Working Group: Program changes - process, communication, decision-making
Thursday, April 28, 2016, 5:00-6:30pm
Board Office Conference Room, John Stanford Center

Agenda

Call to Order   5:00pm

Working Group: Program changes – process, communication, decision-making

- Review of March 23, 2016 Work session
  - Approved meeting minutes
- Review of Suggested Policy and Procedure Changes
  - Director Peters
  - Staff
- Overview of Work Flow Associated with Types of Decisions
- Next Steps

Adjourn   6:30pm

 (*times given are estimated*)

The Board Office maintains the archive for documents that were presented at the meeting. Due to the June 2015 change to the district website, documents for this meeting are provided on the pages below.

Work Session: City of Seattle's Families & Education Levy Update;
Work Session: Program Changes-Process, Communication, & Decision-Making; and
Work Session: Superintendent SMART Goal #3, Special Education
Wednesday, March 23, 2016, 4:30-8:00pm
Auditorium, John Stanford Center

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 4:32 pm.

Directors Blanford, Harris, Patu, Peters and Pinkham were present. Director Geary arrived at 4:33pm. Director Burke joined via Skype at 5:30pm. The meeting was staffed by Deputy Superintendent Stephen Nielsen.

Work Session: City of Seattle's Families & Education Levy Update

Stephen Nielsen noted the voter approved levy dollars that prompted this update from the City, and he welcomed the representatives from the City of Seattle.

Dwane Chappelle, Isabelle Munoz-Colon, Long Phan, Dana Harrison, Sara Rigel, and Kacey Guin represented the City for the presentation.

Mr. Chappelle noted the work around the Levy investment overview, the work around academic milestones, the commitment to equity, stakeholder engagement and satisfaction. He noted that the purpose of today's presentation is to inform the Board of the work that the Families and Education Levy (FEL) is providing, to recognize successes and opportunities for improvement and to identify areas of partnership toward a common goal.

Ms. Munoz-Colon reviewed the levy and the evolution over time. She noted the levy oversight committee with members of the Board, the Superintendent and members of the community and a Councilmember. She discussed the investment categories to which the funds are allocated. Ms. Munoz-Colon noted the innovation grants across elementary, middle and high schools which focus on students that are struggling. She noted Linkage Grants toward targeted work for at-risk populations. Ms. Munoz-Colon outlined the various types of levy support within the areas of summer learning, family engagement and support, and student health. She noted the three overarching goals of the levy and noted the support of closing the achievement gap. Ms. Munoz-Colon noted the vision of all students graduating college and career ready. She noted the continuous improvement cycle mindset and looking at data to identify performance measures, what is being tracked on a regular basis, and are the targets being hit. Ms. Munoz-Colon noted that this is the third year of this levy cycle and showed a graph of the funds which shows the breakdown of where the funds are allocated to. Directors asked if the early learning funds on the chart do or do not include the Seattle

Preschool Program (SPP) funding. Ms. Munoz-Colon noted that SPP money is not accounted for in this chart. Ms. Munoz noted a graph showing community organizations and other contracts for sports transportation, summer learning, heath services, etc.   She then reviewed a map of where the investments are allocated, which is predominately in the central and south areas of the district. Ms. Munoz-Colon noted sites with multiple levy funds collocated.

Mr. Nielsen noted a packet with a blue cover that shows the breakdown per school. Ms. Munoz discussed the levy supports and showed a graph that outlined the alignment of the levy funds with the district scorecard and the district targeted outcomes.   She discussed targeted investments to those who struggle academically and noted the indicators that show which students are struggling, and provided some examples. Ms. Munoz noted many schools use levy funds for additional instructional time, such as math academies and for language arts instruction before/after school or during breaks. She noted the partners with expanded learning opportunity services, such as tutoring. Ms. Munoz-Colon noted there has been a lot of work around improving attendance and the link between attendance and achievement gaps.

Ms. Guin noted key transition points to being successful in school. She noted the 9th grade focus to provide those students with additional academic support in various learning areas. Ms. Guin gave examples of peer learning opportunities at schools to gain insight from older students. Ms. Munoz noted a growing partnership with the University of Washington's (UW) Empowerment Program. She noted teacher/principal teams that identify common core standards, develop curriculum to provide instruction, and then it is tested in a summer program. Ms. Munoz noted this work will continue throughout the year where teachers observe each other's work and explore new strategies. Directors asked if those 200 teachers continue through the year in this program. Ms. Munoz noted that is the intent; however, there may be some changes here and there. Directors asked who determines the subject matter. Mr. Munoz noted they polled teams from the different schools to identify high priority areas of content of instruction, and then UW developed the training based on the feedback. Dir. Blanford noted he had lunch with the College of Education Dean at UW, and she asked him about the appetite for trying to include more Professional Development (PD) on cultural efficiencies and the strategies in the classroom. Ms. Munoz noted wanting to partner with the district as to where to go with PD and noted that they are open to incorporating other areas of interest.   Directors noted that much of this is parallel work, and is not sure of the content of what is being done in terms of the PD that is being done and how it aligns with what SPS is doing, and noted middle school math is a hot topic with the Board. Ms. Guin noted the Empowering Math Project (EMP) is a three way collaboration with Anna Box at Seattle Public Schools (SPS), with the UW and with the City. She outlined the assessment data and the conceptual level of math that not all students understand right away. Ms. Guin noted the cohort team building aspect of the conceptual math program EMP, for those who really struggle in math and through this program they can experience math in a new way.

Directors noted a recent topic of replacing middle school math materials, and asked if FEL funding could be used for that type of support for the middle school math program. Ms. Guin noted she doesn't feel that the levy could supply textbooks and materials, but noted the types of funding that could be used. Ms. Munoz-Colon noted the work of the

educational consultants to figure out how to make sure we are all aligned to support the work of the district. Ms. Guin noted bringing together the knowledge of the various stakeholders to find out what is and isn't working in the current math curriculum. Directors asked if the levy funds could be used toward staff additions if it couldn't assist with textbooks. Ms. Munoz-Colon noted that they do pay for math and language interventionists and support to staff in certain content areas. She noted the model doesn't do direct funding to the district. Ms. Harrison noted that the ordinance is very clear that they cannot provide direct funding to the district in that area.

Ms. Munoz-Colon noted a positive school climate, motivation and engagement. Sarah Rigel provided some examples for social/emotional learning initiatives, RULER, Sound Grading Practices and standardized mental health assessments. Ms. Rigel noted the tools to give students a direct interface to see progress and show direct impact. She noted the academic and mental health integration with counselors and school staff for treatment plans. Directors asked about Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and how those are considered in this instance. Ms. Rigel noted the data sharing practices and outlined the complicated intersection with HIPPA and FERPA. She noted the sets of data and performance measures that the levy holds them accountable for, and noted using data for the standardized and protected data. Ms. Rigel noted there are many places where the data is aggregated when used in reporting. Directors asked for follow up as to how long the data sticks around and noted concerns with how long it follows the child.

Ms. Munoz-Colon noted strategies around home visits, parenting classes, student lead conferences, and Mother's Night Out events. She provided examples of these types of collaborations. Ms. Guin provided an overview of the best practices at the middle and high schools with the student lead conferences and the outcomes of those types of interactions with the schools. Directors asked for research on the benefits of the student lead conferences. Ms. Guin noted student empowerment, parent engagement and participation. Dir. Peters noted in her experience it was limiting on what could be said between the teacher and the parent, and made it less likely to have candid conversations. Ms. Guin noted her experiences in the school with these type of conferences, and noted the perspective of lack of being candid should be considered. Directors asked how the team at the City is working with the community engagement SPS team on SMART Goal #6, and what is being done to leverage the work and not duplicate work. Ms. Munoz-Colon noted a slide coming up that discusses parent engagement and the social/emotional support component. She noted that there is a partnership, she noted working with Pat Sanders, and noted there is more that can be done. Ms. Munoz-Colon noted further on the Mother's Night Out in the Somali community, which has spread to over 7 schools and over 100 families.

Mr. Chappelle noted the funding of certain positions, noted the ordinance and noted creative ways that principals are funding certain positions to align outcomes and goals. He noted that there are schools that are using these funds for positions that are related to specific outcomes and not supplanting funds for instructional time. Directors noted a fear that if someone challenged a specific expenditure that SPS wouldn't want to be in a position to have to defend that expenditure after the fact. They noted that creativity is good, however, this could be possibly problematic for the district and future levies,

and noted a high level of risk associated with funding positions, no matter the fiscal creativity. Mr. Nielsen noted that the school budgeting process requires working with fiscal analysts and ensure proper coding through checks and balances, and expressed that there are built in safe guards. He noted no system is perfect and that there is a balance. Directors asked if they were to take a map of the low performing schools and where the funding is being spent, would they overlap. Ms. Guin noted the evolution of this issue on the middle school level and noted linkage funding dollars throughout the city to invest in schools where there are pockets of students that are struggling and where additional services are needed. She noted that this levy didn't have that built in for elementary or high schools at this time. Mr. Nielsen noted some of the highest performing schools are receiving City funding, and there are limited resources on both sides, and noted a future work session to align the strategies. Directors asked about the funding model for the Seattle Preschool Program (SPP) and asked if it's modeled around the FEL. Ms. Munoz-Colon noted there is performance pay in the FEL as well. Directors asked how it's working and how many meet the performance measures and which do not. Ms. Munoz-Colon noted that last year it was about 90% for the performance measures. She noted that the schools are budgeting toward the amount they will receive, noted that they see the funds that are added later as additional funds that are earned that are flexible throughout the year beyond their base. She noted that schools have done some exciting things as they have collected the flexible resources and she provided examples. Ms. Guin noted that principals don't see it as a hold back; they have seen it as a way to earn additional funds through their performance throughout the year.

Mr. Chappelle noted that he is enthused by the partnership and encourages the Directors to meet at these schools through site visits and would like to come back and provide future presentations at the request of the Board on various topics.   Dir. Harris asked to invite the Seattle Councilmembers to come along on those visits.

The meeting recessed at 5:24pm for five minutes. The meeting reconvened at 5:30pm.

Work Session: Program Changes - Process, Communication, and Decision-Making

Dir. Patu noted that Dir. Burke has now joined us via Skype from London. She noted that this Work Session will be audio recorded, per request.

Mr. Nielsen noted that the audio recording is 45 min per side, and that there will be a one minute pause to change the tape over to the other side. He thanked Dir. Peters for her Board action report on this area. Mr. Nielsen noted his previous experience with working in the district and the confusion around program placement. Mr. Nielsen noted the proposed Board action report brought up many pieces that are touched throughout the system on how this works and noted that staff acknowledges the confusion and that our own documents are confusing. He noted that it reminds him of a Rubik's cube, it looks simple from the start however there are many complexities, as does this program placement area. Mr. Nielsen noted working with Dir. Peters on the agenda and the presentation and outlined the structure for today's discussion. He noted working on what SPS is trying to solve and how to look at all of the interrelated pieces to get this working on behalf of kids and families. Directors asked a process question what happens when there is

opposite feedback from Directors, what is the process for utilizing the feedback in working toward a compromise. Mr. Nielsen noted that he would be surprised if there weren't opposite feedback on this topic, noted this is a work session to produce a discussion, and asks that when there are different ideas to allow the exploration of those and not ignore them. He noted due diligence is critical.

Dir. Peters gave an overview as to reasons for her Board action report regarding Board oversight for site closures and amending existing policy. She gave an overview of a chart showing the recent examples of program closures that have led to this work session to adequately have the Board address the issues. Dir. Peters summarized the chart and provided examples. She noted the pattern is that decision are made, actions taking place without properly informing the Board, yet the public comes to them for answers. Dir. Peters noted two case studies regarding Middle College and Interagency. She noted poor public engagement and lack of transparency in both cases. Dir. Peters noted concerns from the public and the neighborhood regarding these two cases. She noted that constituents assume the worst when they are not informed in a transparent and upfront manner. Dir. Peters noted the history of these programs and schools, and that it's a manner of public trust and an obligation of the Board to do its due diligence of oversight. Dir. Peters noted that the process would remain mainly the same, but that there would be a layer of oversight by the Board and would provide transparency of the decision process. She noted the policies and Superintendent procedures that would be affected by this change, and outlined these details as listed on the slide. Dir. Peters noted an example of Cascadia Elementary at Lincoln High School's Advanced Placement Program (APP) which was changed to a Highly Capable Cohort, and noted the confusion with the distinction of what this is defined as- a service, a school or a program. She noted the definition of a "stakeholder" in terms of what is written in the policy, and noted that families haven't been engaged in many circumstances, and feels that those people should have been considered stakeholders in a program opening and/or closing. In conclusion, Dir. Peters noted that the decision making wouldn't be the Board's responsibility, and that her intent is to have the oversight include the Board.

Mr. Nielsen noted the next step is to engage the Board Directors on this topic. Dir. Patu noted that she feels this is very important work and situations have occurred on many occasions in her six years on the Board, and that she receives complaints from the community. She provided an example at Graham Hill Elementary and the responses from parents. Dir. Pinkham also shared a personal experience with Indian Heritage that was closed and moved, and the need to clarify what the programs/schools/services are and to have Board oversight, and the need to be informed of the decisions that are being made. Dir. Harris noted that it's not enough to inform the Board, but to also get the context and the why behind the decision. She noted that many people were not here when Middle College was evicted from Seattle Community College and it's a very important issue to her heart. She noted the need for a narrative, and that without it, there is mistrust. Dir. Blanford noted an element that is missing, that the Superintendent is not here, and is curious to know his perspective, as he makes the final decision on these program closures, and asked if someone was appointed to speak on his behalf. Mr. Nielsen noted that the Superintendent was already scheduled to be out of town when this

meeting was scheduled, and that he is speaking on Supt. Nyland's behalf. Mr. Nielsen noted themes of trust, process, and communication. He noted SPS is the largest district in the state, it's complicated, and the Superintendent wants to make sure we don't do a quick fix when there are many pieces that are involved. He agrees that what we have now is confusing and there is room for improvement. Mr. Nielsen noted needing to get deeper into the issue, and opening the discussion. He noted the Superintendent's job is to operate and run the district under the Board policy, and that working together on this, betterment of the district can be achieved. Dir. Blanford noted it strikes him that there is some intent to keep the process the way that it is and that they, as elected officials, need some space from the day to day decisions. It's been his experience that the decision has been made, and then the Seattle process kicks in. Dir. Blanford knows there is an issue around communication and transparency, and that it's a disservice to the community without providing the information on why the decision has been made.

Dir. Burke noted the language confusion and the disruption of public trust, stability and transparency. He noted that SPS should be deliberate in the process, not creating disruptions that are improperly vetted or for political whims, and looking at what families really need. Dir. Burke noted the importance of getting the staff and Board on the same page. He noted the Directors rely on the staff to do complex decision making and also ask for trust from them to double check the process to make the process better if done properly. Dir. Burke noted examples of oversight under curriculum adoption with the various stakeholders involved.

Dir. Geary noted the need for fairness of being informed. She noted trying to see how this works with timing, and gave an example of the Experimental Education Unit (EEU). She also noted there is certainly a rationale behind the decisions being made and noted to bring to bear the resources, creativity and thoughtfulness of all of those that want to support our children and families without creating a hailstorm out in the public. Dir. Geary noted the steps that need to happen with opening and/or closing a school, program, service, etc. She likes the idea of a layer of oversight, and to slow the process down, but not to have the final yay or nay on the decision. She noted having advance notice to overcome the lack of transparency and allay the suspicion from the public.

Dir. Blanford noted that for the issues around transparency with the decision making process, if Directors feel there is a lack of responsibility for this area that this should be discussed in the evaluation of the Superintendent or with him directly. Dir. Harris respectfully disagreed, and noted that this is one of many things the Superintendent is evaluated on, and that's only one opportunity per year. She noted wanting further opportunities to have these discussions and work collaboratively throughout the year. Dir. Geary noted that this is something that she feels should be resolved through policy as its inconsistent and it should be cleaned up. She noted coming up with definitions to have clarity on what is expected to be presented to the Board. Dir. Blanford noted he would like clarity on the services and programs and supports that notion. He also noted that there should be communication with the Superintendent even before an evaluation process. Dir. Peters noted that we are all a team and should have checks and balances in place for oversight. She noted that as public servants, Board Directors are elected to

represent the people. She noted the Board has a lot to offer the staff on ramifications of some of these decisions that are being made. She provided examples of the unintended consequences that she has experienced with some of these decisions. Dir. Peters noted that if it's not taken to the policy level, that it's just another expectation that can go unfulfilled. She noted making good on the commitment to community engagement.

Dir. Burke noted feeling the Board doesn't need to micromanage or slow down the process, but for this to be a partnership with the strengths of the Board and the staff to get out in front of these issues. He noted the SMART Goal #6 work session regarding customer service and the communications protocol, and he looks at it with the same lens by being proactive in the community. Dir. Patu noted supporting Dir. Peters' comments, and that it takes all of us to be responsible for transparency, and to keep each other accountable for decisions being made. She noted the need to work together to be more responsible to the community to give proper notification. Dir. Patu noted it's not the Board versus the staff, it is working as a team to serve the kids. Dir. Pinkham noted the definitions of what is a school, program or service and asked if there a list of those in each district and what the authority/influence/oversight is over each.

Mr. Nielsen noted his appreciation of the Board as volunteers trying to help the students of the city and noted the challenges that they go through even when they have no control over the decision process at this time. Dir. Harris added in that the Board often gets blindsided. Mr. Nielsen noted that the processes don't always work well, and that they aren't at the level they could be. He noted that tonight's discussion is a healthy indicator of the progress that has been made. Mr. Nielsen noted that to help create context on some of the areas that have been brought up, that it is important for the Board and staff to be on the same page. Mr. Nielsen noted the upcoming presentation on the technical aspects of what is involved, and noted that Michael Tolley will review. He noted three specific examples of how things work in different areas that we will also review.

Mr. Tolley noted his appreciation for this conversation and the discussion on the policies and procedures that are in question. Mr. Tolley noted that this process was a companion document with the Student Assignment Plan (SAP) and that the documents work in concert with each other. He reviewed the primary criteria of defining a school, as per Superintendent Procedure 2200SP. He reviewed the types of schools throughout SPS, and noted the differences. Mr. Tolley noted the opening and closure of schools and noted the types of services that are offered throughout the district and the definition from the procedures. He also outlined the definition of programs and gave the key criteria. Directors asked if the SAP rises to the level of a policy. Mr. Tolley noted that it is not a policy that is numbered, but it is a School Board approved document within the district. Mr. Nielsen noted that it's the Board's purview on to how they want the SAP to be handled, and noted that it drives a lot of decisions in the district. Mr. Tolley noted the quarterly and annual reports that go to the Board per policy and procedure requirements, and outlined the process. Mr. Tolley noted the examples that have been provided per today's conversation and discussed the communication opportunities. He noted the examples of program decisions and how they are reported.

Wyeth Jessee noted the comments of the Board really resonated with him, and noted the mistrust in the lack of transparency that he has seen. He noted inconsistencies, and the need for service descriptions that provide a predictable, transparent way to notify parents where services are at. Mr. Jessee noted the website posting regarding enrollment and changes prior to the school year. He noted the timeline handout, and provided an overview of the document. Mr. Jessee noted that placements change throughout the school year in special education, and one student moving can change the entire program spaces that need to be up to code. He noted working with enrollment planning, the variables in the systems and looking at reporting projections, capital planning needs, and working with principals to do walk throughs, and finalize where the services will be provided throughout the district and looking at all of the impacts that those enrollment changes have. Mr. Jessee outlined the process, and noted that with minor changes it affects contracts, services, locations and notification to families. Mr. Jessee noted that he also wants accountability and trust and predictability of services.

Mr. Nielsen asked for Clover Codd to give Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) implications. Dr. Codd provided context to understand the intersection of the CBA and the building site decision-making process that would be affected with proposed changes to 2200SP. Per the CBA, schools do determine how programs are being implemented on their own site. Dr. Codd provided examples of the schools that determined the mechanism for the program at their site, per the site decision-making process. She noted that these changes in the proposed language are concerning as they would bump up against the CBA that was negotiated in the fall. Directors asked for clarification on the two thirds votes that are needed. Dr. Codd noted that it is a part of the Seattle Education Association (SEA) agreement and that there is a parent signature line on the document in question. Directors noted the lack of transparency in that area. Directors asked about spectrum programs in advanced learning, and noted that principals are making decisions without Building Leadership Team (BLT) input. They asked where the BLT is monitored, and if principals are hand picking people, are the meetings had on a regular basis, and are minutes taken. Dr. Codd noted that this information is outlined in the CBA, and the process could use some training. Mr. Nielsen noted some good news to get to the desired outcomes, and that Pegi McEvoy will outline her process used during the Bell Times changes. Ms. McEvoy noted a handout showing the process for Bell times and noted the conversation with the Board starts with defining the issue and it's a step through process. She noted that this is part of the transparency that the Board is asking for and where can they be more involved in the process as a model for the quick decisions that need to be made.

Mr. Nielsen noted in no order of priority the summarized phrases that kept coming up as common themes: trust, better communication and engagement, desire for oversight (context and why), stability, teamwork, synergy, process improvement, daylighting of what's going on, and what are we doing to continue the creativity of the people in our schools. He noted what makes this district great is that there are outstanding, creative people, and bureaucracy stifles creativity and the need to be hypersensitive to encourage creativity in the building and throughout the district. He suggested next steps of conducting further meetings or work sessions and

noted that he senses that district staff is willing to help in the process and appreciates everyone's time to move this forward. Directors discussed the options. Directors asked if the follow up meetings would be such where the community could come listen to the conversation and give feedback in a collaborative fashion. Mr. Nielsen noted that it is possible to do. Noel Treat noted that if it's a public meeting, that it would need to be noticed, and that it would be a meeting in which action would not be taken, unless it was posted as such. Directors further discussed the benefits and cons to the next step meetings.

Dir. Blanford noted that it would have been more informative to hear from the staff prior to hearing the other presentation to give more context and better understanding. He noted unintended consequences in making this shift, and addressed what problems SPS is trying to resolve, the potential of going down a path that may upset the delicate balance, and hopes that SPS starts with self-reflection. Dir. Pinkham noted the closing of Indian Heritage, and what could be learned from that process to make things better overall. Dir. Harris noted the well-meaning people working together, plus miscommunication and underfunding, which all contribute to the issue and it hurts SPS kids. She noted learning from our mistakes, learning to trust each other and is appreciative of the comments of other Directors to be thoughtful in the process. Dir. Peters noted that this is a formalized process to come to the Board with more oversight in order to serve the community. She noted the proposal to bring transparency that will benefit everybody and allow the Board to be more responsive to the community. Dir. Peters noted the fundamental support of our children's learning, and it's important to have checks and balances in place that is logical and empathetic to the needs of our community.

Dir. Geary noted the fear that if the Board has ultimate approval, that they could get in a position of lobbying to the staff and against other Directors. She does like the thought that there are guidelines on what the oversight would mean for the Board and meeting the needs of our students while being flexible as well. Dir. Burke noted that if a decision is not governed by the school building policy, then it should be covered under the framework of the Board. Dir. Patu noted that to her, oversight means checks and balances, not the staff and Directors working against each other. She noted the need to be on the same page to show the public that we are on top of things and to communicate to the public. Directors thanked the staff for all of the work that they do.

Mr. Nielsen thanked everyone for their feedback to help to move forward. He noted trying to set up a meeting as soon as possible, and that Supt. Nyland would like to be a part of this discussion. He thanked staff for providing the information today and noted working together to get this right. He noted that things are still grey, and the implications are worth having more discussions.

The meeting recessed at 7:24pm for a ten minute break. Director Burke left the meeting (via Skype) at 7:24pm. The meeting reconvened at 7:36pm.

Work Session: Superintendent SMART Goal #3: Special Education

This work session was staffed by Executive Director of Special Education Wyeth

Jessee, Director of Special Education Michaela Clancy, and Assoc. Superintendent of Teaching & Learning Michael Tolley.

Mr. Jessee noted the purpose of this goal, and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which stems from the corrective action plan. He noted that the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) managed requirements that were met. Mr. Jessee noted that of the $3 million withheld, so far $1 million has been recaptured, and that more will come soon. He noted the movement in the state determination level from a 4 to a 2, in 2 years, which is a big improvement and it shows the oversight can be independent. Mr. Jessee noted that SPS hopes to get a 2 again, but a 1 would be ideal. He noted the MOU verification activities and provided an overview of the Individualized Education Programs (IEP) files and the evaluations and the process for OSPI to review the documentation. Mr. Jessee noted hosted activities that are done with the principals at school sites and that OSPI stay at the site for 2-3 days. Mr. Jessee discussed the filings within the schools and provided some examples. He noted interviews, parent focus groups, and central office review to verify key activities and implementation procedures. Mr. Jessee noted the support and preparation at the sites for OSPI visits, and noted the support that is provided to the teachers and staff. He noted internal reviews to identify any issues and if any are identified they send staff to work at the schools. He noted that revising an IEP is a lot of work and meetings to correct. He noted onsite coaching and support, and they are learning through this process with scheduling, writing IEPs, progress monitoring, and communicating to families. He provided a progress update, and showed a chart of the various regions progress. Mr. Jessee noted June would be the finalization at central office once all five regions were completed and verified.

Directors asked about the process of monitoring, and is the district thinking of how to maintain the lessons learned and thinking of a way to create our own process to go through and monitor, as an internal audit function to make sure we don't get back to where we were. Mr. Jessee said yes, that is what they are doing to build processes, structures and systems, to be institutionalized and to re-culture SPS. He noted that as the largest district in the system, OSPI will continue to work with us and have oversight. Directors asked what a level 1 looks like and asked if the parents and students are happy. Mr. Jessee asked what an indicator of happy is, and noted that SPS is moving toward satisfaction, and that complaints have been proportionately down, which is one indicator. He noted some positive press, and the attendance at community events which shows that people are engaged. Mr. Jessee noted a complete transformation, and noted that it takes time. He noted that SPS is well on the way and positioning to make a huge difference to close the opportunity gaps. Mr. Jessee noted working on positive intervention supports, discipline, academics, and high quality teachers. He noted the hiring process for this year and noted how much farther ahead as compared to last year and compared to urban districts across the country. Directors noted constituents wanting to talk about 504 plans and the growth of the 504 plans as compared to a few years ago. Directors asked for more conversations around the data and the implications on services provided to the students in the district, and the constraints to provide services for those students who really need them. Mr. Jessee noted that it can be brought to the Directors in another venue to provide data and address

those questions as they are part of the continuous improvement cycle.

Ms. Clancy noted the conversations that used to be focused on compliance, and now they are instructional conversations which show the growth of the improvements. She noted the notable successes and ongoing challenges as written on the slides and provided examples of training. Ms. Clancy noted a principal feedback survey and noted the reach through the process to get feedback. She noted the examples of the type of feedback received. Ms. Clancy noted an example of complex system improvement, and Indicator 12- around birth to 3 students- and their transition to IEPs. She told a story of her experience from when she was first exposed to the Indicator 12 process, and highlighted the complexities of the timelines and expectations. Ms. Clancy noted the birth to three services, which are mandated for our most impacted population. She noted that this data should also transfer to the preschool program data. Ms. Clancy described the process, the meetings with medical providers, translators and outside service providers, and the complexities with documentation and timelines. Ms. Clancy noted challenges previously with documentation and reporting to the state, and noted the improvements in the system that have been made in this area. She noted adding staffing in this area to make the data much more useful and visible. Ms. Clancy noted the high benchmarking in the area around documentation and that they are working on being fully prepared by the site visit in June. Ms. Clancy noted the internal control process and looking at file samples which are done biweekly. She noted that the department is working on making this a sustainable process, and that a great deal of work is on data systems and reporting. She noted the work with technology services to have systems for data and query the IEPs in the academic data warehouse to allow for real time data to make decisions. Ms. Clancy noted the budget development process, and the timely evaluation reporting.

Directors noted an apology for not giving enough time to Special Education for their presentation due to going over in the last discussion and noted that this subject is a priority of the Board.

The meeting adjourned at 8:04pm

School Board Briefing/Proposed Action Report

☐ **Informational** (no action required by Board)   ☒ **Action Report** (Board will be required to take action)

DATE: February   , 2016
FROM: Director Peters, Vice President, and Director Patu, President, Seattle School Board

I.   TITLE

Amending Policy Nos. H01.00, F21.00, and 2200 to authorize Board oversight of program, service and site placement and closure decisions.

For Introduction: ~~March 1~~April 620, 2016

For Action: ~~April 6~~May 4, 2016

II.   WHY BOARD ACTION IS NECESSARY

The School Board is the governing body with the authority to adopt, amend, and repeal policies for the District. Board action is therefore required.

III.   FISCAL IMPACT/REVENUE SOURCE

The fiscal impact is _____ .

The revenue source for this motion is _____ .

☐   ☒   ☐
Expenditure: One-time   Annual   Other Source

IV.   POLICY IMPLICATION

If approved, this motion would amend Policy Nos. F21.00, Specific Areas of Involvement Reserved to the District, and H01.00, School Closures, and 2200, Equitable Access to Programs & Services.

V.   RECOMMENDED MOTION

I move that the School Board amend Policy Nos. F21.00, H01.00, and 2200, as attached to the Board Action Report.

VI.   BOARD COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

This motion to amend H01.00, F21.00 and 2200 was discussed at the February 4, 2016 and the March 3, 2016 Executive Committee meetings, and the March 23, 2016 Work Session. The Committee reviewed the motion and recommended_____.

VII.   BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Under current policy, site and program placement and closure decisions do not come before the Board for approval, therefore the Board has no oversight of these decisions. Yet, the public expects the Board to weigh in on them and comes to the Board requesting oversight.

These revisions will add the requirement of Board approval for program and site placement and closure recommendations from staff or the Superintendent.

This will allow the Board to further fulfill its legally mandated oversight responsibilities

VIII. STATEMENT OF ISSUE

Whether to amend Policy Nos. H01.00, F21.00 and 2200.

The motion addresses the following realities and concerns:

- Under current policy, the Board has no oversight of program, service or site closure and placement decisions.

- Two of these policies have not been reviewed in many years and fall into the category of lettered policies that are overdue for updating. Policy review and initiation is a key Board duty, prescribed by policy and law:
  (*http://www.seattleschools.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_543/File/Migration/Departments/HR/10_05.pdf?sessionid=d249654e54f9ae0807a5cf8a160886eb*)

- In 2010, the State auditor found that the Board failed to exercise its necessary oversight duties. It is the Board's duty to ensure that it engages with the community and is empowered to exercise its legally mandated oversight duties.

- The public rightfully expects the Board to weigh in and exercise oversight on important issues, and holds the Board accountable for them. Therefore, the Board should be granted this oversight authority.

- The reality is, these issues still come to the Board in one form or another, through protests, public commentary, lobbying, petitions, etc. But the Board is not currently empowered to influence them, and so the District is perceived as acting without transparency and the Board failing in its duties.

- This change will formalize this process, and allow greater transparency and oversight by affording staff and the Superintendent the opportunity to present the rationale for such recommendations to the Board and community during public sessions.

- This change will also partially address the current ambiguity surrounding the definition of *school* versus *program* verses *site* versus *service* by establishing Board oversight for more of these various offerings. (Also, the nomenclature distinctions made by the district do not necessarily correspond to how these schools are defined or function for families.)

The proposed change will maintain the current process in which staff makes recommendations to the superintendent, or the Superintendent makes determinations directly, but it adds the requirement that these come to the Board for final approval (via committee – Executive, Curriculum & Instruction Policy, or Operations) and then to the full Board for introduction and ultimately action.

IX. ALTERNATIVES

1. Do not amend Policy Nos. H01.00, F21.00, and 2200. This is not recommended because this leaves Board oversight out of significant school program, service and site placement decisions.

X. RESEARCH AND DATA SOURCES / BENCHMARKS

In the last few years alone, various school, program, service and site placement or closures decisions have been made resulting in significant consternation, controversy and lack of community engagement.

XI. TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION / COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Upon approval of this motion, the amended policies would go immediately into effect and would be posted on the School Board's website.

XII. ATTACHMENTS

- Policy No. F21.00 (clean – for approval)
- Policy No. F21.00 (redline – for reference)
- Policy No. H01.00 (clean – for approval)
- Policy No. H01.00 (redline – for reference)

SCHOOL OR SITE CLOSURES

POLICY

It is the policy of the Seattle School Board that prior to the decision to close any school buildings(s) for instructional purposes, the following steps will occur:

1. Development and presentation of the Superintendent's preliminary recommendation for school closure(s) and publication of analysis of possible effects of proposed school closure(s) to include:

   A. Criteria for school closure(s)

   B. Demographic and integration effects

   C. Relationship of the proposed closure(s) to any on-going, established long-range program for facility use, and

   D. Proposed site classification

2. Public review of the Superintendent's preliminary recommendation for school closure(s) (minimum of thirty (30) days). A copy of the recommendation and summary shall be made available in each school proposed for closure(s) and distributed to each school parent organization and community council in the affected area.

3. Public hearing(s) for each proposed site on the Superintendent's preliminary recommendation for school closure(s) will be held in the general geographic area of the affected building. The public hearing will be held in the affected school, where feasible.

4. Presentation of the Superintendent's final recommendation for school closure(s).

5. Public review of the Superintendent's final recommendation for school closure(s) (minimum of fourteen (14) days).

6. Public hearing on Superintendent's final recommendation for school closure(s).

7. School Board discussion of Superintendent's final recommendation for school closure(s).

8. School Board Action on school closure(s). (The Board's final decision shall be made within ninety (90) days of the time hearings are held for each proposed site for closure(s) (#3 above) and no less than seven (7) days after the public hearing on the Superintendent's final recommendation for school closure(s).)

Notices of the hearings in steps 3 and 6 above containing the date, time, place, and purpose of the hearings shall be published in the Seattle daily newspapers. and in the local newspapers in the affected areas of the City.

These notices shall be published once each week for two consecutive weeks, with the last notice to be published not less than seven (7) days before the hearings.

In addition to the notices in the daily newspapers, outreach to potentially impacted communities shall be achieved via a combination of some or all of the following methods:
- Notices in local newspapers
- Notices on the Seattle Public Schools website & television station
- Notices on local television and radio stations
- Notices sent to community centers, libraries, and city neighborhood centers
- Notices sent to families via automated telephone service
- Notices sent home to families in the impacted schools

In the event exigent circumstances make adherence to the above policy infeasible, the Board of Directors may so declare and make a school closure(s) decision following a process consistent only with the minimum requirements of RCW 28A.335.020.

Temporary relocation of students and staff during periods of school building reconstruction or renovation is not considered a school closure and this policy does not apply.

It is also the policy of the Seattle School Board that prior to the decision to close any   programs, or sites serving students in an instructional capacity, , the following steps below shall will occur:. A "site" includes a physical location not on a school campus where participating students regularly receive the majority of their classroom instruction.

1.   Development and public presentation of the Superintendent's ~~preliminary~~ recommendation for site ~~or program~~ closure(s) and publication of analysis of possible effects of proposed closure(s) to include:

A. Criteria for site~~, or program~~ closure(s)

B. Demographic and integration effects

C. Relationship of the proposed closure(s) to any on-going, established long-range program for facility use, and

D. ~~Proposed site classification~~

2.   ~~Presentation of the Superintendent's final recommendation for site or program closure(s).~~

3.   ~~Public review of the Superintendent's final recommendation for site or program closure(s) (minimum of fourteen (14) days).~~

2.   School Board discussion of Superintendent's ~~final~~ recommendation for site ~~or program~~ closure(s).

~~4.~~ 3.   School Board Action on site closure(s).

Reference: RCW 28A.335.020

Revised: AUG 1997
               NOV 2008
~~FEB~~ MAR 2016 ~~--~~ Dir. S. Peters

BOARD ADOPTED PROCEDURE

Within the laws of the United States and the State of Washington and the policies of the Board, and District guidelines, the following areas (listed alphabetically) are reserved to the School Board and/or Superintendent or their designee:

Curriculum

A. Development and adoption of District-wide curriculum frameworks (what is taught at what levels).
B. Development and adoption of policies to insure the quality of educational content.
C. District-wide adoption of educational materials (textbooks, materials, software).
D. Selection of technology systems and hardware (equipment) from which schools may make appropriate selections as their individual needs dictate.

Fiscal Management

A. Application for District-wide grants.
B. Administration of payroll.
C. Setting of salaries and compensation.
D. Adoption of annual School District budget and control audits.
E. Purchase of goods and services.
F. Control of real and/or personal property.

Program, Site, or ~~Service~~ Placement

~~The Superintendent makes the final decision on a~~All placement and closure decisions pertaining to district-level programs, ~~instructional~~ sites as defined in Policy H01.00, and services that impact 25 percent or more of the student population in a building ~~placements , and closure, and school building closure~~ ~~decisions~~ require prior Board approval. The requirement for Board approval does not apply to program and class decisions reserved to a Building Leadership Team or principal under existing Collective Bargaining Agreements.

Program Evaluation

Former Code: C17.03

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Safety

A. Development and adoption of District-wide student behavior rules and regulations.
B. Annual adoption of Student Rights and Responsibilities as required by state law.
C. Development and adoption of a District-wide School Safety Plan.

School Operations

A. Food service planning, purchasing and administration.
B. Conducting data processing services.
C. Legal Services.
D. Planning of transportation routes, schedules, and bell times.
E. Selection and approval of transportation provider(s).
F. Building and grounds maintenance of District non-school facilities.
G. Use of all school space.
H. Determination of building and instructional capacities.

Staffing

A. Hiring, evaluation, discipline, and termination (firing, retirement, resignation) of all employees.
B. Negotiation and enforcement of labor contracts.
C. Selection and/or transfer of principals and assistant principals.
D. Selection and/or transfer of employees other than principals and assistant principals.
E. Development and adoption of staffing standards.
F. Assignment of staff to buildings.
G. Evaluation of principal.
H. Other personnel issues.

Strategic Planning

Development and oversight of District-wide strategic plan

Former Code: C17.03

Students

A. Development, adoption, and implementation of desegregation policies.

B. Development, adoption, and implementation of student placement policies.

C. Discipline of individual students.

Testing

A. State required testing programs.

B. Oversight and adoption of testing measures.

C. Selection and implementation of testing programs.

Other

A. Development, coordination, implementation and evaluation of local, state, and federal legislative agendas.

B. Public relations, representation, and conveyance of District views/opinions.

C. Daily operations of the school (responsibility of the principal).

Revised MAR 2016 – Dir. S. Peters

Former Code: C17.03

It is the policy of the Seattle School Board that programs be developed, replicated, and placed in support of district-wide academic goals that address systemic needs and support quality education for all students within the context of the current student assignment plan.

~~School Board Policy F21.00 delegates to the Superintendent the authority to make~~ requires School Board approval of all program placement ~~and closure decisions.~~ This policy addresses ~~such~~ program and service ~~placement actions~~ actions ~~includingto~~ including ~~make~~ changes to existing programs or services, the development of new programs or services, the replication of existing programs or services, as well as the closing and/or relocation of existing programs or services. ~~throughout the district, to the extent that those programs or services have an impact on budgets, hiring or placement of staff, or on space within a building. This policy does not apply to changes in programs or services which are reserved by law or other Board policies to the School Board or Superintendent.~~

Prior to making program~~matic~~ or service change~~s~~, including those that require School Board Approval under Policy F21.00~~s recommendations to the School Board~~, the Superintendent will take the objectives listed below into account, balancing competing needs to achieve the result that is in the best interests of students, all factors considered:

1. Place programs or services in support of district-wide academic goals;
2. Place programs or services equitably across the district;
3. Place programs or services where students reside;
4. Place programs or services in accordance with the rules of the current student assignment plan, and as appropriate, equitably across each middle school feeder region;
5. Engage stakeholders in a timely and publicly visible manner by informing, involving, and/or consulting with them as appropriate, and consider their input in the decision-making process when feasible;
6. Utilize physical space resources effectively to assure that instructional and program space needs are equitably met across the district;
7. Ensure that fiscal resources are taken into consideration, including analyzing current and future fiscal impacts; and
8. Analyze the impact of any decision before it is made, by using data, research and best practice

The relevant factors considered and the basis for each change shall be documented in writing and also presented to the School Board for those actions requiring School Board approval. ~~consideration in its review of the proposed program or service placement action. kept on file.~~ [On a quarterly basis the Superintendent or designee shall provide an update to the School Board on decisions made during the previous quarter and a preview of upcoming decisions, if known. These quarterly updates should be provided to the School Board in April, July and October.

The fourth quarterly update shall be an annual report that provides detail about all the decisions that were made in the prior year and how those decisions relate to the eight decision making criteria outlined in this policy. The annual report should be provided to the School Board in January.

The Superintendent is authorized to establish Superintendent Procedures or administrative guidelines to implement this policy. Such Procedures are subject to review by the Board.

Deleted: Revised ¶
NOV 12, 2008

School Closure

Deleted: ¶

It is the policy of the Seattle School Board that prior to the decision to close any school buildings(s) for instructional purposes the following steps will occur:

Deleted: POLICY¶
¶

1. Development and presentation of the Superintendent's preliminary recommendation for school closure(s) and publication of analysis of possible effects of proposed school closure(s) to include:

    A. Criteria for school closure(s)

    B. Demographic and integration effects

    C. Relationship of the proposed closure(s) to any on-going, established long-range program for facility use, and

    D. Proposed site classification

2. Public review of the Superintendent's preliminary recommendation for school closure(s) (minimum of thirty (30) days). A copy of the recommendation and summary shall be made available in each school proposed for closure(s) and distributed to each school parent organization and community council in the affected area.

3. Public hearing(s) for each proposed site on the Superintendent's preliminary recommendation for school closure(s) will be held in the general geographic area of the affected building. The public hearing will be held in the affected school where feasible.

4. Presentation of the Superintendent's final recommendation for school closure(s).

5. Public review of the Superintendent's final recommendation for school closure(s) (minimum of fourteen (14) days).

6. Public hearing on Superintendent's final recommendation for school closure(s).

7. School Board discussion of Superintendent's final recommendation for school closure(s).

Deleted: Revised ¶
NOV 12, 2008

8. School Board Action on school closure(s). (The Board's final decision shall be made within ninety (90) days of the time hearings are held for each proposed site for closure(s) (#3 above) and no less than seven (7) days after the public hearing on the Superintendent's final recommendation for school closure(s).)

Notices of the hearings in steps 3 and 6 above containing the date, time, place, and purpose of the hearings shall be published in the Seattle daily newspapers. These notices shall be published once each week for two consecutive weeks, with the last notice to be published not less than seven (7) days before the hearings.

In addition to the notices in the daily newspapers, outreach to potentially impacted communities shall be achieved via a combination of some or all of the following methods:
- Notices in local newspapers
- Notices on the Seattle Public Schools website & television station
- Notices on local television and radio stations
- Notices sent to community centers, libraries, and city neighborhood centers
- Notices sent home to families in the impacted schools

Deleted: <#>Notices sent to families via automated telephone service¶

In the event exigent circumstances make adherence to the above policy infeasible, the Board of Directors may so declare and make a school closure(s) decision following a process consistent only with the minimum requirements of RCW 28A.335.020.

Temporary relocation of students and staff during periods of school building reconstruction or renovation is not considered a school closure and this policy does not apply.

Instructional Site Closure

It is also the policy of the Seattle School Board that prior to the decision to close an instructional site, the following steps will occur. An instructional site is defined as a facility or building that houses one or more Seattle Public Schools classrooms. The facility or building may be one site of a multi-site OSPI-registered school and students are assigned via the student assignment plan (e.g., Middle College and Interagency sites).

1. The decision will be considered, and if applicable, addressed via the student assignment plan.
2. If not addressed via the student assignment plan, the development and public presentation of the Superintendent's recommendation for an

Deleted: Revised ¶
NOV 12, 2008

instructional site closure(s), including the publication of analysis of possible effects of proposed site closure(s). The analysis will contain:

A. Criteria for site closure(s)

B. Demographic and integration effects

C. Relationship of the proposed closure(s) to any on-going, established long-range program for facility use, and

3.   School Board discussion of the Superintendent's recommendation for site closure(s).

4.   School Board action on site closure(s).

In the event adherence to the above policy regarding instructional site closure puts students' safety at risk, the Superintendent is authorized to make the closure decision as long as the Board is informed prior to the decision being made.

Deleted: ¶
¶
Reference: RCW 28A.335.020¶
¶
¶
Revised: AUG 1997¶
.   NOV 2008

Within the laws of the United States and the State of Washington and the policies of the Board, and District guidelines, the following areas (listed alphabetically) are reserved to the School Board and/or Superintendent or their designee:

Curriculum

A. Development and adoption of District-wide curriculum frameworks (what is taught at what levels).
B. Development and adoption of policies to insure the quality of educational content.
C. District-wide adoption of educational materials (textbooks, materials, software).
D. Selection of technology systems and hardware (equipment) from which schools may make appropriate selections as their individual needs dictate.

Fiscal Management

A. Application for District-wide grants.
B. Administration of payroll.
C. Setting of salaries and compensation.
D. Adoption of annual School District budget and control audits.
E. Purchase of goods and services.
F. Control of real and/or personal property.

Program, Service or Instructional Site Closure or Placement

The closure of an instructional site requires Board approval. In the event Board approval of an instructional site closure puts students' safety at risk, the Superintendent is authorized to make the closure decision as long as the Board is informed prior to the decision being made. The Superintendent has the authority to place an instructional site.

Board approval is required for the closure of programs not governed by the student assignment plan. However, the Superintendent makes the final decision on the placements of programs not governed by the student assignment. The Board will be informed of upcoming program placement decisions prior to the decision(s) being made and will receive quarterly updates.

Adopted:
Former Code(s): C17.03
Revision(s): APRIL 1996 / MAY 2016
References: H01.00, 2200, 2200SP
Repealed:

The Superintendent has the authority to make the final decision on the placement and closure of services.

Placement and closure decisions must be aligned to collective bargaining agreements, legal statutes, and other Board policies.

Program Evaluation

Safety

A. Development and adoption of District-wide student behavior rules and regulations.
B. Annual adoption of Student Rights and Responsibilities as required by state law.
C. Development and adoption of a District-wide School Safety Plan.

School Operations

A. Food service planning, purchasing and administration.
B. Conducting data processing services.
C. Legal Services.
D. Planning of transportation routes, schedules, and bell times.
E. Selection and approval of transportation provider(s).
F. Building and grounds maintenance of District non-school facilities.
G. Use of all school space.
H. Determination of building and instructional capacities.

Staffing

A. Hiring, evaluation, discipline, and termination (firing, retirement, resignation) of all employees.
B. Negotiation and enforcement of labor contracts.
C. Selection and/or transfer of principals and assistant principals.
D. Selection and/or transfer of employees other than principals and assistant principals.
E. Development and adoption of staffing standards.
F. Assignment of staff to buildings.

Adopted:
Former Code(s): C17.03
Revision(s): APRIL 1996 / MAY 2016
References: H01.00, 2200, 2200SP
Repealed:

G.   Evaluation of principal.

H.   Other personnel issues.

Strategic Planning

Development and oversight of District-wide strategic plan

Students

A.   Development, adoption, and implementation of desegregation policies.

B.   Development, adoption, and implementation of student placement policies.

C.   Discipline of individual students.

Testing

A.   State required testing programs.

B.   Oversight and adoption of testing measures.

C.   Selection and implementation of testing programs.

Other

A.   Development, coordination, implementation and evaluation of local, state, and federal legislative agendas.

B.   Public relations, representation, and conveyance of District views/opinions.

C.   Daily operations of the school (responsibility of the principal).

Deleted: Revised

Deleted: April 1996

Deleted: ¶
¶
¶
¶

Deleted: Former Code: C17.03

It is the policy of the Seattle School Board that programs and services be developed, replicated, and placed in support of district-wide academic goals that address systemic needs and support quality education for all students within the context of the current student assignment plan.

School Board Policy F21.00 delegates to the Superintendent the authority to make all of the closure and placement decisions for services and the placement decisions for instructional sites and programs not governed by the student assignment plan. This authority includes actions to make changes to existing programs or services, the development of new programs or services, the replication of existing programs or services, the relocation of existing programs or services throughout the district, and the closure of existing services. This policy does not apply to changes in programs or services which are reserved by law or other Board policies to the School Board or Superintendent. Board approval is required for the closure of a school or instructional site.

Prior to making programmatic or service changes, the Superintendent will inform the Board and take the objectives listed below into account, balancing competing needs to achieve the result that is in the best interests of students, all factors considered:

1. Place programs or services in support of district-wide academic goals;

2. Place programs or services equitably across the district;

3. Place programs or services where students reside;

4. Place programs or services in accordance with the rules of the current student assignment plan, and as appropriate, equitably across each middle school feeder region;

5. Engage stakeholders in a timely and publicly visible manner by informing, involving, and/or consulting with them as appropriate, and consider their input in the decision-making process when feasible;

6. Utilize physical space resources effectively to assure that instructional and program space needs are equitably met across the district;

7. Ensure that fiscal resources are taken into consideration, including analyzing current and future fiscal impacts; and

8. Analyze the impact of any decision before it is made, by using data, research and best practice

Deleted: August 15, 2012

Deleted: placement decisions

Deleted: policy addresses

Deleted: as well as

Deleted: closing and/or

Deleted: , to the extent that those programs or services have an impact on budgets, hiring or placement of staff, or on space within a building

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted: August 15, 2012

The relevant factors considered and the basis for each change shall be documented in writing, distributed to the School Board for its reference, and kept on file. On a quarterly basis the Superintendent or designee shall provide an update to the School Board on decisions made during the previous quarter and a preview of upcoming decisions, if known. These quarterly updates should be provided to the School Board in April, July and October.

Deleted: and

The fourth quarterly update shall be an annual report that provides detail about all the decisions that were made in the prior year and how those decisions relate to the eight decision making criteria outlined in this policy. The annual report should be provided to the School Board in January.

The Superintendent is authorized to establish Superintendent Procedures or administrative guidelines to implement this policy.

Adopted: August 2012
Revised: [date]
Cross Reference: Policy Nos. A01.00, 1005, 1620, 1640, F21.00; H01.00
Related Superintendent Procedure:
Previous Policies: C56.00
Legal References: N/A
Management Resources: N/A

Seattle Public Schools is committed to developing, replicating, and placing programs and services in support of district-wide academic goals that address systemic needs and support quality education for all students within the context of the student assignment plan. The following procedure guides how the district will implement School Board Policy No. 2200, Equitable Access to Programs & Services.

Definitions: The following definitions are to be used in implementing Policy No. 2200.

1. **Basic Education:** "Shall be to provide opportunities for every student to develop the knowledge and skills essential to:

   ❖ Read with comprehension, write effectively, and communicate successfully in a variety of ways and settings and with a variety of audiences;

   ❖ Know and apply the core concepts and principles of mathematics; social, physical, and life sciences; civics and history, including different cultures and participation in representative government; geography; arts; and heath and fitness;

   ❖ Think analytically, logically, and creatively, and to integrate technology literacy and fluency as well as different experiences and knowledge to form reasoned judgments and solve problems; and

   ❖ Understand the importance of work and finance and how performance, effort, and decisions directly affect future career and educational opportunities." RCW 28A.150.210

2. **Service**: A service is a supplementary support to basic education that is required by federal, state or local law and/or regulations. Required services should be provided at appropriate locations that give students equitable access to the services. Locations and capacity need to be flexible to meet changing student needs for required services. Required services are Special Education, English Language Learners, and highly capable students, as defined by the state.

3. **Program**: A program may offer educational opportunities that are not mandated by federal, state or local law or regulation. While schools offer a variety of approaches to instruction, using a particular teaching strategy does not create a program under this policy. Students access programs through an established

assignment process consistent with the student assignment plan. Students must opt in and/or qualify for the program.

A program is not an Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) registered school. Programs can be at multiple sites and should be equitably distributed, although can be limited by resources and feasibility.

4. **Curricular Focus**: A curricular focus is a teaching or an instructional approach offered at the local school level and not directly accessed through the district student assignment process. A curricular focus includes, but is not limited to, Career and Technical Education, Science Technology Engineering Math (STEM), and Language Immersion.

5. **School**: A school is an OSPI-registered school defined by state statutes. A school provides or directly supervises the PK-12 educational services, programs, or curricular foci received by students in one or more PK-12 grade groups. A school may have more than one program within it.

6. **Instructional Site**: An instructional site is defined as a facility or building that houses one or more Seattle Public Schools classrooms. The facility or building may be one site of a multi-site OSPI-registered school and students are assigned via the student assignment plan (e.g., Middle College and Interagency sites).

Community Engagement: Stakeholders are to be engaged as indicated below in a timely and publicly visible manner by informing, involving, and/or consulting with them as appropriate, and considering their input in the decision-making process when feasible.

1. **Levels**
   a. *Inform*: Provide timely, balanced and objective information to assist stakeholders in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities, and/or solutions. May include fact sheets, website postings, or open houses.
      i. Used for most program and service decisions, including changes to existing programs or services.
   b. *Consult*: Obtain feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions. May include public meetings and/or surveys.
      i. Used when an existing program or service is replicated, closed and/or relocated.
   c. *Involve*: Work directly with the public throughout the decision-making process to ensure concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered. May include workshops, opinion polling, or focus groups.
      i. Used when a new program or service is developed.
2. **How to Engage**
   a. Engagement should be directed at the community most affected by the proposed decision, but may include a broader reach in order to gather input from a larger audience.

   b. Equity and access to engagement tools should be considered in determining methods of engagement, so as to be able to reach a diverse audience.
  3. **When to Engage**
   a. Community engagement should occur by open enrollment, whenever feasible.

Documentation: The relevant factors considered and the basis for each change shall be documented, distributed to the School Board for its reference, and kept on file by the Teaching & Learning department.

Quarterly Updates/Annual Report: Quarterly updates are to be provided to the School Board in April, July and October. An annual report is to be provided in January.
  1. **Topics to Cover**
   a. *April, July, and October Annual Reports*
    i. Decisions made during the previous quarter regarding the following topics, to the extent that the programs or services have an impact on budgets, hiring or placement of staff or space within a building:
     1. Changes to existing programs or services;
     2. The development of new programs or services;
     3. The replication of existing programs or services; and/or
     4. The closing and/or relocation of existing programs or services
    ii. Preview of upcoming decisions, if known.
   b. *January Annual Report*
    i. Detail about all of the decisions that were made in the prior year, including how those decisions relate to the eight decision criteria outlined in Policy No. 2200.
  2. **How to Present**
   a. *April, July, and October Annual Reports*
    i. Presented to the C&I Policy Committee
    ii. All documentation sent to the full Board via Friday Memo
    iii. Documents posted on Friday Memo website for public access
   b. *January Annual Report*
    i. Presented to the full Board at a regular Board meeting
    ii. Documents linked to regular Board meeting agenda for public access