

## **CORE 24 IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE MEETING NOTES** **January 11, 2010**

**ITF members:** Mike Christianson, Jean Countryman, Lynn Eisenhauer, Chuck Hamaker-Teals, Larry Francois, Lisa Hechtman, Sergio Hernandez, Julie Kratzig, Bridget Lewis, Karen Madsen, Dennis Maguire, Mark Mansell, Mick Miller, Jennifer Shaw, Sandra Sheldon, Brad Sprague

**SBE Board and staff:** Steve Dal Porto (Board Co-Lead), Jack Schuster (Board Co-Lead), Amy Bragdon, Connie Fletcher, Phyllis (Bunker) Frank, Warren Smith, Kathe Taylor (staff)

**Observer:** Tim Knue

**Welcome, Review of Agenda, General Updates.** Steve Dal Porto and Jack Schuster welcomed the group and presented a new Core 24 graphic. (ITF members critiqued the graphic and suggested that it be revised to reflect three credits of career concentration in all pathways. The most recent [Core 24 graphic](#) reflects this change.) Bridget Lewis distributed the results ([comments](#) and [data](#)) of a Zoomerang survey that she, in conjunction with Sergio Hernandez and Mick Miller, had sent to ESD 101 superintendents, assistant superintendents, and business managers. The survey presented each of the four considerations that the ITF had put forward in fall 2009; seventy-one people responded. Mark Mansell and Jennifer Shaw discussed their November 2009 presentation to the SBE, where they shared the phase-in recommendations and issues discussed by the ITF at the November 2 meeting. ITF members emphasized the importance of underscoring to the SBE the cost of reforming the education system.

**Making Core 24 Work for All Students.** Members formed small groups to work on policy issues that might be needed to make Core 24 work for all students. The results of the groups' work is captured in the tables in these notes and reflects the summary of the worksheets turned in by the groups and listed on flip chart paper. Staff provided seven policies for the ITF to consider (or reconsider), and an opportunity for ITF members to suggest additional policies.

**Updates on School Funding, Finance Reform and the QEC.** Isabel Muñoz-Colón, Senior Budget Analyst with OSPI, presented an [Update on QEC and Funding Formula Technical Working Group PowerPoint](#). In preparation for Isabel's presentation, and to seed a conversation about funding elements needed to phase in Core 24, ITF members had been asked to complete a "budget phase-in tool." Specifically, they were asked, thinking about Core 24:

- How should the implementation of each element be sequenced over the eight years?
- What elements in the prototype should be implemented together?

Isabel summarized the views of the eight ITF task members who had submitted their perspectives prior to the January 11, 2010 meeting about the elements needed to implement Core 24. Slides 10-16 represent those views. **ITF members who had not submitted the budget tool yet were asked to send their responses to Isabel so the full ITF could be represented.**

Isabel also noted that the Funding Formula Technical Work Group acknowledged that additional resources would be needed for Core 24 because 1) all districts were not providing 1,080 hours at the secondary level, and 2) additional resources would be needed for students who need additional instructional opportunities to successfully meet more requirements (see slide 7). Further study is needed.

# Policies To Make Core 24 Work for All Students: ITF Work-in-Progress Recommendations

## 1/11/2010

Policy	Revisions (Group 4)	Revisions (Group 1)	Advantages/Disadvantages
<p><b>Two-for-One.</b> The ITF has identified the possibility of creating a new “2 for 1” policy that would enable students to earn 1 credit and satisfy 2 requirements when taking a CTE course that has been designated by the district to be equivalent to a core academic course: One credit is recorded on the transcript, while two graduation requirements are “checked off” as having been met. This policy would not decrease the total number of credits required—the student must still earn 24 credits—but would increase flexibility by enabling a student to choose an elective credit. The ITF also talked about limiting students to one “two for one” opportunity.</p>	<p><b>Two-for-One.</b> The ITF has identified the possibility of creating a new “2 for 1” policy that would enable students to earn 1 credit and satisfy 2 requirements when taking a CTE course <i>in which the content standards for both courses are met.</i> <del>that has been designated by the district to be equivalent to a core academic course:</del> One credit is recorded on the transcript, while two graduation requirements are “checked off” as having been met. This policy would not decrease the total number of credits required—the student must still earn 24 credits—but would increase flexibility by enabling a student to choose an <del>elective credit</del> <i>additional course.</i> <del>The ITF also talked about limiting students to one “two for one” opportunity.</del></p>	<p><b>Two-for-One.</b> The ITF has identified the possibility of creating a new “2 for 1” policy that would enable students to earn 1 credit and satisfy 2 requirements when taking a CTE course that has been designated by the district to be equivalent to a core academic course: One credit <del>is</del> <i>would be</i> recorded on the transcript, while two graduation requirements <del>are</del> <i>would be</i> “checked off” as having been met. This policy would not decrease the total number of credits required—the student must still earn 24 credits—but would increase flexibility by enabling a student to choose an elective credit. The ITF also talked about limiting students to one “two for one” opportunity. <i>Clear state parameters would have to be developed to ensure consistent interpretation and application of this policy to enable credit transfer within and among districts and/or schools.</i></p>	<p><b>Advantages:</b></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> <li>• <i>Leads to more integrated coursework</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Without clear state parameters, the policy could be interpreted inconsistently <i>within and/or</i> across districts and make it difficult for students to transfer credits across schools <i>and/or</i> districts</li> <li>• Might require changes to standardized transcript</li> </ul> <p><b>Questions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Would this option be offered by all districts or “available” for districts to offer?</i></li> <li>• <i>The concern about transfer students must be remedied for this idea to move forward.</i></li> </ul>

# Policies To Make Core 24 Work for All Students: ITF Work-in-Progress Recommendations

## 1/11/2010

Policy	Group Responses	Advantages/Disadvantages
<p><b>Credit Not Defined by Time.</b> Eliminate the time-based requirement for a credit.</p>	<p>Group 1 did not endorse the idea; and wanted to know what would replace time as a requirement</p> <p>Group 2 endorsed and didn't endorse the idea. They said if there is no competency-based state assessment or written district policy supporting CBA, then the 150 hours per credit would apply.</p> <p>Group 4 endorsed the idea, but expressed concern that from a funding perspective, the state could simply eliminate the time and say that the state is funding Core 24.</p> <p><b>Concern:</b> In a standards-based system, we should be defining credit by demonstrating standards—should be focusing our efforts on transitioning to assessment for standards</p> <p>In response to a question about whether Core 24 would force districts to move to a 7- or 8-period day, groups said:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Might encourage districts to move toward a 7-or 8-period day, but districts could still add hours</li> <li>• Yes, because kids will fail classes, districts will have to create shorter periods. This will create huge issues with collective bargaining</li> <li>• No, six periods should be adequate for most students. Use flexibilities to support struggling students is our recommendation.</li> <li>• It will encourage, but not force districts. Districts could always add time before or after school, during the summer, or through online courses.</li> <li>• It will hopefully encourage more intentional use of time during the day</li> </ul>	<p><i>(Responses in <b>bold</b> have been added to the original list.)</i></p> <p><b>Advantages:</b></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>• 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><b>Disadvantages:</b></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> <li>• <b>It would decrease student-teacher contact time.</b></li> <li>• <b>It may conflict with the new 1,080 hour requirement.</b></li> <li>• <b>If the state eliminates the time-based requirement, the state could say that it is already funding Core 24</b></li> </ul>

# Policies To Make Core 24 Work for All Students: ITF Work-in-Progress Recommendations

## 1/11/2010

---

Policy	Group Responses	Advantages/Disadvantages
	<p>In response to a question about whether districts in WA will be pressured to engage in “window dressing—creating more class period with less substance—groups said:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potentially true that districts could add “window dressing” but less time does not mean less substance.</li> <li>• No, unless the district is already good at window dressing actions. Core 24 provides ample opportunities (flexible options) for students to achieve or meet the requirements.</li> <li>• At 7 periods, probably no; 8 periods, it’s getting to be probably yes. However, maybe we would use time more efficiently or effectively. Would need more professional development</li> </ul>	

# Policies To Make Core 24 Work for All Students: ITF Work-in-Progress Recommendations

## 1/11/2010

Policy	Response (Group 2)	Response (Group 4+)	Advantages/Disadvantages
<p><b>Give limited waiver authority to local administrators.</b></p>	<p>Group 2 said “yes,” they would recommend that state policy authorize local administrators to waive state graduation requirements, and suggested the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Limit to 2 credits</i></li> <li>• <i>Base on student need (maybe tied to some sort of process—team assessment of individual issues)</i></li> <li>• <i>Must be documented on the transcript</i></li> <li>• <i>Cannot be in math, reading, or writing (areas of accountability for federal standards)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Clarification Needed:</b> Is the intent to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reduce the credit load from 24 to 22 <u>or</u></li> <li>• waive up to 2 requirements, but still require 24 credits?</li> </ul>	<p>Group 4 said “yes,” they would recommend that state policy authorize local administrators to waive state graduation requirements, and suggested the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Each board must adopt policy that prescribes administrator latitude and discretion on waiving required credits.</i></li> </ul> <p>Suggestion from large group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Once student makes standard on WASL, might waive an upper level course</li> </ul>	<p><b>Advantages: (Group 2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Allows flexibility to meet requirements</i></li> <li>• <i>Allows transparency that waiver has been given and why</i></li> <li>• <i>Not open-ended so thought must be used to give the waiver</i></li> <li>• <i>Acknowledges that there are fundamental skills that cannot be given waivers</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Advantages: (Group 4)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Acknowledges the professional judgment of our staff (principals)</i></li> <li>• <i>Acknowledges that there are so many variables in the way students learn</i></li> <li>• <i>Similar to how IEP teams determine graduation requirements for IEP’d kids</i></li> <li>• <i>Small schools may need flexibility</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages: (Group 2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>It’s only as good as the people/systems giving the waivers</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages: (Group 4)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Inconsistencies will occur</i></li> </ul>

# Policies To Make Core 24 Work for All Students: ITF Work-in-Progress Recommendations

## 1/11/2010

---

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Response (Group 2)</b>	<b>Response (Group 4+)</b>	<b>Advantages/Disadvantages</b>
<p><b>Competency-based Credit.</b> Permit students who meet proficiency on end-of-course state assessments to earn credit, even if they fail the course.</p>	<p>Group 2 said they would and would not endorse the policy as written. They would add the bolded statement:</p> <p>Permit students who meet proficiency on end-of-course state assessments to earn credit, even if they fail the course. <b><i>Districts may use end-of course state assessments to award credits articulated in a written district policy.</i></b></p>	<p>Group 4 said, no, they would not endorse the policy as written. They liked the concept but it needed a statement that <i>measurement of competency-based credit shall be developed at the local level or designated through district policy. They also expressed concerns with the breadth of end-of-course assessments.</i></p> <p><i>One ITF member (perhaps more?) suggested changing the statement as follows:</i></p> <p><i>Permit students who meet proficiency on end-of-course state assessments to earn credit. even if they fail the course.</i></p>	<p><i>(No changes were made to the advantages/disadvantages.)</i></p> <p><b>Advantages:</b></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><b>Disadvantages:</b></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>

# Policies To Make Core 24 Work for All Students: ITF Work-in-Progress Recommendations

## 1/11/2010

Policy	Revision (Group 2)	Revision (Groups 3, 4)	Advantages/Disadvantages
<p><b>Career Concentration.</b> The ITF suggested that the SBE 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><i>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 <del>should</del> shall meet the standards of an exploratory CTE course.</i></p>	<p><b>Group 2 suggested the following revision:</b></p> <p>Fulfill three (3) credits of career concentration courses <del>by taking: CTE courses; credited, work-based learning experiences; approved independent study, and/or general education courses</del> 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 <del>should</del> shall meet the standards of an exploratory CTE course.</p>	<p><b>Group 3 suggested the following revision:</b></p> <p>Fulfill three (3) credits of career concentration courses by taking: CTE courses; credited, work-based learning experiences; approved independent study, <i>and/or "college academic distribution requirements" (CADRs)</i> 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 <del>should</del> shall meet the standards of an exploratory CTE course.</p> <p><b>Group 4 endorsed the policy as originally written.</b></p>	<p><i>(No changes were made to the advantages/disadvantages.)</i></p> <p><b>Advantages:</b></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> <li>• "CADRs" allows more flexibility for small schools with limited CTE programs</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b></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>

# Policies To Make Core 24 Work for All Students: ITF Work-in-Progress Recommendations

## 1/11/2010

---

Policy	Advantages	Disadvantages	Questions for Idaho
<p><b>Middle School Student Accountability.</b> Middle school preparation plays a role in high school performance. Idaho's State Board of Education has forwarded a recommendation to the legislature that will be considered in the 2010 session. Idaho is recommending that middle schools be required to implement a credit system no later than 7<sup>th</sup> grade. Students will be required to attain a minimum of 80 percent of credits. Students will not be allowed to lose a full year of credit in one area (i.e. a student would not be able to fail a full year of math) and automatically move on to the next grade level. Students not meeting (or in jeopardy of not meeting) credit requirements will be given an opportunity to recover credits or complete an alternate mechanism (e.g., end-of-course assessment, achievement tests) in order to be eligible for promotion to the next grade level. Districts can establish attendance policies that can be factored into the attainment of credit.</p>	<p>(Group 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide accountability for meeting grade level standards in middle school</li> <li>• Reduces need for some remediation at high school</li> <li>• Begins credit concept at early age</li> </ul> <p>(Group 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moves the freshman struggle (this is real) earlier (could also be a disadvantage)</li> <li>• Gives students and parents more of an awareness of importance of school</li> <li>• Adds more buy-in</li> </ul>	<p>(Group 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goes against research about student retention</li> <li>• De-motivational effect</li> <li>• Facilities issue</li> </ul> <p>(Group 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We lack wrap-around support for middle level kids who struggle</li> <li>• We don't have a differentiated second year of similar curriculum (definition of insanity...expect a different result)</li> <li>• Forces growing up earlier—do we want this?</li> <li>• Age—developmental levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does summer school work to move on to next grade level?</li> <li>• Positive reward vs. punitive accountability system.</li> <li>• How does state assessment play into it?</li> </ul>

## Policies To Make Core 24 Work for All Students: ITF Work-in-Progress Recommendations

### 1/11/2010

---

Policy	Response (Group 4)	Advantages/Disadvantages
<p><b>Permit local administrators to waive state-mandated graduation requirements for students who receive an IB Diploma or Cambridge Diploma</b></p>	<p>Group 4 said yes, they would recommend that state policy authorize local administrators to waive state-mandated graduation requirements to students pursuing an IB Diploma or Cambridge Diploma</p> <p><i>(No other groups submitted worksheets on this issue.)</i></p>	<p><b>Advantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internationally-benchmarked curriculum that is rigorous</li> <li>• Gives IB students flexibility</li> <li>• Without it, IB kids on a 6-period day would be almost impossible</li> <li>• Still has 24 credits; rigor and college prep</li> </ul> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most districts can't offer IB</li> <li>• How many kids take IB classes but don't get the diploma?</li> </ul>

Policy (Group 3)	Advantages	Disadvantages
<p><b>Waive foreign language requirement as an option for ELL students.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows time in schedule for more support courses such as reading or ELL</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May not meet college entry requirements</li> </ul>
<p><b>Move one credit of fine arts to elective.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows all students to have the same exposure to arts as they do to occupational education</li> <li>• Ensures availability of arts courses for those who want in-depth study</li> <li>• Allows flexibility for small schools with limited arts offerings</li> <li>• Makes room for skill center credit</li> </ul>	<p>(none listed)</p>
<p><b>Allow students to earn one credit of fine arts in middle school.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most middle school students have significant arts electives</li> </ul>	<p>(none listed)</p>
<p><b>Give failing students multiple options to retrieve credit upon demonstration of mastery of standards (create database of programs or options schools are using to retrieve credit other than repeating entire course)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students don't need to take a full course again to earn credit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult—more work for teachers</li> </ul>