

## *Analysis of Senate Bill 6696*

*1/22/10  
Prepared by WEA GR*

<i>Bill</i>	<i>WEA Remarks</i>
<b>Part I—Accountability Framework</b>	
<b>Section 101:</b> Intent section outlining the state’s responsibility to create a coherent and effective accountability framework for the continuous improvement for all schools. Explains Phase I which establishes the reward system and the Required Action District (RAD) system; and Phase II which creates the accountability index for school improvement and non-Title I schools and continues state funded RADS beginning 2013.	<p>Creating the accountability index is an ongoing assignment for the SBE. This identifies schools in need of improvement. Federal approval must be gained first.</p> <p>The lowest 5% of persistently low-achieving schools will be defined as RAD. In 2010 districts can volunteer for the program, in 2011 it is mandatory. In 2-13 RADs shift from federally funded to state funded.</p>
<b>Section 102:</b> Establishes December 1 as the annual date for identifying schools that are persistently low achieving. Sets out the criteria for this designation. The state must use the federal Title I criteria.	Being identified in the lowest achieving five percent of schools is the basis of the criteria.
<b>Section 103:</b> Allows for a year of voluntary participation as a RAD, notification process and timelines for appeal by the district, and parent notification process.	A school district must notify its parents before it knows if there will be any funding available. Appeal timeline is only 10 days.
<b>Section 104:</b> Explains the process for the academic performance audit and the criteria they must examine. Audit findings must be made available to the local school district, its staff, community and the SBE.	The criteria include a broad array of issues including student demographics and mobility patterns. OSPI contracts the review team.
<b>Section 105:</b> Lays out the RAD schedule and planning process. The process must be collaborative including employees, unions, parents, community members, and students. Specifies the four federal intervention models—turnaround, restart, school closure, and transformation. It prohibits charter schools. The plan must address the issues raised in the audit. The school board must hold a public hearing on the plan.	In this section OSPI receives the local action plan for approval. After OSPI approves, then the school district sends plan to SBE for approval. This is contradicted in Section 106 where it appears that SBE approval comes after bargaining takes place.

<p>Specifies PERC mediation must be utilized if bargaining fails and sets up specific timelines for mediation, movement to superior court if necessary and a specific timeline for a decision from said court. Mediation, if necessary, must begin no later than April 15<sup>th</sup> and the court, if necessary, must issue a decision no later than June 15.</p>	
<p><b>Section 106:</b> This section states the plan must be submitted to the SBE for approval. It also says “The state board must accept for inclusion in any required action plan the final decision by the superior court...”</p> <p>It states the CBA changes will not go into affect until the SBE approves the plan</p> <p>If a plan is rejected, explicit rational must be provided by the SBE and the district has 40 days to try again. If federal funds are not provided no RAD plan is required to be implemented.</p>	<p>Contradicts Section 105 with regard to when SBE approves plan. Section 105 has SBE approval of the district plan before bargaining. This section implies SBE approval comes after bargaining. This section will need to be clarified.</p> <p>If a district is notified in January that they have a RAD the plan must begin the following September or start of school.</p>
<p><b>Section 107:</b> Allows the OSPI to redirect the district’s Title I funds based on the academic performance audit findings if the district submits no plan.</p>	<p>Originally the SBE was going to withhold funds.</p>
<p><b>Section 108:</b> OSPI must provide assistance and eligible federal school improvement grant funds to implement the plan. The RAD district must report to OSPI regarding its progress.</p>	
<p><b>Section 109:</b> OSPI must submit a biannual report regard progress of all RADs to the SBE.</p> <p>States successful RADs are released after three years, unsuccessful are not.</p>	<p>The Legislature will have to determine whether or not it will provide funding if Federal Title I funds do not continue past the third year.</p>
<p><b>Section 110:</b> Amends current law by adding “for continuous improvement” in the accountability index section. Deletes the old accountability index language.</p>	
<p><b>Section 111:</b> Definition section.</p>	<p>Defines various terms in the accountability section.</p>

<p><b>Part II—Evaluations</b></p>	
<p><b>Section 201:</b> To existing law it adds that superintendents and classified staff must be evaluated.          Adds reporting requirements that districts must give to OSPI annually: evaluation criteria and rubrics, description of each rating, and the number of staff in each rating.          Specifies that the assignment policy support the learning needs of all students with specific attention to high-need schools.          Requires the district to provide information about its evaluation, hiring, assigning, and terminating policies to its public.</p>	<p>Policies, which are public record, will be placed on the websites of each school district.</p>
<p><b>Section 202:</b> Adds the new teacher evaluation criteria, the four-level rating system, and defines student growth.          It also mandates a teacher in the third year of provisional status be observed at least three times that year.          Makes editorial changes to current probationary law to “not judged unsatisfactory”          This section also includes the evaluation criteria and rating system for principals.          It mandates OSPI to collaborate with state professional associations representing teachers and principals to create models for implementing the new system, tools, professional development etc.          Mandates classroom teachers and principals must be involved.          Describes the two year pilot with full implementation in the 2013-14 school year.          Describes the pilot program specifying that districts chosen must agree to pilot both the teacher and principal systems. Specifies data to be collected, etc. Mandates that the teacher and principal associations in the district be involved and engaged in the development process.          Allows the current PGO to continue if a teacher receives one of the top two ratings. The growth activity must be linked to one or more of the new criteria.</p>	<p>Full bargaining rights for the rating system, the short evaluation form etc. remain in place.          “Using multiple student data elements to modify instructions and improve student learning” is one of 8 minimum criteria.          With the exception of the third provisional year, there are no changes in the numbers of observations, conferences etc.          Please note the only change in current law around provisional status, etc. is the third year option which also requires three full observations by the principal.</p>

<p><b>Section 203:</b> This amends current law from two to three years of provisional status. It further amends it by allowing a superintendent to move a teacher to permanent status at the end of two years if s/he received one of the top two evaluation ratings during the second year of employment.</p>	
<p><b>Section 204:</b> This is new language requiring OSPI must bring WEA, WASA and AWSP together to analyze the new evaluation system and analyze the procedures, timelines, probationary periods, appeal procedures, etc.</p>	<p>This section is critical to assessing the effectiveness of the new system and allowing time for success.</p>
<p><b>Section 205:</b> Mandates funds provided for new teacher mentoring, years 1-3, go to districts piloting the evaluation system first.</p>	
<p><b><i>Part III—Encouraging Innovations and Performance</i></b></p>	
<p><b>Section 301:</b> This amends the current TRI language to include: “or for implementing specific measurable innovative activities specified by the school district to: a) close one or more achievement gaps or b) focus on development of STEM learning opportunities to include professional development.”</p>	<p>This adds an optional new area of bargaining under TRI.</p>
<p><b><i>Part IV—Expanding Professional Preparation Options and Workforce Information</i></b></p>	
<p><b>Section 401:</b> Beginning in 2011-12 all approved teacher prep programs must administer the evidence-based assessment of teaching effectiveness to all preservice candidates.</p>	<p>This continues a direction the Legislature gave the PESB several years ago by putting a starting date on it. Note: it is for college students only.</p>
<p><b>Section 402:</b> Allows the alternative route for certification programs to expand to providers outside of higher education. Requires the same standards currently in place</p>	<p>WEA currently supports the alt route programs in this state.</p>
<p><b>Section 403:</b> Technical clean-up to allow section 402 to happen. Also adds a requirement that the school district develop a workforce plan with the alternative route program it is using.</p>	<p>The purpose of the plan is to contain over production of certain types of teacher certificates.</p>

<b>Sections 404 and 405:</b> Technical clean-up continues.	
<b>Section 406:</b> Requires the PESB to establish regions of educator preparation programs in order to review whether or not they are meeting the staffing needs of the districts they serve.	This could help even out the supply and demand flow.
<b>Section 407:</b> Clean-up	
<b>Section 408:</b> Requires the PESB to determine if there is reasonable teacher preparation program access in each region. If not, the prep programs must submit a plan to provide it.	Again, this may help with supply and demand challenges. There is no “punishment” if a region develops a plan but it doesn’t work.
<b><i>Part V—Common Core Adoption</i></b>	
<b>Section 501:</b> This mandates the state adopt the common core standards that were developed by the multistate consortium in which Washington participated. They must be consistent with current requirements as to ELRs, etc.	
<b><i>Part VI—Parents and Communities</i></b>	
<b>Section 601 and 602:</b> Beginning in 2010-11, each school shall invite parents and community members to provide feedback concerning their experiences with the school. The school shall summarize the responses in its currently required annual report.	