

Student Supports Implementation

2018 Supplemental Budget Decision Package

Agency: 350 Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

Decision Package Code/Title: SK/Student Supports Implementation

Budget Period: 2018 Supplemental

Budget Level: PL

Agency Recommendation Summary Text:

4SHB 1451 (2016) charged the Center for the Improvement of Student Learning (CISL) within the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to develop the Washington Integrated Student Supports Protocol to assist school districts in coordinating academic and nonacademic supports to reduce barriers to academic achievement and educational attainment. The Superintendent is requesting \$201,000 for FY 19 to provide implementation capacity grants to school districts. By coupling targeted implementation support with evaluation, OSPI will have an opportunity to identify best practices, challenges, and opportunities related to implementing integrated student supports in different contexts before attempting to scale the approach statewide.

Fiscal Summary:

Operating Expenditures	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Fund 001-1 (Program 010)	\$0	\$201,000	\$326,000	\$326,000
Total Cost	\$0	\$201,000	\$326,000	\$326,000
Staffing	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
FTEs	0	0.5	0.5	0.5
Object of Expenditure	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Obj. A	\$0	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000
Obj. B	\$0	\$13,861	\$13,861	\$13,861
Obj. E	\$0	\$16,639	\$16,639	\$16,639
Obj. G	\$0	\$3,000	\$3,000	43,000
Obj. J	\$0	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500
Obj. N	\$0	\$125,000	\$250,000	\$250,000

Package Description:

Background:

In 2016, the Washington State Legislature passed Fourth Substitute House Bill 1451 (4SHB 1541) which adopted a framework for the Washington Integrated Student Supports Protocol (WISSP). Integrated student supports are “a school-based approach to promoting students’ academic success by developing or securing and coordinating supports that target academic and nonacademic barriers to achievement.”¹ The framework includes needs assessments, community partnerships, integration and coordination of supports, and data-driven. In the law the Legislature included the integrated student supports among an extensive set of interdependent strategies for closing educational opportunity gaps. This comprehensive approach was based on the recommendations of the State’s Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee (EOGOAC).

¹ Child Trends, 2014 <https://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/2014-05ISSWhitePaper1.pdf>

Student Supports Implementation

In the law, the Legislature charged the Center for the Improvement of Student Learning (CISL), within OSPI, with developing the WISSP based on the framework adopted in the legislation. The purpose of the protocol, as outlined in statute, is as follows:

- Supporting a school-based approach to promoting the success of all students by coordinating academic and nonacademic supports to reduce barriers to academic achievement and educational attainment;
- Fulfilling a vision of public education where educators focus on education, students focus on learning and auxiliary supports enable teaching and learning to occur unimpeded;
- Encouraging the creation, expansion, and quality improvement of community-based supports that can be integrated into the academic environment of schools and school districts;
- Increasing public awareness of the evidence showing that academic outcomes are a result of both academic and nonacademic factors; and
- Supporting statewide and local organizations in their efforts to provide leadership coordination technical assistance, professional development, and advocacy to implement high-quality, evidenced-based, student centered, coordinated approaches through the state.

Current Situation:

When a student struggles in school, the extent to which they get the support they need to be successful depends on a number of factors. First, someone has to notice that the student has a need for additional support. Next, an educator must correctly identify the source of the student's struggle. Finally, the school must be in a position to connect the student to an appropriate intervention at the earliest sign of need.

In many cases, schools do not have a system in place to uniformly identify early warning signs of a struggling student. Even when students are identified, without a system in place, students are not identified based on need, but instead based on whether a caring adult was in the right place at the right time, or had access to the right data they needed to notice students' need for support. This further perpetuates an opportunity gap.

Once a need for support is identified, the speed at which the need is addressed or the extent to which the need is addressed at all, depends on whether the school has resources to support the student in that area or whether they have a relationship with a partner organization who can offer the supports the student or his or her family needs. Access to community-based youth development organizations, healthcare/social services providers, transportation infrastructure, and workforce development opportunities vary across the more than 2,000 schools in the state. This variance has an impact on whether students get the support they need.

Research shows that integrated student supports, which focus on developing or securing and coordinating supports that target academic and nonacademic barriers to achievement, is a promising approach to improving student learning. There are several national integrated students supports models, of which Communities in Schools is most prevalent in our state, and there are also local models that districts like Vancouver and Tumwater are implementing with support from local organizations.

Many schools have embraced a whole child approach to education, and are ready to make a transition to an integrated system of student support. However, as they begin to make these shifts in policies, practices, and school culture they need support for implementation.

Proposed Solution:

OSPI is requesting funding for implementation capacity grants to schools to work in partnership with the Center for the Improvement of Student Learning (CISL) as they use the Washington Integrated Student Supports Protocol (WISSP) to examine their student support systems, take steps to implement a more integrated approach, and to partner more effectively with their community to develop and secure the resources students need to be successful. By demonstrating the tool in a small number of sites and coupling targeted implementation support with evaluation,

Student Supports Implementation

OSPI will have an opportunity to identify best practices, challenges, and opportunities related to implementing integrated student supports in different contexts before attempting to scale the approach statewide.

Embedding an integrated student supports approach within a larger tiered system of support will also help to ensure that students have equitable access to a continuum of supports they need to be successful that is not dependent on them being in the right place at the right time.

Contact person:

- Andrea Cobb, Executive Director – Center for the Improvement of Student Learning
360-725-6032 | andrea.cobb@k12.wa.us

Base Budget: If the proposal is an expansion or alteration of a current program or service, provide information on the resources now devoted to the program or service.

There is currently no base funding for Integrated Student Supports implementation. Funding was provided in the 2017-19 biennium (FY 17, \$196,000 and FY 18, \$189,000) for the development of the WISSP. New funding would supplement this allocation.

Decision Package expenditure, FTE and revenue assumptions, calculations and details:

OSPI assumes it would identify up to five Integrated Student Supports Implementation Demonstration Sites. Sites would be identified to receive grant funds for three years. The initial year would be for implementation capacity building and planning. Years 2-3 would be for implementing the integrated student supports model identified/developed in year 1. Capacity building grants would range in size from \$15,000 – \$25,000 and in years 2-3, implementation grants would range between \$40,000 – \$50,000.

OSPI is also requesting funds for a .5 FTE senior research analyst to build capacity on the CISL team to provide targeted implementation support to sites. Finally, OSPI is requesting \$5,000 annually to collect and analyze implementation data from demonstration sites that will be summarized in a final evaluation of the demonstration sites.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Capacity Building Grant	\$125,000 (15K-25K per site)		
Implementation Grants		\$250,000 (40K-50K per site)	\$250,000 (40K-50K per site)
.5 FTE Sr. Research Analyst	\$ 71,000	\$ 71,000	\$ 71,000
Data Collection & Evaluation	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Total	\$201,000	\$326,000	\$326,000

Decision Package Justification and Impacts

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

Each school's specific community context and the needs and strengths of the students and families they serve should influence the design of the integrated student supports model they choose to implement. However, there will be some broad themes related to implementation in one site that are applicable to others. Through the process of working in partnership with schools as they implement integrated student supports, the CISL staff hope to capture information about these universal themes and disseminate them to other schools that are in earlier stages of implementation.

OSPI expects that disseminating these best practices along with implementation considerations will help to accelerate the pace of the transition to an integrated approach in schools across the state.

Performance Measure detail:

Student Supports Implementation

The success of integrated student supports hinges on schools having a process in place to identify student needs and get them connected to appropriate supports that then have a positive effect on their academic, social, emotional development, or overall well-being. This process starts with individual needs assessments of students who show signs of struggle, and using that information along with other data sources to develop a comprehensive picture of the needs and strengths of the overall school system. Information gathered in the needs assessment process should then inform individual student success plans, should guide the development of strategic partnerships, and should inform the plan for staff professional learning.

Given the central role that needs assessment play in an integrated student supports model, OSPI will measure the success of the sites using three primary indicators that are outlined below. In addition, OSPI will work with sites to identify additional performance measures at both the levels of practice and system to ensure the sustainability of their system of support beyond the demonstration period.

1. Does the school have a clear process for identifying and responding to students' needs for additional supports?
 - a. Are there screening and diagnostic assessments in place covering all domains of learning (academic, social, emotional, physical, etc.) and basic needs?
 - b. Are the procedures for using such assessments clear?
 - c. Are the procedures for collecting and managing assessment data clear?
 - d. Is there a clear planning process that follows from the needs assessment process, to connect the student to support?
 - e. Are families engaged as partners in the needs assessment process?
2. Has the school engaged in a comprehensive system level needs assessment process?
3. Are there any shifts in the nature and scope of school-community partnerships in response to the outcome of the individual and system-level needs assessments?

Fully describe and quantify expected impacts on state residents and specific populations served.

If schools are successful at implementing integrated student supports, then students across the state will have access to a continuum of supports in all areas of learning that are matched to their needs. These supports will enable them to graduate from high school ready for career, college, and life.

Distinction between one-time and ongoing costs:

Funding for implementation grants, data collection, and evaluation are assumed to be one-time. Funding for a .5 FTE senior research analyst are assumed to be on-going. This staff will continue to support implementation of evidence based integrated student supports models in schools across the state.

What are other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

Impact(s) To:		Identify / Explanation
Regional/County impacts?	No	Identify:
Other local gov't impacts?	No	Identify:
Tribal gov't impacts?	No	Identify:
Other state agency impacts?	No	Identify:
Responds to specific task force, report, mandate or exec order?	Yes	Identify: The ISS workgroup created in response to 4SHB 1541(2016) recommended support for trying out the WISSP.

Student Supports Implementation

Impact(s) To:		Identify / Explanation
Does request contain a compensation change?	No	Identify:
Does request require a change to a collective bargaining agreement?	No	Identify:
Facility/workplace needs or impacts?	No	Identify:
Capital Budget Impacts?	No	Identify:
Is change required to existing statutes, rules or contracts?	No	Identify:
Is the request related to or a result of litigation?	No	Identify lawsuit (please consult with Attorney General's Office):
Is the request related to Puget Sound recovery?	No	If yes, see budget instructions Section 14.4
Identify other important connections		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Superintendent Reykdal's Long-term Vision for Education · Results Washington

Please provide a detailed discussion of connections/impacts identified above.

Superintendent Reykdal's Long-term Vision for Education – Phase three (2021–2023) of the Superintendent's vision for education includes a redesign of our K-8 schools. Included as part of this redesign is an extension of the school day and school year that will in part, create the opportunity to provide students with access to intensive supports to catch up and avoid falling behind. In order for these supports to be effective, they must be match to the students' needs, and offered at the earliest sign of struggle. Supporting an integrated student supports approach will help to ensure that schools have the systems in place they need to provide effective interventions in a timely manner.

Results Washington – As part of Results Washington, the state is working toward *providing every Washingtonian a world-class education that prepares him or her for a healthy and productive life, including success in a job or career, in the community and as a lifelong learner.* By supporting an integrated student supports approach the state will help to ensure that schools are attending to both the learning and development needs of students that will enable them to access instruction, and ultimately help achieve our goal of graduation, postsecondary success, and positive longer-term outcomes for all Washingtonians.

What alternatives were explored by the agency and why was this option chosen?

The integrated student supports protocol is a new tool. Implementation science suggests that rather than attempting to take a new innovation or tool to scale all at once it should go through a period of usability testing in a set of diverse implementation demonstration sites in order for the developers of the innovation to make improvements before implementing in subsequent sites.

The CISL staff considered trying to demonstrate the WISSP in natural implementation demonstration sites that it was able to identify with help from colleagues in the agency, but worried that schools may not have the capacity or staff buy-in to fully commit to engaging with OSPI for an extended period of time without additional support. As a result, OSPI is recommending that the Legislature provide funding for formal implementation sites so that schools have the capacity to engage in the work to implement integrated student supports locally and to help OSPI gather information through an evaluation about what needs to happen in order to support implementation statewide.

Student Supports Implementation

What are the consequences of not funding this request?

If this decision package is not funded it is unlikely that OSPI will have an opportunity to identify best practices for successfully implementing an integrated student supports approach, track the outcomes from doing so, and disseminate them in a way that helps to compel other schools in the state to begin to use the integrated student supports protocol to examine and modify their student support systems.

How has or can the agency address the issue or need in its current appropriation level?


The agency is in the process of developing its strategy for supporting schools that are identified for comprehensive and targeted support through the state's accountability systems. As part of this effort it will be engaging with schools to learn about challenges and opportunities related to implementing improvement strategies. For some schools, working to develop or improve their integrated student supports model may be part of their improvement strategy. The CISL team will work closely with OSPI's Office of System and School Improvement in doing this work, but the scope of learning will be limited based on our ability to identify these schools and get agreement from school and district leaders to participate in the improvement work.

Other supporting materials:

Activity Inventory:

Activity Inventory Item	Prog	Staffing			Operating Expenditures		
		FY 2018	FY 2019	Avg	FY 2018	FY 2019	Total
A016	010		0.5	0.25	\$	\$201,000	\$201,000
Total Activities			.5	.25	\$0	\$201,000	\$201,000

Information technology: Does this Decision Package include funding for any IT-related costs, including hardware, software, services (including cloud-based services), contracts or IT staff?

- No 
- Yes Continue to IT Addendum below and follow the directions on the bottom of the addendum to meet requirements for OCIO review.)