



## REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

# UPDATE: Collaborative Schools for Innovation and Success

December 2017

**Authorizing legislation:** RCW 28A.630.106 (2)  
(<http://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=28A.630.106>)

**Cindy Rockholt**  
**Assistant Superintendent of Educator Growth and  
Development at OSPI**

### Prepared by:

- **Maria Flores**, Director of Title II, Part A and Special Programs  
[Maria.Flores@k12.wa.us](mailto:Maria.Flores@k12.wa.us) | 360-725-6359
- **LinhPhung Huynh**, Research Analyst  
[LinhPhung.Huynh@k12.wa.us](mailto:LinhPhung.Huynh@k12.wa.us) | 360-725-6504

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary.....  | 3  |
| Background.....   | 4  |
| Progress Update.....  | 5  |
| Extended and Expanded Learning.....                                   | 5  |
| Data and Technology.....  | 6  |
| Family and Community Engagement.....                                  | 6  |
| Teacher Preparation and Collaboration.....                            | 7  |
| Best Practices and Recommendations.....                               | 8  |
| Planning, Infrastructure, and Evaluation.....                         | 9  |
| Partnerships and Staffing.....  | 10 |
| Mutual Benefits of Better Prepared Teachers.....                      | 11 |
| Family and Community Engagement.....                                  | 12 |
| Data and Trends.....  | 12 |
| Funding.....  | 13 |
| Scalability and Sustainability.....                                   | 14 |
| Replication and Expansion.....  | 14 |
| Conclusion and Next Steps.....  | 15 |
| Tables.....   | 17 |
| Table 1: 2016-17 Site Demographics.....                               | 17 |
| Appendices: <i>Hyperlinks to Progress Reports</i> .....               | 18 |
| Appendix A: Western Washington University/Washington Elementary.....  | 18 |
| Appendix B: University of Washington/Roxhill Elementary.....          | 18 |
| Appendix C: Gonzaga and Whitworth Universities/Holmes Elementary..... | 18 |

## Executive Summary

The Collaborative Schools for Innovation and Success (CSIS) pilot program is a partnership between colleges of education and low-performing, high-poverty elementary schools. The purpose of this five-year pilot is to increase student achievement, close the opportunity gap, and change the way teacher candidates learn to teach students in these schools.

The three college-and-school partnerships selected for the grant include:

1. University of Washington with Roxhill Elementary (Seattle Public Schools);
2. Western Washington University with Washington Elementary (Mount Vernon School District); and
3. Gonzaga University and Whitworth University with Holmes Elementary (Spokane Public Schools).

The CSIS project has allowed these elementary schools to implement research-based, innovative practices with their college of education partners. At the same time, the colleges of education are improving their teacher education programs. Complete progress reports are attached as [Appendices A-C](#), which include a more in-depth description of the innovative practices being used and the progress at each site. Each partnership identified their own metrics for monitoring progress. Highlights from the fourth year of implementation (2016-17) include:

### **Western Washington University/Washington Elementary ([Appendix A](#)):**

- The team's data revealed a closing of the achievement gap in two demographics: between White and Latino/a students in math, and between males and females in both the math and the English Language Arts assessment.
- Students who participated in a 10-week math intervention program experienced an average of 16 weeks of growth.
- 100% of Washington Elementary School teachers have completed Tier 1 Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD) training and are equipped to implement GLAD strategies in the classrooms.
- A much higher percentage of Skagit Valley interns who did their final preparation in high-need schools are now teaching in high-need schools throughout the state, compared to interns who did their preparation elsewhere.

### **University of Washington/Roxhill Elementary ([Appendix B](#)):**

- The percentage of students who self-report having qualities that constitute a learning mindset (e.g. working hard to learn, challenging oneself to do difficult

things) increased slightly in the past year (from 69% to 70%) and was similar to the Seattle Public School district average (72%).

- Each year, the number of students receiving medical, mental health, and dental treatment has increased. For the past two years, 50% of Roxhill's student population has been registered to receive these services, and 148 students were served on-site in 2016-17, which was an increase from 135 students in 2015-16.
- The percentage of teacher candidates who meet the University of Washington's standard (a few points higher than the state standard) on the edTPA assessment increased from 79% in 2012-13 to 98% in 2016-17.

### **Gonzaga and Whitworth Universities/Holmes Elementary ([Appendix C](#)):**

- Average attendance for students in the expanded learning opportunities (ELO) program increased from 50% in 2013-14 to 90% in 2017-18.
- The average number of behavior office referrals dropped from 200 referrals in September 2013 to 65 referrals in September 2017.
- Faculty at Whitworth University have reworked the Master in Teaching (MIT) course sequence to embed English Learner-focused courses, thus providing all teacher candidates (40-45 per year) access to this information.

## **Background**

Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2799 ([ESHB 2799](#)) established the Collaborative Schools for Innovation and Success (CSIS) pilot program in 2012. CSIS is a joint project between the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) and the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB). Expectations for the pilot project are outlined in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW), [Chapter 28A.630](#), sections 101-109.

The purpose of the program is to create pilot projects where colleges of education work with school districts to increase student achievement, prepare teacher candidates to serve in underperforming schools, and increase the effectiveness of current teachers. In 2012-13, all three elementary schools went through a comprehensive needs assessment with input from parents, students, and school communities, as well as the communities at-large. The colleges of education also went through needs assessments with input from teacher candidates and faculty. Once the needs of the students were identified, each team built a five-year action plan that includes support, intervention, and annual targets. The five-year pilot began in the 2013-14 school year and will continue through the 2017-18 school year. A summary of the Innovation and Success Plan development process can be found in the [2013 initial report to the Legislature](#). Sites are currently in the final year of their five-year project implementation plans.

Each college and school partnership selected an innovative model along with specific strategies to implement in their sites based on the results identified in their comprehensive needs assessment.

The innovative models being used at each site are:

| <b>Model</b>  | <b>Site</b>   |
|---|---|
| Collaborative Inquiry and Saturation                  | Holmes Elementary School (Spokane Public Schools) and Gonzaga and Whitworth Universities      |
| Inquiry-Action Teams in a Community of Practice Model | Washington Elementary School (Mount Vernon School District) and Western Washington University |
| Full Service Community Schools Model                  | Roxhill Elementary School (Seattle Public Schools) and the University of Washington           |

## **Progress Update**

Each partnership submitted an annual progress report to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) and the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB). Progress reports describe the best practices and new approaches being used at the collaborative school for innovation and success, lessons learned, adjustments planned and implemented, suggestions for expanding use of best practices to a larger scale, and other results from the collaborative experience of the pilot project.

Throughout 2016-17, CSIS teams continued to implement a variety of innovative programs and practices to increase student achievement and educator preparedness. Each partnership identified their own metrics for monitoring progress. Common themes and approaches are expanded upon below and include: extended and expanded learning time; use of data and technology; family and community engagement; and teacher preparation through mentorship and collaboration. Complete progress reports are attached as [Appendices A-C](#), which include a more in-depth description of the innovative practices being used and the progress at each site.

### **Extended and Expanded Learning**

In Spring 2017, Washington Elementary School scaled up efforts to provide math intervention during regular school hours, targeting below-standard learners in all grades. These efforts involved two Western Washington University graduate interns and three paraeducators to deliver intervention lessons to small groups of students. On average, the 49 participating students experienced 16 weeks of growth during the 10-week intervention. The team attributed this success to the additional staffing resource and

intervention materials that directly aligned to classroom curriculum, and they plan to continue the model in the 2017-18 school year.

The Roxhill Elementary team reported their comprehensive after-school schedule continued smoothly this past year. Students were able to attend a variety of targeted math, literacy, and enrichment after-school programs throughout the week. Roxhill also revised program enrollment limitations in order to be as intentional as possible in enrolling students who would benefit most from additional academic and enrichment opportunities.

Holmes Elementary School continued its expanded learning opportunities (ELO) program, which was offered for two hours after school, two days a week. The school increased student attendance significantly in this after school time by attaching enrichment activities to the expanded learning time. The team created mechanisms to recruit teacher candidates from Gonzaga and Whitworth Universities to support the ELO program, and faculty at each college of education have been developing an academic enrichment curriculum that will remain available to Holmes beyond the life of the grant.

## **Data and Technology**

Washington Elementary's use of instructional technology aligned with the school district's effort to increase mobile technology in classrooms. They reported the opportunities provided through the CSIS grant have allowed teachers at this school to be more prepared and more interested in using mobile technology as a teaching and learning tool. In addition to enhancing instruction and assessment in classrooms, the team is using mobile technology tools to enhance relationships with families. During a first grade parent night, which was held off-site, students were accessed their online reports and shared it with their families.

The team at Roxhill Elementary developed Excel spreadsheets that its community-based partner organization, City Year, used to systemically track student attendance. The tool generated warning alerts when a student reached three absences in a semester, which would prompt City Year volunteers to sit down with the student and reach out to their family to create an attendance plan before absenteeism could negatively impact the student's learning.

At Holmes Elementary, the team partnered with SPARK Central (a neighborhood center) to increase students' access to creative learning opportunities and innovative technologies. The team piloted a story writing event for a third grade class from Holmes Elementary, which involved participation from Whitworth University students and SPARK Central staff. Each student left the session with a bounded book that contained their published story, biography, and photo. The team considered this endeavor a powerful introduction to a local free resource for students and families and has plans for four more story writing sessions in the current grant year.

## **Family and Community Engagement**

Efforts to engage families and communities continued at each site. At Washington Elementary, the team aimed to deepen relationships and develop trust with students' families through activities such as family literacy night. The team reported the four Wolf Pack Nights in 2017 drew 60 to 75 attendees each night, and preschoolers were also invited to participate. They considered opening up this opportunity to Washington's future kindergartners as a successful addition.

Parents who have assumed leadership positions at Roxhill Elementary, with the assistance of the CSIS team, were instrumental in strengthening connections between families and teachers. Weekly coffee hours and English as a Second Language (ESL) classes became a regular occurrence, and the Family Engagement Action Team (FEAT) planned and facilitated family events, such as Night of Hope and Festival of Lights and Social Emotional Learning (SEL) workshops.

At Holmes Elementary, the team aimed to involve families in day-to-day school initiatives. This work has been led by a School Community Liaison/Interventionist, a staff position funded by the CSIS grant. The Liaison, who is deeply connected to the local community, continued to connect students and their families to community resources and has attended community partnership meetings, sought out new resources, and frequently conducted home visits. He directed a regularly occurring Family/Community Professional Learning Team where families and community members strategized how to maximize support for students. In supporting student attendance, he worked with students, families, teachers, and community members to plan how a child may more readily attend school when they have already missed a considerable amount.

### **Teacher Preparation and Collaboration**

Since the pilot year of the grant (2012-13), the Woodring College of Education at Western Washington University has placed several cohorts of interns throughout elementary schools in the Skagit Valley. Mount Vernon School District, where Washington Elementary School is located, has implemented a conditional hiring process for these interns, which has been well received by stakeholders. Five Western Washington University graduates were hired by the district for the 2017-18 school year. Woodring also found a much higher percentage of the Skagit Valley interns who did their final preparation in high-need schools are now working in high-need schools throughout the state. The team suggested both graduates and the principals of high-need schools who hire them feel the graduates are well-prepared to teach the diverse students who are often represented in the achievement/opportunity gap.

The team at Washington Elementary continued to train teachers, school staff, and teacher interns in Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD). They reported all teachers and specialists at Washington are now trained in GLAD, and the current cohort of 21 interns will complete the training in December 2017. GLAD strategies support the learning of English Learners (ELs) in content areas as they continue to develop their academic language skills. The team reported this innovation has helped ensure new teachers have

the skills to teach in ways that close the achievement/opportunity gap, and it has enabled interns and teachers to collaborate in the classroom and promote mutual learning.

Throughout the grant project, the University of Washington has organized a summer program for teacher candidates that emphasizes developing community knowledge, making connections, and cultivating socio-emotional development. This past summer, the team designed experiences for teacher candidates aimed at developing and deepening their understanding about stakeholders and building partnerships in communities. The team also reported teacher candidates placed at Roxhill continued to form relationships, and novice teachers and their mentors continued to work in teams to support student learning.

Holmes Elementary scaled up its expanded learning opportunities (ELO) initiative to involve more teacher candidates. Clusters of undergraduate students were placed at Holmes Elementary to complete early level practica, allowing these students to participate in both a classroom and in an ELO experience without adding significant travel time to their schedules. The team reported teacher candidates who were previously involved in the ELO as a volunteer or as a member of a site-situated methods class took on ‘teacher lead’ positions in academic enrichment programs, thereby creating a ‘cascading mentorship’ effect. The team expects the ELO program, as well as other family and community partnership initiatives, to continue beyond the grant due to the collaborative structures they have implemented. Faculty at Gonzaga and Whitworth Universities expect certain efforts will likely continue, including the focus on mentorship recruitment and development, increasing English Language Learner (ELL) endorsements, and field-situated coursework.

## **Best Practices and Recommendations**

Partnerships are entering their final year of project implementation (2017-18). The Legislature has yet to dedicate funds to the evaluation of this pilot, so grantees may have to search elsewhere for evaluation funding or forego evaluation entirely. Since grantees had their final annual meeting in October 2017 and funding for an evaluation is uncertain, they are using this opportunity to present preliminary conclusions and suggestions, which are informed by their experience with the pilot project. Below are the grantees’ suggested best practices to future collaborative partners along with preliminary recommendations to the Legislature, centered on the topics of:

- Planning, infrastructure, and evaluation;
- Partnerships and staffing;
- Mutual benefits of better prepared teachers;
- Family and community engagement;
- Data and trends;
- Funding;
- Scalability and sustainability; and
- Replication and expansion.

## **Planning, Infrastructure, and Evaluation**

**Best Practice: *A planning year is an instrumental first-step toward developing and implementing intentional interventions.*** The collaborative schools and their college of education partners agree: a 6-year project (one year for planning and five years for implementation) allowed efforts that are not usually possible with 2 or 3-year projects. Grantees see the planning year as an essential first-step in making informed and intentional decisions. Funding from the Legislature for this planning year was indispensable as it allowed grantees to:

- hire third-party contractors to complete a comprehensive needs assessment at each collaborative school site and college of education;
- compensate staff for their work in building partnership infrastructures; and
- develop quality Innovation and Success Plans.

**Best Practice: *Partners should start with a comprehensive needs assessment and then tailor the plan to target site-specific objectives.*** The teams caution against implementing any of their site-specific models—without adaptation—at a new site. Grantees support the requirement for a comprehensive needs assessment, as included in the authorizing legislation: “...each participating college of education and school district must conduct a comprehensive needs assessment...[that] must use disaggregated student data and include a thorough evaluation of student needs as identified by the parents of the students served by the school, as well as the levels of support within the school community and in the external community at-large for students’ academic and social emotional needs” (Washington State Legislature, 2012, [RCW 28A.630.105](#)). From there, each partnership can tailor a project plan specific to the student population and community, using knowledge of which existing resources they can leverage and which resources they will need to develop. Grantees also note once a school’s needs are prioritized, school districts will more naturally ‘buy into’ the project’s other component—developing teacher candidates through field experience and mentorship.

## **Program Evaluation**

**Recommendation: *If this project is replicated or expanded and the Legislature requires evaluation, grantees should receive appropriate funding for this purpose and they should establish certain metrics that allow for analysis and comparison across sites.*** In the authorizing statute, evaluation for this pilot project is dependent on funding from the Legislature: “If funding is appropriated, OSPI shall contract with a northwest educational research organization to conduct an evaluation of the collaborative schools for innovation and success pilot project using quantitative and qualitative analysis to identify successful practices in improving student and educator outcomes” (Washington State Legislature, 2012, [RCW 28A.630.107](#)). Funds were not appropriated for this purpose in the 2017-19 State Operating Budget. Throughout this project, grantees have provided periodic reviews of their initiatives through annual reports highlighting successes, challenges, and changes in approach. However, each partnership identified their own metrics for monitoring progress and adapted them throughout the project as they saw fit, so it has been challenging to perform longitudinal and comparative (i.e. across sites) analyses. If this

project is replicated or expanded, a more cohesive and comprehensive evaluation may yield information that benefits the Legislature in assessing results across sites and across time.

## Partnerships and Staffing

### **Regional collaboration between colleges of education and school districts**

**Recommendation:** *The Legislature should bolster regional collaboration by supporting partnerships between colleges of education and school districts.* In each of the pilot sites, the grant enabled the local school districts and colleges of education to work intentionally on both the workforce and professional development needs of the school district as well as changing the structure of the pre-service programs offered by the college. Regional collaboration allows the colleges to tailor the approach of their programs to better serve the students in the communities of the local school districts in which their candidates will do their student teaching and likely find their first teaching assignment. It also creates deeper, research based professional development and mentorship opportunities for experienced teachers within the schools and school district.

**Best Practice:** *Partnerships should form organically.* All teams recognize the importance of strong partnerships in facilitating innovative approaches at the school sites.

Partnerships were formed between the school and university, families, and community-based organizations. Grantees note there are multiple pathways toward partnership, and the process of choosing a partner/partners can happen organically and creatively. They consider it important for partnerships to form around addressing school and community needs, uniting partners who are most equipped and prepared to work in the local context.

**Best Practice:** *School districts should exercise agency in gauging individual school interest and readiness, so a school does not become an unwilling or underprepared partner.* Participants note seeking out a collaborative school partner should involve more than the school's 'highest need' status. Sometimes the schools with most need are already in the midst of a multitude of projects and interventions that an additional endeavor is more harmful than helpful. District ownership could also provide more stability to a project and mitigate the challenges caused by staff turnover at the school level.

### **Campus Visits/Exchanges**

**Best Practice:** *In addition to collaboration within regions, participants benefited from collaboration across regions.* Collaborative schools and colleges of education note that visiting each other's campuses can play a large role in setting or changing the direction of plans. Especially for college faculty, visiting other campuses can be important for idea exchange and demonstrations of programs and ongoing research.

## **Communication and Adaptability**

**Best Practice: *Developing trust and professional learning teams across institutions helps build an infrastructure responsive to student, family, and community need.***

Participants emphasize communication between a school and its college partner is invaluable in addressing needs that one partner alone cannot resolve. For example, Holmes Elementary School staff identified the midday lunch and recess break as a time when more staff were needed to engage with students, but this was not possible with its staff assignment. By communicating with their College of Education partners, Holmes Elementary now hosts a Lunch Buddies program in which teacher candidates from Gonzaga University engage Holmes students with fun activities throughout the midday break. This solution provides mutual benefits by increasing meaningful engagement for Holmes students and teaching experience for college students.

**Best Practice: *Partners should engage in a continuous process of inquiry that prompts action and adaptation throughout the life of a project.*** Participants find there is an advantage in not setting exact metrics for evaluation and measurement early in the planning process, and in not using the exact same metrics throughout all sites. By embracing a natural evolution of strategies and initiatives, CSIS teams are able to change or refine a strategy to serve students and communities more effectively. At Washington Elementary School, the CSIS team adjusted its initiatives in 2016 to align with Mount Vernon School Board's new strategic plan. The Roxhill-University of Washington team quickly realized replicating a model that was successful at a very similar location would not work at Roxhill. They concluded sometimes participants are required to see how efforts unfold at a particular site first before adapting an approach. Teams also suggest a tiered approach: implementers should focus efforts on certain grade levels or a few academic areas at any point in the project, instead of spreading out efforts too thin by trying to address all grade levels or many areas simultaneously.

## **Hybrid Staff**

**Best Practice: *All teams emphasize the importance of creating positions for 'hybrid staff' who can traverse institutional boundaries between schools, districts, and colleges of education.*** Teams consider these staff members instrumental in building communication and trust between collaborative schools, districts, and colleges of education. Hybrid staff are also uniquely aware of the strengths, resources, and constraints of each partner, which can allow for creative problem-solving and anticipation of potential challenges and risks.

## **Mutual Benefits of Better Prepared Teachers**

### **Better Prepared Teachers**

**Best Practice: *Teams find additional field experience for teacher candidates contributes to their preparedness in successful classroom instruction and behavior management.*** Grantees have sought to increase the amount of field experience for teacher candidates, either by providing a longer duration of time, more independent teaching with guidance and observation by the certificated teacher, or saturation of multiple teacher

candidates in a cohort model at a school. Additionally, participating schools believe their experienced educators, serving as mentor teachers, are being provided the opportunity to serve in a leadership position and improve their practice in the process.

**Best Practice:** *Collaborative partnerships can facilitate teacher induction by preserving continuity of support throughout an educator's preparation, mentorship, and practice.* Grantees observed a cascading effect, which occurs when a teacher candidate is mentored by an in-service teacher who was previously in that internship position themselves. They also find hiring a new teacher at a school where they previously interned allows:

- the new teacher to feel more prepared and knowledgeable (of both teaching methods and their school and community) on their first day of teaching; and
- the school to grow and retain educators from their own community, ensuring teachers are more representative of the student population they are teaching.

**Recommendation:** *Grantees emphasize colleges of education must be culturally responsive to communities and prepare more culturally responsive teachers.* Grantees emphasized the need for teacher programs to graduate teachers who are better prepared to serve *all* populations of students.

### Curriculum Tailored to a School

**Best Practice:** *Grantees find schools benefit from curricula tailored to their student populations.* Faculty at participating colleges of education have been developing curriculum based on their knowledge of school programs and implementation efforts. The pilot project made this possible by connecting faculty, school administration, educators, and teacher candidates through professional learning, co-teaching, and other activities.

**Recommendation:** *Grantees urge the Legislature to incentivize the development and implementation of extended/expanded learning opportunities.* There was a heavy focus at all participating school sites on extended and expanded learning opportunities. Grantees note teacher candidate participation is essential in delivering these opportunities, so it would be beneficial to allow student practicum hours to count toward the requirements of a teacher preparation program.

### Family and Community Engagement

**Best Practice:** *Teams consider family and community engagement to be an indispensable component of project planning and implementation.* They find families must feel connected and comfortable to communicate with their school in order to participate in school initiatives and provide feedback. Grantees recommend a certain mindset: instead of focusing on how families can help schools achieve its work, schools should consider how to integrate the wisdom of families and communities into its work.

### Data and Trends

**Best Practice:** *Teams agree it is important to provide data that show how certain initiatives are effective so other schools are motivated to adopt and adapt those*

**initiatives.** CSIS teams caution against attributing project success to one or two factors since their innovative models represent holistic efforts to address achievement and opportunity gaps.

In collecting and analyzing data, the participants have these suggestions:

- Take into account students' mobility as some students move around frequently and are more difficult to study longitudinally.
- Study cohorts of students as well as cohorts of teacher candidates to understand the trajectory of their experiences.
- Collect a useful mix of quantitative and qualitative data to assess outcomes, program quality, and options for improvement. For example, qualitative data from this pilot project suggests some teacher candidates go from feeling scared to feeling more confident about entering the educator workforce due to their participation in site-situated experiences.
- When using test scores to measure student performance, look at average values as well as distribution (e.g. through box plots). Scores are complex, so it is important to be critical of what tests and indicators are used and how well these align with program objectives.

## Funding

### Flexible Funding Rules

**Recommendation:** *Teams recommend building more flexibility into the funding rules.*

They suggest starting with the following changes:

- Rules should be designed for program adaptability, giving grantees the ability to commit resources to variable costs incurred from unpredictable elements (see the section on Communication and Adaptability, page 10).
- Give partnerships the ability to spread funds throughout a district so resources can be concentrated in the school at the beginning of a project and spread out to the district later on. Grantees believe that once an initiative gains traction at one school, it may be advantageous for both that school and other schools in the district to collaborate on and grow the initiative to reach a larger student population.
- Grantees should be allowed to carry funds over to support summer projects. Due to the biennial funding cycle of the grant, teams thought there were missed opportunities to offer summer learning (e.g. an extended summer program for Roxhill students). All grant sites in the pilot project focused on extended/expanded learning opportunities, and grantees believe changes to spending rules can better support ELO efforts in the future. They add that spending flexibility can also benefit teacher preparation programs by allowing colleges to fund summer immersion experiences.

### Support for Staff and Teacher Candidates

**Recommendation:** *Grantees emphasize the importance of sufficiently funding staff positions created or adapted for the purpose of a collaborative project.* Teams find that certain staff positions, funded partially or fully through the grant, are instrumental in the

success of partnerships and projects. They noted new or additional duties cannot simply be added onto the work of existing staff.

**Recommendation:** *Teams find it especially crucial to provide adequate financial support for teacher candidates who are multilingual and multicultural.* Grantees express the need to eliminate financial barriers that inhibit the recruitment and retention of teacher candidates from underrepresented communities. They think one solution may be to provide greater grant funding for residencies.

## Scalability and Sustainability

### Scalability

CSIS teams agree spending time to develop systems of collaboration and communication and to co-construct a strong partnership is key for scalability. **Recommendation:** *If the Legislature continues or expands this program, grantees recommend investing more resources so partnerships can effectively explore how to scale up their projects.* The grantees consider the current annual grant amount (\$500,000 per partnership) to be inadequate in exploring how efforts can be expanded to the district and regional levels.

### Sustainability

**Best Practice:** *Teams are optimistic certain efforts and initiatives are sustainable and will continue past the life of this grant.* For example, they note certain attendance initiatives and practices, such as ‘nudge letters,’ can be continued by district-funded Communities in Schools (CIS) staff. They add that staff and educators will likely continue applying methods, skills, and strategies gained through this pilot project, even if they move to a new school or district.

**Best Practice:** *Grantees believe changes at colleges of education will have an ongoing effect on each new cohort of teacher candidates.* For example, one-third of candidates have been trained in Guided Language Acquisition Design at the Woodring College of Education (WWU), which grantees believe places some pressure on the College to provide training to the other two-thirds. Gonzaga University is in the process of developing a new degree program anchored in field-situated methods and expanded learning opportunities, through which candidates can earn both reading and ELL endorsements. Whitworth University faculty note student support and leadership will provide consistent bands of volunteers to serve in expanded learning programs well after the grant has expired.

## Replication and Expansion

### Replication

**Best Practice:** *CSIS grantees warn against model replication, but recommend process replication.* Grantees are unable to make recommendations regarding which model(s) works best as all schools have a unique composition of strengths, challenges, and needs. The innovative models used in this pilot project were tailored and refined to address specific conditions at each site. Therefore, teams suggest future sites should not replicate

any model without adaptation. However, they find these main components of the collaborative process worth replicating:

- performing a comprehensive needs assessment at each site;
- taking time to build an infrastructure for communication and collaboration;
- and using best practices to sustain partnerships (see Planning and Infrastructure and Partnerships and Staffing, pages 8-10).

Additionally, the annual process developed by OSPI and PESB to manage the grant and provide assistance to the grantees (see below) was generally successful and should be replicated.

- *July - September:* Once the Legislature appropriates funds for the grant, OSPI makes the iGrants application available online. OSPI and PESB provide technical assistance during this process. A complete application includes a budget matrix through iGrants and a budget narrative specifying how proposed activities and spending align with objectives set forth in the partnerships' Innovation and Success Plans.
- *October:* OSPI and PESB facilitate the annual meeting where grantees discuss progress at each site, common experiences and challenges, and what they hope to accomplish in the current implementation year.
- *October:* Grantees submit their annual progress report to OSPI and PESB staff, who provide feedback and requests for more information.
- *October - December:* OSPI and PESB staff compile and summarize the progress reports in a standard format and forward them to the Governor and appropriate legislative committees by December 1<sup>st</sup>.

Although interaction between the teams and agency staff is most active during the summer and fall months, OSPI and PESB staff remain available throughout the year to provide assistance and guidance. The processes of reviewing iGrants applications and progress reports are interactive—OSPI and PESB staff provide feedback and suggestions for improvement when reviewing all submissions from grantees. Most importantly, staff ask grantees to explicitly relate any proposal to the objectives contained in the partnerships' Innovation and Success Plans, which ensures relevancy and accountability.

### **Expansion**

**Recommendation:** *Grantees recommend funding existing partnerships as 'lighthouse districts' so they can continue their work while helping other partnerships form and initiate programs.* Teams believe it is important to continue funding existing sites as certain practices have taken root and are providing indispensable services to students and educators. Examples include: having 'hybrid staff' who can serve as a bridge between schools, school districts, and colleges; increasing time for teacher professional development and collaboration; and providing innovative interventions to support at-risk students.

## **Conclusion and Next Steps**

The Collaborative Schools for Innovation and Success (CSIS) pilot program has allowed colleges of education, schools, and communities “unique opportunities to leverage resources, foster innovation, disseminate best practices in educator preparation and professional development, and close the educational opportunity gap for students in low-achieving schools” (Washington State Legislature, 2012, [RCW 28A.630.101](#)).

The three partnerships submitted their 2017 progress reports ([Appendices A-C](#)), which describe the innovative practices, challenges, and successes at each site. In the final year of the pilot project (2017-18), participants plan to focus on exploring how initiatives can be scaled up and/or sustained.

The CSIS pilot program is a significant investment by the Legislature in terms of time (five years of implementation) and resources (\$1.5 million/year). If this project is replicated or expanded, the Legislature may want to fully capitalize on its investment by funding an evaluation that uses “quantitative and qualitative analysis to identify successful practices in improving student and educator outcomes” (Washington State Legislature, 2012, [RCW 28A.630.107](#)). Findings from an evaluation could help inform strategies that aim to improve teacher preparation, stem the teacher shortage crisis, and fulfill the state’s responsibility in closing the educational opportunity gap.

To conclude the work of this pilot, OSPI and PESB will submit recommendations and a final report of the pilot project to the Governor and appropriate legislative committees by December 1, 2018 (Washington State Legislature, 2012, [RCW 28A.630.107](#)). OSPI and PESB will consider the experience of participants and evaluation results to make recommendations on the scalability for other elementary schools in the state and/or expansion to middle and high schools.

# Tables

**Table 1: 2016-17 Site Demographics**

| 2016-17 Demographics                      | Holmes | Washington | Roxhill |
|---|--------|------------|---------|
| October 2016 Student Count                | 416    | 413        | 300     |
| Hispanic / Latino of any race(s)          | 17.3%  | 63%        | 34.3%   |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native         | 1.9%   | .2%        | .7%     |
| Asian                                     | 1.4%   | 1.5%       | 11.7%   |
| Black or African American                 | 3.6%   | .2%        | 25.3%   |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 2.9%   | .2%        | 1.3%    |
| White                                     | 53.1%  | 32.7%      | 16.3%   |
| Two or More Races                         | 19.7%  | 2.2%       | 10.3%   |
| Free or Reduced-Price Meals (May 2017)    | 82.8%  | 79.3%      | 76.4%   |
| Special Education (May 2017)              | 24.8%  | 17.5%      | 19%     |
| Transitional Bilingual (May 2017)         | 7.7%   | 32.9%      | 36.1%   |
| Unexcused Absence Rate (2016-17)          | 2.1%   | .6%        | N/A     |

Source: OSPI Report Card. (2017). Student Demographics. Retrieved from: <http://reportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/Summary.aspx?groupLevel=District&schoolId=1&reportLevel=State>

# Appendices

## Appendix A

[Western Washington University/Washington Elementary School 2017 Progress Report](#)

## Appendix B

[University of Washington/Roxhill Elementary 2017 Progress Report](#)

## Appendix C

[Gonzaga and Whitworth University/Holmes Elementary School 2017 Progress Report](#)

All reports are uploaded to the [CSIS site](#), hosted by:  
Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB)

*OSPI provides equal access to all programs and services without discrimination based on sex, race, creed, religion, color, national origin, age, honorably discharged veteran or military status, sexual orientation including gender expression or identity, the presence of any sensory, mental, or physical disability, or the use of a trained dog guide or service animal by a person with a disability. Questions and complaints of alleged discrimination should be directed to the Equity and Civil Rights Director at 360-725-6162 or P.O. Box 47200 Olympia, WA 98504-7200.*

*Download this material in PDF at <http://k12.wa.us/LegisGov/Reports.aspx>. This material is available in alternative format upon request. Contact the Resource Center at 888-595-3276, TTY 360-664-3631. Please refer to this document number for quicker service: 17-0046.*

---



**Chris Reykdal** • State Superintendent  
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Old Capitol Building • P.O. Box 47200  
Olympia, WA 98504-7200