

Board Discussion of
Implementation Task Force
Policy Recommendations

June 15, 2010

Goal of June 15, 2010 meeting:

Provide direction to staff about the graduation requirements framework and related policy recommendations that the Board would like to consider formally in July, for incorporation into draft rules that the Board would review in fall 2010.

ITF Recommendation: Redefine “credit” in WAC--Eliminate the time-based (150 hours) definition of a credit, and maintain the competency-based definition.

...*“high school credit” shall mean:*

(1) Grades 9 through 12 or the equivalent of a four-year high school program, and grades 7 and 8 under the provisions of RCW 28A.230.090

~~*(a) 150 hours of planned instructional activities approved by the district; or*~~

(b) Satisfactory demonstration by a student of clearly identified competencies established pursuant to a process defined in written district policy. (WAC 180-51-050)

For Board Discussion

Consider:

- Changing the rule as the ITF recommended
- Substituting a non time-based statement such as “successful demonstration of a unit of study as established by the district.”

Or:

- Retaining the time-basis but reducing the number of hours to accommodate districts on block schedules
- Leave the rule as is

ITF Recommendation: Define *automatic enrollment* to mean all students take the core 18 credits:

English (4)

Math (3)

Science (3)

Social Studies (3)

Fitness (1.5)

Health (.5)

Arts (2)

Career Concentration (1)

For Board Discussion

The Board needs to determine what “automatic” or “default” requirements mean from the SBE perspective.

- Can local administrators waive an “automatic” or “default” requirement?
- Under what circumstances could a student take something other than the “automatic” or “default” requirements”?
- Does the SBE expect students/parents/HS staff to engage in a formal process in order to take something *other than* the default requirements?

ITF Recommendation: Limited Waiver Authority

Authorize school boards to delegate limited waiver authority to local administrators, within designated parameters.

For Board Discussion

The Board needs to determine whether the parameters outlined by the ITF are sufficient, and are consistent with the Board's definition of what constitutes "automatic" or "default" requirements. For instance, could 2 credits of science be waived (assuming the student has met standard on the science EOC assessment)? Could the culminating project or HSBP be waived?

ITF Recommendation: Two-for-One

Permit students to earn one credit and satisfy two requirements when taking either a CTE-equivalent course or another course that has been designated by the district to be equivalent to a graduation requirement.

For Board Discussion

The Board needs to determine whether the division of responsibility between districts and the state will assure that students are treated equally, regardless of the district they are in.

- Should the SBE require reciprocity?
- Should the SBE (rather than districts) set the limit on the number of two-for-one classes a student could take for graduation purposes?

ITF Recommendation: Phase-In

Phase in new requirements six years after funding begins.

For Board Discussion

The Board may want to consider “phase-in” in two ways:

- phase-in of all new requirements at once (e.g., Class of 2017, based on the ITF recommendation, assuming funding begins in 2011)
- “staggered” phase-in that allows more time for the system to build capacity in designated areas (e.g., Class of 2017 for some requirements; Class of 2018 for others).

ITF Recommendation: Competency-based Credit

Authorize through rule the opportunity for students who meet standard on state-approved end-of-course assessments to earn credit for the associated course, even if the student fails the class.

For Board Discussion

Does the Board agree in principle with this recommendation?

Is it necessary to move on this recommendation at this time, or could it be revisited after the EOC assessments became public?

ITF Recommendation: High School and Beyond Plan Starting at Middle School Focus

Start the HSBP at middle school by focusing on exploring students' options and interests.

For Board Discussion

- This is a system issue, not an individual student graduation requirement issue; students are not going to be prevented from graduation if they did not start their HSBP in middle school. Does the Board agree that it wants to seek authority to require the system to initiate the HSBP with students at the middle level?
- Does the Board agree that the HSBP should focus on exploration of students' options and interests?

ITF Recommendation: Flexibility to Meet High School Requirements at Middle Level Standards

Provide opportunities for students to begin meeting high school graduation requirements at the middle level when courses meet rigorous standards as determined by local districts.

For Board Discussion

- This discussion is not about earning credit at the middle level; middle level requirements for credit are outlined in statute, which states clearly that students must meet high school level standards to earn the credit. (28A.230.090)
- Under what circumstances, if at all, would the Board permit students to meet some high school requirements based on standards identified by the districts (not necessarily high school level standards)? For example, would the Board be willing to consider removing the .5 credit designation of WA State History and simply making WA State History a graduation requirement?

ITF Recommendation: Career Concentration

Define “career concentration” as:

Fulfill 3 credits of career concentration courses that prepare students for postsecondary education and careers on their identified program of study in their high school and beyond plan. One of the three credits shall meet the standards of an exploratory CTE course, as currently defined in the SBE’s graduation requirements WAC (180-51-066).

ITF Recommendation: Advocacy for Resources Needed for Credit Recovery

Advocate for 1) the resources needed to implement and staff programs necessary to assist struggling students in credit recovery and 2) a database of intervention options so that each district has possible models to implement.

For Board Discussion

- When the Board approved Core 24 in 2008, it also approved the following motion:

Affirm the intention of the Board to advocate for a comprehensive funding package and revision to the Basic Education Funding formula, which among other necessary investments should link the implementation of CORE 24 directly to sufficient funding to local school districts for a six-period high school day, a comprehensive education and career guidance system, and **support for students who need additional help to meet the requirements.** The Board will direct staff to prepare a funding requires for the 2009-2011 biennium to begin implementation of CORE 24.

Next Steps:

- *Formal discussion of framework and related policies in July*
- *Costing out of recommended changes this summer*
- *Review of draft rules in fall*
- *Presentation of graduation requirements to 2011 legislature (if there is a fiscal impact, the requirements must be formally authorized and funded, per ESHB 2261)*

All materials available at
www.sbe.wa.gov