

Board Special Meeting



2445 – 3rd Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134

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, health 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 HIPAA 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