

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

HEARING TYPE: ___X___ ACTION

DATE: November 1, 2007

SUBJECT: **SYSTEM PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY DRAFT**
CHARTER **MEANINGFUL HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA DRAFT CHARTER**
 END OF COURSE ASSESSMENT STUDY REVISED CHARTER
 SCIENCE STANDARDS REVIEW REVISED CHARTER

SERVICE UNIT: Edie Harding, Executive Director
 State Board of Education

PRESENTER: Edie Harding, Executive Director
 State Board of Education

 Kathe Taylor, Policy Director
 State Board of Education

BACKGROUND:

At the August Retreat, the Board discussed strategies for chartering current projects and committees. Presented in this section are draft charters for System Performance Accountability and Meaningful High School Diploma. The Board will discuss these charters, make any modifications desired and approve at the meeting.

Also included are the charters for End of Course Assessment and Science Standards Review that were revised to reflect suggestions from Board members provided at the September meeting.



Washington State
Board of Education



Working to Raise Student Achievement Dramatically

System Performance Accountability Charter

Project Purpose:

To develop a statewide accountability system with state and local policy makers, educators, parents, and citizens working together to ensure no student falls through the cracks and that no school fails its students.

Background:

When the legislature reconstituted the State Board in 2005, it transferred the responsibilities for creating a statewide accountability system from the A+ Commission to the State Board of Education. The requirements¹ for an accountability system include:

- » Setting performance improvement goals;
- » Setting cut scores on state assessments;
- » Identifying criteria for successful schools and districts in need of assistance and those where students persistently fail;
- » Identifying criteria for schools and districts where intervention and appropriate strategies are needed;
- » Creating performance incentives;
- » Reviewing the assessment reporting system to ensure fairness, accuracy, timeliness, and equity of opportunity;
- » Providing biennial report on progress; and
- » Determining when school districts should choose from a curricular and instructional materials menu (2SHB 1906 from the 2007 Legislative Session).

Connection to Board's Mission, Goals, and Work Plan

The Board adopted two overall goals to frame its work with accountability and the review of high school graduation requirements. The goals are:

- » Improve student performance dramatically; and
- » Provide all Washington students the opportunity to succeed in post-secondary education, the 21st century world of work, and citizenship.

A focus on system performance accountability is one of the top priorities for the Board's work plan in 2007-08.

¹ RCW 28A.305.130 (4)

Board Role

Kris Mayer will serve as the Board lead. Board members will participate in work sessions as well as regular Board meetings. The Board will adopt a final package of system performance accountability measures in July 2008 to prepare for the 2009 Legislative Session.

Scope of Work

The Board adopted a preamble to its motions on key concepts for the system performance accountability work to provide direction to staff as they develop proposals for the State Board of Education's future review. The Board wants to be clear that these are preliminary, draft concepts that will receive extensive and formative public input and refinement. The Board, in advancing these concepts, is not endorsing specific details at this point. In addition, the Board acknowledges the magnitude of the implementation challenges that these proposals may present and asks our staff to be especially sensitive to identifying potential implementation barriers as well as strategies for dealing with them as they bring forward proposals for our review.

The three draft concepts are:

1. Performance Improvement Goals and Indicators to Measure System Progress
2. A Tiered System of Continuous Improvement for All Schools
3. Targeted Strategies for Chronically Underperforming Schools

Deliverables

- Revisions to school and district improvement plans through SBE rules and guidelines
- Proposed accountability index to identify schools and districts
- Case studies and video on selected issues
- Development of tiers with detail for continuous school and district improvement
- Proposal on when school districts must adopt a state curricular menu
- Proposal on strategies for chronically underperforming "Summit Schools"
- Legislative package on final proposals for school and district support
- Proposals on revision and adoption of performance goals
- SBE report card

Draft Timeline for Input Process and Board Deliverables

October 22, 2007	Board work session with advisors on school and district improvement plans
November 1, 2007	SPA Charter and discussion of teacher distribution study
November-December 2007	Consultant expert review of accountability index
January 9-10, 2008	Board meeting to discuss staff recommendations on WAC rule revisions and other changes for school improvement plans
January-March 2008	Video and case studies on schools (if additional funding is available) developed to examine real life stories and issues to be ready for spring outreach
February 26, 2008	Board work session with advisors on tiers for continuous school and district improvement, a performance reward system, and draft report card
March-June 2008	National Consortium assistance on specific proposals for chronically underperforming schools and districts with draft product due in May and final product due in June
March 26-27, 2008	Board meeting to discuss staff recommendations on tiers, accountability index, and report card
March 27, 2008	Symposium hosted by SBE with national experts on chronically underperforming schools (if additional funding available)
Spring 2008	Public outreach on system performance accountability concepts at seven community meetings across the state
May 14-15, 2008	Board meeting to discuss outreach and chronically underperforming schools
June 19, 2008	Board work session with advisors on chronically underperforming schools
July 23-24, 2008	Board meeting to adopt full proposal package for 2009 session on accountability
September 30, 2008	Submit legislative and budget proposals to the Governor
Fall 2008	Continued Board outreach to key stakeholders and community on proposed legislative and budget package Board work session and meetings on performance improvement goals
Fall 2009	First SBE Report Card produced

Communication Plan

The communication plan includes work sessions and public outreach meetings to be held periodically throughout the year (see Timeline) with relevant stakeholders such as educators, legislators, parents, and business representatives. A symposium with national experts focused on improving chronically-underperforming schools is considered for March 27, 2008.

Staff Project Managers

Edie Harding, Executive Director and Evelyn Hawkins, Research Associate



Washington State
Board of Education



Working to Raise Student Achievement Dramatically

End of Course Assessment Study Final Charter

Project Purpose

The project purpose is to conduct the study requested by the Governor and legislature from the 2007 legislative session on the following research questions:

1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Washington moving in the direction of End of Course Assessments (EOCs), which may be used in conjunction with the WASL or in place of the WASL at the high school level, including: experiences in other states with a specific focus on lessons learned and how those lessons would apply to Washington for end-of-course alternatives and detailed information on what it would take in terms of steps and schedule to implement math and science EOCs if Washington decides to pursue that direction? What states are using EOCs in all subject areas now and what are their purposes?
2. What role do norm reference tests have as alternative tests for graduation?

Background

Currently 25 states, including Washington, require, or plan to soon require, students to pass exit tests for high school graduation. Seven of these states use a series of "end-of course" (EOC) assessments, where students take the test(s) after completing a course(s). Senate Bill ESSB 6023 directed the Washington State Board of Education (SBE) to examine and recommend changes to high school assessments with a limited series of end-of-course assessments. The Governor vetoed the language (see Attachment A for actual language) because she felt that the study should not predetermine that end-of-course assessments would be implemented. What are the implementation issues, costs, and lessons learned?

In addition, The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) is directed to request that vendors bidding on its upcoming new testing contract address cost and technical aspects of implementing EOC assessments.

An additional section of the law passed, directs the SBE to examine opportunities for approved alternatives for the CAA assessment system to include one or more standardized norm-referenced student achievement tests and the possible use of reading, writing, or mathematics portions of the ACT ASSET and ACT COMPASS tests and how they relate to state standards. This review will be conducted as a part of this overall study on alternative assessments.

Connection to Board's Mission, Goals, and Work Plan

This was a study that was required by the legislature initially (and then through the Governor's veto message) to gain an independent review of End of Course Assessments by the Board. This work is connected to the Board's work plan to review the math and science standards, as well, as OSPI proposed instructional materials menus for math and science. The Board will be adopting a 3rd credit of math, as well as, the prescribed content in December 2007 or January 2008. Legislators have a keen interest in implementing the EOCs in math and science for high school students.

Board Role

Steve Floyd will serve as the Board's Lead on this project. Any Board member that has any questions or comments may contact Steve. An interim report will be shared with Board members at the November 2007 Board meeting. The Board will receive the final report at its January meeting. At its September meeting the Board discussed sending the report findings to the Governor, as required by January 15th 2008, but not making recommendations due to insufficient time to review the report and meet with stakeholders.

Scope of Work

The contractor will examine three major areas for the end of course assessment study:

1. A thorough review of the primary and secondary literature on EOCs and high school assessment systems and a documentation of what states are using EOCs and norm referenced tests currently, and in what capacity (EOCs in all subject areas not just those limited to math and science will be explored as well as the purposes);
2. A set of in depth case studies of states with extensive experience implementing EOCs; and
3. A discussion of policy implications for Washington's high school assessment system based on lessons learned from states with EOCs.

The contractor will also report on the opportunities to use additional alternatives for the CAA assessment system using norm referenced student achievement tests.

Consultant Deliverables

- Interim report October 26, 2007
- Final report January 4, 2008

Timeline for Input Process and Board Deliverables

Mid September 2007	Consultant begins work
October 20, 2007	Consultant will submit report to the SBE
October 30, 2007	Consultant will meet with SBE staff, Board lead, and others to discuss draft report in Olympia area
January 4, 2008	Consultant will submit final report to SBE
January 9 or 10, 2008	Consultant will present findings to SBE at Board meeting in Olympia Board will accept report (Note: The Board will review the report findings, but does not plan to make any recommendation at this time)
January 15, 2008	State Board will provide the Governor with the report findings, but not recommendations

Communication Plan

The SBE will work with OSPI, legislative staff, and the Governor's staff to keep them informed of the work and share progress with key stakeholders including legislators.

Staff Project Manager

Edie Harding, Executive Director

The project manager will work with a team from Education First Consulting. The project manager will:

1. Supervise the execution of the RFP and work with a small team including the Board lead to guide the consultant's work;
2. Give feedback on the interim and final report; and
3. Ensure the Board and Board members are informed of the work.

Section 9 of this bill directs the State Board of Education, in consultation with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, to study, examine, and recommend changes to the high school assessments in mathematics and science, focusing on replacement of the current assessments with specifically identified end-of-course assessments. The study's recommendation topics and timelines are structured to point to implementing end-of-course assessments as the predetermined outcome. For this reason, I am vetoing Section 9. However, I am well aware of the strong legislative interest in this subject, specifically related to mathematics and science assessments. I have asked the State Board of Education to conduct a broad, objective study of end-of-course assessments. In the course of this study they will examine the various end-of-course assessment systems used by other states; their purposes; the subjects assessed and how they align with state standards, curriculum, and instruction; whether the exams are used singly or in combination with other assessments for graduation decision purposes; how the exams integrate with an entire assessment system (all grades subjects); and implementation issues learned. Additionally, OSPI will ask potential test vendors to provide information regarding cost and technical aspects of implementing end-of-course assessments and that information will be shared with the State Board. The State Board of Education will provide recommendations based upon their study and present the study information and recommendations by January 15, 2008.



Washington State
Board of Education



Working to Raise Student Achievement Dramatically

Meaningful High School Diploma Charter

Project Purpose

The purpose of the Meaningful High School Diploma project is to review current Board-mandated high school graduation requirements in order to assess what changes may be needed to provide all students the opportunity to succeed in postsecondary education, the 21st century world of work and citizenship. A second purpose is to address, in the context of this comprehensive review, the external tasks the Board has received from the legislature or agreed to assume; specifically, determining the purpose of a diploma¹, adding a third credit of math and prescribing the content of math graduation credits², studying the impact of graduation requirements on students in intensive career and technical education programs³ and addressing tribal history, culture and government⁴.

Background

Although the State Board of Education has had authority for many years to establish or alter high school graduation requirements, it has not revised subject area minimum credit requirements since 1985. In the early 2000's, the Board added two non-credit based requirements—the High School and Beyond Plan and the Culminating Project—that will take effect with the class of 2008.

When the legislature asked the Board to revise the purpose of the diploma, the Board elected to conduct a comprehensive review of high school graduation requirements. To begin this work, the Board established a Meaningful High School Diploma Committee and an advisory group of stakeholders. In addition to feedback from the advisory group, the Committee heard presentations from experts in selected subjects (e.g., math, civics, career and technical education); on designated topics (e.g., differentiated diplomas and district graduation requirements); and on the interests of the

¹ E2SHB 3098 from the 2006 legislative session

² 2SHB 1906 from the 2007 legislative session

³ RCW 28A.230.090

⁴ Memorandum of Agreement with Tribal Leader Congress on Education, related to SHB 1495 from the 2005 legislative session

“receivers” of high school graduates: business, workforce training, and two- and four-year colleges.

Staff produced an inventory of districts’ current graduation credit requirements to serve as a baseline for the review. The Committee proposed a set of preliminary recommendations, including changes to the credit requirements and the addition of essential skills.

Staff synthesized the foundational concepts underlying the recommendations. The Board approved these draft concepts at its September 2007 meeting, with the following preamble to provide direction to staff as they develop proposals for the State Board of Education’s future review:

The Board wants to be clear that these are preliminary, draft concepts that will receive extensive and formative public input and refinement. The Board, in advancing these concepts, is not endorsing specific details at this point. In addition, the Board acknowledges the magnitude of the implementation challenges that these proposals may present and asks our staff to be especially sensitive to identifying potential implementation barriers as well as strategies for dealing with them as they bring forward proposals for our review.

The draft concepts that frame the work of the meaningful high school diploma include:

1. **Purpose of a diploma:** The diploma should signify that students are ready for success in postsecondary education, gainful employment, and citizenship. Requirements should address the personalized education needs of students as well as society’s needs.
2. **One diploma for all:** The purpose and expectations of a diploma apply to all students (with appropriate recognition for special education students on IEPs). Requirements for the diploma send a clear message to all students about what they need to succeed after high school, and ensure that students have met a common set of standards.
3. **Proposed guiding principles.** Graduation requirements should:
 - Establish overarching expectations/essential skills needed for student lifelong learning;
 - Explore equivalency or competency credits, particularly, but not exclusively, in the area of career and technical education;
 - Represent a comprehensive, integrated package;
 - Align with postsecondary education minimum entry requirements.

Connection to Board's Mission, Goals and Work Plan

The Board's mission is to lead the development of state policy, provide system oversight, and advocate for student success. High school graduation requirements are one of the major areas of the Board's policy authority. The Board adopted two overall goals to frame its work with accountability and the review of high school graduation requirements. The goals are:

- Improve student performance dramatically; and
- Provide all Washington students the opportunity to succeed in post-secondary education, the 21st century world of work, and citizenship.

A comprehensive review of high school graduation requirements is one of the top priorities for the Board's work plan in 2007-08. In addition, the ongoing work related to math and science (standards review and revision, review of curriculum); the study of end-of-course assessment; and accountability need to be considered in relation to the meaningful high school diploma.

Board Role

Eric Liu will serve as the Board lead. Board members will participate in work sessions that will delve deeper into selected topics, hear presentations and updates at regular Board meetings, participate in public outreach, and ultimately adopt a revised set of graduation requirements in July 2008 to prepare for the 2009 Legislative Session.

Scope of Work

In late fall 2007, the Board will conduct public outreach on the draft concepts that will provide a framework for consideration of new graduation requirements. The Board will submit to the legislature a revised definition for the purpose of a diploma, establish rules for the addition of a third math credit, and prescribe the content of the math credits required for graduation. It will address the issue of tribal history, culture and government, per the Board's Memorandum of Agreement with the Tribal Leader Congress on Education. Finally, the Board will submit to the legislature a study of the impact of graduation requirements on students in intensive career and technical education programs.

Through much of 2008, the Board will continue to review research and gather information in order to consider thoughtfully, what changes in graduation requirements may be needed.

Deliverables

- Database of districts' graduation requirements
- Revised set of SBE graduation requirements
- Career and Technical Education Study
- Transcript analysis of current course-taking patterns

Draft Timeline for Input Process and Board Deliverables

Task	Time Frame
Board work session on math content	October 18, 2007
Public outreach on draft concepts for MHSD work	Late Fall 2007
Extension of MOA	November 2007
Staff analysis of states' approaches to graduation requirements	December 2007-March 2008
Review of Career and Technical Education Study	January 2008
Decision on purpose of a diploma	January 2008
Decision on math content of graduation requirements	January 2008
Transcript study (if funding received)	January – April 2008
Work session on world languages, arts, health, and fitness	January 11, 2008
Work session on science, social studies, career, and technical education	February 6, 2008
Work session on high school and beyond plan and culminating project	February 20, 2008
Work session with principals on graduation requirements	February 2008
Board meeting to review staff recommendations for proposed graduation requirements	March 26-27, 2008
Public outreach on proposed recommendations	April 2008
Work session on public feedback on graduation requirements	Early May 2008
Board meeting to review revised staff recommendations for proposed graduation requirements	May 14-15, 2008
Funding implications of MHSD recommendations conveyed to Joint Basic Education Finance Task Force	May-July 2008
Board meeting to adopt full proposal package for 2009 session on graduation requirements	July 23-24, 2008
Legislative and budget proposals	September 30, 2008
Adopt rules for revised graduation requirements	Fall 2008

Communication Plan

The communication plan includes work sessions and public outreach meetings to be held periodically through the year (see timeline) with relevant stakeholders such as educators, legislators, parents, and business representatives. All reports will be placed on the SBE Web site, and editorial boards will be contacted as the recommendations develop. The SBE will work with OSPI, legislative staff, and the Governor's staff to keep them informed of the work and share progress with key stakeholders including legislators.

Staff Project Manager

Kathe Taylor, Policy Director



Washington State
Board of Education



Working to Raise Student Achievement Dramatically

Science Standards and Curriculum Review Charter

Project Purpose

Review K-10 science standards and provide feedback on the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's recommended science curricula.

Background

The impetus for the work comes from three sources: *Washington Learns*, student performance on the WASL, and the legislature.

The Governor commissioned a committee, "Washington Learns," to review the entire education system. The report, issued in 2006, called for the State Board of Education to adopt international performance standards for math and science benchmarked to the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) or the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and to adopt high school graduation requirements aligned with international standards.

One reason for this call to higher standards was students' performance on the science WASL. From 2003-2006, performance of students who took the 10th grade science Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) remained essentially flat, with approximately 35 percent of students meeting the standard needed for high school graduation.

In response to both of these events, the legislature directed the Board to review current Washington science standards and propose recommendations to strengthen them (SSHB 1906). In addition, the Board is asked to provide feedback and comment to the superintendent of public instruction regarding science curricula the superintendent will bring to the Board.

Connection to Board's Mission, Goals, and Work Plan

Review of the standards is consistent with the Board's mission to provide K-12 system oversight in order to accomplish its goal of raising student achievement dramatically. In addition, work on science standards will inform the Board as it considers revisions to high school graduation requirements and addresses the question of how much science 21st century graduates will need, and whether additional lab science is needed. The timetable for the standards review has been built into the 2007-2008 work plan.

Board Role

Jeff Vincent will serve as the Board lead. Board members can attend meetings of the science advisory panel and will ultimately:

1. Recommend to the superintendent of public instruction, revised essential academic learning requirements and grade level expectations in science;
2. Review the revised essential academic learning requirements and grade level expectations for science; and
3. Provide comment and recommendations to the superintendent of public instruction regarding the science curricula recommended by the superintendent.

Scope of Work

Three tasks frame the work of this project:

1. Review of the science standards;
2. Official comment and recommendations on science curricula proposed by the superintendent of public instruction; and
3. Establishment of a science advisory panel to provide review and formal comment on proposed recommendations for revised science standards and proposed curricula.

An external consultant will review the standards and present the work as it develops to an advisory panel of Washington science experts and stakeholders. The panel will provide feedback for the consultant to consider and respond to. After recommendations have been developed, the consultant will meet with three focus groups around the state to solicit feedback from a broader array of stakeholders. Throughout the process, the consultant will keep the Board informed through written and oral reports, and through communication with the Board Lead and Project Manager.

Deliverables

- Preliminary, interim and final reports due to SBE from consultant
- SBE Recommendations on science standards revisions to the superintendent of public instruction
- SBE official comment and recommendations regarding the recommended science curricula presented by the superintendent of public instruction

Timeline

Task	Dates
Review of RFPs, signing of contract, and selection of members of science advisory panel	October 2007
Consultant's review of standards and three meetings with science advisory panel	October 2007 – April 2008
Board meeting to discuss preliminary report from consultant	January 9-10, 2008
Board meeting to discuss interim report from consultant	March 26-27, 2008
Public input through three focus groups across the state	March/April 2008
Board meeting to approve final report from consultant	May 14-15, 2008
Recommendations to SPI for revised standards and grade level expectations	June 30, 2008
Review draft revised standards with science advisory panel	November 2008
Receive revised standards from OSPI	December 1, 2008
Receive from OSPI recommendations for basic science curricula	May 15, 2009
Science advisory panel review of curricula recommended by OSPI	May/June 2009
Provide official comment to OSPI regarding the recommended science curricula	June 30, 2009

Communication Plan

The SBE will elicit input on the recommendations by conducting focus groups and encouraging feedback through the Board's Web site. All reports will be placed on the SBE Web site, and editorial Boards will be contacted as the recommendations develop. The SBE will work with OSPI, legislative staff, and the Governor's staff to keep them informed of the work and share progress with key stakeholders including legislators.

Staff Project Manager

Kathe Taylor, Policy Director