

May 13-14 2010 Meeting Highlights

On May 13-14, the [State Board of Education \(SBE\)](#) met in Spokane, Washington, at [Educational Service District 101](#), to:

- Welcome new student Board member [Jared Costanzo](#) (eastern Washington representative).
- Examine the origins of the [meaningful high school diploma work](#) and receive an update on the most recent data.
- Review the [recently-completed work](#) of the [Core 24 Implementation Task Force \(ITF\)](#).
- Review the [mathematics standards setting process](#) for grades 3-8.
- Review the [Race to the Top Assessment Grant](#).
- Receive an update on the [Race to the Top Application process](#) and [Washington State's Education Reform Plan](#).
- Receive an update on the [reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act](#) and the implications for the [SBE Accountability Index](#).
- Discuss the implications of the [2010 session budget and key legislation](#).
- Continue the process of [strategic planning](#).
- Celebrate the top videos from the [2010 student video contest](#).

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION ACTIONS

The Board approved the following:

- Minutes from the [March 17-18 Board Meeting](#).
- The math standard setting plan for the new math assessments for grades 3-8.
- Board Chair Sign-off of [Washington State's Race to the Top Education Reform Grant](#) Application with the following conditions:
 1. The Race to the Top application clearly shows:
 - a. How the state education agency will organize itself to implement the state's education reform plan; and
 - b. How the state will organize the overall governance structure to oversee the execution of the state's education reform plan.
 2. The Race to the Top application contains clear baseline information, action strategies, and ways to measure progress for each of the state's four major reform goals.
 3. A final state education reform plan complete with implementation detail will be completed by September 15, 2010 with a more robust engagement with our stakeholders. Work plan tasks and timelines will be signed off by each member of the steering committee prior to the Race to the Top application sign-off.
- Board Chair Sign-off of [Washington State's Race to the Top Assessment Grant](#) Application

- Colton, Elma, Granite Falls, Oakesdale, Riverside, Rosalia, St. John-Endicott, and White Pass School Districts' requests for waivers from the 180 school day requirement for the number of days and school years requested in their applications to the Board. Note: The Board will advocate for funding to the Quality Education Council for three state professional days as part of the revisions to basic education funding.
- Evergreen School District of Clark County as being in compliance with the basic education allocation entitlement requirements for the 2009-10 school year.

ORIGINS OF THE MEANINGFUL HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA - UPDATE

Board staff provided a [review of the impetus for the Board's work on a meaningful high school diploma](#) and shared stakeholder concerns with the initial [Core 24 framework](#).

FINAL REPORT OF THE CORE 24 IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE

SBE assigned the [Core 24 Implementation Task Force \(ITF\)](#) to provide recommendations with analyses of advantages and disadvantages related to the implementation of the [Core 24 framework](#). The [Task Force](#) was also asked to provide recommendations with analyses of advantages and disadvantages related to other relevant issues the [Task Force](#) identified and to gather feedback from the field on [Core 24](#) perceptions, concerns, and support. In addition, SBE asked the [Task Force](#) to look at the issue of automatic enrollment and to recommend a process connected to the [High School and Beyond Plan](#) for students to elect and formally declare a college or career emphasis if they want to elect an alternative to pursuing the default college- and career-ready requirements.

Representatives from the [Task Force](#) presented their [findings and phase-in recommendations](#) for a [Core 24 framework](#).

A special work session will be held on June 15 for the Board to review the ITF recommendations more thoroughly and discuss next steps for the Core 24 framework to prepare for their July Board meeting.

MATH STANDARD SETTING PLAN FOR GRADES 3-8 AND RACE TO THE TOP ASSESSMENT GRANT

The next State Board of Education meeting will be in Anacortes, Washington, on July 13-15, 2010.

For additional information and Board meeting materials, go to: www.sbe.wa.gov
or call the Board office at: 360-725-6025.

Agenda

- 8:30 a.m.** Summary of HECB Education Committee and SBE Executive Committee June 2, 2010 Meeting
- 8:45 a.m.** Discussion of Core 24 Implementation Task Force (ITF) Recommendations
- 10:30 a.m.** Break
- 10:45 a.m.** Discussion of Core 24 Implementation Task Force Recommendations (continued) and Consideration of Straw Proposal for a Revised Graduation Requirements Framework
- 12:10 p.m.** Public Comment
- 12:30 p.m.** Adjourn

<http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/Core%2024%20ITF%20Final%20Rpt%20April%202010.pdf>

Core 24 final report

HECB EDUCATION COMMITTEE AND SBE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES June 2, 2010

HECB Education Committee members: Jesus Hernandez (HECB Chair), Sam Smith (Education Committee Chair), Ethelda Burke, Bill Grinstein

SBE Executive Committee members: Jeff Vincent (SBE Chair), Steve Dal Porto (SBE Co-chair), Sheila Fox, Mary Jean Ryan

Staff: Jan Ignash and Randy Spaulding (HECB); Edie Harding and Kathe Taylor (SBE)

Purpose of Meeting/Discussion of Common Goals. The purpose of the meeting was to: 1) Explore ways for the two policy boards to work together to keep the state moving forward on shared goals, and 2) Consider ways to align high school graduation requirements and college admission requirements.

Members of both boards agreed that they shared common interests and would like to work together to help students become productive citizens and navigate the system successfully. The current governance system is fragmented and creates artificial lines between K-12 and higher education. By working together, the boards can help extend the state's commitment to education.

Improving Alignment between High School and Four-year Public College Admission Requirements. Two questions were posed for discussion:

1) **Could HECB and SBE move concurrently to a 3 credit science requirement?** Members of the two committees agreed to move together on this requirement and directed staff to develop a proposal for concurrent implementation. SBE may take action on a science requirement in July, although rules would not be implemented until funding is secured. If SBE chooses to move to a 3-credit science requirement, they would like to do so with the knowledge that HECB supports the move and will take a similar step with the revisions to the admission standards. Ethelda Burke wanted to ensure that the change would be phased in over time to allow districts and schools to adapt. The SBE will be considering the phase-in recommendations of its Core 24 Implementation Task Force in their overall review of Core 24.

2) **Would there be strategic value in agreeing to a common, minimum number of requirements?** The consensus of the group was that there would be value in a common number of requirements. Staff were directed to develop a proposal for a shared, minimum number of total requirements that would include a set of courses both boards would hold in common. Twenty credits were suggested as a reasonable target for the common set of requirements.¹ The Core 24 Implementation Task Force (ITF) Final Report recommendation for courses that would constitute "automatic enrollment" will act as a starting point for conversations about what constitutes the common core.

Competencies vs. Credits (based on policy recommendations 2, 3, and 5 from Core 24 Implementation Task Force (ITF) Final Report). Three questions were posed for discussion:

¹ The HECB requires 15-16 Common Academic Distribution Requirements (CADRs). The SBE's Core 24 Graduation Requirements Framework proposes 24 credits/requirements.

1. **What are the implications for higher education if SBE moves away from seat-time requirements? (competencies vs. credits).** States define credits in different ways. A little more than half (27), including Washington², define credit in terms of time. The ITF recommended that the SBE consider eliminating the time-basis of a credit. Some additional research will be necessary on the part of HECB staff but HECB does not expect objections to elimination of a specific hour requirement that equates to a credit. However, HECB anticipates that baccalaureate institutions might have some concerns if students were awarded credit based solely on competency, with no corresponding coursework. One exception might be competency-based credit for world languages. The members of both boards supported further work in this area and would like to see a staff recommendation.

2) **The ITF suggested that districts could count “2 for 1”; how would four-year publics respond? (e.g., can courses double count?).** Again, further investigation with the universities is required. HECB staff did not expect concerns with courses that meet a secondary requirement that is not currently a HECB CADR (e.g., students who earn credit for science while meeting a second graduation requirement in Career and Technical Education (CTE)). However, there might be concerns about courses that met two academic area requirements (e.g., students who earn credit for physics while meeting a second graduation requirement in math). Staff will investigate further and develop a proposal.

3) **How could HECB and Transition Math Project (TMP) College Readiness Definitions be incorporated into high school requirements?** The HECB and TMP developed college readiness definitions for science, English, and math, including content standards and attributes or “habits of mind” that would help students be successful in college. A crosswalk of the science college-readiness definitions with K12 science standards showed that the college-readiness science content had been incorporated into the new K-12 science standards, but some of the attributes had not. Staff were asked to look at the standards in English and math to see whether these attributes were addressed in other disciplines, and how (if at all) they might be highlighted or incorporated into graduation requirements; for example, perhaps through the culminating project.

Additional / regular meetings in the future. Issues had been listed as a possibility for discussion at future meetings, and were addressed briefly.

- **Competency assessment of world language and other subjects.** World language, because of its national standards and assessments, may be the most accessible discipline to pursue the awarding of competency-based credit (i.e., the “low hanging fruit”). Both boards encouraged staff to pursue this and to identify other areas where competency-based credit may be appropriate.
- **Role of middle school courses in high school graduation and college admission.** The HECB currently stipulates that students can earn designated credits in middle school in world language and math and satisfy CADRs; it also stipulates that students cannot earn credits in middle school in other subjects. The HECB will propose a broader approach to how requirements might be met in middle school, particularly in sequenced courses.
- **Alternatives to Algebra II.** More work is needed here - this will likely be a longer term issue. Two key issues were identified – the need to recognize alternative approaches to teaching algebra II content to meet college admission requirements and exploring the possibility of an exception to the algebra II requirement with substitution of another course (e.g., statistics).

² Washington defines a credit as 150 hours of planned instructional activities or satisfactory demonstration of clearly identified competencies defined in written district policy.

- **Statewide implementation of SAT or ACT testing.** Members discussed the value of seeking state support for all students to take the SAT or ACT tests prior to high school graduation. HECB staff will cost out statewide implementation of SAT or ACT tests (funded by the state for all public HS juniors) for a possible budget decision package.
- **IB/Cambridge diploma.** The SBE's Core 24 ITF Final Report encourages the SBE to explore the possibility of allowing students who earn an IB or Cambridge diploma to have met the requirements for a WA diploma. The SBE has not formally considered this issue yet, and it could be considered by the HECB, as well. This is likely a larger impact for high school graduation than for college admission, but it would be good to list it in both places.
- **Legislative strategies.** Staff were directed to arrange a follow-up meeting in August or September to discuss a proposal for common standards and develop a common legislative strategy to support the new standards and present a united front. An important part of the message needs to be the role of education in preparing young people to participate fully in society.

Final Comments

Jesus Hernandez – need to make recommendation to encourage and support parent education and involvement.

Mary Jean Ryan – would like to discuss College Bound Scholarship at a future meeting. She notes that K-12 need to do its part to support the program.

Ethelda Burke – supports the notion that we need to increase parent capacity to increase student's ability to be successful.

Sheila Fox – suggests we can't ignore the persistent issues in K-12 that need to be addressed in order to see the changes in student success we want.

Bill Grinstein – suggests we need to address advising and counseling issues in high school and the need for math and science teachers. Higher Ed's role is to prepare these folks.

Steve Dal Porto – emphasized the need to continue the conversation and continue to work together.

Jeff Vincent – reinforced the need for these meetings – breaking out of silos. Asked staff who else we might need to bring into the conversation.

Discussion Guide for Core 24 Implementation Task Force Recommendations

Policy Recommendation/Description	SBE Action for Consideration	District Role/Responsibility	Staff Notes/Questions
<p>Redefine “credit” in WAC Policy Recommendation (page 5, ITF Report)</p> <p>Eliminate the time-based (150 hours) definition of a credit³ (a), and maintain the competency-based definition of a credit (b). High school credit is defined in rule by the State Board of Education⁴ as:</p> <p>(a) One hundred fifty hours of planned instructional activities approved by the district; or (b) Satisfactory demonstration by a student of clearly identified competencies established pursuant to a process defined in written district policy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change the Board’s rule 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish district policy regarding how credit is earned in that district 	<p>If the Board removes the time-basis for a credit, districts will still be able to establish local, time-based requirements if they choose (in effect, this is happening now).</p> <p>Staff recommendation: Few districts, as yet, have invoked the “competency” definition as a means of awarding credit. A non time-based statement would provide an alternative to a strict reliance on competencies. The Board may want to consider substituting a statement in the WAC for (a) such as: (a) One hundred fifty hours of planned instructional activities approved successful demonstration of a unit of study as established by the district.</p>
<p>Automatic Enrollment (page 10, ITF Report)</p> <p>Define automatic enrollment [<i>staff note: what essentially becomes the default</i>] to mean all students take the core 18 credits—</p> <p>English (4) Math (3) Science (3) Social Studies (3) Fitness (1.5) Health (.5) Arts (2) Career Concentration (1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish in rule the core courses in which all students must earn credit, and which cannot be waived. Establish in rule a requirement that review of the HSBP will occur annually. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enroll all students in the required courses. 	<p>The concept of “default” has been part of the Board’s conversation around Core 24. States with “default” requirements usually specify a clear alternative set of requirements <u>or</u> state very clearly in rule <u>which</u> requirements are flexible (as the Board has done with the math requirement). The alternative to the default requirements is usually intended for a <u>small</u> percentage of students, and requires a formal signature process.</p> <p>Generally, what are the default requirements? Are</p>

³ Washington is one of 27 states that define credit in terms of time. Among these states, only Louisiana, which requires 177 hours for a six-period day, exceeds Washington’s 150-hour requirement. The most frequently occurring (modal) time-based definition is 120 hours (held by nine states, or 33% of the 27).

⁴ 180-51-050

Policy Recommendation/Description	SBE Action for Consideration	District Role/Responsibility	Staff Notes/Questions
			there any that <u>all</u> students must take? Under what circumstances, aside from a third credit of math, could a student take something other than the default?
<p>Limited Waiver Authority (page 6, ITF Report)</p> <p>Authorize school boards to delegate limited waiver authority to local administrators, within designated parameters.</p>	<p>Establish in rule authority for school boards to delegate limited waiver authority of required credits to local administrators using these parameters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waivers are limited to no more than two graduation requirements (not credits). • The waiver(s) must be based upon student need as articulated in the High School and Beyond Plan. • The waiver(s) must be documented on the standardized transcript. • No waivers in a content area are authorized if the student has failed to meet standard on the required state assessment in that content area (e.g., math, reading, writing, science). • A district must have a written policy regarding waivers before any waivers are authorized. • Students must still earn 24 credits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish waiver policy within given parameters • Implement policy with fidelity • Document waiver on standardized transcript 	<p>The policy role is largely one of equity—assuring that students have comparable access to opportunities, regardless of the district they are in. In that context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The only subjects “off limits” to waivers would be those that have a state assessment <u>that the student has not passed</u>—math, English (reading/writing), and science. Is this acceptable? • Could the culminating project or high school and beyond plan be waived? <p>Transcript issues would need to be addressed. (see transcript note in second bullet under SBE Role/Responsibility in the “two-for-one” policy)</p>
<p>Two-for-One (page 4, ITF Report)</p> <p>Students earn one credit and satisfy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish two-for-one policy in rule • Work with OSPI to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish an equivalency process to ensure that the 	<p>The policy role is largely one of equity—assuring that students have comparable</p>

Policy Recommendation/Description	SBE Action for Consideration	District Role/Responsibility	Staff Notes/Questions
<p>two requirements when taking <i>either</i> a CTE-equivalent course <u>or</u> another course that has been designated by the district to be equivalent to a graduation requirement</p>	<p>seek a notation on the standardized transcript of the manner in which graduation requirements have been satisfied (e.g., waiver, two-for-one). Aside from providing greater clarity as students move across districts, these notations would enable the Board to evaluate the extent to which the policy has been used.</p>	<p>standards for both graduation requirements are met in one course,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set the limit on the number of “two for one” classes a student could take. • Honor reciprocity across districts—credits and requirements would be satisfied according to the district policy where the student took the course. 	<p>access to opportunities, regardless of the district they are in. In that context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should the SBE <u>require</u> reciprocity? • Should the SBE (rather than districts) set the limit on the number of “two-for-one” classes? <p>Note: The HECB may have concerns about a two-for-one policy involving two courses that each satisfy CADRs (e.g., a two-for-one designation of a physics course that also satisfies a math requirement) —per June 2, 2010 SBE Exec. Comm. conversation with HECB Education Committee.</p>
<p>Phase-in (see page 4, ITF Report)</p> <p>Phase-in new requirements six years after funding begins.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine a phase-in strategy: either an “all-in” strategy that designates a year for full implementation of new graduation requirements, <u>or</u> a “staggered” strategy that establishes new graduation requirements over several years (e.g., English and social studies in 20__; full implementation by 20 __) • Advocate for funding of the basic education act’s “instruction that provides students the opportunity to complete 24 credits for HS graduation.” • Put graduation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin preparations for moving toward the state’s new graduation requirements as soon as possible. 	<p>The Board originally intended to implement new graduation requirements in 2016 (assuming funding was received in 2011). The ITF suggested 2017. Science is seen to be more challenging to implement, mostly due to concerns about teacher and facilities resources. The Board may want to consider a “staggered” phase-in that allows more time for the system to build capacity in science.</p>

Policy Recommendation/Description	SBE Action for Consideration	District Role/Responsibility	Staff Notes/Questions
	requirements in rule once funding has been obtained.		
<p>Competency-based Credit Policy (see page 7, ITF Report)</p> <p>Authorize through rule the opportunity for students who meet standard on state-approved end-of-course assessments to earn credit for the associated course, even if the student fails the class.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a rule. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts can already make this decision locally, based on the Board’s WAC about competency-based credit. 	<p>This was a controversial recommendation and may bear further study, if for no other reason than no one has yet <u>seen</u> the end-of-course assessments, a key source of hesitation for some ITF members. Because districts can already make this decision locally, the primary value of a statewide rule would be to allow all students access to the same benefit.</p>
<p>High School and Beyond Plan Starting at Middle School (see page 8, ITF Report)</p> <p>Start the HSBP at middle school by focusing on exploring students’ options and interests.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek authority to require middle schools to introduce the HSBP with a focus on exploring students’ options and interests. • Advocate for funding for increasing comprehensive counseling services at the middle level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiate HSBP at middle level, and provide the counseling services needed to support it. 	<p>Board currently does not have the authority to require middle schools to initiate the HSBP.</p>
<p>Flexibility to Meet High School Requirements at Middle Level Standards (see page 9, ITF Report)</p> <p>Provide opportunities for students to begin meeting high school graduation requirements at the middle level when courses meet rigorous standards as determined by local districts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the graduation requirement rule to allow students to meet some high school graduation requirements taught to “rigorous standards” (but not necessarily high school level standards). Since the law (28A.230.090) requires credit-bearing courses at the middle level to be taught to high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify graduation requirements that can be met at middle level, and establish “rigorous standards” for those requirements. • Determine the number and type of courses that could be satisfied at the middle level. 	<p>Students can already earn credit in the middle grades if they take courses that meet high school level standards. This is <u>not</u> the issue being considered.</p> <p>The issue is, <u>under what circumstances, if at all,</u> the Board would permit students to meet some high school requirements based on standards identified by the districts (not necessarily high school level standards). Washington State History is already being treated in this way by some districts.</p>

Policy Recommendation/Description	SBE Action for Consideration	District Role/Responsibility	Staff Notes/Questions
	<p>school standards, this revision would allow some graduation requirements to be satisfied (essentially, checked off as being met) even if they did not earn credit.</p>		
<p>Career Concentration (see page 7, ITF Report)</p> <p>Define “career concentration” as: <i>Fulfill 3 credits of career concentration courses that prepare students to postsecondary education and careers on their identified program of study in their high school and beyond plan. One of the three credits shall meet the standards of an exploratory career and technical education (CTE) course, as currently defined in the SBE’s graduation requirement WAC 180-51-066.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish this definition in rule. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create a HSBP <i>process</i> that makes the HSBP a living document, regularly revisited and updated by students as they make choices about what courses to take to meet their educational and career goals. 	
<p>Credit Recovery Advocacy (see page 8, ITF Report)</p> <p>Advocate for: 1) the resources needed to implement and staff programs necessary to assist struggling students in credit recovery, and 2) a database of intervention options so that each district has possible models to implement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advocate for: 1) the resources needed to implement and staff programs necessary to assist struggling students in credit recovery, and 2) a database of intervention options so that each district has possible models to implement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Help the SBE make the case. 	

Revising Core 24

The Essential 20 College and Career Ready Requirements

Subject	Credits
English	4
Math	3
Science	3
Social Studies	3
Arts	1
World Languages	2
Health/Fitness	1
Career Preparation	1
Career Pathway Electives*	2
Total	20

Meets or exceeds minimum four-year college academic distribution requirements (CADRs)

Provides room for students to pursue a CTE program of study

- Maintains the Board's current requirements that would keep all postsecondary options open
- Builds alignment across all subjects
- Brings credit requirements for Social Studies, and Science

Too focused on four-year requirements and not focused on career-ready requirements

consistent with the majority of states nationally; reflects or exceeds national trends in remaining subjects (world languages, arts, fitness, career)

Concerned about cost and science facilities

- Creates a definition for essential (not minimal) preparation through college and career ready graduation requirements that:
 - align in key subjects (English, math, social studies, science) with states' requirements nationally,
 - enable students to keep all postsecondary options open, and
 - enable students to pursue a CTE program of study (minimum of 2 CTE courses).

Will be criticized for reducing electives, arts, and fitness

- Allows flexibility in a 6-period day schedule for credit recovery classes, support classes, and other local options
- Does not increase total number of credits required currently

The 137 districts that currently require fewer than 24 credits may feel that there aren't enough electives or there is limited room for local requirements.

- "Career Preparation" more clearly conveys intent for this requirement
- Substitutes "Career Pathway Electives" for "Career Concentration" to clarify the intent of the requirement and reflect the ITF's proposed definition of career concentration

New labels that SBE hasn't considered yet Career and technical education (CTE) would like to see occupational education renamed CTE, but principals are concerned that only CTE-certified teachers could then teach the courses

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with basic education act's "instruction that provides students the opportunity to complete 24 credits for HS graduation". It prescribes 20 credits. Ultimately, the state could call for all districts to provide, at minimum, an additional 4, local option credits. 	<p>May be seen as a retreat from "rigor" by stakeholders that have supported SBE's Core 24 framework</p>

Graduation Requirements At-a-Glance

Subject	Class of 2013 Requirements	Proposed Core 24 Requirements	Staff Recommendation
English	3	4	4
Math	3	3	3
Science	(1 lab) 2	(2 labs) 3	(2 labs) 3
Social Studies	2.5	3	3
Arts	1	2	1
World Languages	0	2	2
Health/Fitness	2	2	1
Occupational Education	1	(see career concentration)	1 (renamed Career Preparation)
Career Concentration	0	3	0 (see electives)
Electives	5.5	2	2 (focused as "Career Pathway" electives connected to HSBP)
Total	20	24	20