

# Board Special Meeting



2445 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134

Oversight Work Session: Distribution Services; Interrelated Initiatives Process Update;  
Work Session: Advanced Learning  
Wednesday, October 05, 2016, 4:30-7:30pm  
Auditorium, John Stanford Center

## Minutes

### Oversight Work Session: Distribution Services

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 pm. All Directors were present. The meeting was staffed by Superintendent Larry Nyland, Assistant Superintendent for Operations Pegi McEvoy, and Warehouse Manager Gary Dietz.

Dr. Nyland opened the session by thanking the Warehouse staff for the work done to get the schools equipped and open on time. He acknowledged the long hours involved in this year's start of school.

Pegi McEvoy began the session by stating that she was filling in for Kathy Katterhagen, Director of Logistics, who was called away on a family emergency. She then explained that for the last oversight session, Distribution Services included both Procurement and Warehousing but that re-organization has separated Procurement into the Business & Finance division. The function of Warehouse and Distribution covers all equipment, mail services, and nutrition services; Capital has its own distribution services now.

During the Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats (SWOT) discussion, Ms. McEvoy highlighted the high praise feedback for customer service, the partnership with Special Education for the XIP internship program, and the fact that there have been no audit findings for 10 years. The department has an excellent safety record.

The conversation about the aging fleet and equipment included questions about how replacement equipment was funded. Ms. McEvoy said that is one of the issues the department has, as there is no schedule for replacement. Requests have been made when there is an underspend. Two years ago staff did a budgeting process that included vehicle replacement, but since there was no funding, the department could not actualize that. More money is spent on maintenance as a result. In response to questions, she and Stephen Nielsen said there is no money allocated in BEX or BTA funding and that those could not be used; this is general fund expense. The topic continued into the "threats" area, where warehouse runs are getting scheduled tighter and tighter due to increased enrollment and shrinking resources.

In the Accomplishments area, a high performing team, excellent inventory turns, and an outstanding safety record are supported by recognition for superior customer services.

In a review of the organizational chart, Gary Dietz said there are seven warehouse people, three expeditors, four pickers (cooler and freezer for one), and drivers for food and supplies delivery for schools, custodial, and maintenance. In response to Board questions, he said that during the large budget cuts in 2007, there was a 17% decrease in staff; it is a day-to-day struggle ever since that time. There are three unions represented in Warehouse: Teamsters 174, Teamsters 117, and SAEOP.

Mr. Dietz also described the XIP program, where 15 special needs students are working this year. They work in the mailroom sorting and delivering mail throughout the Stanford Center and to schools and do other projects in the building, like publishing work, cleaning copy machines, and sorting supplies. Gary said the best part of the program is to see the changes in students from the beginning of the year to walking to him and looking him in the face by the end of the semester. This Special Education program provides work places for students; staff members are looking to expand the program to provide more learning opportunities. In response to questions, Mr. Dietz said this work is not paid but is part of their IEP (individual education program) and is a learning environment.

In Goals and Objectives, Ms. McEvoy noted that Mr. Dietz is a green belt in the LEAN process and is working to increase efficiencies and reduce waste in the department. Since the department is so lean, they are cross training and organizing for efficiencies. Staff is at a 50% performance of being cross trained, with a goal of 75% by 2017-18.

In budget and benchmarking, Ms. McEvoy said there are 22 FTE employees, with budget up slightly from 15-16 to 16-17. There are no comparable KPIs for Warehouse in the Council of Great City Schools or the standard districts, as everyone is organized differently and cannot be compared apples to apples. Warehouse administrators meet and standardize definitions, but organizationally functions are not standardized. Mr. Dietz said that one standard says distribution should be less than 20% of budget, and Seattle is so far under that...using the purchasing power of 100+ schools provides efficiencies.

Ms. McEvoy reviewed the policies and procedures that guide the work of this group and the key performance indicators of missed picks, on-time deliveries to schools and food items delivered to schools, where performance reflected well, despite an increased number of line items dispersed.

In key internal and external controls, Mr. Dietz and Ms. McEvoy discussed the functional checks and balances in the department, including a separation of duties, system authorization, budget verification, and a three-way match – purchasing, receiving, and invoicing. Cameras have recently been added in the Warehouse, and the red bag procedures for handling money from schools to Accounting has been audited by the internal auditor, who has approved the whole process.

In looking forward, Ms. McEvoy said that focus areas include investing in aging fleet vehicles and more warehouse management technology for efficiencies. New ways of asset tagging, more and different types of things coming in, compostable bins that staff is able to manage within Warehouse are emerging trends. The flip in bell times impacted warehouse drivers and delivery schedules, and they did not want to impact buses coming to and from schools.

Board member questions and comments included:

- Director Burke asking about anything in logistics adjusting time models and delivery that would cause the district to centralize or use local delivery services. Ms. McEvoy said the new B2B system, ordering on line, has reduced the inventory kept in the warehouse. She also said another consideration surfaced during the large Cascadia earthquake scenario recently run, where both the City and the school district could not store equipment and deal with deliveries in just-in-time scenarios and need to plan for an event like this.
- Director Pinkham asking about outside deliveries like Office Depot directly serving schools. Mr. Dietz said the district's Warehouse is in every school for supplies every third day and in every school every day for mail and food. This topic has been studied several times, but the district's buying and ordering power (i.e., a semi-truckload of paper every two weeks) makes this way the most efficient.
- Director Harris asking about suggestions made in the Prismatic report on nutrition services and putting more cooking in the actual schools. Ms. McEvoy said decisions have not been made for all schools; the next steps in operationalizing that report will be a labor-management group

looking at pilots in schools and programs and revenues for those issues. They will discuss prepared foods rather than bulk foods that are managed at food sites. Pilots may start as early as mid-year this year.

- Director Burke asking about risks or threats associated with Seattle traffic, the viaduct, or potential tolls. Mr. Dietz said the department is feeling the impact of some of those issues and is unsure how accurate predictions would be at this time.

Dr. Nyland closed the session by again acknowledging the tremendous amount of work that goes into providing these services for schools and thanked the Warehouse team for their efforts.

### Interrelated Initiatives Process Update

This session was staffed by Deputy Superintendent Stephen Nielsen and Executive Director of Government Relations & Strategic Initiatives Erinn Bennett. Mr. Nielsen recalled a story about a district employee who used ingenuity and creativity to solve a problem in a unique way.

Erinn Bennett noted this brief discussion was around interrelated activities occurring in the next two years, that the Board will be looking at in the coming months, and wanted to give an update and provide the graphic to show the work. At the top of the '2016-17 Key Interrelated Activities/Decisions', she noted the key activities that happen annually, and how the bottom section is specific to the 16-17 activities, arranged chronologically by action. The arrows demonstrate a connection or interrelation between items, and there are many steps taken to bring work forward. She noted that the transportation vendor contract was moved to lower section as the contract is every 3-5 years, not annual.

Mr. Nielsen noted concerns around this amount of work, in addition to other things being worked on this year, and there are many pieces in play, the calendar drives things that may force us to move more quickly than comfortable. He noted staff has spent a lot of time to consider how to make this easier on the Board and families, and noted a message from Flip Herndon today on the way to address boundary concerns. He also stated that, to get into more detail than we already have, another work session may be needed. Director Harris noted her concern, and asked where the next high school and Lincoln High School are on this list, and what are we doing with the Highly Capable Cohort (HCC) at Cascadia and how are we changing Advanced Learning/HCC. She noted that a lot of people are providing great input, but she is concerned that the Facilities and Capacity Management Advisory Committee (FACMAC) is not addressing that issue, or in a holistic fashion. Mr. Nielsen noted this is a short-term view for 16-17. Michael Tolley noted anticipated conversations on Lincoln and all HS boundaries, and a need to revisit other schools, like possibly moving Cleveland HS to becoming a neighborhood school, and the boundary impacts there. The conversation needs to begin and is anticipated for January. It was noted that the lessons learned from before are that too many overlapping conversations can create confusion. The next conversation is around student assignment, including Cascadia and the HCC pathway as is part of student assignment, which begins in next few weeks. Director Harris asked, in a worst case scenario, if we would be moving students more than we like to. Mr. Tolley noted it depends on the decisions that are made, which grades would they be discussing, etc. Director Blanford noted he would like immersion programs be a topic, calling out the international schools/ dual language immersion task force that has been meeting since last spring to inform decisions on pathways. Directors used a metaphor of airplanes flying, and the need to find places for them to land. Director Peters noted the 16-17 decisions are mostly district-wide decisions, while Cascadia is a focused decision, and asked if that is a capacity issue whether it shouldn't be the larger topic. Mr. Tolley noted it is both capacity and impacts on boundaries. Director Peters noted she would like to have capacity called out in our charts. Mr. Nielsen noted that if Directors have questions during this time, to please call and information will be sent as they learn things.

Director Burke noted there was not an action date give for Collective Bargaining Agreement items and Mr. Nielsen noted in some cases it is just working with the labor partners and may not require Board action, providing the example of speaking to Local 609 to discuss the impact on nutrition services with the bell times changes.

Director Patu recessed the session at 5:17 pm and reconvened the meeting at 5:37 pm.

### Advanced Learning

This meeting was staffed by Associate Superintendent for Teaching & Learning Michael Tolley and Chief of Student Supports Wyeth Jessee. Also present was facilitator Pat Hughes.

Director Burke gave the back story about calling the meeting. As chair of Curriculum & Instruction (C&I) Policy Committee, he learned through the processes that there's been a long history of incremental policy change attempts, whether regarding identification, pathways, etc. He said there are a lot of targets for work. The staff has tried for quite some time to make progress but there hasn't been a unity of voice which has made progress difficult. As chair, he has felt it was his responsibility to take some of these issues head-on. He said he hoped to find shared areas and to take this issue and find actionable items. Dir. Burke directed the group to consider race, socio-economic disparity with respect and candor and a solution-oriented mindset, to be patient and solution-focused. He also commented that the community needs to be engaged.

Director Burke said there are a series of issues and challenges with many possible solutions and opportunities. He asked the group to focus on issues and challenges first so they didn't get lost in the solutions to what may only be a symptom. He asked, when looking at the solutions, are they aligned to our challenges and problems or will there be unintended consequences?

Wyeth Jessee responded by explaining he identified this as an issue rich in history with a lot of complexity attached. He said he believes considering Advanced Learning (AL) services is an opportunity. Mr. Jessee then introduced the facilitator, Pat Hughes, a consultant and facilitator with Trillion who formerly worked with Sound Transit and Children's Hospital, and who is also a Seattle Public Schools (SPS) parent.

Ms. Hughes explained that her sole role was to help keep things moving along. She believes in giving everyone a voice and offered a process so that no one or two people dominated and to allow everyone an opportunity to think before they spoke. Ms. Hughes passed out a note-taking sheet and explained the process and procedure for the meeting, and asked board members to jot notes and thoughts during the slideshow. She also explained that questions would be answered during the slide show but discussion would happen afterward. She started the process by inviting each director, in turn, to comment on what the most significant thing about

Director Harris said that AL in SPS is clear as mud. She expressed concerned because it falls into one of her most significant questions: What is building-based leadership and what is an administrative decision? She believes everybody's got a different opinion. She also expressed concerned because it seems polarized around race as well as those who receive free and reduced lunch (FRL.) She wondered about the 25% who have bailed from SPS.

Director Blanford's concern was one from a meeting and is something he said was the essence: do we believe that the disparity in enrollment in AL are natural (number of students versus the racial enrollment of the school district as a whole?) If not, he wanted to know what the role of the adults in the system is?

Director Geary stated, coming from a special education and legal background, the importance to make sure our smartest students are engaged. She noted that we can view this in a broader way that can be

more inclusive than just academic in a self-contained lens. Looking through arts, we can grow our academic engagement that is better for all our kids.

Director Burke spoke to two issues – one is the disparity in demographics and the other is there is a band of ALs who are being underserved by our current offerings and noted that curricula and focus can improve.

Director Patu noted that when she considers AL, she has had many conversations with a lot of constituents in her community who ask what AL is, and many feel their kids are not given the opportunity to be a part of AL. She also said that, at this point, a lot of parents of color feel it's only for white kids. She then asked for the definition of AL.

Director Pinkham emphasized the question of the definition of AL, and noted we have to be aware that besides reading and writing, it can include art and noted that tests like the Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT) don't evaluate creativity. He also pointed out the assessments we use label students. He noted that we need to empower all students so they know each of them is highly capable, and he stated he hoped that this is what would be addressed.

Director Peters stated she would like to make a distinction between AL and Highly Capable (HC), as it is a different process, and a different way to choose. She noted questions around the barriers and also wondered what keeps students from applying, especially programs where there are no barriers, like with Advanced Placement (AP,) and wanted to know how to break those barriers down. She noted she would like to have a greater understanding of what the attributes of HC and AL kids are, as Directors do not the depth of knowledge needed. Her final note was the need to provide something meaningful, stating that is it not clear what we are offering our HC kids, our Spectrum kids, etc., and we need to take a look and determine if we are even meeting the needs.

Mr. Jessee then began the slideshow. He let everyone know the content is available on the SPS website and asked that people reach out to him or Advanced Learning about this presentation.

Mr. Jessee stated his goal for the meeting was creating a common understanding. He said we have many questions, a definition that isn't clear, a belief structure, but that our community understanding doesn't necessarily match. He also reminded the group that current Board Policy Nos. 0030, Ensuring Educational and Racial Equity, and 2190, Highly Capable Services & Advanced Learning Programs, also exist. He acknowledged that there is a lot of data and not all of it is OK. Mr. Jessee charged the group to make meaning of the data and create a plan for next steps. Mr. Jessee then led the group through the slides.

As Mr. Jessee spoke about Tier 2 in Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), Director Peters noted, with 4026 students identified as HC and 600 who chose to stay in their local school, that also means there are 3400 who do not stay in their local school but go to a Highly Capable Cohort (HCC). She asked why this is and said she thinks it's because the needs of the 3400 were not being met at their assigned school. She went on to ask if MTSS is really meeting the needs and wondered if it's mostly theoretical. Dir. Peters also asked whether self-contained Spectrum still exists and, if not, how do we know if the students are getting anything meaningful. Ms. Hughes looked for clarification on the statistics.

Director Harris asked if Spectrum is Advanced Learning Opportunities (ALO) or dead. She wondered if SPS can own the decision and figure out where to go next. Mr. Jessee noted that is actually one of the work streams staff want to talk about at the end, but for right now to give a quick answer, we can't say it's dead, we have promises to families, and we will come back to it.

Director Patu asked how many students of color are included in the 4,000 student figure. Mr. Jessee noted there are data slides where you will see that and it will be discussed address later.

Director Pinkham wanted philosophical clarification, asking whether AL has an opportunity or achievement gap, and wondered if we are meeting the gap. Mr. Jessee responded by saying about meeting the gap is in our sights and that while the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) defines HC, SPS defines it more academically.

Mr. Jessee continued the presentation and when he mentioned that approximately 45% of the 2015-2016 budget was spent on testing, Dir. Patu asked if this was money well-spent.

Director Peters asked what is meant by Advanced Learning and said she wanted to make a distinction to the programs not tied to testing.

Mr. Jessee continued with the slide show, sharing demographic data, noting that the slides did not contain information regarding native populations and/or Pacific Islanders because their number is less than ten. Director Pinkham expressed concern about this and asked to have that data included and provided, that it needs to be pulled from the “multi-ethnic” category.

Director Blanford discussed a comparison between slides 20 and 26, saying that if 45% of the budget has been spent on testing and there is a focus on outreach, we should be seeing a change rather than the “plateau” Mr. Jessee showed us. He was concerned that we should see a change in disproportionality and that, if it’s not showing a change, he wanted more information. Director Geary also asked about the data and why it didn’t seem complete. Mr. Jessee responded that he could make further data available, but he tried to pick and choose to keep to the time constraints of the meeting.

Director Harris commented that, while the new Department of Technology Services (DoTS) initiative to move the referrals to the Source, it is a concern if a family doesn’t have a computer at home. She also expressed concern about keeping private appeals especially for 2e (twice-exceptional) kids who can be hard to measure.

In response to slide 28, Director Peters wanted to know what was supposed to be extrapolated from it. Mr. Jessee explained that many students who have qualified as AL are not meeting the minimum qualification level on their more recent Standards-Based Assessment (SBA.) Dir. Peters felt this was not a reasonable lens on the data since the test is new to our district and wonders if it would be better to ask what are we doing wrong.

Director Patu noted the money spent on testing and the focus on a “barrier-free environment” contrasted with the low number of appeals from students of color. She asked if there was a reason they weren’t included in the data and Dir. Burke reiterated that the number of students was too small to include – it was not intentional but statistical.

At this point, Ms. Hughes, brought the meeting to a discussion of the questions posed: Issues and questions raised? In regards to the plateau, what else can be done? What next? What are ideas, opportunities, experiments that can be done? She gave an opportunity to brainstorm and get ideas out.

Director Blanford said the Board could tinker with existing or radically rethink. He has heard from many colleagues that some in our community are very interested in tinkering but a large segment is interested in rethinking all segments. He wanted to know if the Board was going to take a big bite or nibble around the edges. Ms. Hughes asked what, specifically, was at issue. Dir. Burke responded by pointing out that incremental work done toward a common vision will get somewhere but that “bites all over” won’t get anywhere. He prefers to look for common themes with focus so it’s not a lateral move.

Director Blanford asked Dir. Burke if that was his position as C&I Chair and respectfully suggested it’s an opportunity to rethink AL. Dir. Burke agreed that AL doesn’t have to be the way it is. Dir. Harris suggested she would die before the Board changes AL. She further explained that there is “no there, there” and that there are 99 programs but no one is happy. She said she and her colleagues said

they'd do the heavy lifting of this issue when they ran for office and that, if no one steps up, they don't belong in office.

Director Geary said it would be an incredible amount of work and that working around the edges just perpetuates and institutionalizes the issues. She believes the Board needs to make it a SMART goal so SPS can redirect resources for community engagement and use the equity tool. Dir. Geary said this step is needed to get to big questions which include over-identification, poor programming, and lack of interesting opportunities. She expressed a need to consider Project-Based Learning (PBL), interest-based education, and the third prong of the law, which is creativity. She is concerned that SPS does not test for creatively highly capable attributes.

Ms. Hughes refocused the conversation, reminding the Board that finding the questions to ask and defining the scope are the work of the evening, not trying to answer the questions.

Director Patu also mentioned the issue of the Board ensuring equity for all (which is Board policy), saying they must be creative without prejudice. She is concerned that AL has been around for a long time but not everyone has been allowed to be part of it. She wants SPS to be creative, to consider that, if testing is not working then we need to look at other ways to find eligibility for gifted services. She said the district talks about the equity and the achievement gap all of the time but SPS needs to look at how this program works for some of our kids but not all of them.

Director Pinkham mentioned referral. He spoke about the use of more summative exams, such as CogAT which is just right or wrong, with no explanations allowed and that this doesn't reflect creativity. He is concerned also that SPS students are not being measured against a local standard.

Ms. Hughes then asked the Board members for one final comment on how to proceed.

Director Peters shared her concern over barriers, including the way we reach out and identify students. She was concerned that not everyone is aware of it or able to navigate it, that SPS is not communicating well enough to families. She also feels the need to educate parents and teachers to understand how to recognize gifted behaviors. She feels more outreach and education would address equity issues.

Director Burke spoke about the many facets or "boxes" of the program (identification, HCC, AL/Spectrum, Pre-K, etc.) and implied we need to make sure that we consider each of these but that each has different needs and we have to prioritize. He feels the area with the most leverage is AL/Spectrum as it generates the most concerns and dissatisfaction.

Director Blanford would also like to know how AL benefits those who are not in it. He is concerned that the research indicates those not in it are stigmatized and that it is just another way of tracking. He feels it is important that this is included.

Director Harris reiterated her question asking what is Spectrum now and noted she is still wondering if it is 99 different programs, or if it's a blended model. She wonders, if it is a blended model, where the data from Chief Sealth is since they started a blended model four years ago. She reminded the group that research is needed and that consistency is needed.

Mr. Jessee agreed that that is part of the investigation, that SPS needs to go to the community, especially to teachers in buildings and find out how they are differentiating for AL/Spectrum students, what's working, and what supports they need.

Director Geary said the Board needs to do an inventory of programs and should HC and AL be added to the current inventory of programs. Things she wants addressed: where does it exist, what does it look like, and how effective is it? She pointed out that Thurgood Marshall is happy and they are

marketing their ideas to the Board and says that can be a data point in this process. She suggested this as a SMART goal for next year as this year's Goal 3 will feed well into it. She also feels they should use the Race and Equity tool to evaluate.

Director Patu would like to look at the various learning styles students of color/Pacific Islanders have. She feels the same test for every child is not going to work.

Director Pinkham mentioned motivation. He wondered what is happening to help teachers motivate our kids to seek achievement. He is concerned some may be checking out and mentioned Jaime Escalante and asked if our district has what it takes to encourage students to achieve.

Director Harris said students need differentiation and teachers need professional development on differentiation. She suggested the next tri-day be on differentiation. She acknowledged the district packs the classrooms with disparity so the teachers must be given the tools to meet the different needs. Like athletics and music, we need to make smart "cool" to engage students.

Ms. Hughes asked about work streams and potential areas of focus.

Mr. Jessee commented that there was a lot to consider and he wanted to stress that there is already a plan that centers on collaboration and ensuring there are tools to do this. We are providing professional developments (PD's) for professionals in schools. As the Special Education leader, we know diagnoses and labels don't define the student. We should ask what we can do to support them in their own growth. We should consider what is going on in our schools and classrooms and what can we do to support them. The work is centered around MTSS which provides a consistent way to do things across schools. He also stressed the need for common assessments and collaboration so we have a common understanding of where students are so we can be responsive in considering AL.

Finally, Mr. Jesse reminded the group to consider the heart. He said that we need to build relationships with every learner and their families because if we cannot engage our students in a culturally respectful manner, they won't buy-in. They won't even show up.

Mr. Jessee then identified three work-streams: structures and definitions, instructional approaches and attributes, and the eligibility process. He then elaborated on each of the three.

Mr. Jessee asked what are the structures and definitions of AL and if it is consistent. He said that looking into the research, equity and accessibility are important as is considering MTSS.

With regard to instructional approaches and attributes, Mr. Jessee mentioned the assessment practices, departmental processes, referrals, and communication as well as long-term growth and achievement. Mr. Jessee noted that some of the instructional approaches are parallel to the structures and definitions of HC (especially with regard to law.) He pointed out that these include instructional approaches and their attributes, the process for testing and notification.

Finally, Mr. Jessee addressed the eligibility process. He asked how the SPS assessment framework aligns with MTSS and, if a student is AL or HC, how does MTSS define the services they will receive. Mr. Jessee wanted to know what the implications of appeals are, whether they could be different and, if so, what that might look like. He said the Board definitely needs to do something with appeals.

Other things he noted were that 90% of districts use the CogAT for advanced learner testing and that the CogAT has addressed the non-verbal portion that used to require different assessments. Mr. Jessee also pointed out that capacity needs to be considered, not just with schools but also considering the work-load for this. In the end, he asked about the Board's timeline. In response to an inquiry by Director Harris, he also included using the engagement tool and suggested the students have a voice, too.

Each Director was then giving a moment for a closing remark.

Director Blanford said that he like Dir. Geary's idea of raising this issue to the level of a SMART goal to be tracked. He also reiterated his concern regarding what the AL programs should be and who they should serve. He wonders if the AL program should mirror our community's diversity and, if so, the group has serious work to do. Director Geary agreed with him.

Director Burke said that he'd like to see the staff working on an identification process that eliminates bias and that he'd also like tools such as MTSS incorporated. He wondered what that would look like and how it would be communicated to the community.

Director Geary said that she'd like to see HC immediately begin recognizing art as part of the program.

Director Pinkham asked for more demographic data, including referrals, appeals, Special Education, students on 504s, etc. He worries if they are being excluded. He wondered what students are being referred for—could something believed to be Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) be a lack of challenge? He also agreed with Director Geary about creativity.

Director Peters commented that there had been a sense of urgency but the meeting ended with a process and she hoped the Board wouldn't lose sight of the needed changes. She agreed with this becoming a goal, but wondered if there was anything that could be started immediately. She also suggested outreach and education about what the traits/characteristics of HC are to teachers and families. She believes the district needs a clear vision and statement regarding AL kids, that they have a need and they need a service.

Director Patu addressed the issue of equity and said that the Board has talked about it for many years and continues to talk about it, but that it seems like they haven't done enough. She said that actions speak louder and that SPS can do more. She wanted to know how every kid can have an opportunity to advance in the programs the district offers and close the achievement gap. She said the group had started off talking about relationships and said they are necessary to be able to reach the kids. She believes every child will be successful if the district can provide these opportunities.

Director Harris spoke about telling the truth about what currently exists. She believes that AL is not clear, that the district has broken its promises in areas such as curriculum and IB. She believes that tools for teachers and being on the same page as well as having definitions of labels and services will help. She agrees with making this a SMART goal. She went on to share that she is disturbed by a lack of single-subject identification, the lack of acknowledgment of 2e kids, the lack of a clear description of MTSS. She also inquired what the organization of all this is under building-based leadership.

Ms. Hughes then thanked the group for giving "love and attention" to the topic and confirmed that the ideas had been captured. Director Burke thanked all for attending.

The meeting adjourned at 7:36 pm.