

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Report and Recommendations
March 11, 2013

Contents

- Introduction..... 1
- Research and Foundational Material 2
- Working Groups..... 3
- Implementation of PBL..... 3
- Recommendations..... 4
 - Tier I Implementation..... 4
 - Recommendation 1 4
 - Recommendation 2 5
 - Recommendation 3 5
 - Recommendation 4 6
 - Recommendation 5 6
 - Tier II Implementation..... 6
 - Recommendation 6 7
 - Recommendation 7 7
 - Recommendation 8 8
 - Recommendation 9 8
 - Recommendation 10 8
- Further study 9
- Appendix A Graduation Handbook Excerpts 10
 - Competency-Based Credit..... 10
 - Alternative, Performance-Based Graduation 10
 - Credit for Alternative Arrangements..... 10
- Appendix B Relevant Statutes 11
 - 161.670 Virtual public school 11
 - 163.011 State Aid 12
 - 167.645 Pupils and Special Services (Reading Assessments Required) 18
 - 171.029 Four-day school week authorized..... 21

Introduction

Commissioner of Education, Chris Nicastro, initiated a task force in November of 2012 for the purpose of identifying barriers and developing recommendations for removing barriers to the implementation of proficiency-based learning by interested school districts. This report is presented to the Missouri State Board of Education to make clear the existing options that districts have, to provide guidance for initial implementation, and to recommend statutory and policy changes necessary to further support proficiency-based learning implementation.

Proficiency-Based Learning (PBL) can be defined as: “Establishing the level of student learning through demonstration of knowledge and or skill without regard for the time taken in the learning process or the structure of delivery.” Important characteristics of Proficiency-Based Learning include:

- Ideally, all students advance upon demonstrated mastery of content
- Competencies include explicit, measurable, transferable learning objectives that empower students.
- Assessment is meaningful and a positive learning experience for students.
- Students receive timely, differentiated support based on their individual learning needs.
- Learning outcomes emphasize competencies that include application and creation of knowledge, along with the development of important skills and dispositions.

Within the profession of education, a variety of labels has emerged for learning systems with these characteristics, including “Competency-Based Learning” and “Performance-Based Learning”. For the sake of clarity, this report will use a single label, Proficiency-Based Learning.

The Co-chairs of the task force wish to express their appreciation for the opportunity to serve in this capacity. They further wish to express their appreciation to members who participated in this work. Task force members include:

Name, District or Organization	Name, District or Organization
Pat Bauer, Lebanon R-III	Elaine Metcalf, Lee's Summit R-VII
Ingrid Caldwell, DESE	David Miller, Pattonville R-III
Craig Carson, Ozark R-VI	Cheryol Mitchell, Hazelwood
Dennis Cooper, DESE	Michael Muenks, DESE
Jeanette Cowherd, Park Hill	Chris Neale, Gasconade County R-I*
Dan Decker, Aurora R-VIII	Ray Patrick, MARE
Bertha Doar, St. Louis Public Schools	Matt Pearce, Springfield Public Schools
Michael Fulton, Pattonville R-III*	Angela Price, Center 58
Kim Gaines, Moberly	Melissa Randol, MSBA

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force

Chris Guinther, MNEA	Harvey Richards, MHSAA
Dennis Harden, DESE	Rusty Rosenkoetter, DESE
Doug Hayter, Branson R-IV*	Lonnie Schneider, MASA
Sharon Helwig, DESE	Michelle Schoeck, Lindbergh Schools
Ann Jarrett, MNEA	Dred Scot, Independence 30
Betsy Jones, Columbia	Don Senti, St. Louis CSD
John Jungmann, Liberty 53	Doug Sutton, DESE
Jim King, MASSP	Kerwin Urhahn, MHSAA
Roger Kurtz, MASA	Margie Vandeven, DESE
Phil Lewis, MASSP	Todd White, Kansas City 74*
Keith Marty, Parkway School District	Chauna Williams, University City
Kelle McCallum, Washington	Mike Wood, MSTA
Bryan McDonald, Harrisonville R-IX	

*Co-Chairs

The co-chairs are particularly indebted to the DESE staff who served as expert resources, scribes, and in other support. Teri Longley deserves special thanks for her behind the scenes work to organize, schedule, nourish, notify, and generally support this task force.

Research and Foundational Material

The work of the task force was informed and supported by the following research, professional literature, and educational programs.

_. (2010). *Graduation Handbook*. Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Jefferson City, MO.

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning*. Routledge, New York.

Schwahn, C. & McGarvey, B. (2012). *Inevitable; Mass customized learning*. Lexington, KY.

Ruff, D. & Leather, P. (2012). *Proficiency-based learning task force; Final report*. Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium.

Sturgis, C. & Patric, S. (2010). *When failure is not an option ;Designing competency-based pathways for next generation learning*. Nellie Mae Education Foundation, Vienna, VA.

Working Groups

Leadership of the Proficiency-Based Task Force divided the task of developing recommendations into several component parts so that a reasonably comprehensive set of outcomes could be developed within the time frame prescribed at the outset. The task force was divided into working groups to address the following areas:

- Existing Options-Current Reality
- Assessment
- Transcription
- Barriers and Solutions

Implementation of PBL

Some latitude already exists for districts to implement Proficiency-Based Learning. However, the degree to which schools can address the learning needs of students without being constrained by time is limited. Guidance and recommendations which would support further learner centered practices can be seen in two tiers or phases. These tiers can be generally conceptualized as changes made within the current time structure of schools (Tier I) and changes made in which both student and school schedules are much more flexible (Tier II).

Specifically speaking, schools can provide greater flexibility for students' learning needs without altering when students arrive or depart from school under a Tier I implementation. In Tier II, start and stop times might vary considerably. In addition, student schedules might be quite variable and might include times of "non-attendance" during the school day. With those understandings, the following guidance and recommendations are organized both by Tier and by hierarchy of change (practice, policy, statute). In both of these contexts, Tier I and Tier II, as with any other successful change implementation, the importance of local decision making and professional collaboration with all stakeholders, cannot be underestimated. The charge of the committee and consequent scope of recommendations concerns those barriers to implementation that exist at the state level.

Recommendations

Tier I Implementation

Recommendation 1: *Revise the Graduation Handbook.*

The Graduation Handbook of 2010 indicates that districts already have the option of awarding credit based on demonstrated competency. The only requirement for districts is to notify DESE of its intent to do so. A revision of the Graduation Handbook, and any related DESE documents, would provide greater clarity for districts and presumably ease any barriers to implementation. Recommendations for revision would include:

1. To provide consistent language for Proficiency-Based Learning, Credit, etc.
2. Provide clearer, more definitive differentiations between various non-Carnegie Unit/traditional approaches and other alternatives. This clarification should reinforce the departure from time-bound structures of traditional approaches.
3. The table below is provided as a possible example for inclusion in the Graduation Handbook.

	Traditional/Carnegie Units	Proficiency-Based Credit	Alternative, Performance-based credit
Definition	Traditional measure of academic accomplishment	Demonstrated mastery of competencies in each course	Alternative system of standards which, when met, lead to the diploma
Scope	Per course	Per course	High School
Transcript	Carnegie Unit, per course	Carnegie Unit, per course	Standards Mastered
MSHSAA/NCAA	Eligibility determined by credit status	Eligibility determined by credit status	Lacks basis for eligibility determination
DESE Requirements	Course and Teacher Approval	Notify	Permission
Seat Time Requirement	7,830 minutes per year	Irrelevant	Irrelevant
Credit Basis	Time, course requirements, passing grade	Demonstration of competency mastery	Demonstration of standards mastery
Affect on State Aid	None	Potential	Potential

4. Communicate and reinforce the transferability of credit, regardless of how that credit is earned.
5. Develop guidance regarding the implications of transcription and credit acquisition practices on eligibility to participate in MSHSAA and NCAA regulated programs.

Further, the Department should develop a communication plan, collaboratively with the state's professional education organizations, to communicate the existing options for credit. It is the strong opinion of the PBLTF that implementation of PBL is due in some large degree to lack of awareness.

Recommendation 2: *Modify MOSIS as necessary to support the implementation of Proficiency-Based Learning.*

The uniform electronic reporting of data through the state's MOSIS system provides an enabling framework for traditionally structured learning. However, in the context of Proficiency-Based Learning, that same framework serves as a barrier to implementation. The following areas may need to be examined.

1. Flexibility with regard to course minutes per student.
2. Students who exceed "full-time" enrollment as regards number of credits earned.
3. "early start" and "late end" courses on a per student basis.
4. Courses:
 - a. "Teacher-less", or
 - b. Teacher overloads

Recommendation 3: *Establish minimum standards by which Proficiency-Based Credit can be earned.*

Because transferability of credit is an important consideration in a highly mobile population and because student success in future learning is linked to mastery of pre-requisite content, minimum standards for awarding credit should be established. The task force recommends that the Department indicate that a score of "Proficient" or "Advanced" on an existing End of Course assessment be considered sufficient for awarding Proficiency-Based Credit. Some similar standard might be considered for courses in which Technical Skills Attainment assessments are administered.

Recommendation 4: *Increase the availability of EOCs, and possibly TSAs, to support Proficiency-Based Credit.*

Currently EOCs are available during a window at the end of each semester and summer school (three times yearly). This time bound structure of availability limits the degree to which districts can implement Proficiency-Based Credit as recommended under number 3 above.

Recommendation 5: *Complete the development of a standard statewide transcript.*

The high school transcript provides credentialing for students and is the primary means of communicating with higher education. Further, the transcript is the basis for eligibility evaluations during high school and in the transition to the post-secondary setting. Consequently, this standard, statewide transcript should be developed in cooperation with higher education, the Missouri State High School Activities Association, and the NCAA.

Specific recommendations related to the transcript include the following.

- Noted by semesters and
- Using a credit of .5 per semester
- Appropriate identification of Proficiency-Based Credit on the transcript.
 - Credit that may be earned sooner than a standard course would be completed.
 - Credit that is earned simply by assessment rather than enrollment and early completion.

Tier II Implementation

Tier I implementation can largely be accomplished through changes in departmental practice and policy and is focused primarily on the high school setting. Tier II, in contrast, engenders significant structural change and broadly addresses the comprehensive K-12 setting. Specifically, structural changes at the high school level might include a student schedule that does not match a standard day because of:

- an early or late start to the day,
- an early or late end to the day,
- a block of time during the middle of the day during which no “class” was scheduled,
- variable learning schedules throughout any given week, or
- learning experiences which are unscheduled.

At the elementary and intermediate levels, structural changes might not take on such variability in scheduling but rather in advancement. In other words, students might be fluidly organized by learning (functional) levels as regards subject areas rather than organization by age peers.

These two illustrations of Tier II implementation imply two major areas of change. First, our current funding mechanism is inextricably linked to time and a standard minimum school year length. Second, in addition to the discussion of availability of EOCs under Tier I, assessment structures (MAP) at the primary and intermediate levels are also based entirely on a single, age-based (grade level) administration once yearly. As might be expected, recommendations for change in these areas involve statute and policy rather than policy and practice. The recommendations also imply significant interagency cooperation and sometimes further exploration.

Recommendation 6: *Develop an assessment system, aligned to Missouri learning standards, for primary and intermediate grades/ages that supports Proficiency-Based Learning.*

Aspects of this recommendation that require significant consideration include:

- An EOC-like assessment system based on testlets (i.e. small tests) that build toward a grade-level specific composite score.
- Classify students by learning level and those learning levels must have a grade-level equivalency.
- Treat time as a variable to demonstrate proficiency with an assessment design that supports that concept.
- Define and develop an adaptive assessment system for English Language Arts and Mathematics that not only assesses, but serves as a screener to determine if current students are ready for first testlet and to determine grade-level equivalent for new students.
- There is a maximum of two administrations of each testlet per student, with the last score counting for accountability.

Recommendation 7: *Develop an assessment reporting system that supports Proficiency-Based Learning.*

As a part of assessment redesign and development, the reporting system should provide for the following:

- MOSIS matures so that it not only collects data from but provides information for school districts.

- Assessment results are available quickly, system is user friendly, and helps teachers easily improve learning through specific diagnostic results at a minimum of the standard level.

Recommendation 8: *Develop an accountability plan for Proficiency-Based Learning and Credit.*

Recommendation 3 advised the establishment of a minimum standard for credit using existing EOC, and possibly TSA, scores. This recommendation is more comprehensive and is required for the K-12 scope of Tier II implementation. The plan should provide for ongoing monitoring and compliance and should ensure integrity and rigor for internal and external constituencies. This recommendation implies not only a plan but likely some internal support structure for the department to provide staff expertise in regard to technical assistance, compliance, and monitoring.

Recommendation 9: *Advocate for legislative action which allows for districts to access ADA (attendance based equivalency) funding for Proficiency-Based Learning in a manner similar to Virtual Education.*

Under the current system, no real incentive exists for schools to allow for accelerated earning of credit. The structure provides, in fact, a disincentive as accelerated learning will lower the ADA of a district. Economically speaking, the reduced variable costs are attractive but fixed costs, by definition, remain regardless of the loss of ADA. The virtual education setting currently provides funding at the level of 94% of ADA for an equivalent traditional class. The recommendation of the task force is to use a 95% standard to ensure A+ eligibility. Further considerations for this recommendation include:

- Legislation appropriately crafted to ensure district funding of learning.
- Appropriate safeguards, in tandem with the state accountability plan recommended in number 7, to ensure learning is the basis for advancement rather than accelerated funding. Without this check, an incentive to accelerate regardless of learning will exist.

Recommendation 10: *Advocate for statutory change which provides economically efficient advantages to fund college credit.*

Currently, students cannot access A+ funding prior to successful program completion and graduation. High schools, through a variety of delivery systems, provide access to college credit prior to graduation. These credits are typically the least expensive tuition ever charged to a student. Furthermore, students who earn sufficient credits to graduate before their cohort might generally be expected to move on to higher education. Specific details to be considered for this legislation include the following.

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force

- Provide students access to A+ funds for post-secondary credit earned during high school.
- Provide for the use of ADA monies to be divided between higher education and public education. This division would address public education fixed costs and yet offset tuition at the higher education institutions.

Further study

The relatively brief duration of the current Proficiency-Based Learning Task force provided an initial set of recommendation which should support initial implementation and development (Tier I and Tier II) of Proficiency-Based Learning. However, significant additional exploration and recommendation are needed. The areas of study should include:

- Changes needed in the accreditation system such as graduation rate calculation, etc.
- Implications for support of the delayed, rather than accelerated learner.
- Best transcription practices for students who have not mastered content at the end of the marking period, Proficiency-Based Credit with respect to G.P.A. and class rank, and Weighted grades.
- Funding for non-time-based learning structures, including ADA-based payments made upon course completion.

Appendix A

Graduation Handbook Excerpts

Competency-Based Credit

School districts may award high school credit to students upon demonstration of mastery of the competencies for a particular course. School districts wishing to award credit based on demonstration of a mastery of the course competencies must notify DESE. School districts must assure that the expected level of performance would demonstrate that a student has mastered the course competencies and may receive credit for the class.

Alternative, Performance-Based Graduation

Educators and others have recognized that completing a specified number of units of credit may not ensure that students will obtain the knowledge, competencies and skills that are considered essential to success in postsecondary studies or on the job. The State Board of Education has authorized the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to waive the standard graduation requirements for school districts that wish to develop and implement performance-based graduation standards as an alternative to the credit-based requirements. Any school district interested in this alternative should contact the School Improvement and Accreditation Section for information and guidance in developing such a system.

Credit for Alternative Arrangements

Some students cannot schedule within the regular school day all the courses they wish to take and, therefore, take some courses under special arrangements such as “Zero Hour,” evening community education programs, centers for at-risk youth, or summer-school programs. Other students are unable to succeed in conventional high school instruction and pursue secondary programs in alternative settings. Local boards of education may, by policy, recognize high school credit for such classes if: 1) the instructors hold valid teaching certificates; 2) the course content and performance standards have been reviewed and determined by the staff of the local high school to be equivalent to corresponding high school courses; and 3) the instructional time is reasonably equated to the state standard for the Carnegie Unit for purposes of granting units of credit.

Appendix B

Relevant Statutes

161.670 Virtual public school

161.670. 1. Notwithstanding any other law, prior to July 1, 2007, the state board of education shall establish a virtual public school to serve school-age students residing in the state. The virtual public school shall offer instruction in a virtual setting using technology, intranet, and/or internet methods of communication. Any student under the age of twenty-one in grades kindergarten through twelve who resides in this state shall be eligible to enroll in the virtual public school regardless of the student's physical location.

2. For purposes of calculation and distribution of state school aid, students enrolled in a virtual public school shall be included, at the choice of the student's parent or guardian, in the student enrollment of the school district in which the student physically resides. The virtual public school shall report to the district of residence the following information about each student served by the virtual public school: name, address, eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch, limited English proficiency status, special education needs, and the number of courses in which the student is enrolled. The virtual public school shall promptly notify the resident district when a student discontinues enrollment. A "full-time equivalent student" is a student who successfully has completed the instructional equivalent of six credits per regular term. Each virtual course shall count as one class and shall generate that portion of a full-time equivalent that a comparable course offered by the school district would generate. In no case shall more than the full-time equivalency of a regular term of attendance for a single student be used to claim state aid. Full-time equivalent student credit completed shall be reported to the department of elementary and secondary education in the manner prescribed by the department. Nothing in this section shall prohibit students from enrolling in additional courses under a separate agreement that includes terms for paying tuition or course fees.

3. When a school district has one or more resident students enrolled in a virtual public school program authorized by this section, whose parent or guardian has chosen to include such student in the district's enrollment, the department of elementary and secondary education shall disburse an amount corresponding to fifteen percent of the state aid under sections 163.031 and 163.043 attributable to such student to the resident district. Subject to an annual appropriation by the general assembly, the department shall disburse an amount corresponding to eighty-five percent of the state adequacy target attributable to such student to the virtual public school.

4. Except as specified in this section and as may be specified by rule of the state board of education, the virtual public school shall comply with all state laws and regulations applicable to school districts, including but not limited to the Missouri school improvement program (MSIP), adequate yearly progress (AYP), annual performance report (APR), teacher certification, and curriculum standards.

5. The state board of education through the rulemaking process and the department of elementary and secondary education in its policies and procedures shall ensure that multiple content providers are allowed.

6. Any rule or portion of a rule, as that term is defined in section 536.010, that is created under the authority delegated in this section shall become effective only if it complies with and is subject to all of the provisions of chapter 536 and, if applicable, section 536.028. This section and chapter 536 are nonseverable and if any of the powers vested with the general assembly pursuant to chapter 536 to review, to delay the effective date, or to disapprove and annul a rule are subsequently held unconstitutional, then the grant of rulemaking authority and any rule proposed or adopted after August 28, 2006, shall be invalid and void.

163.011 State Aid

Definitions--method of calculating state aid.

163.011. As used in this chapter unless the context requires otherwise:

(1) "Adjusted operating levy", the sum of tax rates for the current year for teachers' and incidental funds for a school district as reported to the proper officer of each county pursuant to section 164.011;

(2) "Average daily attendance", the quotient or the sum of the quotients obtained by dividing the total number of hours attended in a term by resident pupils between the ages of five and twenty-one by the actual number of hours school was in session in that term. To the average daily attendance of the following school term shall be added the full-time equivalent average daily attendance of summer school students. "Full-time equivalent average daily attendance of summer school students" shall be computed by dividing the total number of hours, except for physical education hours that do not count as credit toward graduation for students in grades nine, ten, eleven, and twelve, attended by all summer school pupils by the number of hours required in section 160.011 in the school term. For purposes of determining average daily attendance under this subdivision, the term "resident pupil" shall include all children

between the ages of five and twenty-one who are residents of the school district and who are attending kindergarten through grade twelve in such district. If a child is attending school in a district other than the district of residence and the child's parent is teaching in the school district or is a regular employee of the school district which the child is attending, then such child shall be considered a resident pupil of the school district which the child is attending for such period of time when the district of residence is not otherwise liable for tuition. Average daily attendance for students below the age of five years for which a school district may receive state aid based on such attendance shall be computed as regular school term attendance unless otherwise provided by law;

(3) "Current operating expenditures":

(a) For the fiscal year 2007 calculation, "current operating expenditures" shall be calculated using data from fiscal year 2004 and shall be calculated as all expenditures for instruction and support services except capital outlay and debt service expenditures minus the revenue from federal categorical sources; food service; student activities; categorical payments for transportation costs pursuant to section 163.161; state reimbursements for early childhood special education; the career ladder entitlement for the district, as provided for in sections 168.500 to 168.515; the vocational education entitlement for the district, as provided for in section 167.332; and payments from other districts;

(b) In every fiscal year subsequent to fiscal year 2007, current operating expenditures shall be the amount in paragraph (a) of this subdivision plus any increases in state funding pursuant to sections 163.031 and 163.043 subsequent to fiscal year 2005, not to exceed five percent, per recalculation, of the state revenue received by a district in the 2004-05 school year from the foundation formula, line 14, gifted, remedial reading, exceptional pupil aid, fair share, and free textbook payments for any district from the first preceding calculation of the state adequacy target. Beginning on July 1, 2010, current operating expenditures shall be the amount in paragraph (a) of this subdivision plus any increases in state funding pursuant to sections 163.031 and 163.043 subsequent to fiscal year 2005 received by a district in the 2004-05 school year from the foundation formula, line 14, gifted, remedial reading, exceptional pupil aid, fair share, and free textbook payments for any district from the first preceding calculation of the state adequacy target;

(4) "District's tax rate ceiling", the highest tax rate ceiling in effect subsequent to the 1980 tax year or any subsequent year. Such tax rate ceiling shall not contain any tax levy for debt service;

(5) "Dollar-value modifier", an index of the relative purchasing power of a dollar, calculated as one plus fifteen percent of the difference of the regional wage ratio minus one, provided that the dollar value modifier shall not be applied at a rate less than 1.0:

(a) "County wage per job", the total county wage and salary disbursements divided by the total county wage and salary employment for each county and the city of St. Louis as reported by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the United States Department of Commerce for the fourth year preceding the payment year;

(b) "Regional wage per job":

a. The total Missouri wage and salary disbursements of the metropolitan area as defined by the Office of Management and Budget divided by the total Missouri metropolitan wage and salary employment for the metropolitan area for the county signified in the school district number or the city of St. Louis, as reported by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the United States Department of Commerce for the fourth year preceding the payment year and recalculated upon every decennial census to incorporate counties that are newly added to the description of metropolitan areas; or if no such metropolitan area is established, then:

b. The total Missouri wage and salary disbursements of the micropolitan area as defined by the Office of Management and Budget divided by the total Missouri micropolitan wage and salary employment for the micropolitan area for the county signified in the school district number, as reported by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the United States Department of Commerce for the fourth year preceding the payment year, if a micropolitan area for such county has been established and recalculated upon every decennial census to incorporate counties that are newly added to the description of micropolitan areas; or

c. If a county is not part of a metropolitan or micropolitan area as established by the Office of Management and Budget, then the county wage per job, as defined in paragraph (a) of this subdivision, shall be used for the school district, as signified by the school district number;

(c) "Regional wage ratio", the ratio of the regional wage per job divided by the state median wage per job;

(d) "State median wage per job", the fifty-eighth highest county wage per job;

(6) "Free and reduced lunch pupil count", the number of pupils eligible for free and reduced lunch on the last Wednesday in January for the preceding school year who were enrolled as students of the district, as approved by the department in accordance with applicable federal regulations;

(7) "Free and reduced lunch threshold" shall be calculated by dividing the total free and reduced lunch pupil count of every performance district that falls entirely above the bottom five percent and entirely below the top five percent of average daily attendance, when such districts are rank-ordered based on their current operating expenditures per average daily attendance, by the total average daily attendance of all included performance districts;

(8) "Limited English proficiency pupil count", the number in the preceding school year of pupils aged three through twenty-one enrolled or preparing to enroll in an elementary school or secondary school who were not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English or are Native American or Alaskan native, or a native resident of the outlying areas, and come from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant impact on such individuals' level of English language proficiency, or are migratory, whose native language is a language other than English, and who come from an environment where a language other than English is dominant; and have difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language sufficient to deny such individuals the ability to meet the state's proficient level of achievement on state assessments described in Public Law 107-10, the ability to achieve successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is English, or the opportunity to participate fully in society;

(9) "Limited English proficiency threshold" shall be calculated by dividing the total limited English proficiency pupil count of every performance district that falls entirely above the bottom five percent and entirely below the top five percent of average daily attendance, when such districts are rank-ordered based on their current operating expenditures per average daily attendance, by the total average daily attendance of all included performance districts;

(10) "Local effort":

(a) For the fiscal year 2007 calculation, "local effort" shall be computed as the equalized assessed valuation of the property of a school district in calendar year 2004 divided by one hundred and multiplied by the performance levy less the percentage retained by the county assessor and collector plus one hundred percent of the amount received in fiscal year 2005 for school purposes from intangible taxes, fines, escheats,

payments in lieu of taxes and receipts from state-assessed railroad and utility tax, one hundred percent of the amount received for school purposes pursuant to the merchants' and manufacturers' taxes under sections 150.010 to 150.370, one hundred percent of the amounts received for school purposes from federal properties under sections 12.070 and 12.080 except when such amounts are used in the calculation of federal impact aid pursuant to P.L. 81-874, fifty percent of Proposition C revenues received for school purposes from the school district trust fund under section 163.087, and one hundred percent of any local earnings or income taxes received by the district for school purposes. Under this paragraph, for a special district established under sections 162.815 to 162.940 in a county with a charter form of government and with more than one million inhabitants, a tax levy of zero shall be utilized in lieu of the performance levy for the special school district;

(b) In every year subsequent to fiscal year 2007, "local effort" shall be the amount calculated under paragraph (a) of this subdivision plus any increase in the amount received for school purposes from fines. If a district's assessed valuation has decreased subsequent to the calculation outlined in paragraph (a) of this subdivision, the district's local effort shall be calculated using the district's current assessed valuation in lieu of the assessed valuation utilized in the calculation outlined in paragraph (a) of this subdivision;

(11) "Membership" shall be the average of:

(a) The number of resident full-time students and the full-time equivalent number of part-time students who were enrolled in the public schools of the district on the last Wednesday in September of the previous year and who were in attendance one day or more during the preceding ten school days; and

(b) The number of resident full-time students and the full-time equivalent number of part-time students who were enrolled in the public schools of the district on the last Wednesday in January of the previous year and who were in attendance one day or more during the preceding ten school days, plus the full-time equivalent number of summer school pupils. "Full-time equivalent number of part-time students" is determined by dividing the total number of hours for which all part-time students are enrolled by the number of hours in the school term. "Full-time equivalent number of summer school pupils" is determined by dividing the total number of hours for which all summer school pupils were enrolled by the number of hours required pursuant to section 160.011 in the school term. Only students eligible to be counted for average daily attendance shall be counted for membership;

(12) "Operating levy for school purposes", the sum of tax rates levied for teachers' and incidental funds plus the operating levy or sales tax equivalent pursuant to section 162.1100 of any transitional school district containing the school district, in the payment year, not including any equalized operating levy for school purposes levied by a special school district in which the district is located;

(13) "Performance district", any district that has met all performance standards and indicators as established by the department of elementary and secondary education for purposes of accreditation under section 161.092 and as reported on the final annual performance report for that district each year;

(14) "Performance levy", three dollars and forty-three cents;

(15) "School purposes" pertains to teachers' and incidental funds;

(16) "Special education pupil count", the number of public school students with a current individualized education program or services plan and receiving services from the resident district as of December first of the preceding school year, except for special education services provided through a school district established under sections 162.815 to 162.940 in a county with a charter form of government and with more than one million inhabitants, in which case the sum of the students in each district within the county exceeding the special education threshold of each respective district within the county shall be counted within the special district and not in the district of residence for purposes of distributing the state aid derived from the special education pupil count;

(17) "Special education threshold" shall be calculated by dividing the total special education pupil count of every performance district that falls entirely above the bottom five percent and entirely below the top five percent of average daily attendance, when such districts are rank-ordered based on their current operating expenditures per average daily attendance, by the total average daily attendance of all included performance districts;

(18) "State adequacy target", the sum of the current operating expenditures of every performance district that falls entirely above the bottom five percent and entirely below the top five percent of average daily attendance, when such districts are rank-ordered based on their current operating expenditures per average daily attendance, divided by the total average daily attendance of all included performance districts. The department of elementary and secondary education shall first calculate the state adequacy target for fiscal year 2007 and recalculate the state adequacy target every two years using the most current available data. The recalculation shall never result in

a decrease from the previous state adequacy target amount. Should a recalculation result in an increase in the state adequacy target amount, fifty percent of that increase shall be included in the state adequacy target amount in the year of recalculation, and fifty percent of that increase shall be included in the state adequacy target amount in the subsequent year. The state adequacy target may be adjusted to accommodate available appropriations;

(19) "Teacher", any teacher, teacher-secretary, substitute teacher, supervisor, principal, supervising principal, superintendent or assistant superintendent, school nurse, social worker, counselor or librarian who shall, regularly, teach or be employed for no higher than grade twelve more than one-half time in the public schools and who is certified under the laws governing the certification of teachers in Missouri;

(20) "Weighted average daily attendance", the average daily attendance plus the product of twenty-five hundredths multiplied by the free and reduced lunch pupil count that exceeds the free and reduced lunch threshold, plus the product of seventy-five hundredths multiplied by the number of special education pupil count that exceeds the special education threshold, plus the product of six-tenths multiplied by the number of limited English proficiency pupil count that exceeds the limited English proficiency threshold. For special districts established under sections 162.815 to 162.940 in a county with a charter form of government and with more than one million inhabitants, weighted average daily attendance shall be the average daily attendance plus the product of twenty-five hundredths multiplied by the free and reduced lunch pupil count that exceeds the free and reduced lunch threshold, plus the product of seventy-five hundredths multiplied by the sum of the special education pupil count that exceeds the threshold for each county district, plus the product of six-tenths multiplied by the limited English proficiency pupil count that exceeds the limited English proficiency threshold. None of the districts comprising a special district established under sections 162.815 to 162.940 in a county with a charter form of government and with more than one million inhabitants, shall use any special education pupil count in calculating their weighted average daily attendance.

167.645 Pupils and Special Services (Reading Assessments Required)

167.645. 1. For purposes of this section, the following terms mean:

(1) "Reading assessment", a recognized method of judging a student's reading ability, with results expressed as reading at a particular grade level. The term reading assessment shall include, but is not limited to, standard checklists designed for use as a student reads out loud, paper-and-pencil tests promulgated by nationally recognized

organizations and other recognized methods of determining a student's reading accuracy, expression, fluency and comprehension in order to make a determination of the student's grade-level reading ability. Assessments which do not give a grade-level result may be used in combination with other assessments to reach a grade-level determination. Districts are encouraged but not required to select assessment methods identified pursuant to section 167.346. Districts are also encouraged to use multiple methods of assessment;

(2) "Summer school", for reading instruction purposes, a minimum of forty hours of reading instruction and practice. A school district may arrange the hours and days of instruction to coordinate with its regular program of summer school.

2. For purposes of this section, methods of reading assessment shall be determined by each school district. Unless a student has been determined in the current school year to be reading at grade level or above, each school district shall administer a reading assessment or set of assessments to each student within forty-five days of the end of the third-grade year, except that the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to students receiving special education services under an individualized education plan pursuant to sections 162.670 to 162.999, to students receiving services pursuant to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 whose services plan includes an element addressing reading or to students determined to have limited English proficiency or to students who have been determined, prior to the beginning of any school year, to have a cognitive ability insufficient to meet the reading requirement set out in this section, provided that districts shall provide reading improvement plans for students determined to have such insufficient cognitive ability. The assessment required by this subsection shall also be required for students who enter a school district in grades four, five or six unless such student has been determined in the current school year to be reading at grade level or above.

3. Beginning with school year 2002-03, for each student whose third-grade reading assessment determines that such student is reading below second-grade level, the school district shall design a reading improvement plan for the student's fourth-grade year. Such reading improvement plan shall include, at a minimum, thirty hours of additional reading instruction or practice outside the regular school day during the fourth-grade year. The school district shall determine the method of reading instruction necessary to enforce this subsection. The school district may also require the student to attend summer school for reading instruction as a condition of promotion to fourth grade. The department of elementary and secondary education may, from funds appropriated for the purpose, reimburse school districts for additional instructional personnel costs incurred in the implementation and execution

of the thirty hours of additional reading instruction minus the revenue generated by the school district through the foundation formula for the additional reading instruction average daily attendance.

4. Each student for whom a reading improvement plan has been designed pursuant to subsection 3 of this section shall be given another reading assessment, to be administered within forty-five days of the end of such student's fourth-grade year. If such student is determined to be reading below third-grade level, the student shall be required to attend summer school to receive reading instruction. At the end of such summer school instruction, such student shall be given another reading assessment. If such student is determined to be reading below third-grade level, the district shall notify the student's parents or guardians, and the student shall not be promoted to fifth grade. No student shall be denied promotion more than once solely for inability to meet the reading standards set out in this section.

5. The process described in subsections 3 and 4 of this section shall be repeated as necessary through the end of the sixth grade, with the target grade level rising accordingly. Mandatory retention in grade shall not apply to grades subsequent to fourth grade.

6. The mandatory process of additional reading instruction pursuant to this section shall cease at the end of the sixth grade. The permanent record of students who are determined to be reading below the fifth-grade level at the end of sixth grade shall carry a notation advising that such student has not met minimal reading standards. The notation shall stay on the student's record until such time as the district determines that a student has met minimal reading standards.

7. Each school district shall be required to offer summer school reading instruction to any student with a reading improvement plan. Districts may fulfill the requirement of this section through cooperative arrangements with neighboring districts; provided that such districts shall timely make all payments provided pursuant to such cooperative agreements.

8. A school district may adopt a policy that requires retention in grade of any student who has been determined to require summer school instruction in reading and who does not fulfill the summer school attendance requirement.

9. Nothing in this section shall preclude a school district from retaining any student in grade when a determination is made in accordance with district policy that retention is in the best interests of the student.

10. The state board of education shall not incorporate information about the number of students receiving additional instruction pursuant to this section into any element of any standard of the Missouri school improvement program or its successor accreditation program; provided, however, each district shall make available, upon the request of any parent, patron, or media outlet within the district, the number and percentage of students receiving remediation pursuant to this section. The information shall be presented in a way that does not permit personal identification of any student or educational personnel.

11. Each school district shall make a systematic effort to inform parents of the methods and materials used to teach reading in kindergarten through fourth grade, in terms understandable to a layperson and shall similarly inform parents of students for whom a reading improvement plan is required pursuant to this section.

171.029 Four-day school week authorized

171.029. 1. The school board of any school district in the state, upon adoption of a resolution by the vote of a majority of all its members to authorize such action, may establish a four-day school week or other calendar consisting of less than one hundred seventy-four days in lieu of a five-day school week. Upon adoption of a four-day school week or other calendar consisting of less than one hundred seventy-four days, the school shall file a calendar with the department of elementary and secondary education in accordance with section 171.031. Such calendar shall include, but not be limited to, a minimum term of one hundred forty-two days and one thousand forty-four hours of actual pupil attendance.

2. If a school district that attends less than one hundred seventy-four days meets at least two fewer performance standards on two successive annual performance reports than it met on its last annual performance report received prior to implementing a calendar year of less than one hundred seventy-four days, it shall be required to revert to a one hundred seventy-four-day school year in the school year following the report of the drop in the number of performance standards met. When the number of performance standards met reaches the earlier number, the district may return to the four-day week or other calendar consisting of less than one hundred seventy-four days in the next school year.

Proficiency-Based Learning

Recommendations for Removing Barriers

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013

Purpose of the Task Force

• **Remove barriers to implementation.**

• **Recommendations include changes to:**

- Practice
- Policy
- Statute

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013

Characteristics of PBL

• **Proficiency-based learning**

- Students advance upon demonstrated mastery.
- Learning objectives are explicit, measurable, transferable and empower students.
- Assessment is meaningful and a positive learning experience for students.
- Students receive timely, differentiated support.
- Emphasis on application and creation of knowledge, and the development of important skills and dispositions.

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013

Conceptual Framework

- Beliefs
 - All students can learn.
 - Students learn at different rates.
- Traditional structures hold time constant.
- Learning becomes the variable.
- Goal: Free the learning process from time constraints.

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013

Implementation Framework

- Tier I
 - Freedom within current structures.
 - Relatively minor changes in policy and practice.
- Tier II
 - Current structures significantly altered.
 - Changes include policy, practice, and statute.

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013

Recommendation 1

Revise the Graduation Handbook.

- Consistent language
- Improved differentiation between options
- Guidance regarding activity eligibility
- Communication plan

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013

Recommendation 2

Modify Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS) as necessary to support the implementation of Proficiency-Based Learning.

- Flexibility when needed for:
 - Greater than full-time enrollment,
 - Teacher overloads and certification, and
 - Course beginning and duration.

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013

Recommendation 3

Establish minimum standards by which Proficiency-Based Credit can be earned.

- Ensure rigor.
- Ensure transferability of credit.

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013

Recommendation 4

Increase the availability of EOCs, and possibly TSAs, to support Proficiency-Based Credit.

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013

Recommendation 5
Develop a standard statewide transcript.

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013

Recommendation 6
Develop an assessment system for primary and intermediate grades/ages that supports Proficiency-Based Learning.

- EOC – like tests for younger students (content/level appropriate).
- Aligned to Missouri learning standards.

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013

Recommendation 7
Develop an assessment reporting system that supports Proficiency-Based Learning.

- Report as well as collect data.
- Rapid feedback, including diagnostic data.

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013

Recommendation 8

Develop an accountability plan for Proficiency-Based Learning and Credit.

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013

Recommendation 9

Advocate for legislative action which supports funding for Proficiency-Based Learning in a manner similar to Virtual Education.

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013

Recommendation 10

Advocate for statutory change which provides economically efficient advantages to fund college credit.

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013

Further Study

- **Changes needed in the accreditation system.**
- **Implications for support of the delayed learner.**
- **Best transcription practices:**
 - **Incomplete mastery,**
 - **Weighted Grades.**
- **Funding for non-time-based learning structures, including ADA-based payments made upon course completion.**

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013

Questions?

Proficiency-Based Learning Task Force 3/11/2013
