



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

A high-quality education system that prepares all students for college, career, and life.

Title:	<u>Every Student Succeeds Act - Update</u>	
As Related To:	<input type="checkbox"/> Goal One: Develop and support policies to close the achievement and opportunity gaps.	<input type="checkbox"/> Goal Three: Ensure that every student has the opportunity to meet career and college ready standards.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Two: Develop comprehensive accountability, recognition, and supports for students, schools, and districts.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Four: Provide effective oversight of the K-12 system.
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other
Relevant To Board Roles:	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy Leadership	<input type="checkbox"/> Communication
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> System Oversight	<input type="checkbox"/> Convening and Facilitating
	<input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy	
Policy Considerations / Key Questions:	State law authorizes the State Board of Education (SBE) to develop the Washington Achievement Index, and in coordination with the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), to submit the Index to the U.S. Department of Education (USED) for approval for use in the federal accountability system. The OSPI submitted a description of the Washington Achievement Index to the USED in September 2017 and met with the USED in December to discuss the State's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Plan.	
Possible Board Action:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review	<input type="checkbox"/> Adopt
	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
Materials Included in Packet:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Memo <input type="checkbox"/> Graphs / Graphics <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-Party Materials <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PowerPoint	
Synopsis:	The OSPI will be providing the SBE with a presentation that includes an update on the status of the ESSA State Plan and an update on the latest meeting of the ESSA Accountability System Workgroup Technical Assistance Committee (ASW TAC).	



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

A high-quality education system that prepares all students for college, career, and life.

EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT - UPDATE

Policy Considerations

In [28A.657.110](#) (2), the State Board of Education (SBE) is authorized to develop the Washington Achievement Index to identify schools and school districts for recognition, for continuous improvement, and for additional support. 28A.657.110 (3) further states that the SBE, in cooperation with the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), shall annually recognize schools for exemplary performance as measured on the Washington Achievement Index. And finally, 28A.657.110 (4) states that the SBE, in coordination with the OSPI, shall seek approval from the United States Department of Education for use of the Washington Achievement Index and the state system of differentiated support, assistance, and intervention to replace the federal accountability system. Regarding this final section (28A.657.110 (4)), only the state educational agency (OSPI) may seek such approval under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

In September 2017 and after thoroughly engaging other state agencies and the public, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction submitted the [ESSA State Plan](#) to the U.S. Department of Education (USED). The ESSA State Plan included the description of a new Washington Achievement Index which the SBE and OSPI propose to use for federal and state accountability. The USED is allowed 120 days to approve the State Plan.

Overview of the OSPI Presentation

The OSPI will provide the SBE with an update on the ESSA State Plan that is expected to include the following.

- In early-December, the OSPI reconvened the ESSA Accountability System Workgroup (ASW) Technical Assistance Committee (TAC) for the purpose of discussing technical issues related to the new Washington Achievement Index. At the December 9 meeting, the TAC discussed the issues that follow.
 - Details as to how the extended graduation rate should factor into school ratings
 - Details about the possible rounding of deciles to enhance overall understanding of the approach.
- In mid-December, the USED scheduled a webinar meeting with the OSPI to discuss the Department's Interim Feedback Letter for Washington's Consolidated State Plan. A short memo, PowerPoint presentation, and a copy of the USED Feedback Letter follow this memo.

Action

No action is anticipated for this agenda item.

Please contact Andrew Parr at andrew.parr@k12.wa.us if you have questions regarding this memo.



SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Chris Reykdal · Old Capitol Building · PO BOX 47200 · Olympia, WA 98504-7200 · <http://www.k12.wa.us>

State Board of Education
January 10, 2018
Capital Region ESD

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Update

Michaela Miller, Deputy Superintendent
Deb Came, Assistant Superintendent
Tennille Jeffries-Simmons, Assistant Superintendent

Background

OSPI submitted the ESSA consolidated plan on September 18th, 2017. The Department of Education has 120 days to review and provide feedback. In late October ED convened a group of peer reviewers to analyze the final batch of state plans. On December 15th we received an email from ED asking to meet with our team and go over the peer and agency feedback. On December 19th OSPI staff met with the Department of Education to review the feedback.

Current Status

OSPI is in the process of reviewing the feedback and will meet the deadline set out of ED of January 4th, 2018 to respond with a red-line version of our ESSA plan. At that time, we will provide the SBE and other stakeholders with a draft of our response. Until that time, please review the [US Department of Education Feedback Letter](#) sent to Superintendent Reykdal. The OSPI plans to review relevant sections of the feedback with the SBE at the January meeting.

Tiered Support Model Update & RAD Recommendation

System and School Improvement
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
CAPITAL REGION ESD
JANUARY 10, 2018



1/3/2018

1

Objectives for Today's Presentation


- System and School Improvement—Study, Support, and Serve
- Required Action District Recommendation for SY 2018-2019
- ERDC Study Opportunity
- Next Steps




OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

1/3/2018


2





Study

Which schools have been identified through state and federal accountability systems, and are the interventions and supports working?



Examples of Actions:

- ✓ Listening and Learning Tour
- ✓ Evaluation of related RCWs and WACs in consideration of State Board of Education input

Examples of Future Objectives:

- Implement ESSA with an emphasis on program evaluation
- Finalize upcoming education research partnerships in consideration of State Board of Education input
- Understand state and federal accountability systems to inform future policy recommendations with State Board of Education input
- Further align with Federal & Special Programs, Student Information, and partner agencies

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
1/3/2018
4



Support

How will the agency inventory, expedite, and direct available resources?



1/3/2018

Examples of Actions:

- ✓ Website improvements
- ✓ Professional learning and technical assistance inventory
- ✓ School improvement efforts coordinated between OSSI and ESDs

Examples of Future Objectives:

- Implement intake and referral process for tiered support model (including education partners)
- Further align with Learning and Teaching, Special Education, and Migrant Bilingual departments

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

5



Serve

How will the right resources be accessed at the right time, so persistent opportunity gaps are systematically closed statewide?



1/3/2018

Examples of Actions:



- ✓ Leadership and instructional coach objectives and expectations reviewed and redesigned
- ✓ School and district improvement plans review and redesign with input from State Board of Education

Examples of Future Objectives:

- Implement updated resource allocation methodology
- Facilitate networked improvement communities
- Further align with Educator Growth and Development and the Center for Improvement of Student Learning (CISL)

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

6





Study

Required Action Districts (RAD)



1/3/2018

❑ OSPI does not recommend the identification of Required Action Districts for the 2018-2019 school year

❑ OSPI will engage in a school improvement study with the Education Research & Data Center (ERDC) to commence January 2018:

- Explore local policy conditions—system, leadership, and cultural/equity
- Produce short and long term findings to inform tiered support model efforts and future legislative proposals

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

9



Study

Research Study with ERDC



1/3/2018

State Board of Education Input

OSPI will engage in a school improvement study with the Education Research & Data Center (ERDC) to commence January 2018 to explore the intersection of state and local policy conditions which surround the school(s) selected for study—system, leadership, and cultural/equity.

1. What would you add to the description above based on your experience(s) and/or role as a member of the State Board of Education?

2. Based on this initial description for the research study with ERDC, what do you hope our education community can learn from the work?

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

10

Next Steps

- Communication with schools about identification and support—
February 2018

- Partner with ERDC to inform future RAD recommendations

- Future updates as determined





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

DEC 19 2017

The Honorable Chris Reykdal
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
600 Washington Street, S.E.
Olympia, WA 98504-7200

Dear Superintendent Reykdal:

Thank you for submitting Washington's consolidated State plan to implement requirements of covered programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), and of the amended McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (McKinney-Vento Act).

I am writing to provide initial feedback based on the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department's) review of your consolidated State plan. As you know, the Department also conducted, as required by the statute, a peer review of the portions of your State plan related to ESEA Title I, Part A, ESEA Title III, Part A, and the McKinney-Vento Act using the Department's *State Plan Peer Review Criteria* released on March 28, 2017. Peer reviewers examined these sections of the consolidated State plan in their totality, while respecting State and local judgments. The goal of the peer review was to support State- and local-led innovation by providing objective feedback on the technical, educational, and overall quality of the State plan and to advise the Department on the ultimate approval of the plan. I am enclosing a copy of the peer review notes for your consideration.

Based on the Department's review of all programs submitted under Washington's consolidated State plan, including those programs subject to peer review, the Department is requesting clarifying or additional information to ensure the State's plan has met all statutory and regulatory requirements, as detailed in the enclosed table. Each State has flexibility in how it meets the statutory and regulatory requirements. Please note that the Department's feedback may differ from the peer review notes. I encourage you to read the full peer notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your consolidated State plan.

ESEA section §451 requires the Department to issue a written determination within 120 days of a State's submission of its consolidated State plan. Given this statutory requirement, I ask that you revise Washington's consolidated State plan and resubmit it through OMB Max by January 4, 2018. We encourage you to continue to engage in consultation with stakeholders, including representatives from the Governor's office, as you develop and implement your State plan. If you would like to take more time to resubmit your consolidated State plan, please contact your Office of State Support Program Officer in writing and indicate your new submission date.

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202
www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

Please recognize that if we accommodate your request for additional time, a determination on the ESEA consolidated State plan may be rendered after the 120-day period.

Department staff will contact you to support Washington in addressing the items enclosed with this letter. If you have any immediate questions or need additional information, I encourage you to contact your Program Officer for the specific Department program.

Please note that the Department only reviewed information provided in Washington’s consolidated State plan that was responsive to the Revised Template for the Consolidated State Plan that was issued on March 13, 2017. Each State is responsible for administering all programs included in its consolidated State plan consistent with all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements. Additionally, the Department can only review and approve complete information. If Washington indicated that any aspect of its plan may change or is still under development, Washington may include updated or additional information in its resubmission. Washington may also propose an amendment to its approved plan when additional data or information are available consistent with ESEA section 1111(a)(6)(B). The Department cannot approve incomplete details within the State plan until the State provides sufficient information.

Thank you for the important work that you and your staff are doing to support the transition to the ESSA. The Department looks forward to working with you to ensure that all children have the opportunity to reach their full potential.

Sincerely,



Jason Botel
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary,
Delegated the authority to perform the
functions and duties of the position of
Assistant Secretary, Office of
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

- cc: Governor
- State Title I Director
- State Title II Director
- State Title III Director
- State Title IV Director
- State Title V Director
- State 21st Century Community Learning Center Director
- State Director for McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act: Education for Homeless Children and Youths Program

Items That Require Additional Information or Revision in Washington’s Consolidated State Plan

Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies	
A.4.iii.c.1: English Language Proficiency Long-term Goals	The ESEA requires a State to identify and describe its ambitious long-term goal and measurements of interim progress for English learners for increases in the percentage of such students making progress in achieving English language proficiency. In its State plan OSPI provides baseline data, measurements of interim progress, and a long-term goal for the percentage of students transitioning out of English learner status (what OSPI refers to as the transition rate), but does not provide baseline data, measurements of interim progress, or a long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency. Therefore, it is unclear whether OSPI meets the statutory requirements.
A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate Indicator	The ESEA requires a State to describe a Graduation Rate indicator that includes the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and, at the State’s discretion, one or more extended year adjusted cohort graduation rates. The ESEA also requires that the Graduation Rate indicator is consistent for all public high schools, in all LEAs, across the State. OSPI describes an upward adjustment for schools that graduate relatively high percentages of students beyond four years. However it is not clear how that upward adjustment will be calculated, and how it will be calculated consistently across the State consistent with statutory requirements.
A.4.iv.e: School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s)	The ESEA requires that a State describe a School Quality or Student Success indicator that can be measured statewide and is comparable for the grade spans to which the indicator applies and that will allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance. OSPI proposes including a measure of dual credit participation for students in grades 9-12, but does not fully describe how the indicator is calculated and whether it includes all students in the State (not just students enrolled in a dual credit course). As a result, it is not clear that this indicator is valid, reliable, statewide, and comparable, and allows for meaningful differentiation.
A.4.v.c: If Applicable, Different Methodology for Annual Meaningful Differentiation	The ESEA requires a State to include all public schools in its system of annual meaningful differentiation and to describe that system in its State plan. OSPI indicates that it will use different methodologies for various types of schools, but does not describe how the methodologies will be used to identify schools for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement. Because OSPI does not describe how the methodologies will be used to identify schools for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, it is unclear whether OSPI meets the statutory requirements.
A.4.vi.f: Targeted Support and	The ESEA requires that a State describe its methodology for identifying schools for additional

<p>Improvement Schools— Additional Targeted Support</p>	<p>targeted support and improvement in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification as a comprehensive support and improvement school under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I). Although OSPI identifies a methodology that indicates if two or more subgroups fall below the threshold, its methodology does not appear to identify each school in which any subgroup of students, on its own, is performing as poorly as the lowest-performing five percent of schools receiving Title I, Part A funds.</p>
<p>Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children</p>	
<p>B.1: Supporting Needs of Migratory Children</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSPI describes how, in planning and implementing the Migrant Education Program (MEP), it will identify and address the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, through the full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs. However, the ESEA requires that a State also describe how it will evaluate the MEP in the areas described above, to ensure the unique educational needs of migratory children are identified and addressed. • The ESEA requires a State to describe how, in planning, implementing, and evaluating the MEP, it will address the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, through joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migratory children, including language instruction educational programs under Title III, Part A; and through the integration of services available under Title I, Part C with services provided by those other programs. OSPI does not provide sufficient information addressing these requirements. • OSPI describes how, in planning, implementing, and evaluating the MEP, it will address the unique educational needs of migratory children through measurable program objectives and outcomes. However, the ESEA requires a State to also describe how it will address the unique educational needs of preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, through measurable program objectives and outcomes.
<p>B.2: Promote Coordination of Services</p>	<p>The ESEA requires a State to describe how the State will use Title I, Part C funds to promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children, including how the State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records, including information on health, when children move from one school to another, and whether such move occurs during the regular school year. The State does not provide sufficient information addressing this requirement.</p>
<p>Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent,</p>	

or At-Risk	
C.2: Program Objectives and Outcomes	OSPI does not provide enough details to demonstrate how each of the targets and performance indicators that the plan identifies will be used to assess the effectiveness of the Title I, Part D program in improving the career and technical skills of the children in the program. The ESEA requires each SEA to describe program objectives and outcomes established by the State that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the Title I, Part D program in improving the academic, career, and technical skills of children in the program.
Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction	
D.4: Improving the Skills of Educators	The ESEA requires the State to describe how it will improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders in order to enable them to identify students with specific learning needs and provide instruction based on the needs of such students, specifically for: children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels. OSPI generally describes how it will improve the skills of educators, but it does not address each of the required subgroups of students. Therefore, it is unclear whether OSPI meets the statutory requirements.