



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

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

Title: Discussion	Discussion of 2016 Legislative Priorities and Strategic Plan	
As Related To:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal One: Develop and support policies to close the achievement and opportunity gaps. <input type="checkbox"/> Goal Two: Develop comprehensive accountability, recognition, and supports for students, schools, and districts.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Three: Ensure that every student has the opportunity to meet career and college ready standards. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Four: Provide effective oversight of the K-12 system. <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Relevant To Board Roles:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy Leadership <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> System Oversight <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocacy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communication <input type="checkbox"/> Convening and Facilitating
Policy Considerations / Key Questions:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What issues should be legislative priorities for the SBE in the 2016 Session, and what should be the Board's position on those issues? 2. What potential legislative priorities should have more exploration by members and staff in preparation for the November board meeting? 3. How can the Board most effectively communicate to legislators, the education community and the public on its legislative priorities? 	
Possible Board Action:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review <input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Adopt <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Materials Included in Packet:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Memo <input type="checkbox"/> Graphs / Graphics <input type="checkbox"/> Third-Party Materials Board resolutions, position statements and reports. <input type="checkbox"/> PowerPoint	
Synopsis:	<p>The Board will discuss potential legislative priorities for the 2016 Legislative Session. (The 2016 regular session is a 60-day, or "short" session.) In your materials you will find:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A review of the Board's legislative priorities for the 2013, 2014 and 2015 legislative sessions. • A memorandum discussing potential legislative priorities for the 2016 Legislative Session, with links to board position statements, resolutions, and reports. • The resolution on the McCleary decision adopted by the Board at its September 2014 meeting. • The letter to the Governor on the state budget, local levy reform, assessment policy, and other issues that was approved by the Board at its January 2015 meeting. <p>Mr. Rarick will discuss the work plan for future board work and the takeaways from the July 2015 workgroup discussions of the 2015-2018 Strategic Plan. The following documents pertain to this discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • July workgroup summaries. • Six-month planner. 	



DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL 2016 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Options drawn from prior years' legislative priorities, board resolutions and position statements, reports on educational system health (ESSBB 5491), and other board documents.

With the enactment of the 2015-17 biennial budget after three special sessions, the Legislature still has major work ahead of it to achieve compliance with the court orders in the *McCleary* decision. Other major issues of concern to the SBE may also be front-and-center in the 2016 Session.

In the document "Review of 2013-15 Legislative Priorities," we look back not only at the Board's 2015 Legislative Priorities and how they fared in the 2015 regular and special sessions, but also remind of Board priorities in the prior two years and how they were (or were not) addressed by state lawmakers.

In your packet as well are the Board resolution on *McCleary*, as adopted at the September 2014 board meeting, and the letter to Gov. Inslee on the 2015-17 budget, as approved at the January 2015 meeting.

From this and other work of the Board, staff present the following for consideration as potential legislative priorities for the 2016 Session. The purpose is to provide a starting point for discussion, and not to exclude other items that may also be priorities for members. The Board will seek to finalize its 2016 legislative priorities at the November 4-5 meeting.

- **Achieve compliance with *McCleary***
 - **Eliminate reliance on local levies for basic education.**
 - **Establish regular and dependable revenue sources.**
 - **Fully implement ESHB 2261 (2009) and SHB 2776 (2010).**

The Washington Supreme Court, reiterating previous judicial findings, was clear in its *McCleary* decision of January 2012 that "the State's reliance on local dollars to support the basic education program fails to provide the 'ample' funding article IX, section 1 [of the state constitution] requires." Most glaringly, local excess levies continue to bear the cost of salaries for basic education employees, with profound impacts on interdistrict equity and the ability of districts with widely varying capacity to recruit and retain high-quality staff. State legislators acknowledged this deficiency, on a bipartisan basis, in legislation offered in the 2015 Session:

The legislature finds that this failure [to fulfill its obligation to make ample provision under Article IX] has resulted in the state allocation for educator salaries and benefits not reflecting the actual cost of recruiting and retaining competent teachers, which has caused school districts to subsidize salaries with local levy funds. The legislature recognizes that this result is unfair because it has created uneven access to a quality education and has negatively impacted Washington's students. (SB 6109)

Legislators from both sides of the aisle advanced thoughtful proposals to resolve this problem in the 2015 Session. The Board reviewed some of these at its May 2015 [meeting](#). While rich discussions took place, no legislation was passed to reduce or eliminate reliance on local levies before the final *sine die* on July 8. The Board urges the Legislature to complete this work in order to bring the state into Article IX compliance, whether in a 4th 2015 Special Session or the 2016 Session.

- **Establish a program of high-quality, state-funded professional learning for educators.**

In a [position statement](#) approved at its November 2014 meeting, the Board declared that

A primary goal of the State Board of Education is to ensure that all students are prepared for career and college. Achieving this goal requires a portfolio of bold reforms. One essential component of that portfolio is sustained, state-funded professional learning which supports job-embedded professional development activities as an essential, built-in component of the school year calendar.

The Board continues to recommend that the Legislature incorporate 80 hours of district-directed professional learning funding into the program of basic education. Restoring funded time for educators outside the 180-day calendar is not only essential to achieving the state’s goals for student learning, which is paramount for the Board, but will ease the strain on families and children created by the proliferation of partial school days, and reverse the erosion of instructional time that has resulted from the lack of funding for professional development. The Board reinforced this call in its “5491” report on Statewide Indicators of Educational System Health in 2014, where it recommended that the Legislature expand and fund high-quality professional aligned with best practices built on standards such as those of Learning Forward. (See also [HB 1345](#), 2015 Session). The Board urges the Legislature to make progress on this fundamental reform in the 2016 Session.

- **Preserve the integrity of the Career and College-Ready Diploma while expanding graduation alternatives.**

In a [position statement](#) approved at its January 2013 meeting, the Board affirmed that it “continues to support exit exams that students must pass to earn high school diplomas. SBE finds that exit exams reinforce the teaching and learning of standards and help ensure all students are prepared to succeed in college and careers.” The Legislature concurred with this position in passing EHB 1450, which required the Board, by the end of the 2014-15 school year, to establish the scores students must achieve to meet the career and college readiness standard and earn a Certificate of Academic Achievement on the Smarter Balanced English Language Arts and comprehensive mathematics assessments. In January of this year, the Board [reaffirmed](#) its position that “High school exit exams, or alternatives, aligned to rigorous standards, that all students are required to take are part of a meaningful high school diploma and an opportunity for students to demonstrate their readiness for postsecondary education, training and careers.” In conformance with its statutory [mandate](#) to create a system that personalized education for each student and respects diverse culture, abilities and learning styles, the Board continues to support expansion of sound graduation alternatives, including:

- a) Dual credit courses successfully completed under [RCW 28A.320.195](#).
- b) Transition courses developed in collaboration with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges that are comparable in rigor to the skills and knowledge that the student must demonstrate on the statewide student assessment for each content area, per [RCW 28A.655.061](#).

- **Strengthen the High School and Beyond Plan.**

The career- and college-ready graduation requirements adopted by the SBE last year made the High School and Beyond Plan an essential part of the state’s new high school diploma. The HSBP guides selection of a student’s third math and science courses, and shapes the student’s personalized pathways. “The plain intent is that the High School and Beyond Plan is no longer just an add-on to credit

requirements,” a staff briefing explained. “Rather, it is integral to course credits chosen by a student to prepare him or her for pursuit of goals after the cap and gown are returned, and the student comes face-to-face with life after school.” Yet [current law](#) says only that a student must have a High School and Beyond Plan, with little to say about what a High School and Beyond Plan is, or in what it should consist. Legislation passed the House this year that would establish the essential definitional elements of a High School and Beyond Plan, while still leaving needed flexibility to schools and districts. This will help ensure that the HSBP carries the load intended for it by the new graduation requirements, and that all students, regardless of circumstances, have access to a high-quality plan. The SBE supported those provisions in HB 2214 and also testified in support of HB 1591, with very similar provisions on the HSBP.

- **Increase access to high-quality expanded learning opportunities.**

Research too ample to summarize here demonstrates the harm to disadvantaged students from the interruption of learning during the long summer breaks between school years. In [SSB 6163](#) (2014), creating the Expanded Learning Opportunities Council, the Legislature made findings that studies have documented that many students experience learning losses when they do not engage in education activities during the summer, that summer learning loss contributes to educational opportunity gaps between students, that falling behind in school can be a predictor of whether a student will drop out of school, and that this academic regression has a disproportionate impact on low-income students. “Access to quality expanded learning opportunities during the school year and summer helps mitigate summer learning loss and improves academic performance, attendance, on-time grade advancement,” the Legislature said. The SBE made increasing access to high-quality expanded learning opportunities one of its recommended reforms in its 2014 report on Statewide Indicators of Educational Health. The SBE pointed to the [inventory](#) of research-based practices for the Learning Assistance Program by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy, which found academically focused summer learning to be one of two evidence-based practice associated with improved outcomes for students. To implement the recommendation of its 5491 report, the Board might, for example, recommend that the Legislature create an additional LAP allocation to each district, at a per pupil rate to be determined, to support academically focused summer school for each eligible student. The allocation might be seeded in the 2016 supplement budget by the fines imposed on the state by the Supreme Court’s August 2015 order in *McCleary*, to the extent such funds are available.

- **Bring clarity to basic education requirements by harmonizing the definitions of “school day” and “instructional hours.”**

Both the SBE and school districts have struggled with the lack of apparent connection between the definitions of “school day” in [RCW 28A.150.203\(10\)](#) and “instructional hours” in [RCW 28A.150.205](#). A full explanation requires a longer legal analysis than can be provided here. A robust discussion, however, took place at the Board’s September 2012 [meeting](#), and yielded a recommendation for legislation to strengthen the 180-day school year. The root of the problem is that Washington, unlike most other states, does not define “school day” in terms of instructional time. Or, for that matter, in terms of any time at all. ([ECS, October 2014](#)). This seeming anomaly has given rise to (1) Proliferation of partial days on school calendars, as any amount of time in a calendar day on which students are scheduled to be in attendance, however brief, counts as a “school day” toward the minimum 180 days, and (2) Confusion about when a basic education waiver is needed from the SBE, as while parent-teacher conferences are explicitly within the definition of “instructional hours,” a day devoted solely to parent-teacher conferences has been determined not to count as a school day toward the minimum 180. Recognizing the value of parent-teacher conferences and the deleterious impacts of partial days for

instruction, the Board has since 2012 authorized 180-day waivers of up to five days for the sole purpose of parent-teacher conferences. The procedure is set out in [WAC 180-18-050\(3\)](#). Thirty-five districts currently have such waivers. Policy options for the Board could include:

1. Specify in law that full-day parent-teacher conferences are within the definition of “school day” for the purpose of RCW 28A.150.220(10).
 2. Define “school day” in terms of minimum instructional hours, like most other states that have minimum days requirements. In so doing the definitions of “school day” and “instructional hours” would be harmonized in law, and full days used for parent-teacher conferences would become by definition “school days” toward the minimum 180-day requirement.
 3. Place a limit on the number of partial days a district may have on its calendar, defined in relation to the length of the district’s normal school day.
 4. Do nothing, and continue granting waivers for districts to use full days on their calendars for parent-teacher conferences.
- **Other legislative priorities for discussion?**

If you have questions regarding this memo, please contact Jack Archer at jack.archer@k12.wa.us.



REVIEW OF 2013-2015 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

2015 SBE Legislative Priority	Legislative Actions
<p>AMPLE PROVISION</p> <p>Meet the state’s constitutional obligation to ample provision for basic education. Identify reliable and sustainable funding sources for basic education to support a robust response to the <i>McCleary</i> Court order, and make significant progress toward full implementation of the provisions of ESHB 2261 and SHB 2776.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2015-17 biennial budget adds \$1.3 billion for implementation of SHB 2776, including for Materials Supplies & Operating Costs (MSOCs), K-3 class size reduction, and all-day kindergarten. Funds all-day K statewide a year earlier than required by law. • No new funding source enacted for basic education. \$165m in net revenue legislation from changes in tax credits and exemptions.
<p>HIGH SCHOOL AND BEYOND PLAN</p> <p>Provide greater clarity on requirements for the High School and Beyond Plan. The adoption of more rigorous graduation requirements and the creation of personalized pathways increase the importance of the HSBP in a student’s journey to career and college readiness. By beginning the planning process in the middle school years and establishing definitional elements of an HSBP, the Legislature can help ensure that every student is engaged in these essential activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HB 1591, specifying minimum elements of HSBP and providing that HSBP must be initiated in 8th grade and amended annually, passed House Education Committee but did not advance further through the legislative process. • HB 2214, which included the same major provisions on the HSBP as HB 1591, but with somewhat more specificity, passed the House in regular and special sessions but did not pass the Senate.
<p>ESEA FLEXIBILITY WAIVER</p> <p>Take the necessary action to restore Washington’s ESEA Flexibility and return control of federal funds to local districts. Restore our waiver from onerous provisions of No Child Left Behind by requiring that state assessments, when relevant, be used as one measure of student growth in teacher and principal evaluations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB 5749, specifying that student growth data elements that must be used in teacher and principal evaluations include state-based tools when relevant, and delaying the use of the evaluation results in personnel decisions, had a public hearing. • HB 2019, providing that for teachers of reading/ELA or math in a grade in which federally mandated statewide assessments are administered, one of the multiple measures of student growth must be the relevant student assessment results, had no action.

<p>CAREER & COLLEGE-READY ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>Streamline assessments required for HIGH SCHOOL graduation. Expand the use of testing alternatives for students who do not pass the 11th grade SBAC test required for graduation, beginning with the Class of 2019. Additionally, the Board urges the Legislature to end the biology end-of-course exam as a graduation requirement in favor of developing a comprehensive science exam that aligns with Next Generation Science Standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB 6145, delaying for two years the graduation requirement of meeting the state standard on the high school science assessment, passed the Legislature in 3rd Special Session and was signed into law. • No action on expanding use of testing alternatives for students who do not pass the 11th grade SBAC. HB 2214, which would have reduced testing alternatives, passed the House.
<p>PROFESSIONAL LEARNING FOR EDUCATORS</p> <p>Establish a program of high-quality professional learning of ten days or the equivalent number of hours as part of the basic education allocations guaranteed to all school districts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HB 1345, adopting a definition and standards of professional learning for educators, passed the House. • SB 5415, adding professional learning days to the definition of basic education and specifying purposes and topics for funded professional learning time, had no action.
<p>2014 SBE Legislative Priority</p>	<p>Legislative Actions</p>
<p>AMPLE PROVISION FOR BASIC EDUCATION</p> <p>Identify a dependable funding source for K-12 basic education to support a robust response to the Court order in <i>McCleary</i> and implement the provisions of ESHB 2261 and SHB 2776.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2014 supplemental budget included \$64 million in policy-level increases in Public Schools, including \$58m for Materials, Supplies and Operating Costs (MSOCs). No other 2776 funding enhancements were made.
<p>CAREER & COLLEGE READY</p> <p>Authorize a 24-credit career and college-ready graduation requirement framework, supporting multiple pathways to post-secondary education and training. Changes to take effect for students who will be seniors in the 2018-19 school year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E2SSB 6552 directed SBE to adopt rules implementing the 24-credit framework approved by board resolution, to take effect for graduating class of 2019. • Included district waivers of up to two credits for individual students for “unusual circumstances,” and waiver of up to two years for districts to implement the new graduation framework. • 2014 supplemental budget provided additional \$97 million to districts to support the graduation framework.

<p>MATH AND SCIENCE EQUIVALENCIES</p> <p>Expand math and science equivalencies for career and technical education (CTE) programs. Direct the development of statewide model course modules that enable students to fulfill math and science credit requirements at skill centers and other high school programs across the state.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E2SSB 6552 required OSPI to develop curriculum frameworks for a list of CTE courses with content in science, technology, engineering and math considered equivalent to science or math courses that meet graduation requirements. OSPI must submit course list and curriculum frameworks to SBE for review and approval. • School districts must provide the opportunity for students to access at least one science or math course on the OSPI list. Districts with fewer than 2,000 students may apply to SBE for waiver of the requirement.
<p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Restore state funding for three professional learning days to support the professional development needs of educators in implementing state policy reforms, including new educator evaluation models, Common Core State Standards, and Next Generation Science Standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four bills were introduced requiring funding of professional learning for educators. One of the four defined the funded days as basic education. • HB 2358 was introduced establishing a statewide definition of “professional learning” based on a set of national standards. • No bills passed the Legislature.
<p>2013 Legislative Priority</p>	<p>Legislative Actions</p>
<p>FULL FUNDING FOR BASIC EDUCATION AS REQUIRED IN THE MCCLEARY DECISION</p> <p>Support funding and implementation of the revised program of basic education established in ESHB 2261 (2009) and SHB 2776 (2010) and identification of sustainable revenue sources to ensure ample provision for K-12 education.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2013-15 biennial budget included \$1.0 billion in enhancements for K-12 education, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ \$374 million to continue implementation of the SHB 2776 funding formula for Materials, Supplies and Operating Costs (MSOCs). ○ \$143 million to complete implementation of the new Transportation funding model, per SHB 2776. ○ \$104 million to continue implementation of K-3 class size reduction, per SHB 2776. ○ \$90 million to expand state-funded voluntary full-day kindergarten, per SHB 2776. • No action on new funding sources for K-12 education.

<p>IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER- AND COLLEGE-READY GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>Provide direction for phasing in 24-credit graduation requirements as required by ESHB 2261. Support the recommendation of the Joint Task Force on Education Funding for adequate support for implementation of the Career- and College-Ready requirements for the Class of 2018. Support funding for an increase in instructional hours in grades 7-12 for the 2014-15 school year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HB 1692 and SB 6092 were introduced to implement career- and college-ready high school graduation requirements, but did not pass the Legislature. • The 2013-15 budget authorized the implementation of increased instructional hours for basic education per ESHB 2261, beginning with the 2014-15 school year, and provided \$97.0 million to support increased hours of instruction per week in grades 7-12. (E2SSB 6552, 2014 Session, revised instructional hour requirements and redirected the funding provided in 2013 to support of the 24-credit graduation framework.)
<p>A UNIFIED STATE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM, USING THE REVISED ACHIEVEMENT INDEX</p> <p>Support funding and legislation, as necessary, for continued implementation of E2SSB 6696 (2009). Support state funding for school improvement services to low-performing schools, regardless of Title I eligibility. Support the Achievement Index as the primary means of school recognition and identification of schools in need of assistance, including candidates for the Required Action District (RAD) process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E2SSB 5329 required the SBE to establish an accountability framework, and OSPI to design a system of support, assistance and intervention based on the framework, for implementation by 2014-15. OSPI was required to identify persistently lowest-achieving schools for the state RAD process. If a RAD has not demonstrated enough improvement after three years of implementing a required action plan, SBE may require a new plan or assign the district to a Level II RAD process. • The 2013-15 budget provided \$10.3 million in grants to support persistently lowest-achieving schools per HB 5329.
<p>STRENGTHENING THE 180-DAY SCHOOL YEAR</p> <p>Request legislation to strengthen the 180-day school calendar by defining the minimum school day and/or placing limits on half days. Advocate for restored funding for educator professional development to ensure that those activities do not come at the expense of 180 days of instruction. Seek statutory changes for consistency in what constitutes instructional time for satisfying BEA requirements for a minimum 180-day school year and a minimum 1,000 instructional hours.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB 5588 introduced providing that a school day must have a minimum of six instructional hours and restricting waivers of this requirement by the SBE or OSPI. As amended, it did not change the definition of “school day” but instead that a legislative research agency to conduct an analysis of how school districts use school days. SB 5588 did not pass the Legislature, but the study it would have required was included in the budget bill.
<p>COMPULSORY AGE OF SCHOOL ATTENDANCE</p> <p>Support legislation lowering the state’s minimum compulsory age of school attendance to age six.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HB 1283, reducing the minimum compulsory school age from age eight to age six, while providing an exemption for home schooling and repealing a truancy provision filing for districts, passed the House.

<p>BLENDED LEARNING AND ALE FUNDING</p> <p>Restore full funding for blended learning programs, with necessary provisions for program and fiscal accountability.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESSB 5946, which passed the Legislature, included several provisions to improve the accountability of Alternative Learning Experience (ALE) programs. The changes did not result in additional funding for ALE.
<p>ASSESSMENTS FOR HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION</p> <p>The SBE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Recognizes the state is in a time of transition with implementation of the Common Core State Standards; (2) Strongly urges alignment with higher education so the Smarter Balanced 11th grade assessment will be meaningful in admissions and placement; (3) Affirms exit exams as part of a meaningful high school diploma; (4) Supports a move toward exit exams consisting of Algebra I EOC, Biology EOC, Reading and Writing transitioning to SBAC; (5) Advocates for more work to broaden science assessment options. 	<p>EHB 1450 passed the Legislature. The bill:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directed OSPI to implement student assessments developed with a multistate consortium, beginning in the 2014-15 school year. • Required the SBE to establish performance scores for the new assessments by the end of the 2014-15 school year. Provided that the scores established for purposes of graduation may be different from the scores used for determining career and college readiness. • Established certain assessment requirements during the period of transition to the new assessments. • Stated legislative intent to transition from a Biology EOC to a comprehensive science assessment in a similar manner as the transition to ELA and comprehensive mathematics assessments developed with the multistate consortium.
<p>COMMON CORE</p> <p>Support the continued implementation of the Common Core State Standards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No legislation in 2013 Session.



2014 Resolution on the *McCleary* School Funding Decision and school funding proposals entertained during the 2015 Legislative Session

Exhibit D

Adopted on September 10, 2014

WHEREAS the Washington State Constitution establishes, as the paramount duty of the state, to make ample provision for the education of all children residing within its borders; and

WHEREAS no other state constitution contains language stronger in its establishment of the state's role and responsibility in funding public schools; and

WHEREAS Theodore L. Stiles, an early justice of the Washington State Supreme Court, observed in 1913 that "No other state has placed the common schools on so high a pedestal"; and

WHEREAS in 2012, the Washington State Supreme Court held that the state was in violation of its Constitutional duty to make ample provision for the education of all students, and ordered the Legislature to demonstrate "real and measurable progress" towards full Constitutional compliance by 2018; and

WHEREAS the Supreme Court has since determined that the Legislature has not demonstrated real and measurable progress toward Constitutional compliance, nor has it responded sufficiently to a Court order to produce "a complete plan for fully implementing the program of basic education for each school year between now and the 2017-2018 school year"; and

WHEREAS the Legislature has urged the Court to not intervene in legislative policymaking and has asked for additional time to resolve 'legitimate policy disagreements' within its body concerning the method for satisfying its constitutional obligation to make ample provision for public schools; and

WHEREAS while policy-makers in our system of government may desire and benefit from additional time to resolve policy disagreements, such delays in implementing Constitutionally-guaranteed programs and services have real and measurable consequences for the students of Washington state public schools; and

WHEREAS the State Board of Education upholds the statutory goals of the program of basic education as the ultimate consideration upon which all major school funding decisions should be based, including the state's responsibility to provide students the opportunity to become responsible and respectful global citizens, to contribute to their own economic well-being and that of their families and communities, to explore and understand different perspectives, and to enjoy productive and satisfying lives; and

WHEREAS the statutory goals of the program of basic education also clearly articulate the state's obligation to uphold high expectations for all students, and give all students the opportunity to achieve personal and academic success; and

WHEREAS the State Board of Education discussed this issue at its meeting on September 10, 2014.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Washington State Board of Education, in view of its statutory responsibility to provide strategic oversight of the public education system, suggests the following guiding principles to the Legislature in the performance of its duties to ensure that ample provision is made for all students residing within its borders, in a general and uniform system of public schools:

1. Any consideration of delaying the timeline for compliance with *McCleary* orders should be weighed against the consequences those delays will have on entering cohorts of kindergarten students and their opportunity to ultimately realize the goals of the program of basic education.
2. The Board affirms that there can be no credible plan to make ample provision for public schools that does not include new revenue to the state budget.
3. Proposals to increase funding for public schools by decreasing funding in other state programs should be viewed not merely through the lens of Court compliance, but also in view of the ultimate impact on students and their families. Scaling back social service programs, or early and higher education programs, may help narrowly satisfy Court compliance requirements but may also compromise progress towards the goals of the program of basic education.
4. A comprehensive school funding solution should include a substantial increase in the state funding share accompanied by some additional clarity on the intended limits of local levy authority or spending. However, proposals that seek to merely exchange

taxing authority between the state and local governments in a revenue neutral way, such that overall funding to public schools remains roughly constant while only the source of revenues changes, are highly unlikely to materially improve outcomes for students and families. What is needed is not different dollars; what is needed is more dollars.

5. The Board further affirms that a comprehensive statewide accountability program continues to be an essential element to any significant *McCleary* investment in public schools. In addition to school-level accountability, such a system should include explicit goals for student outcomes at a system-wide level, as well as self-imposed, reciprocal elements of accountability for the Legislature in the event that it cannot fulfill its duties under law, even as schools and students are expected to fulfill theirs.

6. The Board affirms that Washington's system of public schools has the potential to be the best in the world, and could serve as a case study of best practice public education for other states and nations. The Board urges the Legislature to embrace this challenge, and to process all school funding decisions with the success of each student in mind.



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

"Every student receives a quality education that prepares for career, college, and life."

January 12, 2015

The Honorable Jay Inslee
Governor of Washington
PO Box 40002
Olympia, WA 98504-0002

Dear Governor Inslee:

It is clear that the 2015 legislative session represents a watershed moment for public education in Washington state. Given the Supreme Court's order of contempt to the state in light of its failure to make ample provision for public schools, the 2015 session represents an opportunity to offer bold leadership. We can forge a new direction for our schools that generates momentum around improving specific outcomes for kids, and brings our state into compliance with the constitution. Toward this end, we are pleased to offer our comments on your 2015-17 budget proposal to the Legislature.

First and foremost, the State Board is thankful that you have made education a focus of your budget, that you have made implementation of SHB 2776 (2010) and its promised K-12 enhancements (funding for K-3 class size, full-day kindergarten programs, and maintenance, supplies and operating costs) a priority, and that you managed to make these strong investments in education without compromising the integrity of the other vital government services government provides to citizens. This budget represents difficult choices, and we commend you for placing a clear focus on children and schools. Your budget sends a message that the state's duty to amply provide for basic education will not compromise the ability of government to provide other essential services to its citizens.

We also want to thank you for the strong focus in this budget on strengthening student guidance and support, and improving graduation rates. It is essential that every student in our system develop a personalized pathway for life after high school, and we know they need strong guidance and support to do this. Your proposal to strengthen funding for guidance counselors in middle school, and strengthen Learning Assistance Program funding toward improved graduation rates, is directly in line with these priorities. We commend you for reinforcing this policy focus for the system, and we would encourage you to make strengthening guidance counseling in secondary schools a key priority as you work with the Legislature during the upcoming session.

At the September meeting of the State Board of Education, members voted unanimously to establish guiding principles for the 2015 budget. We believe these principles offer opportunities for you to strengthen your position even further as you deliberate with the

Isabel Muñoz-Colón, *Chair* • Ben Rarick, *Executive Director*
Dr. Deborah Wilds • Kevin Laverty • Madaleine Osmun • Bob Hughes • Dr. Daniel Plung • Mara Childs • Cynthia McMullen JD
Peter Maier JD • Holly Koon • Tre' Maxie • Connie Fletcher • Judy Jennings • Jeff Estes
Randy Dorn, *Superintendent of Public Instruction*

Old Capitol Building • 600 Washington St. SE • P.O. Box 47206 • Olympia, Washington 98504
(360) 725-6025 • TTY (360) 664-3631 • FAX (360) 586-2357 • Email: sbe@k12.wa.us • www.sbe.wa.gov

Legislature this session.

Local levy reform

Included in our guiding principles was a call for greater clarity in intended limits on local school districts levies. The Court has been clear that “reliance on levy funding to finance basic education was unconstitutional 30 years ago... and it is unconstitutional now.” Several state workgroups have analyzed the role that local levies have historically played in providing adequate pay to K-12 employees, and have proposed solutions.

This session represents a limited window of time in which to place sensible limits on the role that local levies play in supplementing basic education salaries, and our view is that the size and uses of local levies remains a central concern of the Supreme Court. We would urge you to work with the Legislature to make sure that the recommendations of the Basic Education Task Force and the Quality Education Council are reflected in local levy policy moving forward.

Professional development

In our November communication to you, the Board discussed the importance of professional development for teachers. We would like to emphasize how critical professional development is for the success of our teachers, our students and, ultimately, our state.

We need to offer our teachers the opportunity to learn and grow to enable them to successfully embark in the new direction we are setting for Washington education. The Board affirms that professional development is essential to basic education and should be funded as basic education. We also believe that no district should have to choose between professional development time and instructional time. Creating a dedicated funding source will allow districts and teachers to engage in high quality professional development activities that are job embedded and serve all educators.

Assessment policy

The Board also appreciates your continued acknowledgement that exit exams should have an essential role in ensuring that our high school diploma is meaningful. We also appreciate your incorporation of transition bridge courses into the alternative pathways students may utilize if not successful on those exams. We continue to believe, however, that the State should discontinue requiring the Biology end-of-course exam as a graduation requirement while retaining it for federal accountability purposes. Instead, we should devote our full attention to implementing Next Generation Science Standards, which replaces a narrow focus on biology with an emphasis on the integration of the practices, cross-cutting concepts and disciplinary core ideas of science and engineering. Now that we require three credits of science in Washington, using test results from the first course students often take as 9th graders—Biology—to determine their eligibility for a diploma as seniors, seems misplaced.

I-1351 – Class Size

The Honorable Jay Inslee

January 12, 2015

Page 3

Finally, the Board seeks additional clarity on the Governor's policy for implementation of Initiative Measure No. 1351. The Board has not taken a position on the Initiative. Now that it constitutes current law, however, the Board is seeking to understand the impact of this new law on school districts, and the Board's role in ensuring compliance with basic education law, particularly RCW 28A.150.260. The impacts take effect as early as next school year. As you work with the Legislature during the upcoming session, we ask that you establish clearer policy guidance on the role of I-1351 in your budget and implementation of basic education law.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your budget proposal for the 2015-17 biennium.

Sincerely,



Isabel Muñoz-Colón
Chair

bdr

cc: Members of the Washington State Board of Education
Representative Ross Hunter
Senator Andy Hill
Ms. Marcie Maxwell



SUMMARY OF JULY 2015 BOARD RETREAT DISCUSSIONS

At the July 2015 board retreat, members discussed the following three topics in small workgroups:

- Five big strategic steps from the executive committee retreat
 - Address needs of credit deficient students
 - Develop competency-based education framework
 - Develop summer learning incentives/integration into overall framework
 - Framework for 'career readiness' (work with Workforce Training Board)
 - Accountability Framework in post-ESEA Reauthorization Era
- Statutory duties of the Board
- Closing achievement and opportunity gaps

The Board also held a large group discussion of community forums and outreach.

This summary document is intended to provide continuity to the Board's strategic planning and capture the Board's voice to guide staff in future policy work.

Summary of Workgroup on Five Big Strategic Steps from Executive Committee Retreat

Address Needs of Credit Deficient Students: Ways to get all kids to 24 credits

Members voiced enthusiasm at future policy work to address the needs of credit deficient students. The passage of ESSB 6552 and subsequent SBE rule-making was not the end of the work on 24-credit graduation requirements. Rather, it is the beginning of the Board's work to support effective implementation of the new requirements. With greater credit requirements, it is increasingly important to provide opportunities for students to retrieve credit so that they can graduate even if they had a rough start in high school. Credit deficiency is a top reason for why students do not complete high school. Members stated that the development of a competency-based education framework and summer learning initiatives were both ways to address credit deficiency.

Members suggested the following ways to address credit deficiency:

- Restructure the week and year so that students have an opportunity to earn more credit.
- Social-emotional learning plays an important role in encouraging students to persevere even when they become credit deficient early in high school.
- Workforce learning could be promoted as a method to retrieve credit.

- Connect credit retrieval to the High School and Beyond Plan (HSBP) so that students are retrieving credits that they need to both meet requirements and reach the goal that they pursue in their HSBP.
- Focus on credit loss and dropout in 9th and 10th grade. Address the needs of struggling students early in their time in high school.
- Summer learning initiatives and competency-based crediting overlap with ways to address credit deficiency.

Members raised the following concerns with policy work on credit deficiency:

- A suitable definition of credit retrieval has not yet been developed. A definition would need to be developed so that there is a standard level of quality and rigor to credit retrieval options.
- Some children repeat the same coursework to earn even more credits.
- All 24 credits need to be meaningful. The credits should not be checkboxes; the credits should be the correct set of courses that students need to succeed. How do you measure the meaningfulness of the credits that students earn?

Develop Competency-based Education Framework: Moving beyond just elimination of 150 hr. seat time requirement for credit to broader implementation

Members suggested the following ways to develop competency-based education:

- Start with defining personalized education and the scope of work that the Board is willing to do to personalize education.
- Online learning is an option.
- Workplace learning is an option.
- Individualize education so that each student's skills and style is matched with educational opportunities.
- Flexibility in the 24-credit framework is instrumental to competency-based crediting.

Members raised the following concerns with policy work on competency-based education:

- Sometimes the idea of competency-based learning simply means more online learning but competency-based education can be more than just that.
- How far will the state go to personalize education? The number of permutations is almost infinite. Who will sanction it? Who will develop the alternatives? Who will improve it?
- Will a set of credentials from competency-based learning have credibility?
- How will Course IDs work for competency-based crediting? How will data be tracked in a uniform way?
- Resources are needed to improve competency-based education and implement options for students.

Develop Summer Learning Incentives/Integration into Overall Framework: How can summer learning be incentivized and integrated into our system?

Members recognized the value of expanded learning opportunities but raised many concerns and questions of how a state-level policy or action would work. Members emphasized the importance of providing expanded learning to students who need it most. However, members grappled with the means of incentivizing summer learning, establishing an entity to champion it, and developing a measure to hold schools accountable for it.

Members suggested the following ways to develop and promote summer learning initiatives:

- Include summer learning in basic education.
- Collaborate with the numerous organizations that are already engaging kids in summer learning. Schools will need to build connections with organizations that already have capacity to provide expanded learning opportunities.
- Find ways to hold schools accountable for providing summer learning opportunities.
- Provide state-level incentives to provide summer learning. Use these incentives to direct resources to students who need the extra learning opportunities. Is there an alternative funding model that would support summer learning?
- Use state policy to eliminate obstacles and barriers to providing expanded learning opportunity.
- Summer learning needs a champion entity that has an enduring presence in K-12 education. An entity needs to take the leadership role and organize the various organizations to coordinate collective impact on summer learning.
- Explore the development of an achievement award with criteria that promotes summer learning. Also, explore ways to measure summer learning loss. Is there an assessment that is taken at the end of one year and at the beginning of the next that would show whether and how much achievement declined over the summer?
- Online learning can reduce summer learning loss. Students don't necessarily need to be attending a summer learning program all day to benefit from the learning opportunities that are available online.

Members raised the following concerns with summer learning initiatives:

- Although many organizations are engaging students in summer learning not all of the organizations are doing it well.
- Some summer learning opportunities do not further the student's education or get them what they truly need.
- What enduring entity will champion and coordinate summer learning in an effective way in the long-run? The Expanded Learning Opportunities Council convenes with the goal of improving expanded learning and connecting state and local agencies with community organizations that provide learning opportunities.
- Can schools be held accountable for not providing summer learning? Members voiced concern about how an accountability mechanism would work for summer learning.

- Schools are siloed, thus disconnected from organizations that provide expanded learning opportunities.
- There is no incentive at the state level to provide summer learning.
- Although online learning may be an effective way to provide summer learning to many students, the students who need summer learning the most may be the least likely to gain from online learning.
- Do not disincentivize various expanded learning opportunities, such as starting school early, by focusing on summer learning.

Framework for ‘Career-Readiness’ (work with Workforce Training Board): What does ‘career-readiness’ mean in broader context?

Members expressed excitement at collaborating with other agencies and stakeholders to develop a framework or definition for career readiness. However, members discussed this topic less than the other four topics. Some of this discussion overlapped with ways to use workplace learning

Members offered the following suggestions for developing a framework or definition of career readiness:

- Examine studies of Education Commission of the States on career readiness.
- Research methods of evaluating work skills. For instance, ASVAB used for military placement.
- Explore the importance of soft skills, socio-emotional learning, and 21st-century skills to career readiness.

Members raised the following concerns with developing a framework or definition for career readiness:

- Take an interdisciplinary approach to project-based learning that teaches job skills in multiple skills (i.e. in a culinary course about cooking a meal, weave in lessons about marketing, finance, management, and chemistry into the project).
- Many teens work. Find ways to bolster existing systems for earning competency-based credit for that work experience and to create new, effective programs.
- Use work-based learning to both improve career readiness and retrieve credit.

Members raised the following concerns with developing a framework or definition for career readiness:

- Do not take a reductionist approach by setting socio-emotional learning as a box that is a job qualification.
- The system has moved towards a focus on academics and it will take considerably effort to emphasize experiential and socio-emotional learning.
- Although developing a framework or definition is exciting and doable, districts and state-level organizations do not currently have a thorough idea of what career readiness is. The work will require considerable interagency and stakeholder collaboration and engagement.

Accountability Framework in post-ESEA Reauthorization Era: How can we be pro-active, not reactive, in developing our post reauthorization accountability framework?

Members recognized that, if the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is reauthorized, the Board will have a major role in developing a post-ESEA reauthorization accountability system. Members noted that it will be a considerable, important workload but that it is unknown when reauthorization will occur. Members did not discuss this topic in detail.

Summary of Workgroup on Statutory Duties

Guiding question: Among SBE's statutory powers and duties is the responsibility to "provide advocacy and strategic oversight of public education." What does that mean on a practical level for the Board's work?

RCW 28A.305.130 - Powers and duties.

"The purpose of the state board of education is to provide advocacy and strategic oversight of public education; implement a standards-based accountability framework that creates a unified system of increasing levels of support for schools in order to improve student academic achievement; provide leadership in the creation of a system that personalizes education for each student and respects diverse cultures, abilities, and learning styles; and promote achievement of the goals of RCW 28A.150.210." (note: 210 refers to goals of basic education)

RCW 28A.657.005 - Findings.

"The office of the superintendent of public instruction is responsible for developing and implementing the accountability tools to build district capacity and working within federal and state guidelines. The legislature assigned the state board of education responsibility and oversight for creating an accountability framework. This framework provides a unified system of support for challenged schools that aligns with basic education, increases the level of support based upon the magnitude of need, and uses data for decisions. Such a system will identify schools and their districts for recognition as well as for additional state support."

Members engaged in a broad discussion of the statutory duties of the Board.

Strategic planning thoughts. Members raised the following questions that should be considered during strategic planning:

- **What is meant by "strategic oversight?" What is meant by "advocacy?"**
 - Work we do that falls under strategic oversight: Rule-making, providing guidance to districts and the public – pieces under our direct control. Pieces that are more tangential, such as professional development of staff to achieve our goals, fall more under advocacy.
 - Strategic oversight is about how first creating a vision, and then identifying whether that vision is being achieved, and what do we need to modify our oversight in order to achieve it. What are we as a system not doing that causes us not to achieve the vision?
 - Strategic oversight is not operational; it is more high-level. It means making sure the ship is pointed in the right direction. It is oversight of progress against a set of broad goals set out in our strategic plan.
 - Does advocacy mean what we do during a legislative session, or does it mean more than that? What are other things we do?

- Disseminating best practices – everywhere we provide guidance to districts and schools
 - Providing tools, like the High School and Beyond Plan
 - Developing our legislative agendas
 - Working with other agencies and groups
- **Focus on who we are and what things the Board can promote outside of the legislative process. What would that look like, given the capacity and expertise we have? What should we be doing more of, and what less of?**
 - The Board can act as a “thought leader” or “idea generator” to spread successful practices.
 - The Board can act to mitigate fear of change through its communications.
 - Individual members can be utilized more in subcommittees and advocacy work. Convene subcommittees of the Board and devise ways for them to report out to the entire Board.
 - Communication plays an important role in gaining publicity and outside-the-Legislature movement on issues. Communications should be extended to parents, students, and the community through means such as social media and other communications channels beyond the status quo. Speaking to people who are already listening will have limited effectiveness.
 - The Board has a unique role with broad power. Thus, it can provide a broader perspective on education than most entities.
 - Do less of the regulatory stuff and more of the leadership stuff. Do more leadership to develop policy to address the opportunity gaps.
 - Establish more back-and-forth analysis and reporting with the Legislature. Don’t just go to them when it is about the Board’s legislative agenda.
- **How is the Board balancing flexibility and personalization for particular categories of students with the other goals of the Board (e.g., for higher, career and college-ready standards)?**
 - The Board needs to be concerned about the Legislature’s move to eliminate alternative assessments. The Board needs to be concerned about the right kind of educational program for each student. The Board needs to recognize that while students need a minimum standard of rigor, they may get there in different ways, and need to be assessed in different ways. For instance, the Board’s work on CTE addresses that flexibility.
 - Pursue the personalization of education for students experiencing poverty. Address the experience of students outside of school.

Concerns with advocacy, scope of authority, and board processes. Members raised the following concerns:

- The Board generalizes too much in its advocacy work.
 - 24-credits are not for a certain student group. What about those students who are not college-bound? There is more to be done for other students. It is one step in a process that is not one-size-fits-all.

- Some advocacy positions and topics develop that haven't been vetted by the entire Board. Clarification is needed on what is a board action and what is a staff action. There needs to be balance between having a vetting process that involves the entire Board and flexibility for staff to articulate the Board's positions. Is too much advocacy work being delegated to the staff rather than having members devote their own time towards advocacy?
- The strengths, skills, and knowledge of individual board members are not being utilized to develop recommendations are work in subcommittees. However, there is little time to do so.
- Members expressed confusion over what the Board does in relation to what the OSPI does. There is confusion in SBE having oversight, and then OSPI the responsibility to develop and implement accountability tools, under 28A.657.005.
- New members do not receive training. Staff should check in with board members after a couple of meetings to clarify the new member's understanding of what the Board is working on and what questions they have.

Summary of Workgroup on Closing Achievement and Opportunity Gaps

Guiding questions: What is the role of the SBE – a state-level agency – in closing achievement and opportunity gaps? Which gaps should be focused on, and how?

Members indicated that the achievement gap has been studied many times but that more work is needed to measure and take action on opportunity gaps. During the discussion, board members pondered ways to list opportunity gaps, measure the opportunity gaps and how they impact achievement gaps, and then use that research to inform policy decisions aimed at closing achievement and opportunity gaps.

Develop a definitive list of opportunity factors, advocate for equal opportunity, and measure achievement gaps through assessments. Members expressed an interest in creating a list of opportunity gaps that would, for example, include attendance, discipline, early education, incidence of trauma, and education quality. Members noted the need to measure opportunity gaps and the challenge of doing so. This list of opportunity would inform advocacy work and policy decisions through recognition that the achievement is effected by opportunity factors that exist both inside and outside of the classroom.

Opportunity gaps due to poverty inevitably effect achievement gaps. Members noted the inescapable connection between achievement gaps that manifest in assessment results and opportunity gaps due to poverty. Students from underserved groups experience a lower quality education, greater summer learning loss, and fewer learning opportunities.

Equitable distribution of resources is needed, but those resources go far beyond K-12 education. Beyond the discussion of equitable distribution of school funding and *McCleary*, members noted that supports outside of the classroom are necessary to truly succeed at closing achievement and opportunity gaps. For instance, socio-economic issues like adequate nutrition, healthcare, job opportunity, and shelter adversely impact underserved student groups. Improvements within the K-12 system include summer learning, equitable distribution of the best teachers and targeted fiscal allocations. Members noted the potential for the Board to act as an idea generator to spread successful practices and ways to provide equitable distribution of resources or supports.

Cultural values, relevance, and competency are necessary when addressing achievement and opportunity gaps. Members recognized the importance of culturally competent approaches to improving the K-12 system.

Pockets of the system are closing gaps. These pockets need to be recognized, supported, and their successes sustained. Members noted that the system has failed to close the gaps but that pockets of the system are successfully closing gaps. These pockets sometimes rely on resources and support that are from groups or communities external to the K-12 system. These pockets should be recognized so that their successful practices can be spread to the rest of the system. It is important that improvement efforts are sustainable over time even when extraordinary resources from intervention are withdrawn.

Summary of Community Forums and Outreach Discussion

Members engaged in robust discussion of community forums and outreach. The following major points were raised by board members. Note that there were conflicting ideas of having forums that target particular groups or topics and community forums that are held to hear general discussion and concerns from whosoever attends.

Target particular groups with forums. Members raised the idea of targeting particular groups with forums and/or outreach. For instance, intentionally hold a forum for students, especially students of color, to discuss their experience and concerns.

Hold meetings on topical issues. Bring out the voices of particular communities by holding meetings on topical issues that matter to those communities. By using this focused approach, the Board can increase participation of groups that have been impacted by achievement and opportunity gaps. Also, the Board can receive input on policy work that it can take action on.

Do not forsake community forums designed for general discussion for targeted forums. To the contrary of holding meetings focused on particular groups or topics, some members stated that general community forums are important so that anyone and everyone can attend. These community forums with general discussion are open events that allow people to raise whatever concern or issue that they have. Members cautioned that there should either be a balance between targeted forums and general forums. Also, there should be opportunities for the Board to have roundtable discussions of the strategic plan.

Establish a continuum of incorporating feedback into policy decisions. Although summary feedback reports are important, being there to experience the discussion is also important. Find ways to improve the feedback loop so that board members receive input in a meaningful way.

Consider the purpose of forums and decide from there. Members raised questions about the vision and purpose for forums. Are forums designed to shape the strategic plan? Are forums getting a general temperature from the community? Are forums meant to target specific groups instead of the general public? What does the Board expect from a community forum? What are the mechanics of meeting that expectation? Consider these questions and then make a decision about the future of forums.

Use an intentional method of listening. As part of the racial equity toolkit, it is important to listen to communities of color, students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and other communities. The important word here is “listen,” not talk over or speak at.

When targeting particular community groups, network with existing organizations that champion the needs of those groups. Network with organizations that already exist and champion the needs to particular

groups. Go to them. Don't make them come to you if you want the most extensive participation. Designate board or staff liaisons to engage existing community groups. There are pockets of people and schools that are closing the gaps. However, those pockets often have additional resources that come from sources external to the education system. Connect with those groups that have existing capacity to close achievement and opportunity gaps. Do not limit engagement to the same state agencies; reach out to community organizations.

Site visits are useful for engagement and inform board members. Members appreciated the opportunity to see what is going on in different regions of the state by visiting schools. Site visits also offer a chance to engage students and school staff at all levels.

If you have questions regarding this memo, please contact Parker Teed at parker.teed@k12.wa.us.

Potential Major Topics, Policies, or Deliverables by Upcoming 2015 and 2016 Board Meetings					
September 2015	November 2015	January 2016	March 2016	May 2016	July 2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First discussion of legislative priorities • Discussion of Achievement Index indicators • Discussion of charter schools report • <i>McCleary</i> statement? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize legislative priorities • Approval of charter schools report • Possible collaboration with PESB during legislative session 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of Washington Achievement Award categories & Index 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of progress of districts in implementing the 24-credit diploma 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Accountability Framework & Performance of Required Action Districts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBE Planning meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foundational discussion – competency-based education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage WSSDA & other partners in competency-based discussion (credit deficient students, etc.) • Foundational discussion – career-readiness concepts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage national expert in competency-based education • Engage Workforce Board in discussion of career readiness definition and associated policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider competency-based frameworks in context of 24 credit diploma • Engage national expert in career readiness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt operating definition of ‘career-readiness’ for WA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produce audit/review of WA’s competency-based policies