



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

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

<p>Background</p>	<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 (RAD) will meet the requirements of the Federal School Improvement Guidelines to receive funding.
<p>Defining Persistently Lowest-Achieving (PLA) Schools</p>	<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. • OSPI District and School Improvement Assistance (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 School Improvement Grant (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.
<p>Criteria</p>	<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 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (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; Washington Improvement and Implementation Network (WIIN) Professional Development/Technical Assistance 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; Washington Improvement and Implementation Network (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; Washington 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.



OSPI CRITERIA FOR REQUIRED ACTION DISTRICTS

Tonya Middling

Director

District and School Improvement and Accountability

OSPI

August 10, 2010



Timeline for SIG in 2010-2011

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

- ◎ Sept-Oct 2010—FY11 application package and guidance available
- ◎ Nov-Dec 2010—ED reviews states' applications and makes awards
- ◎ Dec 2010-Jan 2011—States run school district competition
- ◎ Jan 2011—States make awards to school districts

Process for Identifying PLAs for 2010-2011

- ◎ Calculate the 2010-11 list of persistently lowest-achieving (PLA) schools using 2010 state assessment results
- ◎ Identify schools based on Tier I and Tier II definitions
- ◎ Consider excluding schools based on a case-by-case analysis subject to US DOE approval
- ◎ Consider schools with a small number of students per grade level tested- (Minimum N Waiver)

PLAs Defined

Identify persistently lowest-achieving Title I and Title I eligible schools based on the following criteria:

 (1) A Title I school that has been identified as being in improvement, corrective action or restructuring that:

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent in the all students group in reading and mathematics combined for the past three consecutive years; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has a weighted-average graduation rate that is less than 60% based on the past three years of data.

PLAs Defined



Tier II

- (2) A secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that:
- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools in the all students group in reading and mathematics combined for the past three consecutive years; or
 - (ii) Is a high school that has a weighted-average graduation rate that is less than 60% based on the past three years of data.

RAD Criteria for 2011

1. School(s) must be on the PLA list;
2. District **did not volunteer** in 2010
3. School **did not make progress** in reading and math in the “all students” category based on combined proficiency in the past 3 years
4. Federal funds are available
5. Up to 2 school districts may be recommended

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 based on combined proficiency in the past 3 years
3. Federal funds are available
4. Up to 2 additional school districts may be recommended for designation

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.

Funding

SIG, Cohort I:

- ◎ 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)

Funding

School-to-school (Achievement Gap)

- ◎ 2010-11 State Focused Assistance: \$1.5m
Encumbered FY 2010; Class Act Schools

Summit DII

- ◎ 2009-10 1003(a) ARRA: \$5.2m Encumbered FY
2010; Summit Districts (8 districts, 49 schools)

Funding

WIIN Center/Other (Bottom Quintile of Tier III Schools)

- ◎ 2010-11 1003(a) Regular: \$7m Encumbered FY 2010; WIIN PD/TA Services (17 districts, 44 schools)
- ◎ DIA-DIF Services (28 districts, 168 schools) Phase-in to support districts with low performing schools
- ◎ ESD Partnerships (CSA)
- ◎ Education Partner Contracts

Thank You