SYSTEM PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM: PROGRESS ON SPA WORK PLAN, REQUIRED ACTION REPORT/PROPOSED LEGISLATION AND REVISED ACCOUNTABILITY INDEX

BACKGROUND

Since 2006, the State Board of Education has been considering the components of a statewide performance accountability system, one essential to ensuring our students receive an excellent and equitable education.

The Board created a Systems Performance Accountability (SPA) work group to review proposals for an accountability system. Dr. Kristina Mayer has served as lead for the SPA work group, which consists of stakeholders from a variety of educational groups. The meeting materials can be found at: http://www.sbe.wa.gov/spa.htm. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) has been a strong partner in helping shape the work. The progress of the SPA work group to date and anticipated new work for 2010 is shown below:

- ● Approve the provisional state Accountability Index and proposed recognition system by May 2009.
- ● Finalize OSPI-SBE recognition program(s) by July 2009 for 2009-2010 school year based on provisional Accountability Index.
- ● Work with OSPI and stakeholders to refine continuous improvement model processes, which includes OSPI voluntary support programs renamed Voluntary Action Districts (and the Innovation Zone) and Academic Watch for Challenged Schools renamed Required Action Districts, June-November 2009.
- ◑ Submit report and proposed legislation on accountability to legislature by December 1, 2009.
- ○ Develop proposed new rule on school improvement planning by March 2010.
- ○ Work with OSPI (and national groups) to request the U.S. Education Department to use the provisional state Accountability Index when making AYP decisions, beginning with results generated in the 2010-2011 school year (we realize we may need to adapt our Accountability Index to meet Federal expectations).
- ○ Develop performance goals on student achievement (new work in 2010).
- ○ Revise school and district improvement plan rules (new work in 2010).
- ○ Consider SBE Report Card indicators on topics such as college and career readiness (new work in 2010).

- Examine how the prototypical school model could be used in a system of accountability (new work in 2010 as required by ESHB 2261).

At its January 2009 meeting, the Board passed a resolution outlining its Accountability Framework (see Attachment A). There are three components to the Accountability Framework:

1. An Accountability Index to recognize schools that are successful and those that need additional assistance.
2. Targeted state programs to assist districts.
3. Required action, if there are no improvements.

The 2009 Legislature's approval of the Board's Accountability Framework is reflected in sections 501-503 of ESHB 2261 (part of the new basic education funding system). The legislature asked the SBE to present its report by December 1, 2009 (see Attachment B). The System Performance Accountability (SPA) work plan may be found under Attachment C. The most recent SPA notes from the October meeting are in Attachment D.

POLICY CONSIDERATION

SBE staff, with consultant help from Jill Severn, has prepared a report that summarizes the detailed actions of the Board's accountability framework, with a special emphasis on a legislative proposal for Required Action. The report, "An Excellent and Equitable Education for All Students: A State and Local Partnership for Accountability" is behind this memo on a tab titled:"Leg Reports."

Under the Required Action proposal, the SBE will consider the policy steps and legislative bill to enable the state to work with local districts to develop a collaborative, required process to make dramatic improvements in a limited number of districts with schools that are persistently low achieving. Currently all school and district improvement is voluntary. OSPI offers assistance only if a district agrees it wants the state's help. The SBE has created its Required Action proposal to align with the new draft federal school improvement guidelines. These may change in the final guidelines, which mean we will make any necessary adjustments. A flow chart of the Accountability Framework is provided in Attachment E. A detailed outline of the Required Action District process (formerly called Academic Watch Districts) is provided in Attachment F. The draft bill will be provided at the meeting.

The SBE consultant, Pete Bylsma, has revised the SBE Provisional Accountability Index approved in May 2009 to include performance subgroups of students as part of the new Accountability Index. See the tab titled "Index Updates" for the "Executive Summary: Washington's new Accountability Index and "Recommendations for Accountability Student Groups". The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) and the SBE plan to recognize schools for high achievement and improvement in May 2010 using the SBE Provisional Accountability Index with some OSPI additions. However, the new SBE Accountability Index will not be used for identifying low achieving schools unless the SBE and OSPI are successful in obtaining a waiver from the U.S. Department of Education or making changes in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Reauthorization. The SBE staff will work with OSPI on this next year on this effort. While staff is not overly confident we will have success, we do believe at least that the draft federal school improvement guideline measures to identify schools are better than what exists under NCLB.

EXPECTED ACTION

Staff recommends that the Board review and approve the draft report "An Excellent and Equitable Education for All Students: A State and Local Partnership for Accountability" and the proposed draft legislation for the 2010 session, with the recognition that some additional information is forthcoming

before the report is finalized. While the final report is due to the legislature December 1, 2009, staff recommends approving this draft now to submit as “draft” to the legislature. Then, at the January Board meeting, when additional information is available, approve the final report. Additional information will include data on the potential numbers of schools and districts that would be identified as persistently low achieving, as well as the final federal school improvement guidelines.

Staff recommends that the Board review and approve the revised SBE Accountability Index that incorporates an analysis of student subgroups through an additional to determine AYP based on the “Executive Summary: Washington’s new Accountability Index” and “Recommendations for Accountability Student Groups.” SBE staff will then work with OSPI to seek federal approval for the use of this new Accountability Index.

Staff also recommends the Board approve a specific recommendation to the Superintendent of Public Instruction to post the results of the Washington Language Proficiency Test results for English Language Learners by district on the OSPI Web site for the 2009-2010 school year.

Attachment A

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY RESOLUTION
JANUARY 15, 2009

WHEREAS, the State Board of Education believes that all students deserve an excellent and equitable education and that there is an urgent need to strengthen a system of continuous improvement in student achievement for all schools and districts; and

WHEREAS, the legislature charged the State Board of Education to develop criteria to identify schools and districts that are successful, in need of assistance, and those where students persistently fail, as well as to identify a range of intervention strategies and performance incentive systems; and

WHEREAS, the State Board of Education affirms the call for stronger accountability must be reciprocal between the state and local school district and accompanied by comprehensive funding reform for basic education that demonstrates “taxpayer money at work” in improving student achievement; and

WHEREAS, the State Board of Education will work with its education partners to create a unified system of federal and state accountability to improve student achievement; and

WHEREAS, the State Board of Education recognizes the need for a proactive, collaborative accountability system with support from the local school board, parents, students, staff in the schools and districts, regional educational service districts, business partners, and state officials to improve student achievement; and

WHEREAS, the State Board of Education believes that schools and districts should be recognized for best practices and exemplary work in improving student achievement; and

WHEREAS, the State Board of Education recognizes the critical role of local school boards in addressing student achievement in developing a new state accountability system as well as the need to create a new collaborative mechanism to require certain school district actions if student achievement does not improve;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board of Education will develop an Accountability Index to identify schools and districts, based on student achievement using criteria that are fair, consistent, transparent, and easily understood for the purposes of providing feedback to schools and districts to self-assess their progress as well as to identify schools with exemplary performance and those with poor performance; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the State Board of Education will work with its education partners to build the capacity of districts to help their schools improve student achievement. Programs will be tailored to the magnitude of need. As part of this system of assistance, the Board will ensure that all efforts are administered as part of one unified system of state assistance including the Innovation Zone – a new effort to help districts dramatically improve achievement levels; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that after a time set by the State Board of Education where there is no significant improvement based on an Accountability Index and other measures as defined by the Board, the district will be placed on Academic Watch and the State Board of Education will:

- Direct the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction to conduct an academic performance audit using a peer review team.

- Request the local school board, in collaboration with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, to develop an Academic Watch Plan based on the review findings, which would include an annual progress report to the local community.

- Review, approve, or send back for modification the local board Academic Watch plan, which once approved becomes a binding performance contract between the state and district.

- Ensure that the local school board will remain responsible for implementation.

- Request the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction to monitor implementation of the plan and provide updates to the State Board of Education, which may require additional actions be taken until performance improvement is realized.

- Declare a district is no longer on Academic Watch when the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction reports to the State Board of Education that the district school or schools are no longer in Priority status; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the State Board of Education believes this accountability framework needs to be a part of the revisions made to the basic education funding system and that the legislature will provide the State Board of Education, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the local school boards with the appropriate legal authority and resources to implement the new system; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board will continue to refine the details of the accountability system by working with its education, parent, business and community partners over the next year.

Adopted: January 15, 2009

Attest:

Mary Jean Ryan, Chair

Attachment B

ESHB 2261 Accountability Language

Summary:

Legislative intent is to create a proactive, collaborative system of accountability based on progressive levels of support and with a goal of continuous improvement in student achievement. The State Board of Education and the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction has been directed to seek approval for use of the system for federal accountability purposes.

Requires the SBE to continue refining an accountability framework that includes:

- An accountability index to identify successful schools and those in need of assistance.
- A proposal and timeline for a comprehensive system of voluntary support and assistance to be submitted to the legislature before being implemented.
- A proposal and timeline for a system targeted to those that have not demonstrated improvement that takes effect only if authorized by the legislature and that includes an academic performance audit, a school board-developed corrective action plan, which would be subject to SBE approval and become binding; and progress monitoring by SPI.
- Report due to legislature December 1, 2009.

ESHB 2261 Language -- now under RCW 28A.305.224 (4) (b)

SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY FOR SCHOOL AND DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT

NEW SECTION. **Sec. 501.** (1)(a) The legislature recognizes that comprehensive education finance reform and the increased investment of public resources necessary to implement that reform must be accompanied by a new mechanism for clearly defining the relationships and expectations for the state, school districts, and schools. It is the legislature's intent that this be accomplished through the development of a proactive, collaborative accountability system that focuses on a school improvement system that engages and serves the local school board, parents, students, staff in the schools and districts, and the community. The improvement system shall be based on progressive levels of support, with a goal of continuous improvement in student achievement and alignment with the federal system of accountability.

1 (b) The legislature further recognizes that it is the state's responsibility to provide schools and districts with the tools and resources necessary to improve student achievement. These tools include the necessary accounting and data reporting systems, assessment systems to monitor student achievement, and a system of general support, targeted assistance, recognition, and, if necessary, state intervention.

(2) The legislature has already charged the state board of education to develop criteria to identify schools and districts that are successful, in need of assistance, and those where students persistently fail, as well as to identify a range of intervention strategies and a performance incentive system. The legislature finds that the state board of education should build on the work that the board has already begun in these areas. As development of these formulas, processes, and systems progresses, the legislature should monitor the progress.

Sec. 502. RCW 28A.305.130 and 2008 c 27 s 1 are each amended to read as follows: The purpose of the state board of education is to provide advocacy and strategic oversight of public education; implement a standards-based accountability framework that creates a unified system of increasing levels of support for schools in order to improve student academic achievement; provide leadership in the creation of a system that personalizes education for each student and respects diverse

cultures, abilities, and learning styles; and promote achievement of the goals of RCW 28A.150.210. In addition to any other powers and duties as provided by law, the state board of education shall …(language continues from current law).

NEW SECTION. **Sec. 503.** A new section is added to chapter 28A.305 RCW to read as follows:

(1) The state board of education shall continue to refine the development of an accountability framework that creates a unified system of support for challenged schools that aligns with basic education, increases the level of support based upon the magnitude of need, and uses data for decisions.

(2) The state board of education shall develop an accountability index to identify schools and districts for recognition and for additional state support. The index shall be based on criteria that are fair, consistent, and transparent. Performance shall be measured using multiple outcomes and indicators including, but not limited to, graduation rates and results from statewide assessments. The index shall be developed in such a way as to be easily understood by both employees within the schools and districts, as well as parents and community members. It is the legislature's intent that the index provide feedback to schools and districts to self-assess their progress, and enable the identification of schools with exemplary student performance and those that need assistance to overcome challenges in order to achieve exemplary student performance.

Once the accountability index has identified schools that need additional help, a more thorough analysis will be done to analyze specific conditions in the district including but not limited to the level of state resources a school or school district receives in support of the basic education system, achievement gaps for different groups of students, and community support.

(3) Based on the accountability index and in consultation with the superintendent of public instruction, the state board of education shall develop a proposal and timeline for implementation of a comprehensive system of voluntary support and assistance for schools and districts. The timeline must take into account and accommodate capacity limitations of the K-12 educational system. Changes that have a fiscal impact on school districts, as identified by a fiscal analysis prepared by the office of the superintendent of public instruction, shall take effect only if formally authorized by the legislature through the omnibus appropriations act or other enacted legislation.

4)(a) The state board of education shall develop a proposal and implementation timeline for a more formalized comprehensive system improvement targeted to challenged schools and districts that have not demonstrated sufficient improvement through the voluntary system. The timeline must take into account and accommodate capacity limitations of the K-12 educational system. The proposal and timeline shall be submitted to the education committees of the legislature by December 1, 2009, and shall include recommended legislation and recommended resources to implement the system according to the timeline developed.

(b) The proposal shall outline a process for addressing performance challenges that will include the following features:

> (i) An academic performance audit using peer review teams of educators that considers school and community factors in addition to other factors in developing recommended specific corrective actions that should be undertaken to improve student learning;
> (ii) A requirement for the local school board plan to develop and be responsible for implementation of corrective action plan taking into account the audit findings, which plan must be approved by the state board of education at which time the plan becomes binding upon the school district to implement; and

(iii) Monitoring of local district progress by the office of the superintendent of public instruction. The proposal shall take effect only if formally authorized by the legislature through the omnibus appropriations act or other enacted legislation.

(5) In coordination with the superintendent of public instruction, the state board of education shall seek approval from the United States department of education for use of the accountability index and the state system of support, assistance, and intervention, to replace the federal accountability system under P.L. 107-110, the no child left 31 behind act of 2001.

(6) The state board of education shall work with the education data center established within the office of financial management and the technical working group established in section 112 of this act to determine the feasibility of using the prototypical funding allocation model as not only a tool for allocating resources to schools and districts but also as a tool for schools and districts to report to the state legislature and the state board of education on how the state resources received are being used.

Attachment C

SPA Work Plan
November 2009

Objectives:

- Approve the provisional state Accountability Index and proposed recognition system by May 2009.
- Finalize OSPI-SBE recognition program(s) by July 2009 for 2009-2010 school year based on provisional Accountability Index.
- Work with OSPI and stakeholders to refine continuous improvement model processes, which includes OSPI voluntary support programs renamed Voluntary Action Districts (and the Innovation Zone) and Academic Watch for Challenged Schools renamed Required Action Districts , June-November
- Develop proposed new rule on school improvement planning by March 2010.
- Work with OSPI (and national groups) to request the U.S. Education Department to use the provisional state Accountability Index when making AYP decisions, beginning with results generated in the 2010-2011 school year (we realize we may need to adapt our Accountability Index to meet Federal expectations).
- Submit report and proposed legislation on accountability to legislature by December 1, 2009.
- Develop performance goals on student achievement (new work in 2010).
- Revise school and district improvement plan rules (new work in 2010).
- Consider SBE Report Card indicators on topics such as college and career readiness (new work in 2010).
- Examine how the prototypical school model could be used in a system of accountability (new work in 2010- required by ESHB 2261).

Revised Timeline for System Performance Accountability (SPA)
Work 2009-2010

Dates	Activities
January 14-15, 2009	Board meeting to review: • Draft resolution for action. • Feedback on Accountability Index and Pete Bylsma's revisions. • Work Plan for 2009. • Achievement Gap Data Overview for Commissions' Work. • ELL Issues for state oversight by Howard DeLeeuw, OSPI.
January- March	Edie and Pete will meet with superintendents at nine ESD meetings stateside to review the Accountability Index, Innovation Zone, and Academic Watch proposals. Pete will meet with technical advisers from

Dates	Activities
	school districts and OSPI at least twice regarding refinements to the index.
February 17	SPA Work session: • Kris and Edie will frame our work for year. • OSPI will give brief update on NCLB status and federal funding. • OSPI will present lessons learned from Summit Districts and Sustainability and thoughts on programs to serve continuous improvement for schools and districts. • SBE Consultant will discuss refinements to Accountability Index, as presented to the Board in January Meeting. • SBE Consultant will discuss recognition program using Accountability Index.
March 12-13	Board meeting: • Hear update from SPA work session. Pete will seek input from several national experts from OSPI's National Technical Advisory Committee on March 13 to review the SBE proposed Accountability Index.
April 21	SPA Work session: • Review continued refinements on Accountability Index (focus on alternative education, ELL), deeper analysis for struggling schools, and recognition program.
May 14-15	Board meeting to review: • Update from SPA work session. • Approve Provisional Accountability Index Plan A (we will also work on a Plan B) and SBE and OSPI recognition program(s).
May-July	Develop strategy and outreach to different stakeholder groups and work with OSPI and the U.S. Education Department on Accountability Index for improved (and unified) system for determining AYP. Work with OSPI on recognition program(s).
June 16	SPA work session on OSPI voluntary state programs of continuous improvement for all schools as well as deeper analysis of struggling schools. Discuss ways to incorporate dropout data and achievement gap recommendations into our work for overall report card tracking.
July 15-17	Board meeting: • Begin discussion on OSPI voluntary state programs of continuous improvement and key indicators for deeper analysis.
August 11	SPA work session on Subgroup analysis for Accountability Index, Voluntary and Academic Watch process, Professional Learning Communities WEA presentation, Data in Motion ESD 113 presentation.
September 17-18	Board meeting: • Continue discussion on provisions for OSPI voluntary school for continuous improvement and Academic Watch process.
October 13	SPA work session: • Discussion of recommendations and timeline on state voluntary support programs and Academic Watch (renamed Required Action) process. • Discussion of revision to SBE Provisional Accountability Index to incorporate sub group analysis.
October - November	OSPI/SBE recognition of schools under new program.

Dates	Activities
	Discussions with U.S. Education Department on proposed unified accountability system.
November 12-13	Board meeting: • Review draft school improvement plan rule revisions (look at nine effective school characteristics) and approval of proposals and timeline for OSPI voluntary state support programs for struggling schools under Academic Watch. • Present overall accountability report card.
December 1, 2009	Report to legislature December 1 on proposal and implementation for 1) recommendations for state voluntary program; 2) "Academic Watch" for challenged schools and districts that have not demonstrated sufficient improvement through the voluntary system-- Legislature must approve this in statute or appropriations bill; and 3) use of prototypical school model to report on how state resources are used (this last provision does not have a December 1 date).
February 9, 2010	SBE Performance Goals, College and Career Readiness Indicators, SBE Report Card , School and District Improvement Plans, Accountability Using the Prototypical Schools Model.
April 13, 2010	
June 8, 2010	

Attachment D

Systems Performance Accountability (SPA) Notes
October 13, 2009

Attendees: Kris Mayer, Phyllis Bunker Frank, Warren Smith, Bernal Baca, Steve Dal Porto, Amy Bragdon, Connie Fletcher, Bob Hughes, Mack Armstrong, George Juarez, Erin Jones, Janell Newman, Tonya Middling, Gary Kipp, Karen Davis, Mike Bernard, Bill Williams, Phil Brockman, Caroline King, Martha Rice, Pete Bylsma, Edie Harding, Brad Burnham

Recap of Progress To Date and Current Work on Accountability Framework for Voluntary and Required Action

Edie Harding gave an update on progress to complete the details of the State Board of Education (SBE) Accountability Framework. OSPI and SBE will ensure our Accountability Framework is seamless, integrates with the new Federal School Improvement guidelines, and builds upon the work of our Systems Performance Accountability (SPA) work group, which includes: a continuous system of improvement for schools and districts, a joint state/local collaboration for voluntary and required action, a focus on improvement and additional state criteria to determine which districts move into Required Action.

The accomplishments of the SPA work group and the SBE include: a review of current national research issues and Washington state school and district policy barriers and performance issues; a collaborative accountability framework; a provisional accountability index to recognize high achieving schools that improve; closing the achievement gap and meeting standard; and creation of a process for reviewing districts with persistently low achieving schools for voluntary and required action.

Janell Newman discussed the expectations under the draft Federal School Improvement guidelines. New measures will be used to determine the lowest achieving schools that include assessing absolute performance as well as growth in the all category of students for reading and math. One cohort of Title I and Title I eligible schools will be identified by Washington based on these and other criteria to receive federal funds under school improvement (through the district with these schools). Districts will be asked to participate based on a determination of greatest commitment to follow through on the four federal models of intervention. These models are: turnaround, closure, restart and transformation.

Edie outlined the proposed steps that would occur for those very few districts that would fall under the SBE proposal for Required Action. The steps include a joint state/local collaboration with recommendation from an independent external audit that the local school board will use to create a plan (using one of the four federal models or a state model or local model). SBE will need to approve the local school board plan. The state will be responsible for providing the resources and authority to districts to implement the binding conditions of the plan.

Feedback forms in hard and electronic copy were distributed to the SPA group for input. Some of the initial thoughts from the group included: concerns about the sustainability of the school improvement funds after three years, timing with the Quality Education Council, and basic education funding revisions. Members of the groups wanted a way to be clear about the role of districts vs. schools in the voluntary and required action, the capacity to address the four federal models for school improvement, and details of how opening up the collective bargaining agreement would work in required action.

SBE will consider action at its November Board meeting to approve further refinements of its Accountability Framework:

1) The details for Voluntary and Required Action for addressing the role of the state and local districts with low performing schools to improve educational outcomes for their students – a final report and a draft bill for the 2010 legislation session will be prepared based upon the Board's action.

2) Revisions to the SBE Provisional Accountability Index to examine high and low achieving schools. The current SBE Provisional Accountability Index will be used for a Joint OSPI/SBE Recognition Program for high achieving schools as well as those that show gains in achievement and closing the achievement gap, compared to their peers or overall improvement. SBE/OSPI will work with the Federal government to pursue a waiver or changes in No Child Left Behind to use the revised Accountability Index with low achieving schools.

Review of Criteria for District Identification for Voluntary and Required Action

Pete Bylsma outlined some suggested state criteria to determine what additional measures beyond the federal school improvement rule could be used to identify districts with persistently low achieving schools. These include as a first step: identification of the bottom 25 percent of schools (both Title I and non Title I) based on percentage of all students in both reading and math for four years; the use of the AYP uniform bar as a metric; the results for elementary, middle, high and multiple grade bands; and examination of those in the bottom quartiles of their grade band in both math and reading for four years. Under the second step, a deeper analysis would include: contextual data (school type, changes in student population, feeder patterns, district governance); other assessment data (subgroups, achievement gaps, Washington Language Proficiency Test); teaching and learning issues (staff qualifications and experience, curriculum alignment, extended learning opportunities, community involvement); other data (dropout rates, external evaluations, participation and unexcused absences); cells of the SBE Accountability Index (peer ratings, close the achievement gap, graduation rates). State criteria for Required Action for districts will need to be legally defensible: quantitative and not open to subjective interpretation.

Race to the Top

Edie provided an update on Washington's plans to seek funding from the Race to The Top competitive grant in Round 1 (January 2010) and Round 2 (June 2010). She handed out an organizational and work plan. The Governor, the Superintendent, and the Chair of the State Board of Education must sign off on the application. The SPA group will receive updates from a number of work groups, including one on struggling schools. We will solicit feedback from local districts and other education stakeholders. Proposals must address: the state's full range of students, show effective strategies to change and improve educational outcomes, be equitable, research based, scaleable, and sustainable.

Revisions to SBE Provisional Accountability Index and Sub Group Analysis

A critical revision to the Provisional Accountability Index is the addition of the subgroup analysis. Pete Bylsma made revisions based upon feedback from his technical advisers, federal experts, and SPA members, which will: 1) keep reporting all subgroups on the OSPI Report Card, 2) keep the Accountability Index the same as the Board adopted last May and used for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) decisions for all students, and 3) use a separate modified Index with more

subgroups to make AYP decisions based on each individual subgroup (this last one was suggested by the SPA group discussion).

The all student group will use SBE Provisional Accountability Index (reading, writing, math, science and graduation rate).The schools and districts must have a 2-year average of at least 3.00 as an overall average on the Accountability Index to make AYP.

On the additional index for subgroups, four more subgroups will be added. The outcomes for the subgroups will be limited to those in the Federal accountability – reading, math and extended graduation rate, computing a row average for each subgroup. Any subgroup may not make AYP if the average of the subgroup row does not improve at least once every two years. Special education students will have no restriction on the percent of students who can count as meeting standard on the Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS) and special education students who reach level 2 on the state wide assessments will be deemed as meeting standard.

The Board will consider taking action on these changes at its November Board meeting.

Revisions to the 180 Day Waiver Process

Brad Burnham presented one of the options for consideration for revisions to the 180 day waivers. The proposed option would shift long term planning efforts for student achievement to OSPI to administer under the new accountability system in both voluntary and required action. SPA members felt that these waivers should not be available to schools and districts that were going to receive additional funds under voluntary or required action. They felt the waivers should be handled in one office (SBE). All acknowledged the dilemma in terms of trading time for professional development and instructional time for students.

Staff does not plan to go forward with a recommendation on this particular revision to the 180 day waiver process.

The next SPA meeting is scheduled for 1- 4 p.m. on February 9, 2010 at the Renton School District.

Washington State Board of Education (SBE) Accountability Framework

Key Components of the SBE Accountability Framework

1. An excellent and equitable education for all students.
2. Continuous improvement for all schools and districts.
3. One federal/state system.
4. State and local collaborative effort.

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) Identification Process

Step One: Identify persistently low achieving schools (and their districts) using proposed federal school improvement guidelines (include non-Title I schools).

Step Two: Use additional criteria to examine school and district performance.

Step Three: Identify the lowest performing schools (and their districts).

All Districts Not Identified for Voluntary or Required Action

Annual Efforts

The districts create School and District Improvement plans to address issues of student achievement.

OSPI provides limited technical assistance.

Districts with Persistently Low Achieving Schools Identified for Voluntary or Required Action

Voluntary Action Districts ↔ **Required Action Districts**

The local board will select one of the four Federal School Improvement Models: (turnaround, restart, closure, transformation) or additional state or local models (for Required Action only).

Positive Outcomes

1. Improve student achievement for all students to prepare for postsecondary education, work, and citizenship.
2. Build the capacity of districts to help students improve.
3. Close the achievement gap.
4. Lower dropout rates.

THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Accountability | World Class Math and Science Standards | Meaningful Diploma/CORE 24
600 Washington Street | Olympia, Washington 98504 | www.sbe.wa.gov

11.02.09

Attachment F

Persistently Low Achieving Schools and Their Districts for Voluntary and Required Action Process

November 3, 2009 DRAFT FOR BILL CONSIDERATION

1. Definitions

Definition of a Persistently Low Achieving School: The U.S. Secretary of Education has committed to turning around the bottom five percent of Title I Schools and Title I eligible schools using the federal school improvement grants as a major catalyst. The primary metric will be measuring all student performance in each school for reading and math in terms of absolute performance (the lowest performers) as well as based on whether schools have improved at the same rate as the state average gains based on the all student category for reading and math. The schools are defined into three tiers:

Tier I: Lowest five percent of Title I schools in a step of improvement as defined by No Child Left Behind.

Tier II: Equally low-achieving secondary schools that are Title I eligible.

Tier III: Title I schools in a step of improvement as defined by No Child Left Behind not identified in Tier I.

Those districts with schools in Tier I and Tier II would be the highest priority to be served under the federal school improvement guidelines.

Definition of a Persistently Low Achieving District: A district with persistently low achieving schools identified below that will be invited to participate as a one of the state's Voluntary Action Districts or Required Action Districts with the addition of non Title I schools for Required Action.

Definition of a Voluntary Action District: A Voluntary Action District contains Title I and Title I eligible schools that have extremely low overall student achievement <u>and</u> have not demonstrated growth in meeting or exceeding the state average performance gains in reading and math for all students <u>in four years</u>, plus additional state defined criteria.

Definition of Required Action District: A Required Action District contains Title I <u>and non Title I schools</u> that have extremely low overall student achievement <u>and</u> have not demonstrated growth in meeting or exceeding the state average performance gains in reading and math for all students <u>in six years</u>, plus additional state defined criteria.

2. Selection Criteria for Voluntary and Required Action based on Districts with Persistently Low Achieving Schools Identification Process:

a. First step: Federal Criteria: Lowest five Percent of Schools Based on All Students Metrics in Math and Reading.

Conduct initial sort of persistently low achieving schools based on draft federal school improvement guidelines described above -- absolute achievement and improvement for "all student" category in reading and math based on the three tiers. This step

would be described in the SBE proposed bill.

b. Second step: State Criteria: Duration and Pattern of Low Achievement and Greatest Number of Students/Schools Affected

Examine state defined criteria[1] which would not be described in the SBE proposed bill except to mention that the state will use other criteria including but not limited to:

i. Six years of performance data on state assessment for elementary schools, middle schools and high schools.
ii. Feeder school patterns: elementary to middle to high school progression that continue to have low achievement.
iii. Number of students and numbers of schools in district with low achievement. Note: removed alternative schools and grades as covered in i-iii); low achievement needs to be defined.

c. Third step: Additional State Criteria Examining Details of Low Achievement

Determine persistently lowest achieving schools and their districts based on above criteria. Additional state criteria after Second Step will include but are not limited to (these will not be described in SBE proposed bill):

i. Extended graduation rate for high school students.
ii. Sub group performance on state assessments.
iii. ELL performance on Washington Language Performance Test.
iv. District capacity in terms of financial and human resources.
v. Percent of required credits seventh-ninth graders have earned to measure if they are on track.
vi. Perception survey data from local board, staff, students, and community.
vii. Local district data on student achievement.

d. Fourth step: Inform all districts identified as Persistently Low Achieving Districts of their status as Voluntary Action Districts or Required Action Districts and invite any of these districts to participate as Voluntary Action Districts

e. Fifth step: For those districts identified as Required Action Districts that choose not to participate on as a Voluntary Action District, they will move into official Required Action District status within three months of identification[2]

3. Voluntary Action Districts Process:

a. OSPI will use external experts to conduct a district needs assessment (similar to audit described under Required Action).
b. Local school district with local school board approval will select one of four federal models described below in Required Action Steps.
c. OSPI will focus on building district capacity to address individual schools.

[1] Future state criteria may include: measures of high school students' preparedness for postsecondary and career readiness: course completion and success (including the CORE 24 recommended graduation requirements and dual college high school credits): achievement based on multiple assessments including college ready tests and IB and AP exams; and attainment in graduation and participation in postsecondary education. Middle school students criteria could include attendance and course failure. Elementary school students' criteria could attendance; refinements at all levels to measures of quality teaching.
[2] The legislature will need to approve the Required Action process before districts will be placed into Required Action.

4. Required Action Districts Process:

a. OSPI notifies the local school district and superintendent that it is recommending the district be placed in Required Action and provides the reasons why. Based on state criteria for the Required Action, a district may be placed in Required Action within three months unless it decides to volunteer to participate as a Voluntary Action District.
b. OSPI notifies SBE of districts recommended as Required Action Districts.
c. The local school district may appeal to SBE/OSPI staff panel for review if it disagrees with OSPI and provide information on why district should not be in Required Action:
    i. Panel will make recommendation to SBE.
d. SBE designates district is in Required Action within three months of determination.
e. OSPI conducts Academic Performance Audit with experts external to the Required Action District:
    i. Composition of audit group:
        1. External expertise in comprehensive school and district reform.
        2. No staff member of OSPI, SBE, or the specific Required Action District being reviewed may participate on the audit group.
    ii. Audit components would focus on student achievement including, but not limited to, the following issues within each school and the district that relate to student achievement:
        1. Strengths and weaknesses of current leadership in district and schools.
        2. Quality and implementation of current district and school improvement plans.
        3. Human resources policies (how staff is evaluated, hired, compensated, assigned, trained, and replaced) through collective bargaining contracts and other local school board policies.
        4. Alignment of curriculum and instruction to state standards.
        5. Use of data to inform instructional practice.
        6. Quality and use of instructional time, including amount.
        7. Current resources (federal, state and local) targeted on lowest performing schools.
        8. Family and community partnerships with schools.
        9. The most effective model based on Academic Performance Audit.
f. Local school board in collaboration with its staff and community develops Required Action Plan based on audit findings and the following steps:
    i. Choose model:
        1. One of four federal models: turnaround, restart, close, and transformation.
            a. Turnaround: replace principal and fifty percent of staff; adopt new governance, other requirements.
            b. Restart: open under new management.
            c. School closure: send students to other schools in districts.
            d. Transformation: develop teacher and school leader effectiveness, comprehensive instructional reforms, extended learning time, community oriented schools, operating flexibility, and sustained support. (Note there are very specific requirements attached to each of these categories, e,g, replace the principal, provide more time for enrichment opportunities, etc.)

2. A state model (if state funding or RTTT funding is available) using the SBE Innovation Zone, which responds to the audit findings and addresses the key elements of the federal transformation model, but does not require specific activities as described in the federal guidelines.
3. A local model that has proven research strategies which does not require state or federal funding.

ii. Develop Required Action Implementation plan, budget, resources, and metrics for measuring outcomes:
1. Plan must identify how to remedy Academic Performance and utilize one of the above models.
2. Budget may include:
a. Federal funds will be available for districts to use in Title I schools or Title I eligible schools.
b. State funds would be available for districts with non Title I schools or if the state model is selected (we will consider using RTTT funds initially but they may not be available for a transformation like model).
c. Local funds for local model.
3. Metrics will include:
a. Specific interventions to be implemented.
b. Leading indicators such as instructional minutes per school year and teacher attendance.
c. Student achievement outcomes, such as assessment data and student enrollment in advanced coursework (for high schools) by subgroups.
d. Others as identified by local school district.

iii. Other things to consider in plan?

g. SBE approves Required Action Plan. Local school district must make significant progress within three years.
h. State provides resources for district to act on Required Action Implementation Plan and make plan binding.
i. OSPI creates list of education management organizations and technical assistance providers that could help districts.
j. Local school board and district required to provide regular reports to SBE/OSPI and community on progress:
i. Required Action District reports will be quarterly.
ii. Reports will contain:
1. Strategies and assets to solve problems.
2. Evidence of implementation.
3. Evidence of impact.
4. Other ideas?

k. OSPI notifies SBE and Required Action district that district is ready to exit Required Action or that the district is not making sufficient progress after three years:
i. Sufficient progress is measured by district's Required Action Plan metrics.
ii. Change in learning index overall and for each subgroup – need to move up at least one level from one to two, etc.
iii. Examining students taking more college prep and college credit classes.
iv. Required Action Implementation progress on federal measures of absolute achievement in reading and math and improvement equal to or above the state average gains in the "all students" category.

l. SBE approves Required Action District's release or requires local school board to assess use of a different model if progress is not made and develop a new Required Action Plan.

5. Timelines

a. Board approves legislative request in fall 2009.
b. SBE, OSPI, Governor, key legislators, and stakeholders request legislation in winter 2010.
c. Identify eligible schools and their districts in winter 2010.
d. Notify all districts that are Voluntary Action Districts and those that are Required Action that they may participate as Voluntary Action Districts winter 2010.
e. Implement new Voluntary Action and Required Action programs in spring/summer 2010 (if legislature approves although state funding for non Title I schools will not be available this early, we will apply for RTTT grant funds initially).
f. Voluntary Action Districts have three years to successfully implement their plans or they will be moved to Required Action.
g. Required Action Districts have three years to successfully implement their plans or demonstrate sufficient progress as defined by the Required Action Plan.

6. Components of Legislation

a. Allow state to intervene through state/local collaboration process for Required Action (required by Feds for new school improvement guidelines and Race to the Top).
b. Required Action:
    i. Lay out steps and avoid being overly prescriptive.
c. Authority:
        1. Ability to reopen collective bargaining contract to include subjects of mandatory bargaining based on audit findings and local board's proposed Required Action Plan.
        2. Collective bargaining agreement must execute a new memorandum of agreement to create an amended agreement that is aligned with the local school board's Required Action Plan.
        3. Express authority for district to use education management organizations for any of the intervention models
    ii. Ability to withhold Title I funds if district does not produce plan that SBE approves.
d. Resources:
    i. Estimate resources needed as part of fiscal note and future legislative request in 2011.
    ii. Initial funding for districts to develop Required Action Plan.
    iii. Federal funding for school improvement may be used for Title I and Title I eligible schools available 2010-13. Estimated $42.5 million.
    iv. RTTT request to support non Title I schools for 2010-13.
    v. State funding for non Title I schools request in 2011-13 biennium.
    vi. State funding to support OSPI request in 2011-13.
    vii. If funding is not available under the Required Action process for additional districts or non Title I schools, districts will remain in Required Action but not penalized and will be the first to receive funding when it becomes available.