



WSSDA would ask State Board of Education members to reject the resolution on State Graduation requirements, dated “Approved January 9, 2014” in your packet for three reasons.

1. The state board has long held that it will not implement 24 credit requirements until funding has been provided to support 24 credits as required by SBE rule. This resolution appears to conclude that funding has been provided for 24 credits.
 - That has been a long-standing position, and was included in the 2010 resolution.
 - With the proposed 2014 resolution, no new funding – of any kind – is projected to be needed.
 - This further breaks trust with school districts.
 - As you may recall, districts felt betrayed in 2010 and 2011 when the SBE reshuffled the 20 credits by reducing electives by 1.5 credits, and increasing English and .5 civics credits saying there was no fiscal impact, so the SBE didn’t need legislative authorization to make those changes for the class of 2016.
 - There is NO consensus in the legislature that the 24-credit framework has been funded. 1,080 hours of instructional time (or funding 6 periods) is not the same as funding a framework that requires 24 credits in certain boxes as the SBE is proscribing.
 - Staff has provided you with their recommendation of why additional funding for a third science credit and second lab is unnecessary. However, OSPI’s capacity report has a different conclusion, and states clearly that funding for a third science credit and lab is needed.

2. This rebranding is the same frame as was proposed in 2010 – just with slightly different words. We believe it is misleading to claim this is an amended framework when it is virtually the same as proposed in 2010.
 - 17 core credits are still required, with either 4 electives (2014) or 2 electives and 2 career concentration (2010).
 - The 2010 concept of using the High School and Beyond Plan (HSBP) as the guide for setting the “flexible” seven credits is just rebranded to “personalized pathways” expressed in HSBP in 2014.
 - There is no structural difference between what this resolution says and what the 2010 resolution said. Here’s a comparison:

Credits	November 10, 2010	(proposed) January 9, 2014	Difference
English	4 credits	4 credits	Same
Math	3 credits	3 credits	Same
Science	3 credits	3 credits	Same
Science labs	2	2	Same
Social Studies	3 credits	3 credits	Same
Health	.5 credit	.5	Same
Fitness	1.5 credits	1.5	Same
Occupational Ed	1 credit	1 credit (CTE)	2014 changed title to Career and Technical Ed
Arts	2 credits*	2 credits*	1 credit is required under both resolutions.

			In 2010 the 2 nd credit could be substituted based on HSBP. In 2014, the 2 nd credit could be substituted based on “personalized pathway.”
World Language	2 credits	2 credits	2010 said this was flexible based on HSBP. 2014 says this is flexible based on personal pathway described in HSBP.
Electives	4 credits	2 credits	2014 calls out 4 electives. 2010 said 2 electives, calling the other 2 credits “career concentration.”
Career Concentration		2 credits	2010 specifies 2 credits based on HSBP.
	24 credits	24 credits	

- We do support, however, the policy shift to recognize all pathways as valid and the departure from a default college credit framework.
3. The resolution concludes with “Be it further resolved that all other changes to the requirements, including initiating the High School and Beyond Plan at the middle school level, will take effect pending legislative authorization and funding.”
- We believe the SBE is stating that the 24-credit framework has been funded, and that **only additional changes** through WAC would require legislative authorization.
 - There is no legislative authorization for the existing framework.
 - There are significant fiscal impacts on school districts which must continue to be considered and funded prior to implementation.

In conclusion, the SBE does not have the authority to move forward with 24 credits. As such, this resolution is premature as written. WSSDA asks you to reject it or rewrite it to:

- Include a clear statement that funding is required prior to implementation, based on the OSPI capacity report, and that legislative authorization is required prior to beginning any rule-making.
- Include a clear statement that districts may adopt the new 24-credit framework, but that implementation shall not be mandatory prior to the class of 2020. (This allows for funding to be included in the 2015-17 and 2017-19 operating and capital budgets.)