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## A Combined Effort

### Responsibilities For Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSPI</th>
<th>SBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifies Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools</td>
<td>Designates Required Action Districts (RAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implements U.S. Department of Education School Improvement Grants (Merit Schools and Required Action Districts)</td>
<td>Approves RAD Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommends RADs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversees Performance Audit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews RADs Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose

- Provide background about SIG/MERIT Schools
- Provide information regarding Required Action under ESS2B 6696
School Improvement Grants (SIG)

- Purpose: Turn around lowest 5% schools nationwide (PLAs)

- 2010-11 Allocation:
  - $42.5 million ARRA over three years
Schools Identified as Tiers I & II in 2009-2010

- 47 schools in 27 districts are defined as “persistently lowest-achieving.”
  - 44 are traditional public schools
  - 3 are alternative schools

Schools with N < 30 continuously enrolled students excluded to ensure accuracy needed for valid and reliable determinations.
New Achievement Metrics

Absolute

Data on state assessment indicate student achievement in reading and mathematics in “all students” is extremely low.

Growth

Data indicate a lack of growth on those assessments over a number of years in the “all students” group.
Definitions

_Persistently lowest-achieving:_

- **Tier I:**
  - Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action or restructuring that:
    - Is among the lowest-achieving 5% in the “all students” group in reading & mathematics for the past 3 consecutive years (*Tier I – Achievement*); or
    - Is a high school that has a weighted-average graduation rate that is less than 60% based on the past 3 years of data. (*Tier I – Graduation*)
  - (2009-10 only) Or for newly eligible schools, any school that:
    - Has not made AYP for at least the past 2 consecutive years; and
    - Is no higher-achieving than the highest-achieving school identified above. (*Tier I – Newly Eligible*)
Definitions

- **Tier II:**
  - Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that:
    - Is among the lowest-achieving 5% of secondary schools in the “all students” group in reading & mathematics combined for the past three consecutive years (*Tier II – Achievement*); or
    - Is a high school that has a weighted-average graduation rate that is less than 60% based on the past 3 years of data; (*Tier II – Graduation*),
    - (2009-2010 only) Or, for newly eligible Tier II schools, is a Title I eligible secondary school that:
      - Has not made AYP for at least the past two consecutive years;
      - Is no higher-achieving than the highest-achieving school identified above; and
      - Is in Step 5 of Improvement with a decreasing performance trend. (*Tier II – Newly-Eligible*)
Definitions

- **Progress defined as:** The school’s percent increase or decrease (slope of linear regression) over the most recent three-year period compared to the state slope.

- **Title I eligible:** Based on SY 2009-10 student data, a school is considered Title I eligible if:
  - Poverty percentage is 35% or more; or
  - The school’s poverty percentage is greater than or equal to the district’s poverty average.
Geographical Distribution

Geographical Distribution: Tiers I and II
(Number of Schools and Percentage)

ESD171 - Wenatchee/Okanogan ESD, 2, 4%
ESD198 - North Puget Sound ESD, 3, 6%
ESD101 - Spokane ESD, 2, 4%
ESD105 - Yakima Valley ESD, 13, 28%
ESD123 - Tri-cities ESD, 8, 17%
ESD121 - Puget Sound ESD, 12, 26%
ESD112 - Vancouver ESD, 3, 6%
ESD113 - Olympia/Occidental ESD, 4, 9%
ESD114 - Bremerton/Olympic Peninsula ESD, 0, 0%
Step of Improvement

NCLB School Improvement Step: Tiers I and II
(Number of Schools and Percentage)

- Step 5, 23, 49%
- Step 4, 10, 21%
- Step 3, 4, 9%
- Step 2, 7, 15%
- Step 1, 3, 6%
- Not in improvement, 0, 0%
School Level

School Level: Tiers I and II
(Number of Schools and Percentage)

- Elem, 15, 32%
- Middle, 21, 45%
- High School, 6, 13%
- Multi-Level, 5, 10%
Ethnic Diversity

Tiers I and II: Ethnic Diversity
(Percent of Enrollment)

- American Indian
- Asian (incl. Ht/Pac Isl.)
- African American / Black
- Hispanic
- White

Tier and State percentages.
Poverty

Tiers I and II: Poverty vs State
(Percent of Enrollment)

Poverty vs State (OSPI)
English Language Learners

Tiers I and II: ELL (Transitional Bilingual) vs State
(Percent of Enrollment)
Four SIG School Intervention Models

- Turnaround
- Restart
- Closure
- Transformation
## Turnaround Model Overview

### Teachers and Leaders
- Replace principal
- Use locally adopted “turnaround” competencies to review and select staff for school (rehire no more than 50% of existing staff)
- Implement strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff

### Instructional and Support Strategies
- Select and implement an instructional model based on student needs
- Provide job-embedded Professional Development designed to build capacity and support staff
- Ensure continuous use of data to inform and differentiate instruction

### Time and Support
- Provide *increased learning time*
- Staff and students
- Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports

### Governance
- New governance structure
- Grant operating flexibility to school leader

---

May also implement any of the required or permissible strategies under the Transformation Model
Transformation Model Overview

Teachers and Leaders
- Replace principal
- Implement new evaluation system
- Developed with staff
- Uses student growth as a significant factor
- Identify and reward staff who are increasing student outcomes; support and then remove those who are not
- Implement strategies to recruit, place and retain staff

Instructional and Support Strategies
- Select and implement an instructional model based on student needs
- Provide job-embedded Professional Development designed to build capacity and support staff
- Ensure continuous use of data to inform and differentiate instruction

Time and Support
- Provide increased learning time
- Staff and students
- Provide ongoing mechanisms for community and family engagement
- Partner to provide social-emotional and community-oriented services and support

Governance
- Provide sufficient operating flexibility to implement reform
- Ensure ongoing technical assistance

An LEA with nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the Transformation Model in more than 50% of those schools.
Who applied for SIG Funds?

- 27 districts were eligible to apply on behalf of 47 schools
- 21 districts applied on behalf of 41 schools
- 37 schools applied using the Transformation model
- 3 schools applied using the Turnaround model
- 1 school applied using School Closure
Districts/Schools Selected

- **Grandview**
  - Grandview Middle School

- **Highline**
  - Cascade Middle School
  - Chinook Middle School

- **Longview**
  - Monticello Middle School

- **Marysville**
  - Tulalip Elementary
  - Totem Middle School

- **Seattle**
  - Cleveland High School
  - Hawthorne Elementary
  - West Seattle Elementary

- **Tacoma**
  - Giaudrone Middle School
  - Jason Lee Middle School
  - Stewart Middle School

- **Sunnyside**
  - Sunnyside High School

- **Wellpinit**
  - Wellpinit Elementary

- **Yakima**
  - Adams Elementary
  - Stanton Academy
  - Washington Middle School
Models of Equity and Excellence through Rapid Improvement and Turnaround
Evaluation Requirements for SIG/MERIT Schools’ Teachers and Leaders

- Implement rigorous, transparent and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals which are:
  - Developed with staff; and
  - Use student growth as a significant factor.

- Identify and reward school leaders and teachers who have increased student achievement and graduation rates;

- Identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities to improve professional practice, have not done so.

- Implement such strategies as financial incentives and career ladders for recruiting, placing and retaining effective teachers.
Current Challenges

- Accelerated timelines; high expectations for change and growth in student performance
- Many years of insufficient professional development for both principals and teachers
- Building authentic parent/community engagement and having parents with us at the table.
- Confusion regarding the requirements under the federal intervention model
- Lack of Tier II and Tier III intervention materials
- Lack of Special Education curriculum
DSIA Support
MERIT Network

5 MERIT Coordinators

- MERIT Coordinators are responsible for monitoring implementation monthly at both the district and school level via Tracker and 90 day plans;

- Co designing PD around HRMS, improving graduation rates and student achievement on state assessment

- Leveraging expertise offered via the WIIN
From Planning to Implementation

Moving forward to an excellent and equitable education for our students.

A review of the Required Action process
The Selection and Process

1. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) creates a list of the bottom 5% of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are Title I or Title I eligible.

2. OSPI criteria determines if district is recommended for Required Action.

3. The State Board of Education (SBE) designates the district as a Required Action District.

4. OSPI conducts a performance audit of Required Action District and schools.
The Process

The Required Action District submits a Required Action Plan based on collaborative planning, public hearing, and potential collective bargaining, or goes to mediation if no agreement.

5

SBE approves the Required Action District's plan

6

OSPI provides technical assistance to support selected intervention model

7

OSPI conducts annual benchmark check in

8

Three years of implementation
The Process

Three years of implementation

Progress after three years

No progress after three years

New or revised Required Action plan
Step One: The List

The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) creates a list of the bottom 5% of the lowest-achieving Title I or Title 1 eligible schools.
Step Two – The Proposed Criteria

OSPI establishes criteria rule for potential Required Action District

A. School is on the Persistently Lowest Achieving List (PLA)
B. District did not volunteer in 2010 (for 2011 process only)
C. Schools did not make progress on Reading and math in all students category and improvement rate is less than State average for last 3 years
Ranking

Schools will be ranked in priority order based on:

(i) The lowest levels of achievement in the all students group in reading and mathematics combined for the past three consecutive years; and

(ii) The schools with the lowest rate of improvement in reading and mathematics combined for the past three years.
RAD Criteria for 2012, & Annually

1. School(s) must be on the PLA list;
2. School did not make progress in reading and math in the “all students” category and improvement rate is less than the state average based on combined proficiency in the past 3 years
OSPI Makes Recommendations to SBE

OSPI will recommend to the SBE one or more Required Action Districts by January:

- Local district has 10 days to request reconsideration from OSPI upon hearing they could be recommended as a Required Action District.
- SBE designates the Required Action District(s) at its January Board meeting.
SBE Designation

SBE designates the Required Action District(s) at its January Board meeting
For identified PLA schools, OSPI will conduct an Academic Performance Audit.
Academic Performance Audit

Audit must include but shall not be limited to:

- student demographics
- mobility patterns
- school feeder patterns
- performance of different student groups on assessments
- effective school leadership,
- strategic allocation of resources,
- clear and shared focus on student learning,
- high standards and expectations for all students
The Required Action Plan

Districts develop a Required Action plan that

1. Addresses audit results
2. Is developed and implemented with collaboration with school and community
3. Utilizes one of four federal intervention models

The plan must be submitted to OSPI by April 15 and SBE by May 1
SBE Evaluation of R.A. Plan

By May 15
SBE approves the Required Action plan or sends it back to district with rationale for revisions

By September
School implements plan
Impasse Options

In the case of impasse, agreement will be reached either through

(1) Mediation, or
(2) Superior Court.

If no plan is submitted or the plan is not approved:

SBE shall direct the Superintendent of Public Instruction to require the local school district to redirect its Title I funds based on the academic performance audit findings.
Moving Towards Excellence

By 2014, OSPI will review the progress of the Required Action district and will determine if the district should move out of Required Action status or engage a new Required Action plan.
Exit Criteria

- 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.
Timeline for SIG in 2010-2011

SIG, Cohort II ($8 million per yr for 3 yrs):

- Nov 2010—FY11 application package and guidance available
- Dec-Jan 2011—ED reviews states’ applications and makes awards
- Feb 2011-Mar 2011—States run school district competition
- Mar 2011—States make awards to school districts
Questions?