

## **REQUIRED ACTION DISTRICT APPROVAL PROCESS DEBRIEF**

### **BACKGROUND**

At the January 2011 Board meeting, the Board designated the following four districts for Required Action:

1. Lakeridge Elementary School, Renton School District
2. Morton Junior-Senior High School, Morton School District
3. Onalaska Middle School, Onalaska School District
4. Soap Lake Middle and High School, Soap Lake School District

### **Required Action Plan Approval**

The SBE may approve a plan only if the plan meets the following requirements:

- Implementation of one of the four federal intervention models.
- A budget that provides for adequate resources to implement the federal model selected and any other requirements of the plan.
- A description of the changes in the district's or school's existing policies, structures, agreements, processes, and practices that are intended to attain significant achievement gains for all students enrolled in the school; and how the district intends to address the concerns in the academic performance audit.
- Identification of the measures that the school district will use in assessing student achievement at a school identified as a persistently lowest-achieving school, which include improving mathematics and reading student achievement and graduation rates that will enable the school to no longer be identified as a persistently lowest-achieving school.

A Review Team of SBE Board members and staff read the plans and academic performance audits in detail to analyze whether the plans meet the above requirements. The Review Team made initial recommendations to approve Renton and not to approve Morton, Onalaska, and Soap Lake.

The RADs presented their plans to the SBE at a Special Board meeting on March 31. Renton was approved, and based on their verbal presentations Morton and Soap Lake were given approval under the condition that they submit revised plans that included their verbal comments made that day. Both districts quickly submitted revised plans and were approved. Onalaska was not approved because the plan did not adequately address each of the academic performance audit areas of concern.

Onalaska School District chose to revise its Required Action plan prior to the May 10 deadline set by the Board. The Review Team recommended approval of the revised plan, and on April 28 a second Special Board meeting was held to review the revised Onalaska plan. SBE found that Onalaska's Required Action plan addressed all the SBE concerns raised during the March 31, 2011 meeting and therefore approved the revised plan, allowing Onalaska to move forward with implementation.

## **POLICY CONSIDERATION**

As this was the first year of a complex approval process, it is not surprising that there were some challenges. Staff and the Review Team have discussed challenges and recommendations for improving the process. Broader SBE input is sought.

### Challenge:

The timeline was extremely short and made it difficult for the Review Team and the larger Board to fully review the documents. The Review Team did thoroughly review them; however, it proved difficult for Board members to fit this compressed review into their schedules.

### Solution:

SBE agreed to hold the initial special Board meeting on March 31 to accommodate OSPI's request. OSPI did not provide materials according to the agreed timeline and therefore the time for review was extremely short. Next year staff will build in additional weeks between receiving the final RAD plans and the SBE meeting to review the plans.

### Challenge:

By definition this process required multiple documents from the RADs. Because SBE did not get materials from OSPI as scheduled, plans were shared with Board members as they were received. This created confusion because there were too many different sets of documents, both electronic and printed.

### Recommendation:

Additional time will enable staff to forward final versions of documents in printed form all at once.

### Challenge:

The Special Board meeting was set up as a conference call with some Board members opting to attend in person. The conference call format was not ideal for the in-person presentations, especially given the number of documents to which RADs referred.

### Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the next RAD plan review happen in person and if possible during a regular Board meeting.

### Challenge:

RADs did not understand the SBE review process. They had been given OSPI approval and did not understand that SBE was looking at a different set of criteria. SBE staff had allowed OSPI to be the only point of contact for RADs in order to simplify communication with districts and streamline the process.

### Recommendation:

Next year SBE will have direct communication (e.g. conference call, webinar) with all RADs to explain the process well in advance of the plan due date. This will ensure that RADs understand that they should directly and clearly address all areas of SBE review.

### Challenge:

Not all RADs had superintendent representation at the first presentation on March 31. One presentation was led by someone from outside the district, which did not convey that the RAD had capacity to implement their plan.

Recommendation:

Staff will ensure that superintendents understand the importance of presenting their plan to the Board directly.

**EXPECTED ACTION**

None.