



**Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
District and School Improvement and Accountability**

**SBE Briefing on DRAFT Criteria for Required Action Districts
August 10, 2010**

Background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature passed E2SSB 6696 creating Required Action Districts that contain persistently lowest achieving Title I or Title I eligible schools in the bottom five percent of performance on state assessments for all students in math and reading. • Beginning in January 2011, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) shall annually recommend to the State Board of Education (SBE) districts for designation as required action districts based on the availability of federal funds and OSPI criteria as defined in rule. In January 2011 and annually thereafter, the SBE will designate the Required Action District(s). • OSPI must ensure the Required Action District will meet the requirements of the Federal School Improvement Guidelines to receive funding.
Defining Persistently Lowest-Achieving (PLA) Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI will recalculate the list of PLAs for the 2010-2011 school year; though this is not required by ED; it is now required by E2SSB 6696. • DSIA will amend its FY 2009 State SIG app to remove “newly eligible” from the definition of the PLA list and show changes in models or DSIA direct service provided to SIG schools-Sept • DSIA will need to apply for FY 2010 SIG app for Cohort II in the amount of approx \$8 million per year for 3 years. ED SIG guidance is expected for release Sept-Oct. • 2011 PLA list will be based upon ED’s approval of the new PLA definition. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Takes into account case by case analysis ○ Schools with a “Minimum N” less than 30; subject to approval of a waiver ○ Complies with federal guidelines • Note: DSIA renamed SIG to MERIT which stands for Models of Equity and Excellence through Rapid Improvement and Turnaround.
Criteria	<p>For the 2011 RAD designation, the following criteria will be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school district has one or more schools on the persistently lowest achieving list; • For recommendations in January 2011, the school district did not apply for a school improvement grant in the 2009-10 school year application period; • Student achievement in the school has not improved in reading and mathematics combined in the past three years as measured by state assessment scores; and • Federal funds are available to provide appropriate assistance for the school or schools in the school district. • Up to 2 school districts may be recommended for RAD designation based on these criteria. <p>The 3rd bullet in this section is being defined through our work with consultants.</p> <p>For the 2012 RAD designation and annually thereafter, the following criteria will be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school district has one or more schools on the persistently lowest achieving list; • Student achievement in the school has not improved in reading and mathematics combined in the past three years as measured by state assessment scores; and • Federal funds are available to provide appropriate assistance for the school or schools in the school district. • Up to 2 additional school districts may be recommended for RAD designation based on these criteria.

<p><i>Exit Criteria</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A school district may be recommended for removal from required action after three years of implementation if the district has no school or schools on the list of persistently lowest achieving schools, and • The school or schools on the list of persistently lowest achieving schools have a positive improvement trend in reading and mathematics on the state's assessment in the "all students" category based on a three-year average.
<p><i>Funding</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2009-10 SIG ARRA: \$42.5m Encumbered FY2010 -2013; SIG Cohort I (9 districts/18 schools) • 2009-10 1003(g)SIG: \$3m Encumbered FY2010 - 2013; SIG Cohort I (9 districts, 18 schools) • 2010-11 1003(g)SIG: \$7m Encumbered FY 2010 – 2012; SIG Cohort I (9 districts, 18 schools) • 2010-11 State Focused Assistance: \$1.5m Encumbered FY 2010; School to School Initiative (12 schools) • 2009-10 1003(a) ARRA: \$5.2m Encumbered FY 2010; Summit Districts (8 districts, 49 schools) • 2010-11 1003(a) Regular: \$7m Encumbered FY 2010; WIIN PD/TA Services (19 districts, 46 schools from bottom quintile of Tier III and unfunded Tier I and Tier II schools) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DIA-DIF Services (28 districts, 168 schools) ○ ESD Partnerships (CSA) ○ Education Partner Contracts (AWSP, WASA, WSSDA) • 2011-12 1003(g) SIG: SIG \$8m Projected FY 2011; SIG Cohort II (3 districts/6 schools – 1st year only) • 2011-12 1003(a) Regular*: \$8m Projected FY 2011; WIIN PD/TA Services, Summit Cohort II and DIA-DIF Services • 2012-13 1003(g) SIG: \$8m Projected FY 2012: SIG Cohort II (3 districts/6 schools – 2nd year only) • 2012-13 1003(a) Regular*: \$8m Projected FY 2012; WIIN PD/TA Services and DIA-DIF Services • *ESEA Reauthorization will potentially impact funding amount and distribution/use of these school improvement funds • NOTE: State Focused Assistance funding is not projected as a part of current or future resources available to support SIG, WIIN, DIA or Summit activities, CSA and other Education Partner Contracts.