

# STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

**HEARING TYPE:**    X INFORMATION/NO ACTION

**DATE:**             JANUARY 26, 2007

**SUBJECT:**            **SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY  
OPPORTUNITY GAPS  
COLLEGE READINESS DEFINED**

**SERVICE UNIT:**    School and District Improvement and Accountability  
Janell Newman, Ph.D.

**PRESENTERS:**      Janell Newman, Ph.D., Duane Baker, Ed.D., Greg Lobdell

## **BACKGROUND:**

Based on conversations with Systems Performance chair Dr. Kristina Mayer and State Board Executive Director Edie Harding, this presentation will focus on the scope of school improvement assistance currently provided by OSPI and will examine the profiles of schools and students that have not participated in the School and District Improvement and Accountability (SIA) (DIA) Program. The discussion will address opportunity and achievement gaps and equity for all students. Based on the current work in SIA and DIA, the information provided may inform conversations of the State Board over the next several months regarding the development of a new state accountability system that will result in improved student achievement. Specifically, the presentation will provide the following:

1. An examination of the students and schools that have been served by the School Improvement Assistance Program and students and schools that have not met state/federal standards nor been served by the School Improvement Assistance Program; policy questions related to a range of voluntary or required appropriate interventions.

### Policy Questions and Considerations

- Currently, improvement plans are approved by local school boards without any provision requiring them to be seen by the State, no common template or unified system for approving them. Should the State Board strengthen its requirement on the development of School Improvement Plans by requiring a common template and a criterion-based system for external review or collaborative scoring to provide statewide data on schools' focus, to guide appropriate statewide technical assistance and professional development?

- Currently, districts are not required to demonstrate support matched to a plan of improvement or to report assistance efforts to the state. This group of schools includes those not being served by the School Improvement group at OSPI. Should the State Board require that School districts report the specific support and technical assistance they provide to schools that have not met state/federal standards on their annual Basic Education Report?
  - Currently, participation is voluntary. There are many districts that have not met their goals and have not volunteered. Should participation in the Washington State School Improvement Assistance Program or an approved alternative intervention be required when schools continue to fail to meet state/federal standards?
  - Currently, only Title I schools are required to receive assistance under NCLB – our state accountability system requires goal setting for reading and math but does not require low performers to receive assistance. Should all schools regardless of Title I designation be held to the same levels of accountability as required by NCLB?
2. College and workplace readiness in the 21<sup>st</sup> century based on college awareness, college eligibility and college preparation; Washington transcript analysis and findings on course of study, college and workplace readiness for students of color and poverty; policy questions related to graduation requirements and equitable access.

#### Policy Questions and Considerations

- One third of the districts in the state already require more math than the graduation requirement. Should the State Board adopt more rigorous graduation requirements that would give all students the knowledge and skills they need to succeed in college and in the 21<sup>st</sup> century workplace?
  - Currently, like-named courses differ in their rigor and substance. Should common statewide transcripts, course descriptions and course numbers be established to ensure equitable, consistent and comparable access to rigor for all children?
3. Examination of distribution of teachers based on experience, qualifications and out-of-field status and the resulting impact on the academic performance of students of color and poverty; examination of equity in funding by students in schools of poverty and high minority population, and policy questions related to equity for all students.

#### Policy Questions and Considerations

- Survey data from the University of Washington shows that new teachers are often given assignments in hard-to-staff schools. Should the State Board require the collection and monitoring of distribution patterns of teachers to ensure that poor and minority students are not being taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified and out-of-field teachers?
- Should the State Board recommend incentives to encourage highly qualified teachers and principals to serve in schools with the greatest needs?
- Should the State Board require districts to submit evidence of equitable distribution of all financial resources (including human resources) by school?