

## CORE 24 IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE MEETING NOTES August 14, 2009

**ITF Members:** Michael Christianson, Linda Dezelle, Lynn Eisenhauer, Larry Francois, Sergio Hernandez, Julie Kratzig, Bridget Lewis, Dennis Maguire, Karen Madsen, Mark Mansell, Mick Miller, Alex Otoupal, Jennifer Shaw, Sandra Sheldon

**SBE Board Members and Staff:** Steve Dal Porto (Board Co-Lead), Jack Schuster (Board Co-Lead), Amy Bragdon, Anna Laura Kastama, Mary Jean Ryan (Board Chair), Kathe Taylor

### **Consideration and Vote on Preliminary Recommendations to SBE for September Interim Task Force Report**

Jennifer Shaw and Mark Mansell led the ITF through the “Foundational Questions” document (on the SBE website at:

<http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/Discussion%20Guide%20for%20Recommendations.pdf>).

The Foundational Questions came from the ITF charter from the SBE to the Task Force. After discussion by the whole group, the following recommendations were made:

- Change “preliminary recommendations” to “preliminary considerations;” the group isn’t ready yet to make preliminary recommendations
- In first recommendation (question #2 in document), eliminate bolded paragraph and focus on first bullet under “advantages” as the consideration: “Permit students who meet proficiency on end-of-course state assessments to earn credit, even if they fail the course.” Include related key questions that still need to be considered: Do you have to take the course at all? What if you challenge the course by asking to take the end-of course assessment—and then you pass it? Is proficiency on an end-of-course assessment sufficient to earn credit?
- Other 3 considerations can move forward as is
- Include advantages and disadvantages with each consideration
- Okay to use charter’s Q & A format, but for the purpose of taking this out to stakeholders, an easier format would be appreciated.
- May want to discuss a revision of the language pertaining to the Higher Education Coordinating Board in the current WAC regarding high school credit

The outcome of this discussion was to move forward the following considerations:

1. Permit students who meet proficiency on end-of-course state assessments to earn credit, even if they fail the course.
  - Note: The ITF will be returning to this question and seeking feedback from stakeholders on key questions such as, “Do you have to take the course at all? What if you challenge the course by asking to take the end-of course assessment—and then you pass it? Is proficiency on an end-of-course assessment sufficient to earn credit?”

2. Consider eliminating the time-based WAC definition of a credit and reinforce instead the connection between a credit and student learning: “A high school credit shall mean the student has demonstrated proficiency in the identified learning outcomes of a course approved by the district as meeting the relevant state subject-area standards.”

#### Advantages

- Consistent with the state’s direction toward standards-based learning
- Does not artificially connect learning to time
- Creates more flexibility for districts to focus on student-centered learning that will enable students to progress at their own rates
- Acknowledges the realities of online learning, where learning is not time-based
- 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
- Eliminates inconsistencies in the ways districts define and count “instructional hours”

#### Disadvantages

- May not be viewed as objective, measureable and easy to understand as a time-based requirement is
- Lacks the power of a time-based requirement that may act as an equalizer—a form of standardization that reduces the likelihood that districts will cut corners
- There is no minimum, measurable threshold of expectation

3. Consider implementing a “2 for 1” or “Credit Plus” policy that would enable students taking classes formally identified as course equivalents to document the academic credit on the transcript and satisfy a CTE requirement at the same time, thereby creating space for an additional elective.

#### Advantages

- Provides greater flexibility for students to take other courses they need or want to take
- Provides greater flexibility for students in skills centers
- Will encourage districts to establish course equivalencies, and the process of collaboration among teachers to establish equivalencies could contribute to professional learning communities

#### Disadvantages

- Without clear state parameters, the policy could be interpreted inconsistently across districts and make it difficult for students to transfer credits across schools
- Might require changes to standardized transcript

4. 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. For example:

- *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.*

#### Advantages

- Provides sufficient flexibility to address different students' needs
- Retains core (employability and leadership skills) of occupational education requirement
- Connects High School and Beyond Plan (HS&B) with course selection

#### Disadvantages

- Relies on a HS&B planning process that may not exist yet in some schools

Jennifer and Mark will present the ITF considerations at the SBE's next meeting on September 17.

**Teacher Capacity Presentation.** Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director of the Professional Educator Standards Board, presented a PPT to identify state strategies for recruiting/retaining teachers. The PPT can be found in the materials posted for this meeting at:

<http://www.sbe.wa.gov/CORE24Dates&Materials2.html>

A Q & A followed Jennifer's presentation, with ITF members posing questions about alternative routes, CTE certification options, retention of teachers who pursue alternative vs. traditional certification, avenues available to teachers trained in other countries to teach in WA, suitability and effectiveness of career-changing professionals who seek alternative certification, availability of teachers in high need areas, and measurements of teacher effectiveness.

Jennifer's parting message: "Build it and they will come." The changes in graduation requirements will drive the ongoing search for better ways to recruit and retain teachers in needed fields; each will drive the other.

**Facilities Capacity Presentation.** Gordon Beck, OSPI Director, School Facilities presented a PPT to provide an overview of the school construction funding formula and program history and authority, with an emphasis on the school construction assistance program. The PPT can be found in the materials posted for this meeting at:

<http://www.sbe.wa.gov/CORE24Dates&Materials2.html>. Gordon noted that there is an inventory underway by the State joint Legislative Audit Review Committee that will recommend data collection around facilities.

A Q & A followed Gordon's presentation, with ITF members posing questions about analysis of basic education costs from a facilities perspective, the possibility of streamlined processes to secure short-term funding to serve changing operations needs, and differences between the formula for state funding of facilities and actual costs.

Board member Jack Schuster posed a direct question: If CORE 24 is implemented, more specialized facilities—science labs, fine arts facilities, and CTE facilities may need to come on board. What should we be communicating to the SBE? What would make it easier for this to happen?

Gordon noted that there were "no good answers. One thing about capital, a response to facilities is a long-term issue, not something that can be resolved in one or two years. The

kindergarten exercise (a calculation of how many classrooms would be needed to provide all-day kindergarten) was an example of that—just making portables available wasn't sufficient. Ultimately, it's a local decision where districts choose to put their resources."

Gordon's parting message: Those that are making choices about program needs or operating budget decisions need to recognize that there are capital impacts.

ITF members made the following comments:

- May need to look at using existing resources more hours of the day.
- Instead of matching capital money with bonds, look at levy money.
- It's up to districts to decide what to use the space for—need to be creative about the use of space.
- Need to reconsider what is considered facilities—perhaps using community buildings to augment what is considered instructional space.

**Quality Education Council (QEC).** Mary Jean Ryan, Board Chair, talked about the role of the QEC's, its membership and its charge to recommend ways to move House Bill 2261 into reality.

The QEC was created in 2009 by HB 2261. Its purpose is summarized in this statement from the Governor's office.

"Recommendations of the council will be used by the governor and Legislature to identify measurable goals and priorities for Washington's K-12 education system for a 10-year time period. As provided by the legislation, the council will recommend a timeline to phase in changes to instructional programs and funding formulas, as well as a new student transportation formula. The council will also study how to establish a statewide teacher mentoring and support system, as well as an early learning program for at-risk children. The council is expected to return its first report by January 1, 2010, and will include recommendations for resolving issues or decisions requiring legislative action during the 2010 legislative session." (*Per August 4, 2009 Governor's Office press release*)

QEC members include:

- Randy Dorn, Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Jane Gutting, Superintendent, ESD 105 (appointed by the governor)
- Stephen Rushing, Professional Educator Standards Board Chair
- Mary Jean Ryan, State Board of Education Chair
- Betty Hyde, Director, Department of Early Learning
- Representatives Frank Chopp, Bruce Dammeier, Skip Priest, Pat Sullivan
- Senators Curtis King, Rosemary McAuliffe, Eric Oemig, Joseph Zarelli

The QEC will meet for the first time August 27. Mary Jean noted that the legislation doesn't sunset—it's supposed to be ongoing. The power of 2261 is its redefinition of basic education.

Mary Jean asked the ITF to consider when the legislature should begin funding six periods of instruction, and when extra instructional time for struggling students should start. She noted that by November, the QEC would be having big debates about what to put into its plan.

Mary Jean also talked about the Race to the Top funding possibilities, noting that Washington would need to decide whether to apply for the first round of grants or the second round. She

said that the two issues WA would need to look closely at were 1) the state has no intervention authority to turn around schools and 2) the state has a minimum bar for teacher evaluations. She urged everyone to read the RTT guidance (summarized in this *Education Week* article: <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2009/07/23/37race.h28.html?tkn=YSUFYIm%2BMA2jCca4Ty69mm89stWNLqKb4Eu2>)

## **Grounding Our Work in the Reality of Local Graduation Requirements Transitions**

**Bellingham School District** Julie Kratzig, Counselor at Sehome High School and ITF member, discussed Bellingham's transition to new graduation requirements. (See PPT presentation at: <http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/Core%202024%20State%20Board%20Presentation.pdf>)

Bellingham:

- reconfigured its 23 required credits in 2007 to assure that all students have a postsecondary *choice*
- will require Algebra II of all students, beginning in 2013. (Currently have a model where Algebra I is taught over 2 years, with first year in middle school; Algebra II also taught over 2 years. Students earn 1 credit after completion of second year.)
- will implement 2 years of world language in 2014. Are looking at competency across K-12; currently have an IB elementary school where students are learning world language
- added .5 credit of English to require 4 credits, effective 2012
- created sample schedules to show how this would work

**La Center School District.** Mark Mansell, Superintendent of La Center School District and ITF member, discussed La Center's transition to new graduation requirements. (See Mark's handouts at:

<http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/NEW%20La%20Center%20Graduation%20Requirements.pdf>; <http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/Pathways.pdf>)

La Center:

- reconfigured its previous 23 credits and added a credit to require 24 credits for the class of 2013
- is a policy governance district, which means it's rooted in the student profile
- is focused on preparing kids for their next step of learning—technical, academic, honors pathways: Multiple pathways, same diploma
- will require students in all pathways to take 3 credits of math, science, and 2 credits of arts
- is aiming to integrate career inventories in middle school; career explorations in 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>; mentorship/job shadowing in 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>.

**Discussion of Phase-in.** Time was running short, so the ITF focused discussion on the questions Mary Jean Ryan had posed earlier in the day:

- When should the legislature start funding six instructional hours?
- When should the legislature start funding additional hours for struggling students?

Following is a summary of the issues identified, to be continued at the next (September 28) meeting:

- Just fund us. Please.
- Fund the instructional hours as soon as possible. If our district is already funding six hours, we can use the additional \$\$ to support struggling students.
- Fund struggling students first, then phase-in the graduation requirements over the next 2 biennia.

(Note: This list may be incomplete. Staff forgot to save the PPT slide on which the group's ideas were recorded. If anyone has notes from the meeting, please share them and a revision will be made.)

**Communication Strategies.** A draft Communication Plan for outreach on issues the ITF is considering was distributed. ITF members will take responsibility for talking to their local school and district colleagues and professional groups. In addition, almost every member is assigned to convey ITF information to key stakeholder groups. The ITF added WEA and the WA State PTA, with Lynn Eisenhauer assuming responsibility to talk to WEA and Karen Madsen to the PTA. Sandra Sheldon and Linda Dezellem will split responsibilities for ESD 105 and 171. Members asked that a communications packet be prepared with talking points, ITF considerations, and a feedback form to help organize feedback.

The next meeting will be September 28, 2009, 10:00-4:00 at the Puget Sound ESD.