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The Problem
There are great job opportunities in Washington, but too many Washington kids aren’t prepared

- Washington will add **740K jobs** over next 5 years
- High-growth jobs will be **higher-skill and higher-paying**
- There is a **universal preference** among Washington Roundtable members to hire locally
- Washington kids are **not adequately prepared**, which requires companies to import talent from elsewhere
- Washington Roundtable members are taking **innovative approaches to closing this gap**

~ Washington Roundtable/Boston Consulting Group: *Pathways to Great Jobs in Washington State*  
October 2016
WA’s economy is growing, but WA’s schools aren’t preparing enough students for this economy. Too many fall out over time.

- 80,700 start 9th grade
- 3,500 drop out before 10th grade
- Another 3,400 drop out before 11th grade
- Another 4,900 drop out before 12th grade
- Another 8,300 drop out before graduation
- 14,000 do not enroll in a postsecondary program
- Another 21,200 fail to earn a postsecondary degree
- 25,500 obtain a postsecondary credential

* Includes students who transfer in after 9th grade and excludes students who transfer out.
** Estimate counts students who do not graduate in five years as dropouts.
*** Six years after graduation.
**** Seven years after graduation. Students obtaining a postsecondary degree does not equal the number of students starting 9th grade less the students exiting the “leaky pipeline” due to rounding.
The Washington Roundtable has an ambitious goal

TODAY’S REALITY

31%

of Washington High School Students Go on to Earn a Postsecondary Credential

OUR GOAL: BY 2030

70%

of Washington Students Earn a Postsecondary Credential By Age 26

Source: Education Research and Data Center. “A Credential by Age 26?”
Characteristics of Low-Performing Schools in Washington State
Washington defines two types of low-performing (LP) schools. A school that meets *any* of the following criteria is classified Priority (bottom 5%) or Focus (bottom 10%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Schools (N=121 for 2015-16)</th>
<th>Focus Schools (N=134 for 2015-16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Ranks in the lowest 5% in student performance on state assessments</td>
<td>▪ Ranks in the lowest 10% based in student performance on state assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Has fewer than 40 percent of all students scoring proficient or better on state assessments</td>
<td>▪ Consistently graduates fewer than 60 percent of its students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Has a 3-year average graduation rate for all students of less than 60%</td>
<td>▪ Has consistently low performance among some demographic groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Priority and Focus School designations apply to Title 1 and Non-Title 1 Schools with at least 20 continuously enrolled students in the “all students” group in each of the 3 years.*
Low performance is a statewide problem: More than 1/3 of WA districts have at least one low-performing school.

The size of the circles on the map corresponds with the number of schools designated as low performing in a particular school district. Districts with more low-performing schools have larger circles.

- Most LP schools are in urban districts.
- LP schools serve the greatest share of students in small, rural districts.

Source: Public Impact analysis of publicly available data.
WA’s LP schools serve higher rates of high-needs students

Higher rates of students who are:

• Hispanic
• Transitional Bilingual
• Low-Income

Source: Public Impact analysis of publicly available data.
Student achievement in low-performing schools significantly trails that of students statewide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRIC</th>
<th>STATE AVERAGE</th>
<th>LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS AVERAGE</th>
<th>LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS TRAILED BY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>16 POINTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBAC, GRADES 3-8 MEETING STANDARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17 POINTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBAC, GRADES 3-8 MEETING STANDARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATION</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>29 POINTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-YEAR COHORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Education First analysis of OSPI data
Washington’s Current Policy Options to Improve Low-Performing Schools are Limited
OSPI offers limited levels of intervention and support for low-performing schools

REQUIRED ACTION DISTRICT LEVEL I

REQUIRED ACTION DISTRICT LEVEL II

PRIORITY, FOCUS, AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (SIG) SCHOOLS & DISTRICTS

ALL SCHOOLS & DISTRICTS

STATE ACTIONS

SCHOOL & DISTRICT ACTIONS

SCHOOL & DISTRICT ACTIONS

STATE ACTIONS

RECOGNITION & ACCOUNTABILITY

ASSISTANCE & INTERVENTION
Washington uses three primary interventions to support low-performing schools

**Required Action Districts (RADs) (N=4)**
- Districts with at least one school identified as “persistently lowest achieving,” for "all students" on state assessments in reading and mathematics for the last three consecutive years
- Two levels of RAD (I & II); RAD II districts receive direct guidance from State Supt and less autonomy
- Must conduct Academic Performance Audit and create action plan to be approved by State Board

**School Improvement Grant (SIG) Schools**
- Between 2010 and 2015, 41 schools in 32 districts have received federal SIG funds to apply one of 4 federal intervention models; schools receive btwn $50K and $2 million per grant ($24 million total received by WA)
- Must be Priority schools & demonstrate greatest need
- Provide evidence of strongest commitment to use SIG funds to substantially raise student achievement and, if applicable, graduation rates
- Exhibit capacity to implement and sustain reforms over time

**Turnaround Support for Priority/Focus Schools**
- Implement [Student and School Success Principles](#) ("turnaround principles")
- Leadership coaching (technical assistance and monitoring)
- Data packages for newly identified Priority and Focus Schools
- Create Student and School Success Action plan; reviewed by OSPI
- Access to OSPI/AESD professional development and services
- Minimal iGrants to support engagement in professional development and services aligned to the Student and School Success Action Plan
What is happening with Priority and Focus schools?

We compared the school improvement status of 138 schools first identified as Priority or Focus schools in 2012-13 against the 2015-2016 designations and asked:

– Which of the 138 schools have improved enough to exit improvement status altogether?
– How many schools are not improving?
More than half of the 2012-13 Priority and Focus schools are not improving enough to exit low-performing schools status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Schools</th>
<th>Focus Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46 in 2012-13</td>
<td>134 in 2012-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 out of 46 schools were still Priority schools in 2015-2016.
- Six improved slightly and became Focus schools
- 17 improved enough to exit Priority and Focus status

52 out of 92 schools were still Focus schools in 2015-2016.
- 40 of 92 schools made enough improvement to exit Focus status
- 34 out of 92 schools placed on the Focus schools list in 2012-13 are still Focus schools
- 18 schools designated as Focus schools in 2012-13 were downgraded to Priority schools.
RAD and SIG policy results have been mixed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Action Districts (RADs) (N=4)</th>
<th>School Improvement Grant (SIG) Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ All 4 schools in cohort 1 RAD districts (2011-2012) made sufficient progress on state assessments; in 2015 all cohort 1 districts exited RAD status</td>
<td>▪ 1 school has closed since the SIG program started in 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ In 2014: RAD cohort 2 of 4 districts were designated and are currently receiving state funding to implement one of 4 federal turnaround models</td>
<td>▪ 36 out of 41 SIG schools chose the “Transformation” federal option which required replacing the principal but no other radical changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ At least 4 more districts (Highline, Pasco, Seattle and Yakima) have more than 1 persistently low-performing school, but have not been designated as RADs</td>
<td>▪ <a href="#">2012 study of WA SIG program</a> noted overwhelming majority of the schools exhibit little evidence of bold, transformative changes and that capacity of districts to help schools radically rethink how they approach teaching and learning appears to be limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One-third of Priority schools exited out of all status

17 out of 46 schools identified as Priority schools in 2012-13 made enough improvement to exit that designation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>Chinook Middle</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>West Seattle Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>Odyssey - The Essential School</td>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>Rogers High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville</td>
<td>Tulalip Elementary</td>
<td>Soap Lake</td>
<td>Soap Lake Middle &amp; High (RAD cohort 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Morton Junior-Senior High (RAD cohort 1)</td>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
<td>Sunnyside High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>Columbia Basin Secondary</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>Jason Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakville</td>
<td>Oakville High</td>
<td>Toppenish</td>
<td>Valley View Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onalaska</td>
<td>Onalaska Middle (RAD cohort 1)</td>
<td>White River</td>
<td>Collins Alternative Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Lakeridge Elementary (RAD cohort 1)</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>Adams Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Cleveland High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Six schools improved slightly to move from Priority to Focus

6 schools designated as Priority schools in 2012-13 have improved slightly, but remain Focus schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlington-Edison</td>
<td>West View Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview</td>
<td>Grandview Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>Cascade Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview</td>
<td>Monticello Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville</td>
<td>Totem Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>Angelo Giaudrone Middle School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At least 23 schools aren’t improving enough after 3 years

But 23 out of 46 schools placed on the Priority schools list in 2012-13 still had that designation three years later.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Granger</td>
<td>Granger Middle School</td>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>Virgie Robinson Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inchelium</td>
<td>Inchelium Elementary</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Hawthorne Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inchelium</td>
<td>Inchelium Middle</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Interagency Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Kent Phoenix Academy</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Rainier Beach High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville</td>
<td>Quil Ceda Elementary</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>Stewart Middle (RAD**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Adams</td>
<td>Harrah Elementary</td>
<td>Toppenish</td>
<td>Eagle High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Adams</td>
<td>Mount Adams Middle</td>
<td>Wapato</td>
<td>Adams Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Adams</td>
<td>White Swan High</td>
<td>Wellpinit</td>
<td>Wellpinit Elementary (RAD**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nespelem</td>
<td>Nespelem Elementary</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>Barge-Lincoln Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>Emerson Elementary</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>Stanton Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>Longfellow Elementary</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>Washington Middle (RAD**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>Rowena Chess Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Orange highlight indicates the school has received a school improvement grant (SIG)
**Three schools are currently in Required Action Districts (RADs)*
Nearly half of schools improved enough to exit Focus status

40 out of 92 schools identified as Focus schools in 2012-13 have made enough improvement to exit that designation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Miller Junior High</td>
<td>Mabton</td>
<td>Mabton Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>Centennial Elementary</td>
<td>Mount Vernon</td>
<td>Lincoln Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewster</td>
<td>Brewster High</td>
<td>North Franklin</td>
<td>Palouse Junction High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kitsap</td>
<td>Fairview Junior High</td>
<td>Othello</td>
<td>Hiawatha Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kitsap</td>
<td>Pinecrest Elementary</td>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>Mcloughlin Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Place</td>
<td>Meadow Brook Intermediate</td>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>Pasco Senior High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastmont</td>
<td>Clovis Point Intermediate</td>
<td>Pioneer</td>
<td>Pioneer Intermediate/Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephrata</td>
<td>Ephrata Middle</td>
<td>Prosser</td>
<td>Housel Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephrata</td>
<td>Sage Hills High</td>
<td>Quillayute</td>
<td>Forks Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Hawthorne Elementary School</td>
<td>Quincy</td>
<td>Monument Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>Endeavour Intermediate</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>Boze Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview</td>
<td>McClure Elementary School</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>Mann Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite Falls</td>
<td>Granite Falls Middle</td>
<td>Union Gap</td>
<td>Union Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>Hilltop Elementary</td>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>Valley P-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>Mount View Elementary</td>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
<td>Lincoln High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>Tieton Intermediate</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>Warden Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelso</td>
<td>Coweeman Middle</td>
<td>Wellpinit</td>
<td>Wellpinit Alliance High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Covington Elementary</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>Gilbert Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Scenic Hill Elementary</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>Lewis &amp; Clark Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynden</td>
<td>Lynden Middle</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>Wilson Middle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Focus schools are not eligible for SIG funds or RAD status*
### One-third of schools remain on the Focus list after 3 years

But 34 out of 92 schools placed on the Focus schools list in 2012-13 still had that designation three years later.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Harbor High</td>
<td>Mount Vernon</td>
<td>La Venture Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>McDermoth Elementary</td>
<td>Mount Vernon</td>
<td>Mount Baker Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>Chester H Thompson Elementary</td>
<td>North Franklin</td>
<td>Robert L Olds Junior High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>Spanaway Elementary</td>
<td>Othello</td>
<td>McFarland Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton</td>
<td>Renaissance Alternative</td>
<td>Port Angeles</td>
<td>Lincoln High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Allen Elementary</td>
<td>Quincy</td>
<td>Quincy Junior High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Valley (Yak)</td>
<td>East Valley Elementary</td>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Dimmitt Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldendale</td>
<td>Goldendale Middle</td>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
<td>Harrison Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>Bow Lake Elementary</td>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
<td>Sierra Vista Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>Madrona Elementary</td>
<td>Toppenish</td>
<td>Toppenish Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>McMicken Heights Elementary</td>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Showalter Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>Sylvester Middle</td>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
<td>Garrison Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelso</td>
<td>Huntington Middle</td>
<td>Wapato</td>
<td>Pace Alternative High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennewick</td>
<td>Park Middle</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>Warden Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Cedar Valley Elementary</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>Davis High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview</td>
<td>Mint Valley Elementary</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>Franklin Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>Park Place Middle</td>
<td>Zillah</td>
<td>Zillah Intermediate School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Focus schools are not eligible for SIG funds or RAD status*
Unfortunately, some schools’ performance has worsened

18 schools designated as Focus schools in 2012-13 have been downgraded to Priority schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clover Park</td>
<td>Lochburn Middle</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Highland Park Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover Park</td>
<td>Tyee Park Elementary</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Madrona K-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>Tieton Intermediate School</td>
<td>Toppenish</td>
<td>Kirkwood Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood Canal</td>
<td>Hood Canal Elem &amp; Junior High</td>
<td>Toppenish</td>
<td>Lincoln Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview</td>
<td>Kessler Elementary</td>
<td>Wahluke</td>
<td>Saddle Mountain Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>Frank Wagner Elementary</td>
<td>Wahluke</td>
<td>Wahluke Junior High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>Ellen Ochoa Middle</td>
<td>Wapato</td>
<td>Camas Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>Stevens Middle</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>Garfield Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Emerson Elementary School</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>Roosevelt Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*None of these districts are RAD districts*
But, of ~1 million public K-12 students in Washington, just ~100k students are in low-performing schools. Most low-performing students in Washington do NOT attend a low-performing school. Addressing just low-performing schools is insufficient.

Source: OSPI. “SBA Scores by School.” Analyzed by Public Impact.
Nearly half of students who took the Smarter Balanced assessment in 2014-15 scored below proficient.

In 2014-2015, ~200k students did not meet standard in ELA, and more than 225k failed to do so in math.

Source: OSPI. “SBA Scores by School.” Analyzed by Public Impact.
Promising Practices from National Research
Our research methodology

Practices from Sites Focused on LP Schools and Students
- Denver, Colorado
- Indianapolis, Indiana
- Lawrence, Massachusetts
- Tennessee ASD

Research-Based Strategies
- Access to excellent teachers
- Student-based budgeting

Recommendations from Field Leaders
- American Institutes for Research (AIR)
- Reform Support Network (RSN)
- Public Impact
## Problem

School funding is often focused on paying for inputs (teachers, resources, etc.) rather than the needs of the students at that school.

## Strategy

Adopt a student-based budgeting allocation formula:

- All students generate the same base funding
- Students with greater needs (e.g. FRL, transitional bilingual) generate additional funding
- Dollars follow students to the schools they attend
Research base:
Components of a strong funding system

A strong school funding system is...

- Equitable
- Efficient
- Flexible
- Transparent
Why student-based budgeting

## BENEFITS OF STUDENT-BASED BUDGETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQUITABLE</th>
<th>✓ Students with same needs generate same funding ✓ Students with different needs generate different funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFFICIENT</td>
<td>✓ Funding targeted students needs, minimizing waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEXIBLE</td>
<td>✓ School funding changes as needs of students enrolled change ✓ Funding not tied to school structures or program, creating space for innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPARENT</td>
<td>✓ Formula makes clear how much funding each school and student should receive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student-based budgeting: Evidence from districts and states

**Baltimore, MD:** Central office reduced and $160 million pushed to classrooms

**Hawaii:** Funding equity increased and more predictable

**Hartford, CT:** Principals approach budgets more strategically

**San Francisco, CA:** SBB part of reform package leading to six years of improvement
Enhance supports and accountability
2. Identify and illuminate low performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policymakers must know where low-performing students are in order to support them</td>
<td>• Develop a robust methodology for identifying truly low-performing schools and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public is unlikely to demand change unless it understands the extent of the problem</td>
<td>• Use those data to elevate the issue and build grassroots support for dramatic action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Identifying the problem in Denver

Denver’s School Performance Framework (SPF):

- Identifies and prioritizes high-needs schools
- Incorporates academic and non-academic metrics and district review
- SPF rating dictates type and intensity of support within tiered system
- Process has been revised many times to reflect lessons learned and better meet goals
Example: Illuminating the problem in Indianapolis

In 2011, **The Mind Trust**, an Indianapolis nonprofit that aims to provide every student in the city access to a high-performing school, published the *Opportunity Schools report*.

- Exposed poor performance of Indianapolis Public Schools

- Received local and national press, fueled school board elections, and led to new reform-oriented administration

- Created foundation for TMT monitoring and reporting on city progress in creating high-quality options
## Enhance supports and accountability

### 3. Broaden range of supports and accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-performing schools and the challenges they face vary greatly, and a one-size-fits-all approach does not work</td>
<td>• Create diverse toolbox of interventions and strategies for schools to choose from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop system for matching school or student needs with a menu of interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create robust process for adopting improvement strategies tailored to students’ needs and matching autonomy and resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Denver’s Intervention “Toolbox”

Strategies include:

• Innovation Schools with enhanced autonomies based on tailored turnaround plans

• Denver Summit School Network that implements “5 tenets of high-performing charters”

• Closure and replacement
Select intervention based on:

- Extent of academic failure
- Availability of a turnaround leader
- District capacity to support turnaround
- Availability of school providers
- State laws regarding staffing

Enhance supports and accountability

4. Monitor progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Whether a turnaround or improvement effort is working is not often evident | • Set clear and realistic goals  
• Track progress against those goals  
• Report on progress  
• Adjust in response to the data |
Example: Massachusetts turnaround districts

In Massachusetts, districts with the most chronically low-performing schools enter receivership, where the state appoints a receiver to run the district and grants the receiver charter-like autonomies. In those districts:

• The district develops turnaround plan including specific targets (e.g., gains in student proficiency and growth rates)

• Receivers report progress on goals quarterly

• State commissioner assesses district’s turnaround plan implementation and progress towards goals annually
Massachusetts’ system for differentiated accountability for school districts could be a model for Washington

Massachusetts has defined its approach to district engagement based on the premise that district accountability and state assistance must be closely linked to produce continuous and sustainable improvement.

Level 1

Granted considerable autonomy and flexibility and have access to the online tools and resources available to all districts.

Level 2

Granted some autonomy but must perform annual needs assessment to improve conditions in schools not effectively supporting needs of all students.

Level 3

Receive priority assistance from regional District & School Assistance Centers (DSAC), engaging with DSAC in needs assessment process and identification of interventions.

Level 4

Assigned liaison from the state education department to engage leadership team in system-level analysis of district support activities; closely monitored for efficacy and impact.

Level 5

State education department engages a receiver to oversee management of the school.

Source: MA Department of Elementary & Secondary Education website
Lawrence has experienced modest gains under receivership

- Lawrence has been in receivership since 2011.
- Receivership was renewed in 2015, but there have been improvements.
- Lawrence no longer ranked in bottom 10 percent of districts statewide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Change since 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Proficiency</td>
<td>+ 4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Proficiency</td>
<td>+ 16 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>+ 20 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [2015 MCAS Report for Grade 10 All Students. School and District Profiles](http://example.com), Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Enhance supports and accountability

5. Create real consequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Too often, low-performing schools languish year after year | • State takeover of the failing school or district  
• School closure |
Example: State takeover in Tennessee

Tennessee Achievement School District (ASD):

• Lowest-performing 5% of schools are eligible

• Schools bring facility and funding to ASD

• ASD directly runs schools or finds charter partner

• Option to return to home district if school meets exit criteria
Early indicators of success in Tennessee’s ASD

• Since 2012, math and science proficiency up 10 points

• Schools in the ASD two or three years earned the state’s top score for growth in 2015

• Survey: 83% of ASD parents satisfied

• Survey: 75% of ASD teachers plan to stay at school v. 55% of teachers statewide

Example: School closure in Denver

Denver Public Schools’ Improvement Strategy:

• When other interventions fail, consolidate or close and replace school

• Clear guidelines for replacement, restart or closure

• Since 2005, 48 of lowest-performing schools phased out, consolidated, or shuttered

School closure and replacement produces proficiency bump in Denver

• According to Donnell Kay study, between 2009 and 2011:
  – Proficiency rates up 8 points
  – Percentage of schools meeting quality benchmark up 11 percentage points
  – Number of low-income students attending a quality school nearly tripled

• Improvements largely credited to closing low-performing schools and replacing them with higher performing charters

### Problem

Too few excellent leaders and school operators capable of driving a successful turnaround effort in the lowest-performing schools

### Strategy

- Build the supply of great leaders
- Extend the reach of those you already have
Example: Recruiting talent to Indianapolis

The Mind Trust has employed a variety of programs to recruit education talent:

- **Innovation Schools Fellowship** – To find and support talented leaders to launch Innovation Schools
- **School Design Challenge** – To develop transformational new charter school models
- **Education Entrepreneur Fellowship** – To recruit and support leaders with a plan to address a pressing educational challenge
- **Various charter school incubators** – To incent high-performing CMOs to open schools in Indianapolis
## Increase access to educator talent

### 7. Increase access to excellent teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Too few low-performing students have access to excellent teachers capable of closing the achievement gap | Increase students’ access to excellent teachers by:  
• Attracting more high-caliber candidates  
• Retaining more of the best  
• Incentivizing great teachers to help peers improve  
• Reaching more students with the state’s best teachers |
Research base
Great teachers matter... A lot

- Students of excellent teachers make about 1.5 years of growth in a single school year

- Students who start:
  - Two years behind can catch up in four years
  - One year behind can catch up in two years
  - On grade-level can leap ahead and compete with their peers internationally
Research base
Teacher pay matters

• Cross-sector research: Performance-based rewards improve retention of high performers

• U.S. education studies: Top teachers would take on additional responsibility for more pay

• Top-performing countries:
  o Pay teachers more
  o Recruit better candidates
  o Have lower teacher attrition rates
Research base

Career paths matter

• Cross-sector research: High performers want advancement opportunities and flexible, challenging roles

• Teacher survey: Responsibility and advancement listed as strategies keeping great teachers in the classroom

• Teach Plus experience: Teachers more likely to remain in teaching if they can expand their influence
Research base
Lessons from the Opportunity Culture initiative

In 2014-15:

• OC schools were highly selective, hiring just 11% of applicants

• Compared to other schools in the same states:
  o 45% more OC schools achieved high growth
  o 46% fewer OC schools showed low growth

• “…to actually think that I could be paid what I’m worth is the best feeling in the world.”

  ~Master Teacher Tiffany McAfee, Merit Prep Newark

www.opportunityculture.org
IMPACT in DCPS:

• Highly effective teachers can earn up to:
  o $25,000 in annual bonuses
  o An additional $27,000 as base salary

• Study: Highly effective teachers less likely to leave teaching as a result of IMPACT
# Close achievement gaps early

## 8. Early childhood education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Problem</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strategy</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The achievement gap starts before kindergarten</td>
<td>• Provide targeted, publicly supported pre-K for high-need students focused on academic readiness for kindergarten.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefits of early childhood education
Evidence from successful programs

Tulsa, Oklahoma:
52% gain in early literacy and 21% gain on pre-math skills assessments

New Jersey:
Gains from two years of pre-K closed achievement gap between minority and white students up to 40 percent.

Denver, CO:
98% participants reading at or above grade level at end of kindergarten, while 99% at or above average in math
Research base
Long-term benefits of pre-K

At-risk kids who receive high-quality pre-K:

• Less likely to drop out of school
• Less likely to become teenage parents
• Less likely to be arrested
• More likely to attend college

= Annual ROI of 7-10% from increased earnings and reduced social dependency as adults
Priority Strategies for Washington
A two-pronged approach

- Low-Performing Schools
- Low-Performing Students
Four steps to meaningful improvements in student performance

1. Improve K-12 Financing
2. Enhance Supports & Accountability
3. Increase Access to Educator Talent
4. Close Achievement Gaps Early
Improve K-12 Education Financing: Allocate state funds based on student need

A student-based budgeting system would establish a per-pupil level of base funding, which would be adjusted upward for students who have greater needs, such as students from low-income households or students who are English language learners.

**BENEFITS OF STUDENT-BASED BUDGETING**

| EQUITABLE | ✓ Students with same needs generate same funding  
|           | ✓ Students with different needs generate different funding |
| EFFICIENT | ✓ Funding targeted students needs, minimizing waste |
| FLEXIBLE  | ✓ School funding changes as needs of students enrolled change  
|           | ✓ Funding not tied to school structures or program, creating space for innovation |
| TRANSPARENT | ✓ Formula makes clear how much funding each school and student should receive |
Enhance supports and accountability

1. Identify and illuminate low performance
   • Develop a robust methodology for identifying truly low-performing schools & students and use resulting data to drive demand for change.

2. Strengthen accountability and support
   • Create a diverse toolbox, develop a system for matching low-performing schools & student needs with interventions and a process for adopting strategies that match autonomy and resources.

3. Monitor progress
   • Set clear and realistic goals, track and report on progress against those goals, and adjust goals in response to the data.
   • Collect evidence of successful improvement efforts as well as unsuccessful ones.

4. Create real consequences
   • Consider a range of interventions offering support and autonomy based on performance, including school takeover or closure.
Increase access to educator talent

6. Grow the pipeline of great leaders and teachers for low-performing schools
   • Build the supply of great leaders and teachers for low-performing schools & students

7. Increase struggling students’ access to excellent teachers
   • Attract more high-caliber candidates
   • Retain more of the best
   • Incent great teachers to help peers improve
   • Reach more students with the state’s best teachers
Close achievement gaps early

8. Provide early childhood education for high-need students
   • Fund publicly supported, but targeted pre-K for high-need students
   • Focus on academic readiness for kindergarten
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