the CORE 24 Implementation Task Force?

- The Task Force was established by the State Board of Education to consider implementation issues associated with the Board's proposed graduation requirements framework, CORE 24. Twenty education practitioners, selected from a pool of 155 applicants, bring with them a depth and diversity of experiences from the field. The Task Force met for the first time in March, 2009 and is scheduled to meet through early 2010.

### What is the charge of the Task Force?

- To provide recommendations, with analyses of advantages and disadvantages related to issues that will make CORE 24 work for all students, including:
  - a proposed phase-in implementation schedule
  - ways to operationalize competency-based approaches
  - ways to assist students with credit retrieval and advancing their skills to grade level;
  - ways to address career preparation;
  - relationships between scheduling approaches and credit definitions
  - other issues as identified by the Task Force
- To provide feedback from the field on CORE 24 perceptions, concerns, and support.

### Why is this work important?

- CORE 24, in concert with other system improvements (more rigorous standards, aligned curriculum materials and assessments, better prepared teachers) is intended to improve student preparation for postsecondary education and the 21st century world of work and citizenship.
- CORE 24 increases opportunities for all students to receive an excellent and equitable education by creating a more coherent set of requirements designed to help students prepare adequately for their next step after high school—whether it's enrollment in an apprenticeship, certificate, two year-degree or four-year degree program.

**What is the timeline for CORE 24's implementation?**

- The Board's intent is for CORE 24 to be fully implemented with the graduating Class of 2016.
- The Board has stated clearly that CORE 24 will not be an unfunded mandate. Key to the implementation of CORE 24 is funding for six instructional hours, one of several funding parameters the Board has established (the need for additional funding for struggling students, support for a comprehensive guidance system, and support for curriculum and materials are the other parameters).

**What is the relationship between the Board's CORE 24 work and ESHB 2261?**

- ESHB 2261 is the basic education reform bill passed by the 2009 Legislature. Included in ESHB 2261 is an expanded definition of basic education that includes the opportunity to complete 24 high school graduation credits.
- ESHB 2261 calls for phase-in of the new basic education program over 8 years, with full implementation by 2018.
- ESHB 2261 establishes a Quality Education Council (QEC) to recommend and inform the ongoing implementation of an evolving program of basic education and the financing necessary to support it. The QEC, of which the SBE is a part, must submit an initial report to the legislature by January 1, 2010 that includes a recommended schedule for phased-in implementation.
- The Implementation Task Force will recommend to the Board considerations for a phase-in timeline of graduation requirements, and the Board will use that information to provide its recommendations to the QEC.

**When will the CORE 24 Implementation Task Force forward its draft preliminary recommendations to the Board?**

- The Board received an interim report from the Task Force at its September 17-18 2009 meeting. The interim report contained preliminary *considerations* (not recommendations). The Task Force will submit its final report to the Board in spring, 2010.

**Will stakeholders be able to provide input about the Task Force draft recommendations to the Board?**

- Stakeholders will have an opportunity to comment upon the draft recommendations in the interim and final reports before the Board takes any action. Task Force members, Board staff, and Board members will be reaching out to various constituent groups to elicit feedback.

### CORE 24 Guiding Principles

1. Equip everyone. Prepare all students for life after high school.
2. Expect more. Align requirements to meet the increased expectations of the 21st century workforce.
3. Provide flexibility. Allow students to customize their education, creating relevance to their interests.
4. Give focus. Encourage students to align course work to their future career goals.
5. Plan ahead. Emphasize the High School and Beyond Plan to offer students personalized guidance to prepare them for work, postsecondary education, or both.
6. Start early. Prepare students to enter high school and create opportunities to meet high school graduation requirements in middle school.

### CORE 24 Key Tenets

1. Prepare students for life beyond high school--postsecondary education, gainful employment, and citizenship.
2. Enroll all students automatically in default requirements that keep all options beyond high school open (and align with Higher Education Coordinating Board minimum admissions requirements).
3. Provide flexibility for students to personalize their study based on their education and career goals.



	Some of the Questions SBE Asked the ITF to Consider*	Responses the CORE 24 Implementation Task Force is Considering to Date	Advantages/Disadvantages	Your Thoughts?
1	<p><i>What should the career concentration requirement look like in practice?</i></p>	<p>Consider a definition of career concentration that integrates both academic and CTE/occupational courses with sufficient flexibility to address students' interests in a variety of ways, such as:</p> <p>Fulfill three (3) credits of career concentration courses by taking: CTE courses; credited, work-based learning experiences; approved independent study, and/or general education courses that prepare students for postsecondary education based on their identified program of study in their high school and beyond plan. One of the three credits should meet the standards of an exploratory CTE course.</p>	<p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides sufficient flexibility to address different students' needs</li> <li>• Retains core (employability and leadership skills) of occupational education requirement</li> <li>• Connects High School and Beyond Plan with course selection</li> </ul> <p>Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relies on a High School and Beyond planning process that may not exist yet in some schools</li> </ul>	<p>Practicality/Workability at the local level 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p> <p>Personalization: Will meet individual needs 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p> <p>Equitable - Can be implemented across districts: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p> <p>Integrity: Maintains integrity of intent to prepare all students for career/college 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p>
2	<p><i>What flexibility, if any, is needed to make CORE 24 requirements work for all students?</i></p> <p><i>What conventional and out-of-the-box ideas should the SBE consider to implement CORE 24?</i></p>	<p>Consider implementing a "2 for 1" or "Credit Plus" policy that would enable students taking classes formally identified as CTE course equivalents to document the academic credit on the transcript and satisfy a career concentration requirement at the same time, thereby creating space for an additional elective.</p>	<p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides greater flexibility for students to build other courses into their schedules</li> <li>• Provides greater flexibility for students in skills centers</li> <li>• Will encourage districts to establish course equivalencies, and the process of collaboration among teachers to establish equivalencies could contribute to professional learning communities</li> </ul> <p>Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Without clear state parameters, the policy could be interpreted inconsistently across districts and make it difficult for students to transfer credits across schools</li> <li>• Might require changes to standardized transcript</li> </ul>	<p>Practicality/Workability at the local level 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p> <p>Personalization: Will meet individual needs 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p> <p>Equitable - Can be implemented across districts: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p> <p>Integrity: Maintains integrity of intent to prepare all students for career/college 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p>
3	<p><i>What flexibility, if any, is needed to make CORE 24 requirements work for all student? What conventional</i></p>	<p>The ITF recognizes that CORE 24 could work with both standard and block schedules, but the current time-based requirement creates inconsistencies across different types of schedules in the number of instructional hours typically provided. Different policies may be needed to assure that whatever type of schedule a school adopted, and whatever needs specific groups of students might have, they could still meet the requirements of CORE 24. The ITF will revisit</p>	<p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the state's direction toward standards-based learning</li> <li>• Does not artificially connect learning to time</li> <li>• Creates more flexibility for districts to focus on student-centered learning that will enable students to progress at their own rates</li> <li>• Acknowledges the realities of online learning,</li> </ul>	<p>Practicality/Workability at the local level 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p> <p>Personalization: Will meet individual needs 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p>

	Some of the Questions SBE Asked the ITF to Consider*	Responses the CORE 24 Implementation Task Force is Considering to Date	Advantages/Disadvantages	Your Thoughts?
	<i>and out-of-the-box ideas should the SBE consider to implement CORE 24?</i>	<p>these discussions at its upcoming meetings.</p> <p>One consideration is to eliminate the time-based WAC definition of a credit.</p>	<p>where learning is not time-based</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eliminates existing inconsistencies created by differences in schedules; evidence suggests that the time-based requirement varies across districts, depending on the type of schedule the schools are following, and is not being met by all districts</li> <li>Eliminates inconsistencies in the ways districts define and count “instructional hours”</li> </ul> <p>Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May be viewed as less objective, measurable and easy to understand</li> <li>Lacks the power of a time-based requirement to act as an equalizer—a form of standardization that reduces the likelihood that districts will cut corners</li> <li>Creates no minimum, measurable threshold of expectation</li> </ul>	<p>Equitable - Can be implemented across districts: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p> <p>Integrity: Maintains integrity of intent to prepare all students for career/college 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p>
4	<p><i>What flexibility, if any, is needed to make CORE 24 requirements work for all students?</i></p> <p><i>What conventional and out-of-the-box ideas should the SBE consider to implement CORE 24?</i></p>	<p>Permit students who meet proficiency on end-of-course state assessments to earn credit, even if they fail the course</p> <p>Note: Individual districts could elect to grant credit in this way today, based on the SBE’s current WAC that defines a high school credit. Whether this statement would become part of the SBE’s WAC is the issue. The ITF will be returning to this question and seeking feedback from stakeholders on key questions such as, “Does a student have to take the course at all? Is proficiency on an end-of-course (EOC) assessment sufficient to earn credit? What if a student asks to take the EOC assessment before ever taking the course (assuming this were feasible)—and the student passes the EOC?”</p>	<p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides guidance to districts about competency-based credit</li> <li>Consistent with the state’s direction toward standards-based learning</li> </ul> <p>Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If students know they can earn credit as long as they pass the EOC, they may choose to disregard other course requirements</li> <li>If students don’t have to take the course, they may miss out on aspects of the course not covered by the assessment</li> </ul>	<p>Practicality/Workability at the local level 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p> <p>Personalization: Will meet individual needs 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p> <p>Equitable - Can be implemented across districts: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p> <p>Integrity: Maintains integrity of intent to prepare all students for career/college 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</p>

\*The State Board of Education (SBE) approved a charter for the Implementation Task Force (ITF) that identified specific tasks and questions the SBE wanted the ITF to address. The ITF, which began its work in March 2009, has not yet had the opportunity to consider all of the questions and tasks posed by the SBE, and will not complete its work until spring 2010. Twenty education practitioners, selected from over 150 applicants, serve on the ITF. ITF meeting materials can be found at <http://www.sbe.wa.gov/CORE24Dates&Materials2.html>. Questions about the work can be directed to ITF members or contact Kathe Taylor, SBE Policy Director, at [kathe.taylor@k12.wa.us](mailto:kathe.taylor@k12.wa.us).

**CORE 24 2009-2011 Work Plan for SBE and Its Work With  
Implementation Task Force, Quality Education Council and Legislature**

<b>SBE Task in Response to ITF Work</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>State SBE of Education (SBE)</b>	<b>Quality Education Council (QEC)</b>	<b>Legislature</b>
Receive first interim report from the Implementation Task Force (ITF).	September 2009	SBE receives first interim report with the ITF's preliminary considerations on: 1) ways to provide appropriate career preparation courses, as well as career concentration options; 2) scheduling approaches to 24 credits that can meet the required 150 instructional hours; and 3) ways to operationalize competency-based methods of meeting graduation requirements. SBE will consider action to assign an additional task to the ITF.		
Receive second interim report from the ITF on phase-in schedule; take action on advocacy for six instructional hours.	November 2009	SBE receives second interim report with preliminary recommendations from ITF on: 1) an implementation schedule that prioritizes phase-in of new credit requirements; and 2) phasing in CORE 24 to address issues such as teacher supply, facility infrastructure, etc.  SBE takes formal action to "authorize" advocacy for six instructional hours in the 2011-2013 biennium to the QEC.	Brief QEC on CORE 24 and recommend to QEC that funding for six instructional hours begin in 2011-2013 biennium so CORE 24 can be fully implemented by 2016. (QEC initial report due January 1, 2010).	
Refine policy for High School and Beyond Plan, Culminating Project, and other unfinished policy issues (e.g., middle school, essential skills).	January 2010	SBE reviews policy recommendations from MHSD work group.		
Conduct outreach on ITF considerations.	Fall 2009 and winter/spring 2010	SBE staff, Board members, and ITF members seek and receive feedback on implementation considerations.	Continue to represent SBE interests to QEC during its meetings.	Advocate for funding during the 2010 session.

SBE Task in Response to ITF Work	Date	State SBE of Education (SBE)	Quality Education Council (QEC)	Legislature
Receive final report from the ITF.	May 2010	SBE receives final report with recommendations on each of the assigned tasks given to the ITF. Each recommendation will include advantages and disadvantages. SBE begins consideration of policy implications of ITF recommendations.		
Adopt CORE 24 Implementation Policies.	July 2010	SBE adopts implementation policies and gives direction to staff for development of draft CORE 24 rules.		
Work with OSPI on fiscal impact of proposed changes.	Summer 2010	SBE staff works with OSPI staff on fiscal impact of key elements of CORE 24—instructional hours, struggling students, comprehensive guidance, and curriculum/materials.		
Review draft CORE 24 rules.	September 2010	SBE reviews draft CORE 24 rules.	Continue to represent SBE interests to QEC during its meetings.	
Adopt draft CORE 24 rules.	November 2010	SBE adopts draft rules.	Present proposed changes to the high school graduation requirements to QEC for review, in conjunction with OSPI fiscal impact analysis; advocate with QEC to recommend funding for CORE 24 on proposed timeline.	Present proposed changes to the high school graduation requirements to education committees for review, in conjunction with OSPI fiscal impact analysis. Advocate for funding and go-ahead from Legislature.
Adopt new graduation requirement rules for the Class of 2016.	Fall 2011	SBE adopts rules for the Class of 2016. (The Class of 2016 will enter 9 <sup>th</sup> grade in 2012).		

ITF Member: \_\_\_\_\_

Group(s) Providing Feedback: \_\_\_\_\_

Date(s): \_\_\_\_\_

# of Respondents: \_\_\_\_\_

### Summary of Feedback

ITF Consideration	What Looks Good	Questions/Considerations/Suggestions
Definition of career concentration that integrates both academic and CTE/occupational experiences, as long as 1 credit meets the standards of an exploratory CTE course		
"2 for 1" or "Credit Plus" policy for CTE-equivalent courses that enables students to earn 1 credit and satisfy 2 requirements, creating more scheduling flexibility		
Eliminating the time-based definition of a credit		
Permitting students who meet proficiency on end-of-course state assessments to earn credit, even if they fail the course		