

OSD vs. HB 338

The following columns present the major similarities and differences of the failed OSD Amendment 1 and HB 338 by Rep. Kevin Tanner (R-Dawsonville). HB 338 is slated to hit the House floor for a vote on Wednesday, March 1, 2017.

OSD	HB 338
<i>How it's Enacted</i>	
Constitutional amendment (Failed on Nov. 8)	Passage by simple majority in General Assembly and Governor's signature
<i>Who's in Charge</i>	
Opportunity School District Superintendent appointed by the Governor and reports to the Governor	Chief Turnaround Officer appointed by and reports to State Board of Education (whose members are appointed by the Governor), in consultation with the State School Superintendent and the Education Turnaround Advisory Council
<i>Intervention Trigger</i>	
3 or more years as a "chronically failing school"	CTO target schools for intervention based on annual chronically failing schools list published by the Governor's Office of Student Achievement as well as scores, data trends, and "any other factors deemed appropriate" by the CTO
<i>How are Schools Identified for Intervention</i>	
Failing Schools as Determined by GOSA	Failing Schools as Determined by GOSA
Schools selected at discretion of OSD Superintendent	Schools selected at discretion of CTO
Maximum number of schools targeted for intervention capped at 20 per year and 100 total	No specified maximum number of schools may be targeted for intervention. Number of schools will depend on available resources
Geographic distribution with mix of urban, rural schools	In addition to the GOSA list, CTO will consider schools for intervention if schools opt in, are in close proximity to another struggling school, or if 50% or more of schools in the district are chronically low performing
<i>Intervention Models</i>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Close the school 2) Reorganize school personnel, including hiring and firing teachers 3) Conversion to a state charter school 4) Joint direction of the school by contract by the local school board and the OSD superintendent <p><i>OSD allowed private non-profit AND for-profit charter school management operators</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Continued implementation of intensive school improvement plan 2) Appointment of a school master or management team to oversee principal 3) Target removal of school personnel 4) Conversion to state charter school 5) Total reconstitution of school personnel 6) Intra-district public school choice for students 7) Complete restructure of school's governance arrangement 8) Operation of the school by a successful school system 9) Operation of the school by a private, non-profit entity 10) Any other intervention or requirements deemed appropriate by the CTO in accordance with the district's flexibility contract

<i>Intervention Models (Continued)</i>	
OSD takes over control of the school operations and facility for up to 10 years and all state funding for the school	No similar provision
OSD can contract with school district for transportation and other services	No similar provision
<i>What's New</i>	
	In collaboration with local agencies and leaders, community factors including poverty, lack of economic development, safety, adult education, wellness and mental health services to be studied for effect on schools
	Comprehensive needs analysis by Turnaround Coach in partnership with RESA or state-approved third party (state's cost) or district selected and approved third party (district's cost)
	Removal of BOE members if one half or more of a district's schools are identified as eligible for intervention for a fifth consecutive year
	State Board of Education will create an annual report of all schools identified for intervention and the interventions applied at each school
	Development of an Education Turnaround Advisory Council for non-binding advisement re: selection of the CTO, input into local district evaluation response for proposals, and other duties as assigned. Council includes PAGE, GSBA, GSSA, PTA, GAE, & GAEL
	Development of a Joint Study Committee of a State Accreditation Process to consider whether a new state accreditation agency and process should be created