

ESEA FLEXIBILITY PART B MONITORING REPORT

MONITORING VISIT INFORMATION	
State Educational Agency (SEA)	Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)
Request Approved	July 6, 2012
Request Amended	February 27, 2013
ESEA Flex Monitoring Activity	Part B Desk Monitoring
Monitoring Review Date(s)	November 25-26, 2013
Exit Conference	December 16, 2013
Interviews Conducted	OSPI Staff
U.S. Department of Education (ED) Monitors	Leslie Clithero and Michael Wells, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, and Jennifer Denny, Office of Special Education Programs

OVERVIEW OF ESEA FLEXIBILITY MONITORING

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) is committed to supporting State educational agencies (SEAs) as they implement ambitious reform agendas through their approved ESEA flexibility requests. Consistent with this commitment, ED has designed a monitoring process to assess an SEA's implementation of the principles of ESEA flexibility and the State-level systems and processes needed to support that implementation.

Part B Monitoring

In Part B monitoring, SEA implementation of ESEA flexibility was reviewed across several key areas: State-level Systems and Processes, Principle 1, Principle 2, and Principle 3, as outlined in the *ESEA Flexibility Part B Monitoring Protocol*. In each broad area, ED identified key elements that are required under ESEA flexibility and are likely to lead to increased achievement for students. Through examination of documentation submitted by the SEA and interviews with SEA staff, ED assessed the effectiveness of implementation of ESEA flexibility by identifying the extent to which an SEA:

1. Is ensuring that implementation is occurring consistent with the SEA's approved request and the principles and timelines of ESEA flexibility.
2. Is continuing to review and make adjustments to support implementation.
3. Is establishing systems and process to sustain implementation and improvements.

The report contains the following sections:

- *Highlights of the SEA's Implementation.* This section identifies key accomplishments in the SEA's implementation of ESEA flexibility.
- *Status of Implementation of ESEA Flexibility.* This section indicates whether or not the SEA has met expectations for each element of ESEA flexibility.
- *Elements Requiring Next Steps.* When appropriate, this section identifies any elements where the SEA is not meeting expectations and includes Next Steps that the SEA must take to meet expectations.

- *Recommendations to Strengthen Implementation.* This section provides recommendations to support the SEA in continuing to meet the principles and timelines of ESEA flexibility and strengthening implementation.
- *Additional Comments.* When appropriate, this section includes any additional information related to the SEA’s implementation of ESEA flexibility not included elsewhere.

HIGHLIGHTS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ESEA FLEXIBILITY

The SEA’s work includes the following key accomplishments relating to the implementation of ESEA flexibility and/or efforts to engage in a process of continuous review and analysis, particularly for those elements receiving a comprehensive review:

- Driven by a new State law, OSPI is developing a collection of instructional, research-based best practices for use by all schools in Washington. This includes the establishment of expert panels in each content area to review and collect these best practices. The initial content will involve English/Language Arts, Mathematics, and student behavior, with the intention to expand this process in the future.
- OSPI created an interactive map of its reward schools that allows schools to search for other schools based on geography and similar demographics to identify potential partners for sharing best practices.
- OSPI is engaged in collaborative work with local educational agencies and schools to address the needs of priority, focus, and emerging schools (targeted other Title I schools) with similar expectations for rigorous approaches to improving the lowest performing schools. All priority, focus and emerging schools are expected to develop interventions that address all seven turnaround principles. OSPI has plans to expand this approach to all low performing schools in the State, using State funds to support those schools that are not Title I schools.

STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ESEA FLEXIBILITY

SEA Systems & Processes

Element	Status
Monitoring (EDGAR 80.40 and 2.G)	Not Meeting Expectations
Technical Assistance (2.G)	Meeting Expectations
Data Collection & Use (§9304(a)(6))	Meeting Expectations
Family & Community Engagement and Outreach (Implementation Letter)	Meeting Expectations

Principle 1

Element	Status
Transition to and Implement College- and Career-ready Standards (1.B)	Not Meeting Expectations
Adopt English Language Proficiency Standards (Assurance 2)	Meeting Expectations
Develop and Administer High-Quality Assessments (Assurance 3)	Meeting Expectations
Develop and Administer Alternate Assessments (Assurance 3)	Not Meeting Expectations

Develop and Administer English Language Proficiency Assessments (Assurance 4)	Meeting Expectations
Annually Reports College-going and College-credit Accumulation Rates (Assurance 5)	Not Meeting Expectations

Principle 2

Element	Status
Develop and Implement a State-Based System of Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support (2.A)	Meeting Expectations
Reward Schools (2.C)	Meeting Expectations
Priority Schools (2.D)	Meeting Expectations
Focus Schools (2.E)	Meeting Expectations
Other Title I Schools (2.F)	Meeting Expectations
State and Local Report Cards (§1111 of the ESEA; 2.B and Assurance 14)	Not Meeting Expectations

Principle 3

Element	Status
Teacher Evaluation and Support Systems (3.B)	Washington’s Principle 3 guidelines are under review
Principal Evaluation and Support Systems (3.B)	Washington’s Principle 3 guidelines are under review

ELEMENTS REQUIRING NEXT STEPS

Element	Monitoring (EDGAR 80.40 and 2.G)
Summary and Status of Implementation	<p>The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request and the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>.</p> <p>Under <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>, OSPI is required to have a process to monitor implementation of ESEA flexibility activities at the local educational agency (LEA) and school levels regarding implementation of Principle 1 (college- and career-ready standards), Principle 2 (differentiated recognition, accountability, and support systems), and Principle 3 (development, adoption, piloting, and implementation of teacher and principal evaluation and support systems). While OSPI monitors LEAs for Principle 2 and 3 implementation, OSPI is not meeting the expectations for ESEA flexibility monitoring because it does not conduct formal statewide monitoring for Principle 1. OSPI recognizes they do not have a formal monitoring system, but are assured this occurs on a regular, informal basis. OSPI partners closely with the Educational Service Districts (ESDs) to support statewide implementation. OSPI and ESDs have data related to the number of districts and educators that have been involved in statewide professional learning and capacity building opportunities. OSPI will work with ESDs and LEAs through OSPI’s Consolidated Program Review (CPR) process to establish formal monitoring.</p>

Element	Monitoring (EDGAR 80.40 and 2.G)
Next Steps	Within the ESEA flexibility extension process OSPI must submit a high-quality plan that provides its strategy to work with Washington’s ESDs to ensure that all LEAs are monitored for implementation of college- and career-ready standards.

Element	Transition to and Implement College- and Career-ready Standards (1.B)
Summary and Status of Implementation	<p>The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request and the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>.</p> <p>Under <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>, OSPI is required to have a process to monitor implementation of ESEA flexibility activities at the LEA and school levels regarding implementation of Principle 1 (college- and career-ready standards), Principle 2 (differentiated recognition, accountability, and support systems), and Principle 3 (development, adoption, piloting, and implementation of teacher and principal evaluation and support systems). While OSPI monitors LEAs for Principle 2 and 3 implementation, OSPI is not meeting the expectations for ESEA flexibility monitoring because it does not conduct formal statewide monitoring for Principle 1. OSPI recognizes they do not have a formal monitoring system, but are assured this occurs on a regular, informal basis. OSPI partners closely with the Educational Service Districts (ESDs) to support statewide implementation. OSPI and ESDs have data related to the number of districts and educators that have been involved in statewide professional learning and capacity building opportunities. OSPI will work with ESDs and LEAs through OSPI’s Consolidated Program Review (CPR) process to establish formal monitoring.</p>
Next Steps	Within the ESEA flexibility extension process OSPI must submit a high-quality plan that provides its strategy to work with Washington’s ESDs to ensure that all LEAs are monitored for implementation of college- and career-ready standards.

Element	Develop and Administer Alternate Assessments (Assurance 3)
Summary and Status of Implementation	<p>The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request and the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>.</p> <p>Under <i>ESEA flexibility</i>, OSPI is required to demonstrate that it has college- and career-ready expectations for all students in the State by developing and administering annual, statewide, aligned, high-quality assessments, and corresponding academic achievement standards, that measure student growth in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school. A “high-quality assessment” is an assessment or a system of assessments that is valid, reliable, and fair for its intended purposes; and measures student knowledge and skills against college- and career-ready standards in a way that (among other things) provides for</p>

Element	Develop and Administer Alternate Assessments (Assurance 3)
	alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(a)(2). In order to meet the requirement to develop and administer alternate assessments, OSPI is a member of the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) consortium. Although OSPI remains a member of the DLM consortium and it appears that the DLM work is on track for full implementation in 2014-2015, OSPI will not implement the DLM tests in 2014-2015 as originally planned. OSPI does not believe the tests are ready for full implementation. OSPI plans to reassess whether the tests will be operational for 2015-2016 as the tests are further developed.
Next Steps	Within the ESEA flexibility extension process OSPI must amend its request to explain how it will administer high-quality alternate assessments in 2014-2015 given that it will not administer the DLM assessment in 2014-2015 as outlined in its currently approved request for ESEA flexibility.

Element	Annually Reports College-going and College-credit Accumulation Rates (Assurance 5)
Summary and Status of Implementation	<p>The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request and the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>.</p> <p>In OSPI's request for ESEA flexibility, OSPI assured that it would "report annually to the public on college-going and college credit-accumulation rates for all students and subgroups of students in each LEA and each public high school in the State" by the 2014-2015 school year, as defined by the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12). An SEA must report subgroup data on college enrollment and course completion in a manner consistent with ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II). That section identifies the following subgroups: economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and English Learners. OSPI is not yet reporting this data for the students with disabilities or English Learner subgroups.</p>
Next Steps	Within the ESEA flexibility extension process OSPI will outline its plan for collecting and reporting the required data under Assurance 5 of ESEA flexibility by the 2014-2015 school year.

Element	State and Local Report Cards (§1111 of the ESEA; 2.B and Assurance 14)
Summary and Status of Implementation	<p>The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request and the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i></p> <p>OSPI did not demonstrate that the state and local report cards made available all</p>

Element	State and Local Report Cards (§1111 of the ESEA; 2.B and Assurance 14)
	required information including disaggregated participation rates, graduation rates, NAEP scores and statewide assessment scores by subgroup, especially for English learners and students with disabilities. The SEA reports that they have plans for this information to be available for upcoming report cards.
Next Steps	Within the ESEA Flexibility extension process OSPI must submit a template demonstrating how its report cards based on data from the 2013-2014 school year will fully comply with ED's current report card guidance.

Element	Teacher Evaluation and Support Systems (3.B)
Summary and Status of Implementation	As indicated in ED's August 14, 2013 letter, OSPI has not addressed the condition placed on the approval of its ESEA flexibility request requiring the submission of final guidelines that include student growth as a significant factor in its teacher evaluation and support system. This element is being addressed through OSPI's work to address that condition and resolve its high-risk status.
Next Steps	OSPI must resolve its high-risk status and address the outstanding condition on its ESEA flexibility request consistent with ED's August 14, 2013 letter.

Element	Principal Evaluation and Support Systems (3.B)
Summary and Status of Implementation	As indicated in ED's August 14, 2013 letter, OSPI has not addressed the condition placed on the approval of its ESEA flexibility request requiring the submission of final guidelines that include student growth as a significant factor in its principal evaluation and support system. This element is being addressed through OSPI's work to address that condition and resolve its high-risk status.
Next Steps	OSPI must resolve its high-risk status and address the outstanding condition on its ESEA flexibility request consistent with ED's August 14, 2013 letter.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO STRENGTHEN IMPLEMENTATION

The following recommendations are provided to support the SEA in continuing to meet the principles and timelines of ESEA flexibility and strengthening implementation through continuous improvement and the establishment of systems and processes to sustain implementation and improvement.

- OSPI's theory of action is to support schoolwide interventions to increase student achievement throughout schools. OSPI should also ensure that sufficient supports and resources are in place to meet the specific needs of students in low achieving student groups, as well as English Learners and students with disabilities.
- OSPI should continue to develop the work it has already begun to integrate its systems and processes across the three principles of ESEA Flexibility (for example, OSPI's work to ensure that LEAs utilize language in intervention planning that is aligned with the LEA's chosen teacher and principal evaluation framework).
- OSPI should strengthen its communication regarding state and local report cards to parents and stakeholders by making disaggregated data more easily accessible either on the main

page of the report card or on linked pages, as well as included with any hard copies that are printed and made available to the public.

- While OSPI has until 2014-2015 to report for students who enroll in an in-state public institution of higher education (IHE) within 16 months of their high school graduation, and the number and percentage of such students who complete at least one year's worth of college credit (applicable to a degree) within two years of enrollment in the in-state public IHE, OSPI should ensure that it is collecting and able to link all data necessary to be able to report that information as required.