



Required Action District Rule Revisions

January 10, 2019
State Board of Education

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Chris Reykdal, State Superintendent

Equity Statement:

Each student, family, and community possesses strengths and cultural knowledge that benefit their peers, educators, and schools.

Ensuring educational equity:

- Goes beyond equality; it requires education leaders to examine the ways current policies and practices result in disparate outcomes for our students of color, students living in poverty, students receiving special education and English Learner services, students who identify as LGBTQ+, and highly mobile student populations.
- Requires education leaders to develop an understanding of historical contexts; engage students, families, and community representatives as partners in decision-making; and actively dismantle systemic barriers, replacing them with policies and practices that ensure all students have access to the instruction and support they need to succeed in our schools.



Guiding Principles for Revised Rules

- Aligned with improvement system, provides continuity of programming
- Transparent and straightforward, data informed, and minimizes administrative burden
- Considers broader systemic issues and focuses on student groups targeted in ESSA plan
- Operates within the current statutory framework



RAD Superintendents Said:

- The current RAD policy is “arbitrary and capricious”
- The label is stigmatizing; negative impact on hiring teachers in already challenging labor market
- The extensive reporting requirements are a burden
- There’s no recognition of the challenges that these schools face nor the hard work that they do
- “We all want the same thing – [the schools and districts], OSPI, SBE – to unlock the potential of our kids, but we don’t know which keys to use.”



OSPI RAD Rules Overview

Identify schools for improvement

Identify persistently lowest achieving schools

Recommend required action districts to SBE

Recommend release from required action status



ESSA-Identified Student Groups

Washington's long term goal: 90 percent minimum proficiency rate for all student groups within 10 years (by 2027).

ELA Proficiency Rates, Targets

Subgroup	Projected 2017 ELA Proficiency Rates (%)	Annual Target for Improvement (%)	Projected 2027 ELA Proficiency Rates (%)
All	61.9	2.8	90
American Indian/Alaskan Native	31.6	5.8	90
Asian	76.6	1.3	90
Black/African American	44.6	4.5	90
English Learners	19.2	7.1	90
Hispanic/Latino	44.9	4.5	90
Low Income	47.3	4.3	90
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	41.3	4.9	90
Special Education	24.1	6.6	90
Two or More Races	64.7	2.5	90
White	68.2	2.2	90

ELA Proficiency Rates Baseline and Targets, *ESSA Consolidated Plan* pg. 22

Math Proficiency Rates, Targets

Subgroup	Projected 2017 Math Proficiency Rates (%)	Annual Target for Improvement (%)	Projected 2027 Math Proficiency Rates (%)
All	53.1	3.7	90
American Indian/Alaskan Native	23.5	6.6	90
Asian	72.8	1.7	90
Black/African American	33.9	5.6	90
English Learners	20.7	6.9	90
Hispanic/Latino	36.4	5.4	90
Low Income	38.8	5.1	90
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	32.9	5.7	90
Special Education	20.7	6.9	90
Two or More Races	55.5	3.5	90
White	58.8	3.1	90

Math Proficiency Rates Baseline and Targets, *ESSA Consolidated Plan* pg. 23



Proposed: Identify schools for improvement

Challenged schools in
need of improvement



Schools identified for
comprehensive supports (WSIF)



Statute: “Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools”

- Must be a subset of “challenged schools in need of improvement”
- Must consider “lack of progress for all students and subgroups of students over a number of years”
- Must “take into account level of state or federal resources available to implement a required action plan”



Proposed Criteria: “Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools”

- A subset of challenged schools;
- In the lowest decile for combined student growth as defined in WSIF;
- In the lowest decile for combined student proficiency as defined in WSIF; and
- Located in a school district serving a significantly higher proportion than state average of students in student groups targeted by OSPI for the highest rates of annual improvement in ELA and math proficiency.



Proposed Prioritization: “Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools”

- Prioritization based on proportion of schools in the district identified for improvement.
- Superintendent has discretion to remove from recommendation if the recommendation is unnecessary or inappropriate based on changes in the schools or district status, or is otherwise not in the public interest.



Proposed: “Recommend RAD to SBE”

- A district with one or more school on “persistently lowest achieving list”
- Prioritized by highest proportion of schools in district identified for improvement
- Recommendation based on number of districts that can be served with available funding



Proposed: Recommend Release from RAD

- Must recommend release if:
 - District implemented a required action plan for three years;
 - Has made progress based on “persistently lowest achieving” criteria;
 - No longer has a school on “persistently lowest
- Can request early release if meeting criteria after two years



Proposed: District Option to Extend

A district can request an additional three years of RAD supports even if they are eligible for release after the initial three year cycle.



Discussion or questions?

