



Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee
Monday, August 15, 2016, 4:30 – 6:30 pm
Board Office Conference Room, John Stanford Center

MINUTES

1. **Call to Order:** Director Rick Burke called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

a. Directors Burke, Geary, Pinkham and Harris were present.

b. **Approval of Agenda:**

Dir. Burke called for a motion to approve the agenda. Dir. Geary so moved. Dir. Pinkham seconded. The agenda was approved unanimously.

c. **Approval of Minutes:**

Dir. Burke thanked the minute taker for the thorough minutes from the last meeting, and called for a motion to approve the minutes. Director Pinkham so moved. Dir. Geary seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Dir. Burke welcomed Nate Van Duzer, the new Director of Policy, Board Relations and Special Projects on his first day at Seattle Public Schools (SPS). Mr. Van Duzer comes from the City of Seattle.

2. **Agenda Items:**

a) **BAR for Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook**

Pat Sander and Erin Romanuk provided an overview of this item. Ms. Sander noted that a version of this document was recently approved by the Board in May, then new regulations from the State came out after. Ms. Romanuk noted the House Bill signed by the Governor, and noted that it became law on July 9. Staff decided to make changes this summer to align the Student Rights and Responsibilities (SRR) document to reflect the changes required by law in order to have it ready for school leaders at School Leaders Institute (SLI). Ms. Romanuk noted the changes to: academic term language, non-discretionary vs discretionary discipline and behavior codes, and identifying a timeline on long term suspensions or expulsions.

Dir. Geary noted that the Board Action Report (BAR) section regarding “necessary for action” the language was unclear as to the necessity and asked that the BAR be updated to reflect changes to explicitly state that these changes were legally required. Staff noted the request.

Dir. Burke asked how often legislation changes are lagged from the changes that SPS makes. Ms. Romanuk noted that when documents are prepared for changes, the process starts early to incorporate for feedback and discussion, and noted that in this case, it was the best attempt to get ahead of it as possible. Staff did not want to wait a full year to make these changes. Mr. Boy noted this is the first year that legislation made changes that would need to be made in the actual SRR document, and that it was more specific this year. Ms. Sander noted that the matrix had to be adjusted.

Dir. Burke recommended shifting the future edit renewal date of this document. Ms. Romanuk noted that it was beneficial to have done much of the work before hand, to be able to conduct trainings at SLI prior to the school year starting.

Dir. Harris questioned if SPS has shared this with other districts in the Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA) because SPS is the biggest district in the state, and she would like to share this so other districts can use this, and to be able to tap in to them to not reinvent the wheel. Ms. Romanuk noted that she has not shared this outside the district, and would explore this.

Dir. Burke asked which bodies of work in the district are using the original and which are using this updated version. Ms. Romanuk noted the timeline in moving forward with translations prior to these most recent changes being mandated. She noted that the English versions and the matrix are this updated versions, as the matrix did not need translation. She noted that the "basic rules" portion are the version approved in the spring. However, the non-English versions will not be the updated version, and that SPS will have a translated document that outlines the changes that were made, but the entire document will not be translated due to cost and time. Ms. Sander noted that the SRR document will be on the District website on September 8, 2016.

Dir. Pinkham asked for the costs associated with executing the changes outlined in the SRR. Mr. Boy noted that the expectations for educational services are great, and that we are waiting for guidelines, as they are essentially unfunded at this point. He noted that SPS need guidance as to what is required at this time, and noted that it is a difficult proposition to meet the legal requirements by the school year. Dir. Pinkham asked to update in the BAR regarding the mention of August 1st, as it is now past that date.

DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE: Dir. Burke asked for a motion. Dir. Geary made a motion to move this item forward to the full Board for approval, incorporating the requested changes. Dir. Pinkham seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

b) BAR for Policy 2090, Program Evaluation & Assessment/Policy 2163, Supports & Interventions

Eric Anderson gave an overview of the BAR for Policy 2090 and 2163. He noted the original version of the policy covered program evaluation and assessment, and as they are different functions, it would be cleaner to have separate policies. Dr. Anderson noted that Policy 2090 is focused purely on evaluation. He noted the changes to language in strategic goals on improvement and eliminating opportunity gaps, noted Board Director input, evaluating programs annually, and the annual report. Dr. Anderson noted that due to program mapping and review being under consideration as Goal 3, there is lack of clarity on internal review process for this year and future years. He noted that a Superintendent Procedure would be appropriate at that time.

Dir. Burke noted Dir. Peters' concerns with language that was taken out. Mr. Tolley noted that the language wasn't incorporated as intended, and will be looked into.

Dir. Burke noted the relationship with this policy, the Superintendent Procedure and Superintendent SMART Goal 3, and asked what is the timeline for by which this work becomes something tangible for staff, principals and students. Dr. Anderson noted that this pilot year may not be the best to define that, but perhaps developing the plan in late spring, early summer and then to begin initial activities in the fall.

Dir. Burke noted that from his point of view, there is a clear charge to begin the work and a lot of enthusiasm to push the work forward.

Dir. Pinkham asked if within Policy 2163, if it should include language to "see Policy 2090." Dr. Anderson noted there is a cross reference section at the bottom that they could add it to.

Dir. Geary asked if there was a Superintendent Procedure involved at all. Dr. Anderson noted that was the intent, and that they will start to draft that for discussion in September.

Directors noted that it's broad in its approach and would be nice to see a Superintendent Procedure along with it to see how it works. Dir. Burke asked if the Superintendent Procedure can also be presented to the September 12 C&I Policy Committee meeting. Staff made note of the request.

Erinn Bennett noted an upcoming discussion on flushing out SMART Goal 3, and that perhaps a Superintendent Procedure should wait until that discussion has happened. Mr. Tolley noted that these two policies have been moving together and would be best to move them forward simultaneously.

Regarding Policy 2163, Dir. Burke noted the specific language changes from Dir. Peters, and asked if anything else had come up for the Directors. He further noted this is the meat and potatoes of the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and is a particularly important body of work. Cashel Toner noted the objective was to bring clarity to Policies 2163 and 2090, while not losing the intention of either. She discussed what was added (as listed in the track changes document) and read through each addition. She noted discussions of capturing the language from Policy 2090 that is being moved over to Policy 2163. Ms. Toner noted closing the feedback loop with families in the last paragraph. She further discussed the spirit of what staff were trying to do with the carryover of language from Policy 2090 to Policy 2163, and asked Directors for feedback.

Dir. Geary noted that the semi colon, punctuation, formatting and structure of the policy are not consistent in the document, which makes it unclear and not parallel. Staff made note.

Dir. Harris noted that most people in this room are familiar with what formative assessments and common screening assessments mean, however, parents may not understand what is being talked about or what MTSS is. She noted that these policies need to pass the average parent "sniff test" for their level of understanding. Dir. Harris would like things to be made clear to the taxpayers, the parents, the community.

Dir. Burke noted his appreciation for that ask, and further requested that an assessment definition document be created to clarify what is an assessment, what is the scope, how does it affect the kids and the families. Dir. Burke asked Dir. Harris for some take home work to formulate some language to provide to staff. Dir. Geary noted that where it says "core principles," that she would like it to also state what the core principals actually are, to make sure everything is explained. Wyeth Jessee noted the complexity of the assessments even for experts, and that he was working on a document to where the general public can understand terms and also working on a communication platform around a way to communicate. Mr. Jessee noted that Brent Jones is working on going out to the constituents to see what is resonating and what is not, to try to get to a place where there can be a published product.

Dir. Burke noted that the building level of depth and clarity in Policy 2163 might undermine the level of intervention they are looking for, and they need to decide if it would be in another policy. Mr. Tolley noted the need to cross reference the different policies to give clarity and definition between policies. He noted that there is value with having that information contained within both policies.

Dir. Burke asked for clarity on if there should be two policies and asked what is that body of work that can be done this year. Dir. Geary noted the resolution regarding assessments, and many different pieces that need to be aligned. She asked if the policy is definitional or directional. Mr. Tolley noted it would take a period of time to do the research and the work around two different

policies and that the C&I Policy Committee work plan is already ambitious as it is now, and perhaps would need to move to next year.

Dir. Harris asked if the points made are high enough priority to be moved up on the list of priorities within the work plan. Dir. Geary noted that assessments seem to be a wrench in the wheel every year, and asked if this is going to continue or can the work be done and not have this turmoil take up time and energy. She noted that the public is looking to the Board to get this work done. Mr. Tolley noted the community engagement time as well, and with the rest of the work that it would need, it would be about a years' worth of work.

Dir. Burke asked if he and Dr. Anderson could work directly to come up with a plan with a goal to have Policies 2090 and 2163 move forward next month, and then an assessments policy start being worked on separately. Dir. Geary noted that race and equity assessment as well as the community engagement need to be considered. Erinn Bennett noted that she would like to be included on the work group.

Dir. Harris asked again about something getting bumped from the work plan to get this on it. Mr. Tolley noted that there are other policies on the Work Plan that have timelines, especially with the 24-credit work, that cannot be moved ahead of this new policy development.

DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE: School Board Policies 2090 and 2163 will not move forward to the August 24 full Board meeting. They will be reconsidered at the next C&I Policy Committee meeting on September 12, 2016.

c) **BAR for Team Read Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)**

Kathleen Vasquez provided an overview of the action report, and noted that this is for a grant exceeding \$250,000. She noted that Team Read is a tutorial program situated within SPS, that works to support students reading below grade level. Ms. Vasquez noted that Team Read raises their own funding for 11 SPS schools, which they offer in the form of this grant. Maureen Massey noted the agreement lays out the framework of the acceptance of those funds, the opportunity of the program in SPS in support of the students that are engaged in the program, and that the MOU is for 5 years, so as to not come back to the Board every year for the approval of the grant. She described the after school and summer reading program as being focused on 2nd and 3rd grade students that are reading below grade level. She noted that the program is embedded in the district to allow SPS to align with curriculum and instruction and give those students who need support to get it in the classrooms. Ms. Massey noted that what is unique about this program is they recruit, hire and train teenagers that are secondary students within the district as reading coaches. She further described the screening, hiring and training process. Ms. Massey noted that there are approximately 425-450 eighth to twelfth graders who provide support. She noted that Team Read recently adopted a 5-year strategic plan to expand the number of school and students being served, and it's being brought forth to the Board now due to the current agreement being old.

Dir. Burke asked if bell times impacted this work. Ms. Massey said that it is a separate discussion, and that yes, it will have impacts on the program.

Dir. Harris noted data sharing is an issue with the public, and asked if the data sharing piece has been layered in to this contract. Mr. Boy and Ms. Massey noted that yes it is within the document.

Dir. Harris noted her pleasure to hear that SPS teenagers receive their first paycheck from Team Read and also are learning skills that are valuable and can be compensated for. She suggested having some of those students come and present at the Board meeting. Ms. Massey noted that they would love to include the student voices. She noted there are choices for the students in the means to which they are compensated, and described the options that teenagers can choose. Ms. Massey also noted that the teenagers are drawn from the same communities from the schools that

they serve. She noted principals are happy that there are students of color that have had successes within SPS, are now teaching other students of color.

Dir. Geary asked if the contract states five years, as it was unclear. Ms. Massey clarified that it is not currently written that way, and is up for discussion and decision by the Board. Dir. Geary noted the differences in coming to the Board annually or in five years, depending how it's written.

Dir. Harris asked if there are other five year rolling over contracts like this to reference. She also asked if the five-year plan was due to fundraising efforts. It was confirmed, yes it was to raise money. Mr. Boy noted other contracts of five years, where there is continued work and that changes would not be made to the services. He noted that it is rarer, but there are quite a few that have been done at the 5-year level for those positive historical relationships with no significant changes. Dir. Harris noted that she would like to know which contracts are the longer term, and where on the cycle are they within each of those long term contracts. Mr. Boy noted that he will work on a list.

Dir. Burke noted that even with a five year MOU, there is an annual cancellation clause written in. Supt. Nyland noted the food services contract is a multi-year contract. Mr. Tolley noted that they can bring examples at the time of the introduction to the full Board. Dir. Geary noted a longer term contract at Aki Kurose.

Dir. Pinkham noted that within the contract where it states discipline records are being shared and was concerned on potentially cross referencing these lists. Ms. Massey noted that the teenagers screening process for the applicants are the discipline records in question, so that they meet the minimum qualifications on grade, discipline and attendance. She noted these teenagers are working with 2nd and 3rd graders to make sure that they will be able to be a positive role model. Ms. Massey further clarified that it was not the 2nd and 3rd grade students whose discipline records were being referenced, so the cross referencing question would not be an issue. Dir. Pinkham noted a need to show that SPS is keeping the data safe, and to follow up to ensure that the data is secure. Ms. Massey noted that this MOU has the standard contract language as all data sharing agreements have.

Dir. Pinkham noted perhaps needing to change the standard contract. Directors discussed options on this. Dir. Burke suggested connecting with the correct staff on that piece. Dir. Harris asked if we are talking about young people having access to this data. Ms. Massey clarified absolutely not, the teenagers do not have access to the elementary student records. Dir. Harris asked if that could be incorporated in the documents for clarity. Ms. Massey noted that the teenagers only see the student name, the teacher's name and the reading level, and noted that the teacher provides guidance with the strategies that they want the teenagers to focus on.

DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE: Dir. Burke asked for a motion to move this forward. Geary noted to move forward with consideration by the full Board, as amended with the need to address some data concerns and contract terms. Dir. Burke seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Standing Agenda Items

a) **SMART Goal #1, MTSS-B**

Ms. Sander provided an overview of the district TRI-Day, the four-hour district event on September 1. She noted the day is built on relationships and resiliency. She discussed the training facilitators and building administrators who will also facilitate. Ms. Sander noted that it will be developed out of the positive beliefs, relationships, learning and partnerships. She further noted that the training contains district data and student voice, the Student Rights & Responsibilities document, the student and staff discussions, a section on research and evaluation on school climate, the student climate survey and social and emotional belonging. Ms. Sander noted the end activity will be school climate goal, in which the Seattle Education Association (SEA) wanted a

piece incorporated to have a commitment to action for each staff member in regards to a school climate goal. She noted that they will revisit this in October. Ms. Sander noted the video she saw today, which was a tear jerker, and discussed the incredible work done since spring. She noted all of the people that have done the work to put this together. Ms. Sander noted it will be available on Thing Link, a format with links where facilitators will pull up the links and/or videos.

Dir. Geary asked if these would be made accessible. Ms. Sander noted that just after the first of September. Ms. Sander noted the staff involvement for TRI-day and working with Pegi McEvoy to get the rest of staff involved and on board with what is being put out there. Ms. Sander noted “job alike activities” that staff will participate in, within the areas of special education, physical education, and native curricula options. She noted that the training will be on the August 24th, 25th and 29th. Ms. Sander noted that facilitators will be paid for the training and the preparation time.

Bernardo Ruiz noted the applications received for the racial equity teams, and that training will start at the end of October or early November. Mr. Ruiz noted the strong partnership with MENDR and the University of Washington, they are continuing to look for meaningful ways to participate in activities that produce results. Based on the research from the MENDR grant, Mr. Ruiz noted that they will look at best practices on disproportionality in discipline. He noted that the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) states that ten people are required per year to participate in the racial equity team.

Dir. Burke asked if that is minimum or maximum number of participants. Mr. Ruiz noted that it is the exact number written in to the CBA. Dir. Harris asked for estimate on receiving information on best practices. Mr. Ruiz noted that they have just started discussions, and that perhaps in January he will have results to share. Ms. Sander noted that they are working on pilot schools this year, and discussed the communication between staff to get the partnership going. Dr. Anderson noted that this is a practice partnership to work closely with two schools and then looking further at strategies to disseminate best practices once the work has been done.

b) Special Education Update

Mr. Jessee noted the website update, as feedback was received that constituents felt the site was too complex. He noted the work over the last six months on the website with staff and parent feedback. Mr. Jessee noted the draft of the new website, and that it is a product that is logical, sequential and parent friendly. He noted that it is a large improvement and they will continue to make updates, and is currently over 200 pages in hard copy. The site will be live in early September. Mr. Jessee pointed out that it has specific help links and who to contact on every page.

Mr. Jessee noted that Parent Partners is up and running, and that there are now 13. He noted the continued search for more diversity within the demographics. Mr. Jessee noted teaming up with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) on that as well.

Mr. Jessee noted that with OSPI, SPS has heard back for the five regions approved on the MOU. He noted that there are four verification activities left to complete, which are being worked on now. He noted that the timelines have been difficult to meet. Mr. Jessee noted some internal work at the district on discipline practices, and timelines for district wide policies and practices to be implemented. Mr. Jessee noted an extension that was received in order to continue the work through the fall.

Mr. Jessee discussed the therapeutic services item that he sent to the Board as an update a week ago. He noted that SPS initiated the request for qualifications for in tandem services with an outside agency to provide expertise in this specialized area, to support district employees, therapist, psychiatrist, and educators as wrap-around services. He is looking to close that Request for Proposal (RFP) process in a couple of weeks.

Dir. Geary asked if there will be a Board Action Report. Mr. Jessee noted that they are waiting to hear back from multiple services on their proposals so are not yet at the action report stage.

Dir. Harris asked about the NW SOIL contract. Mr. Jessee noted that a lot of work has been done, discussed placement of student to specific services, and noted the choice by the parent/guardian takes precedence. Mr. Jessee noted that even if SPS backs out of the contract, we still may be held to maintain that student while we look for alternate placement. He noted a joint letter that was drafted to clarify what SPS and NW SOIL are doing to support the students. Mr. Jessee noted needing to continue to work with them, and that the IEP would have to follow the intervention plan and emergency protocol. He is working on them with regard to prone restraints. Mr. Jessee noted this is a multi-state healthcare system, and there are many people who need to give approval on language changes, and it has taken weeks so far. He hopes to have this move to the Audit & Finance committee this Thursday for re-approval of the NW SOIL contract at the Board meeting on August 24th.

Dir. Geary noted an issue she has heard from the parent population in regards to a document from NW SOIL that states that they have the right to use restraint, and that by the parent signing that document that they are agreeing to the restraint, regardless of what the IEP states. Mr. Jessee handed out the referenced document that the parents sign to provide clarity on this misunderstanding. He read the behavior management policy on the form, and clarified that what is written is in conjunction with the law, and noted that an escort is not physical restraint.

Dir. Harris asked if SPS have brought some of our other partners to discuss this form. Mr. Jessee noted the understanding for doing that, and that this is such a unique placement, and that it comes down to a parent's individual placement to these partners. Mr. Jessee noted that this is why SPS is adding therapeutic services. Dir. Harris noted the need to hold hands with those who speak the loudest, and to not be reactionary. Mr. Jessee noted that there are many parents that are engaged in this process, and it is public knowledge, therefore is sufficient at this point. He noted that there will be more parent engagement as the therapeutic services contract is solidified.

4. **Board Policies and Procedures**

a) **Policy E14.04, Research Activity and Test Administration**

Eric Anderson provided an overview of this policy, and noted that it has come up for discussion at the last few committee meetings. He noted that if we do a stand-alone policy on assessment as discussed earlier, that there would be an impact on this policy. Dr. Anderson noted that hiring Dr. Beaver has given more capacity to the department and that work has been done to revamped the intake process, revise the website process, clear internal process and they held the first research review committee last week. Dr. Beaver did her due diligence and continues to communicate with various staff and departments to gather high level analysis and red flags, and discuss as a committee to make further recommendations. Dr. Anderson noted that Principals have the right to refuse, unless mandated by the Superintendent. He noted that documents were sent out to principals via the Principal Communicator to let them know the process. Dr. Anderson discussed the principal approval process, the language involving protections involving federal laws, and due diligence on human subjects and student data. Mr. Tolley noted that he is seeking input on the current language written in the policy. Dir. Burke wanted to see how this can be moved forward. He also asked what work is taking place currently, and what is the fiscal impact. Dr. Anderson noted the guidelines on the assessments and the processes, which is located on the website. He noted the piloting of new programs is not something that is part of the research review, and that external researchers are conducting the research. Dir. Burke asked what is the value add for our students of this work, and how does it contribute to our mission. Dr. Anderson noted many principals are in favor of doing the research. He said it's set up with a rubric with categories for moving forward with research. Dr. Anderson noted that SPS isn't trying to micromanage, and there could be more layers of oversight, or more guidance to school leaders. Mr. Tolley noted the

intent is to receive the reports and use the outcomes to improve our practices. Dr. Anderson noted a research review that will be conducted quarterly, and dissemination the findings and communication to the public.

Dir. Geary noted there is no requirement that the research results be provided to the district written in on this document. Dr. Anderson noted that he will add that in. Dir. Geary asked about the application and if it is necessary to write in the academic benefit. Dr. Anderson said it does say “does this align to the strategic priorities” and “what are the direct benefits to the school district” on the application.

Dir. Harris noted that the contextual information is very important to send to the whole Board. She noted that she doesn’t see Building Leadership Team (BLT) anywhere in there, and some parents have this as a hot topic if their kids are “Guinea pigs.” Dir. Harris noted the need to have the contextual information before she can advocate for this in the community.

Dir. Burke noted the levels of complexity within this good body of work, and suggested that perhaps this body of work should not take precedence. Dir. Geary noted that the work is being done this way already. Dr. Anderson confirmed that it has been taking place and they have put other process improvements in place.

Dir. Harris asked Mike Starosky if the school leaders know what research is being done throughout the district. Mr. Starosky noted that they do not.

Dir. Burke noted the linkage between district practices and building level practices. Dir. Burke asked for a recommendation for when this could come back to the committee, perhaps next year.

Mr. Tolley noted that it would be helpful to summarize the vetting process that has been put in place and the improvements in screening and approval processes could be placed in a Friday Memo.

Dir. Burke wants to be explicit on internal needs and program placement, and this work is paying it forward to benefit us, but that it’s not a top priority for our current resources.

Dr. Anderson noted direct and indirect benefits involved, and that research is a part of the educational landscape. He noted that they are doing due diligence to make sure research is not being done that is not relevant and not adding value, but that crafting guidelines is important in moving forward.

b) Superintendent Procedures 2190SP, Highly Capable Services & Advanced Learning Programs

Mr. Jessee provided an overview of this Superintendent Procedure. He noted that it’s a new procedure coming forward to clarify language in procedures, oversight, and making sure they are in alignment with what is actually happening. He noted 6 primary changes in this document which were based on input from 60 stakeholders in last month and from district conversations. Mr. Jessee noted that there hasn’t been full agreement among the 60 stakeholders, and are trying to find solutions to have better communication with families. They are working hard as a team to create an assessment schedule that works and has efficiencies, clear understanding, clear communication to families and meeting enrollment timelines.

Stephen Martin noted since the last meeting they had received feedback and have continued to adjust the document. He noted the ask to move through the equity tool, a community engagement period (60 responses that closed July 31), and to look again at a recommendation for waivers, and also discussed some language adjustments.

Dir. Harris asked if this is a new document that they have been given tonight. Mr. Martin states that it was new and was disseminated to the whole Board with the packet.

Dir. Burke noted the discussion that he had was that there is more work to be done for the pieces of advanced learning offerings, and noted that he hears it internally and from the community that there is no clarity of vision or guidance that should be associated with an advanced learning policy. He is concerned that we are micromanaging a Superintendent Procedure that isn't even under Board review, because we are addressing equity issues. Dir. Burke noted that this is a topic that can get hotly debated, yet these incremental changes have been discussed for a year and a half. He noted that even now, he's uncomfortable moving forward, as there is no unity as a Board and staff to approach this work. Dir. Burke wants to capture and institutionalize classroom success, and provide enough oversight that if it goes rogue corrections could be applied. He noted Dir. Geary's comment about a waiver, and that when things are outside of the box, there isn't always a way of capturing that.

Dir. Geary asked about the work that needs to be done, and with regards to program definitions. She noted that Policy 2190 does a lot to provide education to highly capable students, and with respect to self-contained classrooms and self-pacing. Dir. Geary asked if there is a need for a waiver, if the policy gives a series of options? Or is that information contained in the student enrollment plan?

Dir. Burke noted the self-contained cohort option is available in grades 1-8, which is subject to interpretation. The specificity in the procedure is what guides this discussion. Dir. Geary asked who has the authority of that. Mr. Tolley noted that it depends on how it has been interpreted over time, and how the advisory committee has interpreted it. Mr. Martin noted that it was brought up in May and June, and that some respondents think it should be celebrated as an acknowledgement of how equity and diversity are goals of the district, with innovative ways to address the questions. Mr. Tolley asked Mr. Martin how the committee interpreted the language. Mr. Martin noted that it was mixed, however the tradition in schools is that students were not self-contained all day, every day. It has been practice that they move throughout the day in the cohort. Kari Hanson noted that all students are blended for orchestra and band. She noted that the district has had the policy of self-contained for certain subject, but that it was not a state requirement.

Mr. Jessee noted self-contained is not a designation on to itself. There is no way you'll have a class that is truly self-contained. Mr. Jessee noted that it goes against the equity policy to segregate the kids. He noted the Superintendent Procedure is to get us to do the day to day work as the school year approaches. He also noted that the policy is a good place to put us right next to the equity policy, it's a large body of work, and we are open to talking about that. Mr. Jessee noted that we have an October 5 work session on that, that we can get clarity from the Board on next steps and commitment to moving forward at that work session. He noted that today we are talking about a Superintendent Procedure with little changes, and there is a waiver. Mr. Jessee noted that we work for the families, and they want to do this and to have innovation in the classrooms. He noted that the waiver is to highlight that it is happening and that there is a centralized process.

Principal May clarified that they are ready to begin the work, and noted that it has been a topic with the equity team, parents and staff. She noted that this will be third year, they have it down and are ready to make it work with assessments in every grade level.

Mr. Jessee noted it enriches the social and emotional needs as well.

Dir. Harris noted site base management and oversight. She hears from the public that if we continue to polarize these issues that they will become ugly and painful.

Mr. Jessee noted that his recommendation is to move forward with the Superintendent Procedure and the waiver on an annual basis, and allow for innovation be rewarded at the site level. He summarized that the policy is not reflective of what the Board wants and asked whether this is a racially charged policy. Dir. Burke noted that to be very specific we are looking to serve the kids, and he appreciates that this is brought forth, even if it's not a Board approved document. However, he noted that we cannot get on the same page without rewriting the document, and that needs to be done at the work session.

Dir. Burked asked if we are serving the students of Thurgood Marshall with this work or are we denying them opportunity and the body of work that has already been done to put this in place. He noted that it seems like there is not enough justification to make the work stop, but that we have to be explicit to address public perception around disbanding the program and other concerns down the stream. Dir. Burke would feel better if we had a scheduled meeting on advanced learning work session- for the work of the Board to do vision aligning on advanced learning and the advanced spectrum. He recommends to let Thurgood Marshall go on with their work, and to make sure they inform the district of their practices. Dir. Geary is happy with that resolution. Dir. Geary noted the policy says that all students will have equitable access to programs and services, and we are getting close to that, but we should say "all learners based on their willingness to participate in that level of challenge."

Dir. Pinkham noted the definitions around self-contained, and that there seems to be an issue of these definitions. He asked about the parents who put their child in a school based program thinking it offers services, and then later the school doesn't have the program. Mr. Jessee noted that this happens in every school and every class, and they need to be mindful of the interpretations on the policy.

c) Policy D121.00, Student Activities General Standards & Regulations

Mike Starosky noted his follow up on Policy D121.00, and the last time the committee met in June, he agreed to review this document. He noted that it's a big animal since it is so ambiguous. Mr. Starosky noted the discussion on this outdated, redundant and obsolete policy. Mr. Starosky noted this could fall under an umbrella policy, as Directors had suggested, but that it does get more complex. He noted Dir. Burke made note to not get rid of it, and to mitigate risk. Mr. Starosky noted the spirit and intent was to give students access to activities, but what it talks about is a manual that we don't use and can't track down. He discussed issues related to Associated Student Body (ASB), money and decision making, Student Rights and Responsibilities, building use permits, students supervision, security, budget & finance, safety & security, and site based decision making. He noted various series policies that this could fall under or have something to do with this specific policy. Mr. Starosky is asking the Board how far they want him to go with this, what is the problem we are trying to solve?

Dir. Geary asked what families would bring to us that this would speak to, and do we have something out there that says we want to encourage non-profit social activities, and to what decision making processes are present? Mr. Starosky noted there are policies that exist that speak to that decision making. He noted the equally important piece is who is responsible for making the decision and the supervision, ultimately it's the principal or their designee. Supt. Nyland encourages us to follow the line that Dir. Geary is on, do we have another policy that addresses these. He noted that closing the opportunity gaps and relationships is where we are heading. Supt. Nyland noted there is research outside of Seattle which states there is an opportunity gap with access to extracurricular activities. He noted the anonymous donor that provided funds towards the "pay to play," which now allows for more access. Supt. Nyland noted there are after school activities issues for special education students. He noted a quote from Jeffrey Canada regarding extracurricular activities, stating that every child deserves a good childhood including extracurricular activities. Supt. Nyland suggested to look to see what policy we already have that we can add to without getting too deep in to this.

Erinn Bennett noted that if everything lives somewhere, that we can repeal this policy instead of coming up with a new number. Dir. Geary would like to see extra-curricular being accessible. Mr. Starosky noted that this gives more breadth to what this original work was trying to get to. He will continue down the path and look more specifically in the 3000's policies and he will work with Nate Van Duzer on this.

5. **Special Attention Items**

a) **K-5 English Language Arts (ELA) Adoption Update**

Ms. Vasquez informed them that the field testing will begin very shortly of the three finalists. The teachers that volunteered were assigned different vendors and grade levels to acquire the materials to review. Ms. Vasquez discussed the timelines and the challenges that they have faced in the adoption selection process. She noted that school leaders can attend professional development next week to get a bird's eye view for what training goes with each of the vendor materials. She extends that invitation to the Board, and can provide the locations throughout the district. Ms. Vasquez noted challenges with vacation schedules within the purchasing department and with the vendors over the summer months. She suggested that in the future they have a different process with level of access directly to vendors, as the committee has a better sense of the questions on materials. Ms. Vasquez noted another challenge is that one is a full robust MTSS model, with various tiers and assessments, and it's being compared financially and curriculum-wise with resources that aren't as strong. She noted that there are large price variations that we will have to face. Ms. Vasquez noted that it really isn't comparing apples to apples, as one is much more robust which better allows implementation of a full MTSS model in a classroom with a lot of flexibility.

Dir. Geary noted a past conversation about one being over budget, and asked if that one was weeded out. Ms. Vasquez noted that the materials she was just referencing is the one that is over budget, and it wasn't weeded out at this point. She noted that it couldn't have been foreseen as the price tags were not known at the beginning of the process. Ms. Vasquez noted that materials have changed dramatically over time with online options, additional resources, etc. She noted that there is a lot of thought around the next adoption process that comes up, including to reevaluate the purchasing department's role, to provide greater collaboration early on, and to have more opportunities to weed out what these materials are before we are so far down the path.

Dir. Geary asked if in doing the analysis is there a savings to be seen in the long run. She further asked how the economic evaluation is done to be aligned with our SMART goals. Ms. Vasquez's recommendation is to move forward with the current evaluation process, and make adjustments in the next adoption process. Dir. Geary asked if the curriculum that gives most access to the general education students, also has specialized design instruction built in to it. Ms. Vasquez noted that it is also designed to support higher level learners as well. She noted that teachers have a lot of access to resources to support underperforming students in the same classroom as those students that need more of a challenge.

Dir. Burke noted the instructional materials have so many resources that it can become cumbersome, and the tools are rendered useless. He noted that if we can get 80% of our needs met, instead of 120%, and be cost effective, we can build the other 20% within the district.

Dir. Pinkham asked if multi-tiered systems of support were built in their scope when looking for materials. Ms. Vasquez noted that it wasn't in the ask, but it was part of the scope of some vendors' materials, and some are far more complete in that arena. She noted that in the field test they will be able to sit through two days of professional development to determine how challenging it could be to implement.

Dir. Burke asked if the MTSS was required to be included in their program or if they could choose specific components. Ms. Vasquez noted that some parts and pieces could be moved, but that the overall systems would be hard to do with the strong assessment component, which is what made it individualized MTSS instruction. She noted that they tried to ask for removing pieces to get the price down, but that teachers had already seen the other materials and evaluated based on what they saw, not on what would be pulled away in the field test in order to assess again. Ms. Toner thanked Ms. Vasquez for her work on the process in the summer, and the work to restore trust from teachers and through the changes in the C&I department.

Dir. Geary asked if the teachers have been prepped on the cost of this, and where will the trust go after that information is known. Ms. Vasquez noted that we will work through it with the committee, and that we need to vet it and let it play out to gather the necessary data, and that there is another really attractive option as well.

b) C&I Work Plan

Dir. Burke discussed looking at priorities, and it is important to get Policies 2415/2420 in to the works. He noted that the work plan for September is pretty tough, and looks unachievable. Ms. Bennett noted that the small work session will impact this, and that there may be a recommendation for changes after the work session. Supt. Nyland noted the 20-minute issue could go through audit and finance or operations. He noted that it's on a tight timeframe and we need to know by October 1 when SPS needs to run busses as part of the bus contract. He discussed the options to add the twenty minutes of instructional time. Supt. Nyland noted that with the 24 credits implementation, that is a big one to move forward for 2017/18, but there might need to be an interim plan to work on this year.

Dir. Geary asked about the waiver on that process. Nyland noted that we are already in the waiver year, and that the students coming in in 2017 will have to meet the requirement. He noted that if a student fails a class, they will be in the hole on credits, therefore they are working on a plan with forgiveness built in to it. Supt. Nyland noted that Mr. Tolley is working with Ruth Medsker and Jill Hudson to see how this be implemented. Mr. Tolley noted a work session on September 28th around this subject.

Dir. Geary noted the need for creative and flexible options with online, summer school and other methods. Mr. Tolley noted the task force received recommendations from the principals wanting to explore how we truly meet the needs of our students, and then working on the schedule to support that. Dir. Burke noted that the policies in regards to these items will come to committee after the Board has their work session, which will allow to receive further feedback and have discussion from the full Board and staff.

Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

Decision/Follow Up Items
1. Decision: BAR for Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook - <i>The Committee moved this item forward with a recommendation for approval, with requested edits, by the full School Board.</i>
2. Decision: BAR for Policy 2090, Program Evaluation & Assessment/Policy 2163, Supports & Interventions - <i>The Committee decided to bring these Policies to the September 12, 2016 Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee for further review.</i>
3. Decision: BAR for Team Read MOU - <i>The Committee moved this item forward to the full School Board with a recommendation for consideration.</i>