

Board Special Meeting

2445 – 3rd Avenue South, Seattle WA 98124



Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee
Monday, November 14, 2016, 4:30 – 6:30 pm
Board Office Conference Room, John Stanford Center

Minutes

Director Burke called the meeting to order at 4:30pm.

Directors Burke, Geary, and Pinkham were present. Dir. Harris arrived at 4:41pm.

Dir. Burke made a motion to amend the agenda to move up the discussion on the 20 Minute Survey to accommodate staff schedules. Dir. Geary seconded. The motion to amend the agenda as discussed passed unanimously.

Dir. Burke made a motion to approve the minutes as published. Dir. Pinkham seconded. The minutes were approved by a vote of 2-0-1. Directors Geary and Pinkham voted yes. Dir. Burke abstained as he was not present for the October committee meeting.

Items Requiring Board Action or Informational Board Action Reports

Annual Approval of Schools

Mike Starosky, Michael Stone and Jon Halfaker provided an overview of the Board Action Report regarding the Comprehensive School Improvement Plans (CSIPs). This is an annual process that comes to the School Board for approval. Mr. Stone noted the past tool that principals used, which was cumbersome, and feedback received indicated that it did not give a comprehensive look at each building and there were inconsistencies. Mr. Stone indicated that the previous tool is no longer in use, and the server no longer works. He noted a new simple word document on SharePoint, where principals have access to their own and other school plans. Mr. Stone noted that plans were adjusted per feedback from School Board Directors, building leaders and the community. He read through the various sections within the document as well as some guiding questions for school leaders to assist in providing a comprehensive plan.

Dir. Burke asked for clarification on the goals. Mr. Halfaker noted the overlap and alignment with the school goals. Dr. Starosky noted transparency, support and follow through with this new process. He noted the timeline for when this item will go to the Board, and the process of the Education Directors (EDs) going over every CSIP to ensure they are complete, comprehensive and consistent. Dr. Starosky noted there has been better feedback this year in the process.

Dir. Harris arrived at 4:41pm.

Dr. Starosky noted the example in the packet from Fairmont Park. He discussed the materials presented in the packet. He also noted the positive feedback from constituents regarding being able to see where the money is coming from and where it is going to, all in one place on the

document. Dr. Starosky noted the future tool beyond this year. Mr. Stone noted the future cycle this item will be spring driven, which is better aligned with budgeting and end of year data, and more aligned with other district level goals.

Dir. Burke asked about the timeline for weighted staffing standards. Mr. Stone noted it is in February, and that this timing will be aligned for the CSIP planning in the future. He noted English Language Learners (ELL) and Special Education (SpEd) staffing starts in March and April, and that schools would be developing their plans for the next year and to be ready for August.

Dir. Pinkham asked what the follow up from the schools will be. Dr. Starosky noted that after the meeting tomorrow, the EDs will follow up with the school leaders to give them an opportunity to correct the plan. Mr. Halfaker noted that the guiding questions have been the driver to the questions in the plans so far. He noted that with the plans on SharePoint, he can check them at any time, and the school leaders can also look at other schools for examples.

Dir. Harris noted she is pleased to see the attention paid to the CSIP, due to last year they were lacking. She asked if the Building Leadership Team (BLT) members and EDs sign off on this for accountability. Mr. Stone noted that a suggestion came through and that on the example the principal had indicated that the BLT approved in on a specific date. Mr. Stone further noted that the EDs are going through every single one, and they are all going through them together, and providing feedback consistently. Dir. Harris asked when they will be uploaded for the December 7 Board Meeting. Mr. Stone noted they will be uploaded with the Board agenda packet the week prior to the introduction. Dir. Harris asked if this document can be aligned with the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) goals. Mr. Stone noted that the behavioral, school, parent components, and others will be included. Dir. Harris asked if this can be used as a data set for answers on if strategies are working on. Mr. Stone noted that is the future state for the CSIPs. Dr. Starosky noted it will give clear indicators of the intention to measure, and in the future there will be better alignment. Dir. Harris asked for the estimate on when in the future this will occur. Dr. Starosky noted the complexities involved with other departments and various components, so it's hard to be specific at this point, however, it will not be this year. He noted that this is a stepping stone to get to where they want the CSIPs to be. Dr. Starosky noted this is a framework for discussion on what is being measured and how they are measuring.

Dir. Geary noted that advanced learning is always a hot spot, and she sees the components in the document, and feels that the language is not common and are vaguely referenced. She is concerned that it is not meeting both ends of the spectrum and meeting the needs of all of our students. Dir. Geary noted concern that the documents will not be so easy to compare due to this. Dir. Burke thanked the team for the work to get this to a cleaner place. He has some concerns with the differentiation on the building level on advanced learning, which was more clearly stated in years past. Mr. Stone noted the second component/box where there is a specific guiding question on how they are providing advanced learning services that is included in the document that will be addressed. Mr. Tolley noted the guiding questions for each section, and that the portion on advanced learning is a required response. Dir. Geary noted that she wants consistent language amongst the community discussions, otherwise it leads to miscommunication. Dir. Burke noted adding a designated header that would break that out.

Dir. Burke noted that he does not feel this item is ready to move this item forward to the full Board. He would like to see better clarity on how the leaders are doing this work. Mr. Tolley noted in the past, this item was moved forward for consideration in this same manner as what is being presented today. Mr. Stone discussed the timeline if this item does not move forward. Directors and staff discussed the consequences of moving the timeline. Dr. Starosky asked for

what the committee is needed prior to moving this item forward to the full Board. Dir. Burke would like more CSIP examples and would like to see the guiding questions.

Dir. Harris made a plea to decrease the jargon and for clear writing for the constituents. Dr. Starosky noted the request, and said that is also what he and the Education Directors are looking for.

DECISION: This item will come back to the C&I Policy Committee on December 12, 2016 with the requested modifications and additions.

20 Minute Survey Results

Dir. Burke noted the 20 Minute survey that had been conducted, and noted that bell times always comes up in this discussion. He noted his request to Michael Tolley to have transportation be a part of this discussion at committee today. Mr. Tolley noted that this briefing paper in the packet is around the three tier system.

Sherri Kokx noted the Superintendent's Friday Memo on the survey results, and noted the approximately 12,000 respondents to the survey. She noted the questions on the survey on where to put the additional time. Ms. Kokx discussed the results as listed in the briefing paper. She noted the recommendation of the Department of Teaching & Learning, that in a three tier model, the additional time would be split ten min before and after school. Ms. Kokx noted the early release time portion which discussed the preferences of the staff, the Seattle Education Association (SEA) and families. She noted the recommendation is for Wednesdays early release due to the results and having meaningful and productive professional development (PD) for teachers. Pegi McEvoy noted that arrival/departure times (which are based upon bell times) are incorporated into the transportation service standards. These will go to the Operations Committee in December with the full Board voting on it in January. She noted there has been conversation on two tiers, and it has been a historical conversation. Ms. McEvoy noted the concerns with the cost associated with a two-tier model, and the projection is as high as \$3.8 million. She asked the transportation staff to look for additional efficiencies to draw down the costs, and discussed the options and considerations that will come to the Operations Committee and also within the budget conversations. Ms. McEvoy noted this is a puzzle as there is a deficit in the budget, and staff is looking for ways to make it a viable option. Ms. Kokx noted that many respondents noted that they did not have enough information to make certain decisions, and she further noted the respondents did not want to make the decisions if it cost more, or made the students have to walk farther distances to get to and from school.

Dir. Pinkham asked for the data on the respondents. Ms. Kokx noted that information was include in a Friday Memo in the past, and noted that there is raw data. Dir. Harris asked if that can be sent to the full Board. Ms. Kokx noted that she will provide that information in this week's Friday Memo. Dir. Burke noted that the two/three tier system will be resolved during the transportation standards conversation, and that they are researching cost reducing options, and asked if there is a risk that the State would not reimburse a two-tier model. Ms. McEvoy noted that she feels that there wouldn't be more risk than there is now. Dir. Burke asked if they have looked for outside ways to fund/pay externally. Ms. McEvoy noted that they have been looking internally only at this point. Dir. Burke noted that would be interesting to look at external funding sources.

Policy 2415, High School Graduation Requirements

Dan Gallagher provided an overview of the Board Action Report, reviewed the background section, and noted previous work sessions where this item has been discussed. He noted the new State Law requiring students to have 24 credits to graduate, instead of the current 21 credits. Mr.

Gallagher pointed out the redlined version of the policy and noted the top of the page shows where the change that has been made to the policy. Mr. Gallagher noted that the change will happen now, so that the class of 2021, current 8th graders, who will be registering for high school in the next couple of months will clearly know the graduation requirements. He noted another policy he will discuss later, that will address community engagement and other items.

Dir. Harris noted international baccalaureate (IB) program mentioned in this policy and that there is not sustained funding to this program. Mr. Tolley confirmed. Mr. Gallagher noted that this policy may have continued revision in the future, and that next year's C&I Policy Committee work plan it will be revisited in the fall. He noted the targeted audience for this current change is that the 8th grade students who will need to know what will be required to graduate. Mr. Gallagher noted that this policy change is a conservative policy change at this time, and that staff is working toward making progress. He noted they are working on the IB issue as well, it just is not being addressed in the policy change at this time.

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

Creative Advantage/CTE Media Arts Skills Center Programs and Creative Advantage Regional Arts Showcase (Informational Only)

Gail Sehlhorst, Michael Stone, Dan Gallagher provided an overview of this Board Action Report. Mr. Stone noted that this item went to the Audit & Finance Committee last week, and is being presented here today as informational only. Mr. Stone noted that the Seattle Foundation is working with Vulcan to help support the regional arts showcase and to develop a media arts curriculum at the skills center. Ms. Sehlhorst gave a brief overview of the creative advantage program, as outlined in the action report. Ms. Selhorst noted the purpose of equitable access to arts and culture and the community based arts organizations in the city who partner with Seattle Public Schools (SPS). She noted the goal to have every elementary school student to have visual art and music instruction and to make connections with arts learning with professional artists who come to the schools. Ms. Sehlhorst noted the focus groups to assist in finding out what the students want to highlight for the continuum of learning, and that they will be hiring a coordinator to move the work forward. She also noted working on a toolkit to be able to replicate the program throughout the district and to find more funders.

Lara Davison noted the work with SPS has been exemplar. She noted the work done in the past was to make connections between arts and career. Ms. Davison noted some strong programs already within the district, but noted that they are not available across the district, only at certain schools. She noted the growth in our region for arts and media. Ms. Davison noted the work on the skills center to develop the hands-on college prep, led by industry professionals to help students be successful in this particular workforce.

Ms. Selhorst noted students would be at home half of the day, and at the skills center the other half of the day. She noted doing work with the University of Washington (UW) to find careers in demand, so that the SPS students would graduate career ready. She noted the pilot over the summer for students to have free access to courses to be tested this summer, and that the program will launch in the fall. Ms. Sehlhorst noted hiring a media arts specialist and a project manager to help realize the work, as there are some barriers in place on marketing to the students to enroll. Dan Gallagher noted that this is funded through apportionment, and that state dollars will follow to make the program self-sustaining. Mr. Sehlhorst noted that this is about capacity building for sustainability.

Dir. Harris asked where the physical location will be. Ms. Sehlhorst noted that decision will be a part of the research, and knows that transportation is a barrier for students. She noted that it would be good to be in a centralized location, but that is to be determined, and they are looking at partnering with industries to be in a real environment. Mr. Gallagher noted the great work of this program, and this investment will allow SPS to determine the play book for any type of course in the different media/arts industries and to use this as a playbook to replicate across the district. Mr. Gallagher reiterated the challenges with transportation and locations, and noted looking in to exploring additional satellite sites for less constraints for physical locations and capacity challenges. He noted that this program will help drive further investment for additional settings.

Dir. Pinkham asked about the budget. Ms. Sehlhorst noted the typo in the document and that there is \$710,000 for the total project. The total is correct, but there is a typo in the line item. Staff noted they will make the adjustment prior to introduction to the full Board.

Standing Agenda Items

Dir. Burke noted with the new Superintendent SMART goals for this new year, that instead of alternating the updates from MTSS-A to MTSS-B, that the committee will be having a new standing agenda items section.

Transition of Standing Agenda Items

2015-16 Superintendent SMART Goals 1-3

Michael Tolley noted the recent work session that concluded regarding the work around the 2015-16 SMART Goals, and noted the transition to the 2016-17 whole child framework around MTSS Goals 1-3, as described in the provided rubric.

2016-17 Superintendent SMART Goals 1-3

Kyle Kinoshita noted Goal 1 is an implementation of MTSS, and noted that this year it is not split between A and B, as it was providing a false dichotomy to divide those two parts. He noted a decision to reduce those areas in to two goals where the academic and social emotional goals were Goal 1. Dr. Kinoshita noted the benchmarks on the handout, and discussed the implementation of building a MTSS system at five schools where they could learn from and apply at other schools. He noted Goal 2 and the focus of making it culturally relevant and to eliminate opportunity gaps for a specific group of students, in particular, African American male students. Wyeth Jessee noted the Teaching & Learning (T&L) retreat last Thursday that was centered on Goals 1 and 2 to come together and think about eliminating the opportunity gaps in a systemic way. He noted the rubric and the collaboration piece. Mr. Jessee noted that to change the outcomes in every school, they need to change the way things are done in the district office to service the school in a more productive way. He discussed the case studies and how the application at schools would look like. Mr. Jessee noted using the data to help make a mind shift to really service the schools, and to have accountability here at the district office in order for the classrooms to really see the impacts. He noted that the work needs to be coordinated and channeled in a specific direction and to prioritize the work of the district with individual schools and using the CSIPs to guide that work and the direction. Mr. Jessee noted also putting together a professional development (PD) plan district wide and continuing that discussion on how to formalize and prioritize the PD plan to target the right resources to schools. Mr. Jessee noted wanting consistency across the schools and speaking in apples to apples by using the data access points. He noted the MTSS advisory team and cadre, who are looking at language and definitions, and discussed the importance of speaking a common language across the district. Mr. Jessee noted that this guidance has been given to school leaders to have them use in their CSIPs and will continue to enhance that work.

Dr. Kinoshita noted that the draft of these two goals is driving the work to increase the coordination and cooperation at the district and school levels. He noted that it is pointing out the gaps in the system and data to keep track of the student and is driving the activity and the work that will be done. Mr. Tolley noted the support of the Board in this work, and that the tools were not in place before. He thanked the Board for pushing the work forward to get the appropriate tools in place. Mr. Jessee noted that they will have the data tool identified in December.

Dir. Pinkham asked about the scorecard that was presented at the work session, where 1/3 of Native American students are in special education, and 1/8 of SPS students overall are in special education. He asked for the comparison in other districts, and if this is due to parent referral for testing. Mr. Jessee noted that if we do not know how to serve students, and feel like the student needs remediation, that opens the can for a referral to special education. He noted that the overall special education population is below 13%, that there are still issues with reporting certain populations. Mr. Jessee noted that if they do not have the data to pinpoint, they will not know where to target and start the remediation of the issues. Mr. Jessee noted the need to be culturally responsive and changing strategies within the populations, and the ideas of using the shared database to pinpoint the real issues. Dr. Kinoshita noted working with a school in his past work and noted the support system that were in place without having to develop an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for them, and can focus the supports where they are actually needed.

Dir. Geary asked about collaboration strategies and not reinventing the wheel. Mr. Jessee noted that Gail Morris brought that up and noted this specific high need school and the need to be coordinated and that multiple departments were going to the school multiple times without the coordination to really address the issues, and to really share the areas of expertise across departments and teams. He gave examples of how to coordinate within the funding and resources that we have.

Dir. Harris noted that it all sounds very good, but she doesn't have an understanding of what is meant by the assessments request for proposal (RFP), how the \$11 million underspend has been spent and what is the return on investment. She is in favor of blowing up silos and wants to see the overlapping of the work in a visual, as there is nothing tangible to market what it is that the district is doing, and then she doesn't feel it can be measured. Dir. Burke noted the need to not force something on to our schools, but also does not want the schools to reinvent the wheel 99 times. He noted the need to provide the right level of resource base, and asked if the MTSS groups are being provided with a body of knowledge that schools can implement the practice. Mr. Jessee noted that both comments and questions are related, and clarified that they are asking for a district of 99 schools with over 53,000 students to have a product to go district wide at this point in time. He noted that the school year started two months ago, and he has draft products, but they are not ready to publish to go to market at this time. Mr. Jessee noted that he is getting stakeholder input, and noted that the working teams are exploring the materials and the work. Mr. Jessee noted the gaps and the complexities of the work that he is discussing and noted that people are coming to the table and ready to make the shift. He noted the desire to not be in a rush and to make sure the work that is done is done right. Dir. Burke asked for help with time managing the expectations. Mr. Jessee noted that he can have some draft materials for the next C&I Policy Committee meeting. Dir. Burke asked how many leaders from outlier schools are on the advisory team. Mr. Jessee noted 6 principals, and about half are outliers. He noted there is representation in the group.

Dir. Geary asked for the updates to have information on where we have been, where we are, and where we are going to have more clarity in tracking the progress. Mr. Jessee noted the request.

Board Policies and Procedures

Policy 2420, High School Grade and Credit Marking Policy

Dan Gallagher provided an overview of the documents per conversation from the last C&I Policy Committee Meeting. He noted the packet that he brought forth today and noted the slides are copies from the September 28th Work Session on Policy 2420, and discussed the timeline as listed in the slides. He noted Principals Jill Hudson and Jill Medsker are on special assignment to lead principals and groups to revision high school, which is also tied to the 24 credit transition. Mr. Gallagher pointed out the handout that outlines the policy issues that will need to be addressed and read through the handout titled Policy Revisioning and Stakeholder Engagement Timeline.

Dir. Harris asked if this went through the community engagement tool for each of these categories. Mr. Gallagher confirmed yes, and pointed out the bottom which discusses the tool and engagement. He noted that the tools are still in draft and that there is not a score associated at this point. Mr. Gallagher noted that there is collaboration as a first step, and noted that he erred on the humble side for collaboration. He noted involving families along the step after identifying and highlighting concrete options that may have been overlooked by families.

Dir. Burke noted the framework and the resources provided. Mr. Gallagher noted that this is a big deal and it needs to be done carefully. He noted that they are exploring all sides, including State Law, Board Policy, other stakeholders and legislation, and human resource policies. All of which are included in the different levels of collaboration along the timeline.

Dir. Geary noted that the visual on this is that families are just going to be told/informed, and not collaborated with to be a part of the brainstorming process. She noted to maximize the brainpower in the community in this process. Mr. Gallagher noted the request. Dir. Harris suggested to bring this to the next community engagement meeting, as we run the risk of not using the community engagement tool in the way it was intended and that families may see this in draft form and give push back. Dir. Burke noted that request, and mentioned that it is a new tool that everyone is trying to figure out how to leverage. Mr. Gallagher appreciates the feedback and is also learning along the way. He doesn't want to convey a sense of finality due to the number that says just to inform, as he wants to be responsive to get feedback from many aspects.

Special Attention Items

K-5 English Language Arts (ELA) Adoption Update

Kathleen Vasquez noted they just finished the field test, and that an update was sent in the Friday Memo to the Board last week. She noted that at the meeting of the focus groups last week the feedback received was that the field test was a huge success, and they uncovered a lot of information that they wouldn't have had by just reading the materials. She noted the alignment to the rubric, and all of the committee members heard feedback from all field testers. Ms. Vasquez noted that this has been a great process and recommends it for all adoption committees in the future. She noted that the field test cost \$30,000 and noted that it is money well spent to get great information in a short amount of time. Ms. Vasquez noted a clear third place that families and field testers are unhappy with. She further noted that with the remaining two options that families prefer one and field testers prefer the opposite. Ms. Vasquez noted the forms online that 225 families had filled out, and 22 staff members had filled out. She noted the problem of practice was to get teachers to participate in the responses and noted it went out district wide and tried various communication strategies to get the feedback. Ms. Vasquez noted that on December 9th the committee will review the survey data from families, which closes November 30th. Then on the 13th they will go to the Instructional Materials Committee (IMC) with the number 1 and 2 choices.

Dir. Harris asked how involved the Education Directors (EDs) were in soliciting for staff feedback. Ms. Vasquez noted that the field tester data is separate from the staff member data. She noted that there are a total of 49 feedback inputs received. Ms. Vasquez noted last year the number was a lot higher for feedback. Dir. Harris asked that we charge the EDs to charge that feedback. Mr. Tolley noted that they could address that with the EDs and that there is still time. Dir. Burke asked about the work of the reviewers of the pilot study and if that will be used during the roll out of the instructional materials. Ms. Vasquez confirmed that yes, there is clear ways to see how to support the teachers during implementation, and that both are strong choices. She noted the creation of PD and online resources that are available. Ms. Vasquez noted that she will present the findings at the December committee meeting.

Advanced Learning Update

Mr. Jessee thanked Kari Hanson and Stephen Martin for their work for the Advanced Learning (AL) School Board Work Session. He noted the organizing of the next steps for the work plan and noted areas of prioritization. Mr. Jessee discussed the draft work plan, as outlined in the document within the packet. He noted the positive feedback received and that constituents were excited on next steps and the commitment to improving AL and the Highly Capable Cohort (HCC). Mr. Jesse noted the guidance and initial research that was performed in this, and discussed the sample document in further detail. Mr. Jessee noted ongoing engagement, continually circling around to stakeholders and to get to preexisting, new and diverse populations to engage. He noted engaging the student voice as well, which has not been traditionally done. Mr. Jessee noted using the data streams and equity piece for outcomes of this work. He read through the stages to get the work going and to continually move it forward. Mr. Jessee noted the timeline of the work and the intention to be prepared to do the work with intention. He noted the input from the priorities that came to the surface at the work sessions and noted the large body of work for all three options listed within the document.

Dir. Harris asked for the timeline around the work, the economic needs and the resources that will be needed, especially with the levy cliff. Mr. Jessee noted the schedule depends on what is chosen by the Directors, as there are many different layers. He noted the implications and also considerations for testing windows and student enrollment. Mr. Jessee noted he could come back with timelines once the level of work is established. Mr. Jessee noted the plan for the budget is to work within the means that we already have and noted that Mr. Martin's team is equipped to do the work.

Dir. Burke asked the Directors to weigh in on their priorities. Directors discussed their personal recommendations for the priorities, and discussed pros and cons for each. Dir. Geary noted for option #3 that perhaps it be look at for 2018-19 year, as it would be difficult to tackle at this point in the current school year, to ensure we are reaching more students and eliminating the opportunity gap. Mr. Jessee confirmed yes, and noted the tension is to move it now and fix it, but if it moves too fast, they steam roll over some issues and the end up in an area that was perhaps not intended. He noted that they can come back with regular updates to the committee to inform the Board as it is very fluid, and they need to do an authentic review with the stakeholders. Dir. Harris suggested putting this in a Friday Memo to get input from other Board members and the public. She noted that AL has the perception that it does not have the resources to actually do all of this good work, she is not interested in failing, but looks at this skeptically. Mr. Tolley noted to look closely at the budgetary piece. He also noted the research and evaluation team is leading the work to support the department to do the work necessary for these aspects and noted that there will be additional supports. Dir. Harris wants to see it in writing with the budget piece. Dir. Burke noted that Mr. Jessee will come back next month with an update for the item that is made priority. Mr. Tolley noted that taking on all of AL at one time is not possible and noted the committee is being asked to take a look at the various options and to prioritize the work to move

forward. Dir. Burke summarized and noted that the committee has asked to begin with spectrum services and the community engagement process.

Instructional Materials for new Buildings

Dr. Kinoshita noted that the district is looking for solutions and pointed out the draft document included in the packet. He noted the aging instructional materials at SPS and that there is a need to purchase materials for new schools that will be opening. The old materials are either outdated or are not available for purchase. Dr. Kinoshita discussed the options as listed in the handout and discussed the waiver process to select materials for those new schools. He noted that on the SPS website there is no Superintendent Procedure for waivers, that all he could find was in a draft form, and there were outstanding issues to be addressed. Dr. Kinoshita noted staff and cabinet will tighten up the process and review the waiver process. Dir. Burke asked what Dr. Kinoshita's recommendation would be. He noted that the recommendation would be option #1, and that there still needs to be work done in the waiver process and the procedure. Dir. Burke agrees and that the schools and the materials have to meet a certain level of rigor and accountability in order to approve a waiver. Dir. Pinkham asked about Options schools. Dr. Kinoshita noted that those schools would already have adopted materials and further noted that it depends on the school. He noted that in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), a school can apply to be a Creative Approach School (CAS) which would exempt them from this process as well. Mr. Tolley noted the staff and parent involvement in the CAS, and that is not the same as the waiver process.

C&I Work Plan

Nate Van Duzer noted that in December all of the School Board Committees will be reviewing coming the 2017 committee work plans and noted that the approval will come in January after the new committee assignments are designated.

Dir. Burke noted to email himself or Mr. Van Duzer about what is in the parking lot and to discuss the prioritization that is going on.

The meeting adjourned at 6:42pm.

BAR for Annual Approval of Schools

DECISION: Directors requested to have this item come back to the C&I Policy Committee on December 12, 2016 with additional examples of the Continuous Improvement Plans before making a recommendation to the full Board.

BAR for Policy 2415, High School Graduation Requirements

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

BAR for Creative Advantage/CTE Media Arts Skills Center Programs and Creative Advantage Regional Arts Showcase

This item came to the C&I Policy Committee as informational only. The Audit & Finance Committee reviewed the item on November 10, 2016 and made their committee recommendation.