

# Board Special Meeting

2445 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue South, Seattle WA 98124



## **Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee**

Monday, October 10, 2016, 4:30 – 6:30 pm

Board Office Conference Room, John Stanford Center

The meeting was called to order at 4:31pm.

Directors Geary, Harris and Pinkham were present. Dir. Burke was unable to attend. Dir. Pinkham served as Chair of the Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee meeting.

Dir. Geary made a motion to approve the agenda. Dir. Harris seconded the motion. The agenda was approved unanimously.

Dir. Geary made a motion to approve the September 12, 2016 meeting minutes as published. Dir. Harris seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

### **Items Requiring Board Action or Informational Board Action Reports**

Annual approval of the written plans of programs or schools using the alternative learning experience model.

Michael Tolley introduced the principals of the alternative learning experience (ALE) models. He noted that School Board policy was amended to add Nova and Middle College. Policy 2255 requires on an annual basis, Seattle Public Schools (SPS) approves the school plans and the draft reports, as listed in the packet. He noted the timeline of the additional information from Nova and Middle College that will be present prior to introduction to the whole Board. Mr. Tolley noted the attached checklist of requirements within state law, and noted the verification process for particular concerns. He noted that the school principals were present today to answer Director questions.

Dir. Harris asked the status of the audit regarding ALE. Mr. Tolley asked if she was referring to the Interagency Audit back to 2012 school year. He noted that the auditors were looking at concerns involving parent signatures for students who were in many cases homeless. The issue has been corrected, and a new process has been put in to place. He noted that the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) was doing a final review. Mr. Tolley noted that he does not have a final update beyond it going to OSPI. Sherri Kokx noted that process wise, the auditors from OSPI make a final recommendation to the state on what SPS would be charged for in terms of specific findings, and the next steps will be reviewed and there will be a final cost to be paid to the state.

Dir. Harris asked about stakeholder participation at Middle College, and how are we making the circle bigger with the community and parents to strengthen this program? Jennifer Kniseley took note of the request. Dir. Geary clarified that Dir. Harris' request is that she would want an extra piece added to the plans for the ALE schools, and that Middle College has a heavy lift presently.

Dir. Geary asked Mr. Tolley about this checklist and felt that the Board had recently looked at these documents. Nate Van Duzer noted that the new schools were approved by the Board this summer, so that these documents for the new schools would look familiar to them. Dir. Geary asked if these are state forms or developed by the district. Mr. Tolley noted that these were created about 8 years ago by the district. Dir. Geary asked to add some internal requests on the forms beyond what the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) mandates. Mr. Tolley asked if they referred to Board member input or community input, and that perhaps the form could be changed so that the principals are not having to recreate the form. Mr. Tolley noted that there could be a section added on the forms for additional attachments. Dir. Harris noted to add additional information to the form instead of amending the form. Dir. Geary asked about Policy 2255 reports, and noted that the two new schools were not included. Mr. Tolley noted that it is because the reports are from last year, and the new schools were not ALE schools so the information was not available at this time. Dir. Geary noted on number 4, she would like to hear additional information for next year as to the progression of the goals for the new ALE schools, and not wait until next year. She suggested a one-page snap shot. Mr. Tolley noted they could have that information presented at introduction. Mr. Tolley noted that question 5 is from the previous year, and the schools weren't ALE last year, so they did not respond to that section.

Dir. Harris noted that there is nowhere listed that Middle College is a service school, and then it is going to be changed in the Student Assignment Plan. She suggested training for the enrollment planning department on the differences. Mr. Tolley noted that Enrollment Services, which is responsible for admissions, could have some training on this. He noted that Enrollment Services department is different from the Enrollment Planning department, for clarity. Mr. Tolley noted that he will work with enrollment services/admissions to train on how these service schools serve our students.

Directors asked for a background and update from the Principals of each of the ALE schools.

Principal Owen Gondor from the Cascade Partnership Program noted that his school is considered a K-12, but actually serves K-8. He noted that up until 5 years ago there was high school on campus, but it was let go of, as it was not serving students well. Principal Gondor noted that although they moved to K-8 instruction, they held on to the K-12 designation. He noted the number is decreasing in the running start enrollment, and the families are going back to the comprehensive schools. Principal Gondor noted that the parent partnership has been working closely with the home school families on the school plans for the students. He noted some examples of the well-rounded experiences they are receiving. Principal Gondor noted that the parents are required to check in with counselors monthly for certificated oversight, which allows counselors to coordinate resources for the students and families and is another way to serve as a conduit for other community resources. He noted that there are currently 158 students enrolled, and 152 FTE on the October enrollment report. Principal Gondor noted a waitlist of 20 students, due to limited funding to expand the staff, and suggested hiring part time staff in the second quarter. Principal Gondor noted that there are more families that are eager to enroll.

Dir. Pinkham asked if any students that were on the waitlist were allowed in. Principal Gondor noted that yes, at the beginning of the school year, additional families were added from the wait list. Dir. Pinkham asked for the specific number. Principal Gondor noted that he could get that information.

Principal Mark Perry noted that Nova's teaching and learning system has been being developed for 16 years now, and based on state common core standards. He noted the advisory system that

is a 24-1 ratio with teachers to students, multi-graded, and multi aged. Principal Perry noted the highest extended graduation rate, and that the 4-year rate is lower. He noted that the population has changed quite a bit in the last ten years. Principal Perry provided an example that 50% of students are transfer students now, who are behind in credits and don't feel like the other schools have options for them to succeed. He also noted that the students are coming to Nova due to anxiety, mental health reasons, not feeling safe at other school environments, or needing a different kind of learning experience. Principal Perry noted that they typically have 344 students enrolled, and now their enrollment is 331. He noted an issue with enrollment where dates were incorrectly listed for transfer students. Principal Perry noted that at this point, according to a survey, 45% of students identify themselves as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered and queer (LGBTQ), and 27% identify as special education students, both of which are higher than previous years. Principal Perry noted many students have mental health issues. He noted the student surveys have been off the charts with feeling safe at this school- socially, emotionally and physically. He also noted expanding the partnership with Children's Hospital, who comes to Nova once a week, and noted other partnerships for drug and alcohol counseling on-site. Principal Perry noted a program that they are trying to set up to get running start services as well. He noted working on a partnership with a local health center to have LGBQ focused health center to serve all students for four hours a day.

Dir. Geary noted what she has heard in the community about the enrollment issues that were mentioned by Principal Perry.

Principal Jennifer Kniseley noted that at Middle College High School is modeled after a national program. She noted that other programs nationally are knocking it out of the park and it's her vision to have Seattle be a part of those that are successful. Principal Kniseley noted a new funding model with a lot of compliance around written student learning plans, common core standards assessment and the process to create those plans. She noted the professional learning communities are starting up soon, and the focused work on teaching and learning and also following compliance guidelines.

Dir. Geary asked for a summary of the heart of the program. Principal Kniseley noted it is for students who are underserved and underrepresented. She noted that the program works to provide these students with ways to partner with the University of Washington (UW), and other community colleges for a direct partnership, as running start has been challenging. She further noted they are creating a system to nurture the process with these schools. Principal Kniseley noted that the program is a college prep support model, in a sense. She noted they are preparing these students for college, and they intentionally focus on underrepresented and underserved students. Principal Kniseley noted that the reason why students come to this program is the small student/teacher ratio, and the supportive environment. She noted that the classes are no larger than 15 students, and right now are much lower than that.

**DECISION: Dir. Geary made a motion to move this item forward for consideration by the full Board with the suggested additions. Dir. Harris seconded. This motion passed unanimously.**

#### Policy 2030, Service Animals in Schools

Kelli Schmidt noted that the Board Action Report was originally brought to the committee in June, where it was decided there was a need for community engagement. She noted that engagement efforts had been made with principals, district staff, the District's Leadership Team,

public announcement about the proposed policy and procedures change on district website and School Beat. Both contained a link to the Office of Student Civil Rights' webpage with the draft policies and procedure and contact information.

Dir. Harris asked what feedback was received from public. Ms. Schmidt noted there was no feedback received either externally or from internal district staff. Dir. Harris asked if the 609 gave any feedback regarding dogs in schools. Ms. Schmidt noted that there is nothing in the collective bargaining agreements requiring outreach to them. Dr. Clover Codd noted that federal law requires the District to admit service animals, so the District is obligated even if they were to object to service animals in schools.

Dir. Geary noted a concern with receiving no feedback on the community engagement process, and that posting on the website is pretty passive in terms of soliciting feedback from a community who have disabilities, vision impairment, etc. She asked if any Special Education Parent Teacher Student Associations (PTSAs) or other Seattle organizations who are focused on these issues were reached out to, as she didn't see any overt outreach to the groups that connect with those groups. Dir. Geary noted that she can imagine that the community may not feel that this was done with enough outreach or engagement. Ms. Schmidt noted that when looking at the community engagement model, that the level that was decided on was to inform and ask for feedback, especially with the low number of service animals in schools. Dir. Geary noted that the perspective from those who are dealing with these impairment issues, and those experts in the area may feel there is an issue with due diligence. Ms. Schmidt noted the engagement on the front end by reviewing case law, the feedback from the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights, and with there was extensive community input with the creation of the federal law. She noted the limited resources in the district, and that this was the right level of engagement for this topic.

Dir. Geary noted the redline on the policy, that they no longer require the animals to be immunized and licensed, and asked if we add in that it be encouraged, even if it's not required. She noted that if the animals are in our children's populations, that there could be an inquiry and follow up. Ms. Schmidt noted that the policy is not allowed to add that language in, as this is not a school district role, it is the City's role as regulator of the immunizations and licensing. Ms. Schmidt noted the requirements of the federal government, and that enforcing compliance with licensing and immunizations is a city/county function. The thinking here was that we do not want to create a situation where school staff ask impermissible questions or that users of service animals feel that those issues are being used as a pretext for discrimination.

Dir. Pinkham asked why it was in there before. Ms. Schmidt noted that WSSDA had it in there, but the federal government feedback on the policy was to remove it. There is language in the federal ADA that public entities cannot require documentation, such as proof of licensing, and Ms. Schmidt noted that it could be a barrier for those who cannot afford the immunizations.

Dir. Harris noted that she is uncomfortable that the engagement with PTSA of special education was not included, and she noted that the Board has made it very clear that community engagement is a high priority. Dir. Harris noted her understanding of time and resources, and she sees this is not on fire, but we have to have a culture that says we are reaching out. Ms. Schmidt noted that this change is not reactive to any community input, rather it is in response to compliance, and noted that as the policy stands, it is not compliant with federal law. Dir. Harris noted that she would like this information sent to the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC), the special education PTSA and Lighthouse for the Blind via email to seek out input.

Ms. Schmidt asked what she sees as the process for this policy, and what timeline the Directors are looking for. Dir. Harris asked to continue the outreach, but to not delay the Board Action Report. Dir. Geary noted that she trusts that staff can take the extra step and understand internally this need within the district to do this amount of engagement, and not have it be micromanaged.

**DECISION: Dir. Harris made a motion to move this item forward for consideration by the full Board. Dir. Geary seconded. This motion passed unanimously.**

Acceptance of Teacher Principal Evaluation Program (TPEP) iGrant 664

Dr. Clover Codd noted this is the fourth year that this is coming before the Board and provided a timeline of the past Board Action Reports. She noted that this is not a competitive grant, it is an allocation model. Dr. Codd noted that in the action report, there is a budget for what the grant will be used for, and outlined the attachment specifying the training, materials, extra time for teachers, teacher leaders, eVal implementation (online evaluation tool developed by the state). Dir. Harris asked if everyone is on eVal. Dir. Codd noted no, and that there is a three year roll out, and that it will not be mandatory at this time. She noted that in the third year, all will be required to participate in the online evaluation tool. Dr. Codd noted it is only for classroom teachers, not counselors or librarians. She noted the Danielson rubrics for other certificated teachers. Dir. Harris asked about the early year evaluation effectiveness. Dr. Codd noted a survey to get teacher and principal perceptions on the effectiveness that will be conducted.

Lindsay Berger, the TPEP program manager noted that she wants to continue to do further evaluation and collect feedback at the end of all training sessions to support ongoing training opportunities. Dr. Codd noted the 50-member Peer Assistance Review (PAR) community in which various central office leaders and teachers meet monthly to discuss ideas of what is working and what is not working for continuous improvement. Dir. Harris asked for a one pager on how it has worked in the past, how it is evaluated, the implementation of TPEP, additional assessment and accountability. She would like an attachment added to this action report showing where the money was used in the past and where we are going, and why is it effective necessary.

Dir. Pinkham asked about long term substitutes using this process. Dr. Codd noted that it was not mandatory but they could participate in the professional development if they would like, they are not excluded from it. Dir. Harris asked if we were encouraging the substitutes to participate. Dr. Codd noted that she would have to check with the Seattle Education Association (SEA) to see if they are encouraging this. Dr. Codd noted that every time a substitute attends training that we have to pay for extra time and that we cannot get a substitute for another substitute.

Ms. Berger noted that SPS could have substitutes attend the after school trainings through this funding and could be sent out through the SEA Unity newsletter.

**DECISION: Dir. Harris made a motion to move this item forward to the full Board with a recommendation for consideration. Dir. Geary seconded. This motion passed unanimously.**

Repeal Policy D121.00, Student Activities General Standards & Regulations

Mike Starosky noted that this is the third time that this policy has come to committee, and noted that the previous two times were to discuss the redundancy of the policy and the recommendation was to repeal. He was asked to research and provide a recommendation. Mr. Starosky noted 6 different polices that address what this policy had covered. He was asked to produce a Board

Action Report as a formality to repeal this current policy as it is. Mr. Starosky noted that it is an ineffective, outdated and irrelevant policy.

Dir. Geary thanked him for covering all the bases and for his thoroughness. Dir. Harris noted she is in favor of getting rid of redundancy in policies.

**DECISION: Dir. Geary made a motion to move this item forward to the full Board with a recommendation for approval. Dir. Harris seconded. This motion passed unanimously.**

### **Standing Agenda Items**

#### Special Education Update

Wyeth Jessee noted meeting with OSPI and the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), which was a full day meeting where SPS provided documentation from the last meeting in late spring, and further information on what activities have been performed to complete the last Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), and to discuss the four remaining items. He noted that SPS made a lot of progress and that OPSI and OSEP have confidence in what has been done to improve, and noted that there were some system issues. Mr. Jessee noted additional support from the creation of the Student Support Services department, the data management systems updates, and common assessments updates. He noted that the work plans were demonstrated, and well received. Mr. Jessee anticipates the other parties will be back in March to verify the remaining four activities- calculation of least restrictive environment, using schedules, IEPs, etc. He discussed the plans on the areas in which OSPI and OSEP are looking for improvement.

Dir. Geary asked about the technology not communicating well and reporting differently in different places. Mr. Jessee noted taking a preventative stance and training on data entry. Dir. Geary asked if we are making sure there is more than one person per building that can enter this information. Mr. Jessee noted the differences in size of schools, and in the smaller schools it can fall on the principal, and at larger schools it may be an administrative person. Dir. Geary asked about the money still being withheld. Mr. Jessee noted remaining \$500,000 still to come back to the district, and that SPS has 90 days from September 30 to still receive those dollars and that SPS will not be ready to do those necessary activities until January. He noted the level of assurance to meet the standards. Mr. Jessee noted the request to OSPI for an extension and that they would request to OSEP for the extension. He noted that is the current plan as was discussed at this meeting.

Dir. Geary asked if Mr. Jessee feels that they will likely receive the funding back. Mr. Jessee noted that is more important to meet the expectations and get everything right, more so than rush to get the funds back. Dir. Harris asked for a Friday Memo update, as now she feels there is a risk element as to whether the \$500,000 will be received back. She feels that this needs to be transparent, clear and communicated early. Mr. Jessee noted the request. He noted that he has provided updates all along, and will add details from the last meeting, as requested. Mr. Tolley noted that he commends Mr. Jessee's team for their diligent work to receive all of the funds. He noted that he did not feel it was communicated that the district receiving the funds back was a given. Mr. Jessee noted there is nothing to hide, and that perhaps the timeline has been lost in the narrative, and that they have been communicating all along and will add an additional level of detail.

Dir. Geary noted the success of Mr. Jessee's team and a huge credit and not to diminish the

amount of work going in to resolve this issue. Mr. Jessee noted the heavy lift of re-culturing of 99 schools and it was a fast pace to build it one year, and to then see it in schools the next year. Mr. Tolley noted the Superintendent included in the recent Friday Memo that moving forward, Special Education will be moved off of high risk status, but that the district may not necessarily be moved off the high risk grantee status, primarily due to the reasons that lack of supporting systems for the special education department- which will be further discussed at the meeting in March.

Dir. Harris asked about the high risk category, and what are the ramifications. Mr. Tolley noted the example was that the withholding of the \$3million of the funding, but they didn't give any more detail at the meeting. Mr. Jessee noted to put together a proposal of what it would look like, and to take a look back at the original letter that was sent to the district.

#### SMART Goal #1, MTSS-B (Ruiz)

Bernardo Ruiz noted a first retreat for the 2016/17 Race and Equity Team, where they discussed establishing norms, establishing trust, developing a community of unified leaders, understanding School Board policy on equity, the equity tool, strategy to align with strategic plan and SMART goals with the vision and mission of the district to increase student achievement for students of color. He noted a handout that he gave to the Directors. Dir. Harris asked why this wasn't provided ahead of time, as they don't have time to read through it at this meeting. Mr. Ruiz noted it was sent to schools and was not soliciting feedback from the Directors. He brought the document just to inform them of what had been sent out. Mr. Ruiz noted developing a rubric and application for schools to be selected as an Equity Team School. He noted trainings and objectives for those schools. Mr. Ruiz noted the advancement of the work and the professional development for leadership. He noted the three meetings for African American Males Advisory Committee, and the subcommittees where they did backwards mapping to have meaningful recommendations to provide to the Superintendent. Mr. Ruiz highlighted this at the Extended Cabinet meeting, where he discussed the work on stereo type threat and identifying safe work in classrooms. He mentioned Indigenous People's day in the district offices where they watched a TED Talk in the subjects, and had a discussion to improve the ways we visualize and honor Native American students in our schools.

Dir. Harris asked how many meetings have been conducted of the African American Male (AAM) task force. Mr. Ruiz noted that there have been three. Dir. Harris asked if minutes were on the website. Mr. Ruiz noted that they could be put on the website, as he is not sure they are on there as of now. Dir. Harris asked for transparency and have asked this before. Mr. Ruiz noted that he is only sure that they are posted on the SharePoint site, and is unsure of the task force site. Dir. Harris said if it's important enough to do, it should be done well and celebrated.

Dir. Geary asked where this information is found on the website. Mr. Tolley noted he could provide that information. Dir. Harris asked if this is the number one goal to close the opportunity gap, why has there not been more meetings and why are we waiting until September to provide a recommendation. Mr. Tolley noted the history of the AAM task force, it existed and reported a final set of recommendations last year, which were implemented. Mr. Tolley noted the task force ended and this is now an advisory committee which has met three times. He noted that the work is with a large community group who are leading the direction of the committee and sub committees with were recently established. Mr. Tolley noted that this is one of seventeen major initiatives to eliminate the opportunity gaps, and he noted the continuation of the work to deliver the results. Dir. Harris asked if there is a sense of urgency. Mr. Ruiz noted really understanding

the problem and not just put out solutions but rather to solve the right problem. He further noted they are working on providing an in-depth look and taking this very seriously, and have declared a sense of emergency on this work to eliminate opportunity gaps. Dir. Harris asked where to find the seventeen initiatives. Mr. Tolley noted at a request at the Executive Committee recently and that Dr. Brent Jones will be providing that information to the Board.

Dir. Geary noted a search on the SPS website, but that there isn't an underlining webpage that she can find. She asked if this is backlog or is listed somewhere else. Mr. Ruiz noted that it is on the Eliminating Opportunity Gaps website, which has a link on the SPS front page. Dir. Geary noted that she feels it is difficult to find via a Google search. Directors discussed having all committee meeting minutes online. Dir. Geary noted identify safety and read a book recently in regards to this. Mr. Ruiz noted that Dr. Kyle Kinoshita presented that information on Identity Safe Classrooms today at Extended Cabinet, and that Dr. Kinoshita noted the narrowing in on what it looks like in practice at the building level that are rooted in race and racism.

### **Board Policies and Procedures**

#### **Policy 2200, Equitable Access Quarterly Report (Kokx)**

Sherri Kokx noted the report reflects changes since the last report in June, and are listed in the handout. She noted the Open Doors Youth Reengagement Program run by Seattle Vocational Institute (SVI) and serves students who are not expected to graduate by the time they are 21. She noted that this program is an onramp to secondary achievement, per the OSPI website. The SVI website shows 17 students are currently enrolled, and noted that these students do not receive instruction through SPS staff, they get 100% of instruction at SVI, however, they register as SPS students. Ms. Kokx noted the funding that was brought to the Board back in June, and she wanted to point that there is still some debate as to whether this is a SPS program or not. She further noted that this is a new program, and is the same program run at Interagency.

Dir. Geary noted that this report calls it a program and asked for clarity. Ms. Kokx noted that these students are not receiving instruction from SPS teachers, and is not sure if it officially lands on report or not. She noted that SPS is a pass-through for these students. Mr. Tolley noted that it is not contemplated within the policy. Dir. Geary asked what the ask is. Ms. Kokx said there is no ask, this is just to inform.

Under services, Ms. Kokx noted the enrollment changes in special education from June to the start of school seventh day count, as noted in the data table attachment. She noted there was an addition of 5 total special education instructors due to enrollment. Dir. Geary asked about the special education classroom additions, and did this solve the problem of students being served closer to their own neighborhoods. Ms. Kokx noted that these adds were driven by where the students actually enrolled at. Ms. Kokx noted that without knowing the specific kids Dir. Geary is referring to, she was unable to adequately answer. Mr. Tolley noted the variables, dynamics and the process. He further made note of the students being served last year compared to this year, and said there could be an analysis done. Dir. Geary noted a civil rights complaint last spring, and that we should look at this closer to get a better grasp of this issue. Ms. Kokx noted that Wyeth Jessee may know the answer already. Dir. Harris noted program evaluations and how is this reported out other than this committee. Ms. Kokx noted other than the committee, that it goes in the Friday Memo. Mr. Tolley noted this is a quarterly report, and there is an annual report in January that gives additional information on program evaluations. He noted a new

process to come on program evaluations, and that this report is not the annual report. Staff noted the request.

### Policy 2415, High School Graduation Requirements

Mr. Tolley noted the school Board Work Session on this policy which Dan Gallagher, Director of Career and College Readiness, facilitated. He noted the recommended change to the policy and that it will come back to the committee in November as a Board Action report and will bring back the community engagement piece regarding the components of this policy. He noted that the last paragraph references the counseling manual and that serves as the Superintendent Procedure in support of this policy. Dir. Harris asked for clarity as to why it is not called a Superintendent Procedure. Mr. Tolley noted he is unsure of the history of why it is called that. Dir. Harris asked if anything was prohibiting this. Nate Van Duzer noted that this is an Administrative Procedure, which is the lower level of procedures, and noted that it is not seen often which is why there may be confusion. Dir. Geary noted that this is a document that is regularly published out, and advised to not make it more drawn out by adding the language.

### Special Attention Items

#### K-5 English Language Arts (ELA) Adoption Update

Kathleen Vasquez noted the process of field testing the three finalists for instructional materials. She noted that all of the field testers have given preliminary feedback, which is still too fresh to be considered valid. Ms. Vasquez noted that all three of the selections were right on, and for the most part, the committee got it right. She noted that one vendor is bubbling to the top right now and that teachers are extremely excited about from the chosen. Ms. Vasquez noted the next step is to open up the field testers who are comfortable to talk to the school leaders to observe the field testing and give feedback, which will be about six weeks. Ms. Vasquez noted that they are currently being tested in five schools in in all five regions across the district. She noted that there are feedback forms in five top languages, and the resources are available online where the parents can get a sense of the resources and fill out the evaluation form. She noted the 150 families who have participated, and they are working on a greater push to get additional feedback through principal communicator and school beat. Ms. Vasquez noted a recent issue where every student in the district received communication asking for K-5 adoption feedback that was addressed to the student's first name instead of being sent to the students' parent/guardian, but no identifiable information was sent, and a correction was made.

Dir. Harris asked if we have distributed through community partners and PTSA. Ms. Vasquez noted that she asked Sean Duke to do this, but she has not verified if it has been done or not. She gave him a list of the communities that she has contacted in the past and the underserved communities and school newspapers. Dir. Pinkham asked why all districts are not covered in the five regions she noted. She noted that they only get the five versions and the policy was for only five. Dir. Harris asked for fliers for the Director Community meetings this weekend. Ms. Vasquez noted the request.

#### Math Adoption and Cycle of Inquiry Outline Update

Dr. Kinoshita noted the first page of the detailed timeline that Anna Box created. He went through the handout and listed the details and the price information for the purchases early on by submitting requests for proposals (RFPs), and also noted that we need to make sure we don't skimp on public engagement, so all of the pieces are built in to the timeline. Dr. Kinoshita noted the time that this will take for engagement and field testing to gain feedback and for the trust factor. He noted that the first steps are this fall, and we are right at the beginning of the timeline.

Dir. Harris noted correspondence with Mr. Tolley last spring to get numbers and costs for middle school math adoption, and noted at the retreat the feedback about tools that they can get from the outliers. She asked what is being changed due to the budget and numbers to make this happen. Dr. Kinoshita noted to move up the RFP to get the pricing to see how far we are out of the ball park, and noted that it is difficult to state without doing the pre-work. Mr. Tolley noted the commitment to purchasing instructional materials, which hasn't always been the case in this district. He noted convincing the prior Board on providing instructional materials as a line item in the budget annually, and he discussed the budgetary implications. Mr. Tolley discussed the budgeting year over year for instructional materials adoption, and we need more information on actual pricing to determine what the next steps are. He noted the budget challenges, and historically what is taken out to fund other needs is often instructional materials.

Dr. Kinoshita noted the factors for the schools that are successful in closing the achievement gaps. He noted a partnership with Dr. Eric Anderson to use the sound methods of a mini study to get quick results which look at successes in the school. Dr. Kinoshita noted that the study would look at the interaction with teacher and student, look at the teacher knowledge and at the instructional materials. He gave an overview of the handout provided to the Directors. He discussed professional development, and student engagement. He noted a previous study on the beliefs and cultural values of the school that accompany the three outliers, it didn't name specific details, and noted that they will be expanding on that study to get the rest of the elements discovered. Dr. Kinoshita noted that there were extremely positive attitudes on student learning, and that this mini study will get down to the particulars that the other study did not assess. He noted the methods may be good to evaluate future adoptions to understand the quality of what is going on in the school, assist in developing protocols for future adoptions and systems, and also be a general practice for launching adoptions and other professional development. Dr. Kinoshita noted that it is a work in progress and that they will provide reports as they go along with the work, so as not to wait for the complete report in January.

Dir. Geary noted that she spoke with the Seattle Education Association (SEA) and they are happy to cooperate to get teachers available and show successes. She recalls speaking with Kathleen Vasquez about the (English Language Arts) ELA adoption, where she felt there was a roadblock with multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) being incorporated in to the curriculum, a piece where the expertise to make sure the materials could be sufficiently generalizing for special education, and it wasn't a part of the conversation. She feels that the same curriculum should be used as a part of MTSS as part of standards together. Dir. Geary would like clarity on the barrier within this and making sure that what we are adopting conforms to what we are expecting our teachers to do. She noted that MTSS is not mentioned anywhere in this document. Dr. Kinoshita noted that the MTSS triangle is the part that deals with academics, and if we ensure there is a sound tier 1, students would not need intervention. He noted that the methods or curriculum should mesh with the materials being used for 80% of the kids that need intervention. He noted the hope is that the core materials will be in place and we can have a conversation with district leaders to reinforce tier 1 materials. Dir. Geary noted that every time a kid is taken out of a classroom, that intervention may put the student behind and that we should always look for ways to make our kids feel like they are participating in the same education and not making it hard on teachers. Mr. Tolley noted other strategies in pre-teaching where students are given the material prior to the students actually going to the classroom, and noted other methods of intervention.

Dir. Harris noted there was no mention of differentiation and that there be a mandate for pulling students out of the classroom and she would like that addressed in these documents. Dr.

Kinoshita noted the intervention methods that do differentiate, even if the word is not actually in the document, and further noted that these outlier schools are using differentiating methods.

### C&I Work Plan

Dir. Pinkham noted that Dir. Burke had mentioned to him that at the November 14 C&I Policy Committee that advanced learning be a report only instead of the policy work, due to the load of the committee and staff. Mr. Tolley noted that we do need to come back and continue the conversation, from the feedback after the recent Work Session on advanced learning. He noted that there is a desire from Directors to do a program review, perhaps not entirely doing a policy rework. Mr. Tolley noted a theme from the meeting last week is to continually move forward. Dir. Harris asked for a menu of choices on what can be done, she appreciates the work load, but does not want to stop the momentum. She noted the constituent emails on the boundaries with some of the policy work. Mr. Tolley noted the discussion of capacity management for Cascadia and the Highly Capable Cohort (HCC) program, and mentioned that there is a meeting with staff tomorrow to discuss the community engagement for this. He further noted that this item will be going to the Operations Committee. Dir. Geary noted that she feels that it should stay as part of a conversation to move it forward. Mr. Tolley noted to leave it there, not as a recommended policy change, but a conversation as to next steps. Dir. Harris noted fundamental issues and that she would like a menu of options. Mr. Tolley noted the Superintendent briefing papers on recommended next steps.

The meeting adjourned at 6:52pm.

BAR for Annual approval of the written plans of programs or schools using the alternative learning experience model.

**DECISION: Dir. Geary made a motion to move this item forward for consideration by the full Board with the suggested additions. Dir. Harris seconded. This motion passed unanimously.**

BAR for Policy 2030, Service Animals in Schools

**DECISION: Dir. Harris made a motion to move this item forward for consideration by the full Board. Dir. Geary seconded. This motion passed unanimously.**

BAR for Acceptance of Teacher Principal Evaluation Program (TPEP) iGrant 664

**DECISION: Dir. Harris made a motion to move this item forward to the full Board with a recommendation for consideration. Dir. Geary seconded. This motion passed unanimously.**

BAR to Repeal Policy D121.00, Student Activities General Standards & Regulations

**DECISION: Dir. Geary made a motion to move this item forward to the full Board with a recommendation for approval. Dir. Harris seconded. This motion passed unanimously.**