

Comparison of Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2261 & Engrossed Senate Bill 6048 - Relating to Education

	Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2261	Engrossed Senate Bill 6048
Legislative Intent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature intends to fulfill its obligation under Article IX to define and fund a Program of Basic Education. • Legislature intends that the policies in the bill fulfill the obligation to establish a general and uniform system of public schools. • Legislature intends to adopt a schedule for concurrent implementation of redefined Program and resources necessary to support it, beginning in 2011-12 and phased in over 6 years. • It is the intent that the policies and formulas in the bill, including the implementation schedule, should not be revised or delayed for other than educational reasons. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature intends to continue to review, evaluate, and revise the definition and funding of Basic Education, and to continue to strengthen and modify the structure of the entire K-12 system, including non-Basic Education program elements. • Legislature intends to fulfill the obligation to establish a general and uniform system of public schools. • Legislature intends to begin a schedule for implementation of a redefined Program and resources necessary to support it, beginning in 2011-12. It is the intent that when the system has capacity to fully implement reforms, they will be included in a definition and funding of Basic Education. • Legislature intends also to address issues of importance that are not part of Basic Education. • <i>Not included.</i>
Implementation Oversight	<p>Basic Education Steering Committee is created.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 legislators • Representatives of Governor, SPI, SBE, PESB, DEL <p>Oversees 3 Working Groups (reports due November 15, 2009, and September 1, 2010)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Finance and Compensation ○ Early Learning ○ Achievement Gap <p>Steering Committee submits annual report to Legislature, including recommending schedule for concurrent phase-in of changes in program and funding. Expires June 30, 2017.</p>	<p>Legislature intends to maintain active and ongoing role in overseeing implementation.</p> <p>State Board of Education, Professional Educator Standards Board, OSPI, and 3 Working groups report on progress to a Joint Work Session of House and Senate Education Committees, as required by the Legislature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Funding Working Group by December 1, 2009 ○ Local Finance Working Group by December 1, 2011 ○ Compensation Working Group by December 1, 2012
Definition of Overall Program of Basic Education	<p><u>Program that is deemed to meet Article IX is defined as:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instructional Program required from school districts ○ Program for residential schools & juvenile detention ○ Program for juveniles in adult corrections facilities ○ Transportation to and from school for eligible students 	<p><u>Program that is deemed to meet Article IX is defined as:</u></p> <p>That which is necessary to provide the opportunity to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet state graduation requirements that are intended to allow students the opportunity to graduate with a meaningful diploma that prepares them for postsecondary education, gainful employment, and citizenship:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instructional Program required from school districts ○ Program for residential schools and juvenile detention ○ Program for juveniles in adult corrections facilities ○ Transportation to and from school for eligible students

	Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2261	Engrossed Senate Bill 6048
Basic Education Goal	<u>Provisions added:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic education is an evolving program.... • A basic education must provide all students the opportunity to graduate from high school with a meaningful high school diploma, ready for success in postsecondary education, gainful employment, citizenship. 	<u>Provisions added:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic education is an evolving program.... • <i>Not included. (See overall definition above.)</i>
Instructional Program of Basic Education	<u>Provisions added:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts must provide sufficient quantity and quality of instruction and give students the opportunity to complete graduation requirements intended to prepare them for postsecondary education, gainful employment, citizenship. • District average of 1000 instructional hours in grades 1-12, increased according to a schedule adopted by the Legislature to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1000 hours for each of grades 1-6 ○ 1080 hours for each of grades 7-12 • 450 instructional hours in Kindergarten, increased to 1000 hours in phase-in of full-day K • Includes instruction that provides students the opportunity to complete 24 credits for graduation, established and phased-in by State Board of Education • Instructional Program must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Learning Assistance Program ○ Transitional Bilingual Program ○ Special Education ○ Highly Capable Program • <i>Not included</i> 	<u>Provisions added:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Not included. (See overall definition above.)</i> • <i>Not included. (Current law: District average of 1000 instructional hours in grades 1-12)</i> • <i>Not included. (Current law: 450 instructional hours in Kindergarten)</i> • <i>Not included</i> • Instructional Program must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Learning Assistance Program ○ Transitional Bilingual Program ○ Special Education • Nothing precludes a district from enriching the program with additional services as appropriate for that district's students.
Early Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature intends to establish a Program of Early Learning for at-risk children and intends to include it within the overall Program of Basic Education. • DEL and OSPI convene a Working Group to develop the program, including recommended eligibility criteria, mixed delivery system, shared governance, minimum standards, and statewide kindergarten assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Not included.</i>

	Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2261	Engrossed Senate Bill 6048
Instructional Program Funding Allocation & Formulas	<p><u>Beginning September 1, 2011, revises the funding formula:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on prototypical schools (elementary, middle, high) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does not include minimum required staffing ratios ○ For allocation purposes only ○ Minimum allocations for small schools • Minimum allocations based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Class size <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Basic ▪ High poverty schools ▪ K-3 ▪ CTE/Science ○ Maintenance, supplies, operating costs (MSOC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regular ▪ CTE/Science enhanced ○ Other Staff (specified as principals, librarians, health, counselors, custodians, office, safety, etc.) ○ Central Administration as % of staffing allocation • Enhanced allocations for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LAP (based on low-income students) ○ Bilingual (based on eligible and enrolled students) ○ Highly Capable (based on 2% of enrollment) • Excess cost allocation for Special Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ .9309 times allocation for class size, other staff, MSOC, LAP & Bilingual (1.15 for preschool) ○ Up to 12.7% of population ○ Safety Net created in statute <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Must maximize all state and federal special ed revenues, including federal impact aid. ▪ May consider proximity to group homes, military bases, regional hospitals. 	<p><u>Beginning September 1, 2011, revises the funding formula, to the extent the Legislature has adopted the technical details:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on prototypical schools (elementary, middle, high) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does not include minimum required staffing ratios ○ For allocation purposes only ○ Minimum allocations for small schools • Minimum allocations based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Class size <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Basic ▪ High poverty schools ▪ K-3 ○ Maintenance, supplies, operating costs (MSOC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regular ○ Other Staff (<i>unspecified - see working group</i>) ○ Central Administration as % of staffing allocation • Enhanced allocations for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LAP (based on low-income students) ○ Bilingual (based on eligible and enrolled students) • Excess cost allocation for Special Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ .9309 times allocation for class size, other staff, MSOC only (1.15 for preschool) ○ Up to 12.7% of population ○ Safety Net created in statute
Phase-In	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding formulas are implemented beginning in 2011-12 and intended to be phased-in over 6 years according to an implementation schedule adopted by Legislature. • Object of the schedule is to assure that increases in funding are timely, predictable, concurrent with increases in requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding formulas are implemented beginning in 2011-12 to the extent the technical details of the formulas have been established and according to an implementation schedule adopted by Legislature. • Object of the schedule is to assure that increases in funding are timely, predictable, concurrent with increases in requirements • It is the Legislature's intent that no increased expectations be imposed without an accompanying increase in resources.

	Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2261	Engrossed Senate Bill 6048
Funding Working Group	<p>OFM and SPI convene a Working Group to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop details of funding formula • Recommend phase-in schedule for implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examine possible revenue sources and options • Develop options for compensation (<i>See below</i>) • Develop options for local finance (<i>See below</i>) 	<p>OFM, with assistance of SPI, convenes a Working Group to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend details of funding formula and concurrent implementation schedule, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How to adjust from school prototypes ○ Additional data necessary to adjust allocations ○ Additional class size categories ○ Other staff categories, including at a minimum principals, librarians, nurses, counselors, custodians, office, safety, mentors, etc. ○ Other MSOC enhancements ○ Highly Capable enhancements
System Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Not included.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of biennial budget submittal, SPI annually makes determinations on the education system's capacity to accommodate increased resources in relation to the funding model and reports to Legislature. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Legislature must use the information as it continues to redefine and enhance Basic Education. ○ Legislative intent is that as state support is increased, non-Basic Education appropriations above maintenance level are used to build system capacity for class size reduction in K-3 and for beginning teacher mentoring. ○ "System capacity" includes capital facilities, qualified staff, higher education capacity to prepare staff, and data.
Other Topics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Full-day Kindergarten</u>. Phased in, starting with high poverty schools. Included as part of Basic Education. • <u>Graduation Requirements</u>. SBE must give Legislature an opportunity to review proposed changes. Changes with fiscal impact are subject to Legislative approval. • <u>Highly Capable</u>. Legislature finds that, for highly capable students, accelerated learning is Basic Education. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Legislature intends to allocate funding based on 2 percent of population and authorize districts to identify students using multiple, objective criteria ○ Access to accelerated learning through a Highly Capable Program is not an individual entitlement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Not included. (Current law: Phased in, starting with high poverty schools. Not part of Basic Education.)</i> • <u>Graduation Requirements</u>. SBE must give Legislature an opportunity to review proposed changes. Changes with fiscal impact are subject to Legislative approval and funding. • <i>Not included.</i>

	Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2261	Engrossed Senate Bill 6048
Other Topics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Achievement Gap</u>. An Achievement Gap Working Group with 3 members appointed by SPI and 12 appointed by the Governor representing various groups is created to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide oversight and accountability ○ Synthesize recommendations from 2008 studies ○ Recommend policies and strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Not included.</i>
Certification & Professional Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By January 1, 2010, PESB must adopt teacher knowledge, skills, performance standards for effective teaching, associated with improved student learning and articulated on a career continuum. • By January 1, 2010, PESB must submit to Gov/Legislature: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Update on implementation of external assessment for professional certification ○ Proposal for classroom-based means of evaluating teacher effectiveness for residency certification based on multiple measures and including state-trained evaluators ○ Other recommended certification modifications ○ Estimated costs and authority needed to implement • By January 1, 2011, PESB recommends definitions for voluntary master-level certification, which must include NBPTS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By January 1, 2010, PESB must adopt articulated teacher knowledge, skill, performance standards for effective teaching that are evidence-based, measurable, meaningful, associated with improved student learning, calibrated on career continuum. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To the extent possible, incorporate standards for cultural competency (as defined). • By January 1, 2010, PESB must submit to Gov and Legislature: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Update on implementation of external assessment for professional certification ○ Proposal for classroom-based means of evaluating teacher effectiveness at preservice, used during student teaching. Includes multiple measures, classroom performance, artifacts, student work. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish timeline for when assessment is required, taking into account capacity of the system to accommodate a new assessment. ▪ Include common and standardized rubric for determining minimum performance ▪ Address administration and management ○ Recommendation on length of time residency certificate is valid and time period for professional certification. Must consult with stakeholders. ○ Estimated costs and authority needed to implement • Beginning no earlier than September 1, 2011, professional certification is based on 2 years teaching experience and results of external assessment, not on enrollment in program. • Beginning July 1, 2011, residency certificate programs must demonstrate how the program produces effective teachers. • By January 1, 2010, PESB adopts definition of master teacher, with comparable level of increased competency between professional certification and master as with NBPTS. Definition must include NBPTS.

	Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2261	Engrossed Senate Bill 6048
Compensation Working Group	<p><i>{Combined with Funding Working Group above}</i></p> <p>Working Group must recommend options for a system that provides support for effective teaching and recruitment/retention of high quality staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options and costs for salary allocation schedule for new staff into which current staff have option to transfer. Must align with certification system developed by PESB. • Update comparable wage and regional wage analysis and develop options for regional wage adjustment. • Options and costs for administrative and classified staff. • Collect and analyze detailed data on TRI contracts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature intends to enhance current salary model and recognizes changes cannot be imposed without great deliberation and input from teachers, administrators, classified. • It is the intent to begin the process of developing a model that is collaboratively designed to ensure rationality of conclusions regarding adequate compensation. <p>Beginning July 1, 2011, OFM convenes working group to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend details of enhanced salary model that aligns state expectations for certification with compensation and recommends a concurrent implementation schedule, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reducing the number of tiers in the model ○ Accounting for labor market adjustments ○ Role and types of bonuses ○ Accomplishing salary equalization ○ Fiscal estimates, including permanently grandfathering current staff on the current schedule • Conduct or contract for comparative labor market analysis of salaries and other compensation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For teachers, other CIS, principals, other building certificated staff, classified employees. ○ Calculated statewide that identifies labor markets. ○ Compares salaries and other compensation to labor market for at least beginning teachers and ESAs.
Preparation and Professional Development	<p><u>Math & Science Teachers.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PESB serves as lead agency in coordinated approach to create adequate supply of well-qualified math and science teachers, assuming specified functions. • Each public four-year institution must develop a plan for a Washington Teach initiative, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Making math & science an institution priority ○ Proposing streamlined requirements ○ Reducing enrollment in elementary education • Each institution must begin exploring partnerships with school districts to offer alternative route programs. 	<p><u>Learning Improvement Days.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A current statute regarding LID days is amended so that school districts are eligible to receive funding limited to specific activities related to student learning.

	Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2261	Engrossed Senate Bill 6048
Levies/ Levy Equalization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature finds local levy authority and local effort assistance to be important components of overall system of school finance, even though outside Basic Education. • Working group {<i>Combined with Funding Working Group</i>} to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Develop options for new system of supplemental school funding through levies and LEA. ○ Recommend phase-in that reduces reliance on levies concurrently with increased state funding. ○ Assure no district suffers decrease in overall funding due to implementation of new systems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature finds local levy authority and local effort assistance to be important components of overall system of school finance, even though outside Basic Education. • Working group is convened by OFM with OSPI assistance, beginning July 1, 2010, to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Develop options for new system of supplemental school funding through levies and LEA ○ Assure no district suffers decrease in overall funding due to implementation of new systems.
Legislative Intent: Shared Accountability & Continuous Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive finance reform and increased investment must be accompanied by equally comprehensive system of continuous school and district improvement. • The state and school districts share responsibility for continuous improvement and achieving state standards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ State must provide tools such as accounting, data, and assessment and support, assistance, recognition, and, if necessary, intervention. ○ State must take into account the capacity of the school system to implement changes and adjust expectations accordingly. • Legislature intends to implement a new state system only if authorization is received to use it for federal accountability purposes under NCLB. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive finance reform and increased investment must be accompanied by a new mechanism for defining relationships and expectations for state, districts, and schools. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Legislature intends to accomplish this through a proactive, collaborative system that engages the school board, parents, students, staff, and community. ○ System must be based on progressive levels of support, with a goal of continuous improvement in student achievement and alignment with federal accountability system. • Legislature intends to develop a system in which the state and school districts share accountability for supporting continuous improvement and achieving state standards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ State must provide tools such as accounting, data, and assessment and support, assistance, recognition, and, if necessary, intervention. • Legislature has already charged the State Board of Education to develop criteria and identify a range of intervention strategies and a performance incentive system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SBE should build on the work already begun. ○ As development progresses, the Legislature will monitor progress.

Continuous School Improvement - State Board of Education	Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2261	Engrossed Senate Bill 6048
	<p>The <u>current statutory direction to the SBE</u> is amended to state more simply that they must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt objective, systematic criteria based on multiple indicators to identify successful schools and districts, those in need of assistance, and those in which significant numbers of students persistently fail. • Recommend ways to recognize exemplary schools. • Identify schools needing state support and assistance. • Recommend appropriate intervention strategies. <p>The <u>SBE, in consultation with SPI, must also:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a comprehensive system of voluntary support and assistance, where intensity of support increases based on objective, systematic criteria. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SPI implements to the extent funds are available • Develop proposal for support and assistance for those that have not demonstrated improvement in a voluntary system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implemented only if authorized by Legislature. • Develop a methodology for using the prototypical school funding model as an analytical tool to compare funding assumptions and actual use. • Examine feasibility of incorporating Baldrige quality program into state system. <p>SBE and SPI seek federal approval to use state system for federal accountability purposes.</p> <p>SBE and SPI submit progress report to Legislature by December 1, 2009 and a final report by December 1, 2010.</p>	<p>The <u>SBE must continue to refine development of an accountability framework</u> that creates a unified system of support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an accountability index based on student growth using fair, consistent, transparent criteria and multiple indicators including graduation rates and assessment results. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Must take into account level of state resources. ○ Must be easily understood by employees and parents. ○ Legislature intends the index to provide feedback for schools to self-assess their progress. • Based on accountability index and in consultation with SPI, SBE must develop a proposal and timeline for implementing a comprehensive system of voluntary support and assistance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Timeline must accommodate capacity limitations of the K-12 system. ○ Proposal and timeline must be submitted to Legislature for review before being implemented. ○ Changes with fiscal impact on districts take effect only if formally authorized by Legislature. • Develop proposal and timeline for a more formalized comprehensive system targeted to those that have not demonstrated improvement in a voluntary system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Timeline must accommodate capacity limitations of the K-12 system. ○ Proposal and timeline must be submitted to Legislature by December 1, 2012, with recommended legislation and resources to implement the system. ○ Takes effect only if authorized by Legislature. • Work with Education Data Center and Funding Working Group to determine feasibility of using the prototypical school funding model as a tool for reporting how state resources are used. <p>SBE and SPI seek federal approval to use state system for federal accountability purposes.</p>

	Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2261	Engrossed Senate Bill 6048
Pupil Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning 2011-12, a new pupil transportation funding formula is phased-in, using a regression analysis. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The funding basis of a radius mile is removed. ○ Ridership counts are increased. ○ Transportation for extended day academic programs is included within allowable trips. ○ Service is extended outside the "school walk area" rather than within a mile of school. • A method of allocating increased funding during the phase-in period is specified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Not included.</i>
Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is Legislature's intent to establish comprehensive K-12 education data systems for financial, student, educator data, with capacity to link data components by student, school, district, and statewide. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ First priority should be financial, budgeting, and accounting systems to support new formulas. ○ Benefits of significant increases in data must be weighed against costs to school districts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Not included.</i>
Revenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning September 2011, and every odd-numbered year: if the previous biennium's general state revenues grow more than 5 percent above revenues compared to the biennium before that, half of the amount over 5 percent is transferred to a Basic Education account. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Not included</i>