

# Board Special Meeting

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



**Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee**  
Monday, December 12, 2016, 4:30 – 6:30 pm  
Board Office Conference Room, John Stanford Center

## Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 4:30pm.

Directors Burke, Geary and Pinkham were present.

Dir. Burke made a motion to amend the agenda to allow for the Indian Heritage High School discussion to occur directly after the Board Action Reports due to staff schedules.

Dir. Geary seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Dir. Burke made a motion to approve the amended agenda. Dir. Pinkham seconded the motion. The amended agenda passed unanimously.

Dir. Geary made a motion to approve the minutes from the November 14, 2016 Curriculum & Instruction (C&I) Policy Committee meeting. Dir. Pinkham seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as published, unanimously.

## Items Requiring Board Action or Informational Board Action Reports

### Annual Approval of Schools

Michael Stone noted that this Board Action Report came to the C&I Policy Committee last month, and now the Continuous School Improvement Plans (C-SIPs) are all posted to the website as of November 30, 2016. He noted that this action report is coming back to committee for a recommendation to the full Board. Dr. Mike Starosky noted the timeline of reviewing the documents since the last committee meeting, including meetings with the principals and communications out to them to set expectations for the C-SIPs. He noted the granular level of the expectations set. Dr. Starosky provided highlights of changes since committee: adding the date of the Building Leadership Team (BLT) meetings around the C-SIPs, and the level of detail in the document as outlined in the guiding questions document. Dr. Starosky noted some issues with the SharePoint site, that caused some questions from building leaders and staff. Mr. Stone noted that in order to fix this issue that the browser needed to be refreshed, as old versions may be pulled up if they had been accessed before on a computer. Dr. Starosky noted the at or above grade level student data updates made by Principals. He also noted that Education Directors (EDs) and staff made sure the budget sections were dedicated funds for student learning. He noted the update to ask the Principals to look for acronyms that the public may not understand and to make it more user friendly for the public. Dr. Starosky noted asking leaders to look for spelling, grammar, and consistency between the schools, which EDs and staff looked for in their review as well.

Dr. Starosky noted all C-SIPs were posted by the November 30, 2016 deadline, yet there are some updates still going on based on new information that the principals are receiving based on staff reviews. He noted they are more consistent and readable for constituents, and meet the asks of the committee.

Dir. Pinkham asked further about the refreshing of the browser issue. Mr. Stone noted that the cache had older versions, and to clear the cache to access newer data. This was only an issue if the document had been downloaded prior to November 30. Dir. Pinkham asked if that was written on the page for the public. Mr. Starosky noted that was for the previous downloaded versions, and now they have all been updated and is no longer an issue.

Dir. Burke asked if these new C-SIPs are helping toward school accountability and helping our students. He further asked if there is a high enough level focus to help reach the targets. Dr. Starosky noted the process and outcomes are moving farther from being a compliance document and more toward a document that is an active document in the schools and with district staff. They are making strides to not be cumbersome and difficult. Dr. Starosky noted it is getting closer to where it needs to be, but not at the level of assessment that they would like. He noted that it is now a more workable, relevant version than it has been in the past. Dr. Starosky noted that the EDs will be using these in their site visits to the schools, to ensure that everyone knows that it is moving the District to where we want to be. He noted that there are currently no systemic tools that are going to get this to where we want it to be. Dr. Kyle Kinoshita noted in his time with the District, that there has been more teacher engagement in this process. He noted a level of awareness by school staff that helps the focus of teacher teams to create a common understanding of where resources are going, and what time is being devoted to students. Dr. Kinoshita noted that the C-SIPs set a clear expectation on improvements that need to be made for progress.

Dr. Starosky noted that in the Extended Cabinet meeting, a C-SIP was reviewed and the elements that they were searching for as an exercise were listed appropriately in the document. Dr. Starosky noted that this year's process has been going a lot better than the process in the past, and has been more consistent and readable.

Michael Tolley added that the set of guiding questions that school leaders were given is now an attachment to the Board Acton Report, which sent a message to school leaders of what the District priorities are. He noted that ideally we would have tools to monitor progress, and we are working toward that in the future. Mr. Tolley noted the District is striving for consistency and to list priorities within the plan document.

Dr. Starosky noted the budget sections are very telling and noted the funding source and amounts are listed to paint a clear picture. He noted it also shows how the funds are being used at the schools, which is helpful for District staff and the public for transparency.

Dir. Burke asked if this was the first year to look over the budget and asked if it is a requirement. Mr. Stone noted that it is not a requirement, but that it was an ask of the Board last year, so was added in to this year's document.

Dir. Geary asked if staff is getting a sense of principals seeing it as a useful tool or a burden. Dr. Starosky noted the timeline was the burden, even though it was messaged out to school leaders in advance. He noted that the timing coincides with the start of school, goal setting with teachers, as well as other priorities within the school. Dr. Starosky noted some buildings only meet once per

month with the BLTs and the timing with having the BLT review and approval made timelines more difficult.

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

Dir. Geary noted the importance of consistency and that there is a robust review of our schools for transparency.

**DECISION: The Annual Approval of Schools item was moved forward for consideration by the full Board for introduction at the January 4, 2017 School Board Meeting.**

### Indian Heritage High School

Stephen Nielsen noted that Dr. Nyland wanted to address the learning opportunities for our Native American students and noted that he wants to better address this issue. He noted there are programs at Seattle Public Schools (SPS) that were successful in the past. Mr. Nielsen pointed out the handout for this topic in the packet, and that tonight he wanted to specifically address Robert Eagle Staff High School. Mr. Nielsen noted the big picture is to find a way to best meet the needs of the Native American students, and noted geographic challenges and other opportunities. He also noted the Urban Native Education Alliance's (UNEA) request to reconstitute a Native American high school. Mr. Nielsen noted wanting feedback from the Native American parents enrolled in or who may enroll students in our schools. He noted that Dr. Nyland would like four regional Native American family meetings to honor the transportation challenges and to receive feedback on the preferences to help the Board deliberate on what to do with Robert Eagle Staff High School. Michael Tolley noted the briefing paper within the handout, and the pros and cons for the restoration of Indian Heritage High School. He noted the desire to conduct a Native American regional summit and discuss what it would take to open a new high school. Ultimately the question is to meet the needs of the Native American students and families. Mr. Tolley noted the considerations listed within the briefing paper, as proposed by staff. He noted the trainings that have been presented by Gail Morris and her team. Mr. Tolley noted the other training opportunities around the district and opportunities to expand that training program to other locations. Mr. Tolley noted the compact school option as proposed in the briefing paper. He noted the ultimate goal is to have discussion to find a way to best meet the needs of the Native American families in SPS. He noted the Licton Springs portion of the briefing paper, which was brought up by the Board regarding this subject.

Mr. Nielsen asked for guidance from the Directors on the C&I Policy Committee as to ideas for where the District should focus. He noted that Dr. Nyland recommends the four regional meetings to hear the diversity of feedback from Native American families from around the city.

Mr. Tolley noted that staff held 2x2 meetings this week to further discuss with the Directors.

Dir. Burke asked what guidance was needed from the C&I committee. Mr. Nielsen noted that Dr. Nyland had noted the tensions around space and money, and wanted to get thoughts from Directors to help focus on where to go from here. Mr. Nielsen noted another question is how to engage with UNEA, and would like guidance. Mr. Tolley noted the briefing paper has key questions at the end of each option for the Directors to explore.

Dir. Burke summarized the asks from staff and asked Directors for their comments. Dir. Pinkham noted to reach out to the Native American community more, and that we rely perhaps

too heavily on Ms. Morris. He noted that there will likely be a wide variety of feedback from across the District. Dir. Burke asked to go in to these meetings to address what does educational success look like to the Native American families. Dir. Pinkham noted the unique position of SPS being in a city like Seattle where there are more confederated tribes and not in rural communities like other areas within the state.

Dir. Geary noted a concern of isolating the conversation for this specific group, which may isolate the feedback, and may not benefit the larger educational system. She noted examples from California around cultural education. She noted we have adopted Since Time Immemorial (STI) in our curriculum, and that it is relevant that members of our community be represented and get the robust education. Dir. Geary noted that should be included for all of the cultures at SPS. She noted that often when there is a small focus on what the student needs, that in isolation it is difficult to see how that filters out to the whole community.

Dir. Pinkham noted to find results that are best for all students. Dir. Geary noted that when we drill down too far, then it is difficult to extrapolate for different populations. Dir. Burke is interested in understanding the funding ramifications, and success models at student, regional and district levels. He noted aligning the granularity of the process with the funding, the population of students and other factors. Are there other places in Seattle or outside that have success models that can be leveraged?

Dir. Pinkham noted the success models may not work for Seattle as other models are within tribal communities- Leschi and Neah Bay as examples. Dir. Burke asked for common attributes that we can take examples from, not necessarily replicate. Dir. Pinkham noted the need for sense of belonging and appreciation. He noted the need to find out what makes students want to come to school, and that occurs when their heritage is appreciated.

Mr. Tolley noted the success at Chief Sealth, where the students feel safe and comfortable. Mr. Tolley thanked the Directors for their input and noted that the conversation will continue during the 2x2 meetings later this week.

Exercising option to extend the contract for Middle School and High School yearbooks with Herff Jones for an additional year.

Dr. Kyle Kinoshita provided the purpose and background for this Board Action Report. He noted the contract that was Board approved and signed last year, with the option to renew every year for three years. Dr. Kinoshita noted the two stage process for the original contract, and after a thorough review, the Herff Jones company was selected for the service they provide and the service costs. He noted that this year they reached out to yearbook advisors at schools to solicit feedback on how satisfied with the product and services and noted that overall there was great feedback on the services with Herff Jones. Dr. Kinoshita noted the respondents as listed in the packet. He noted the recommendation is that the Board approve the second year of the contract, as it is over the \$250,000 threshold, and that the funds come from the Associate Student Body (ASB) school funds.

Dir. Geary noted the deep dive last year, and asked for the timeline for the next deep dive. Dr. Kinoshita noted this will come back next year, just as it is this year. He predicted that the trends would indicate that the next deep dive would be at the end of the three-year contract extension period. Dir. Geary asked about the contract documents and the packet assembled. Dir. Burke noted that the contract was scanned and that the Optical Character Recognition (OCR) process was likely run on the document, and needs to be cleaned up. Staff made note of the request.

Dir. Pinkham asked about the schools that create and publish their own yearbook, and how is the cost with this contract compared to that. Dir. Kinoshita said he was unaware of that cost and process. He noted he could do some research to find out additional information. Dir. Pinkham asked for this information in a Friday Memo. He noted that it would not affect his decision, but that he is more curious.

Dir. Geary made a motion to move this forward to the full Board with a recommendation for approval. Dir. Pinkham seconded. This motion passed unanimously.

**DECISION: The Board Action Report for Exercising option to extend the contract for Middle School and High School yearbooks with Herff Jones for an additional year was moved forward to the full Board with a recommendation for approval, as an introduction item at the January 4, 2017 School Board Meeting.**

### **Standing Agenda Items**

#### Update on 2016-17 Superintendent SMART Goals 1-3

Erinn Bennett noted there is a School Board Work Session on Wednesday to discuss these goals in full detail. Bernardo Ruiz provided an update for Goal 2, noting a partnership with principals who attended a workshop by Dr. Daudi Abe, a Professor of Education who spoke on the history of racism in Seattle. He noted that Dr. Kinoshita was present to provide information regarding the Asian American racial issues as well. Mr. Ruiz noted the Racial Institute held on Saturday, December 10, which had positive feedback and 100% attendance from the cohort. He noted that the focus was on culturally responsive training and leadership by transforming pedagogical practices to meet ethnically diverse students and to share practices of adaptive leadership. Mr. Ruiz noted the desire of the attendees to become equity guardians at their schools. He noted racial equity and analysis training for staff regarding the updated the Board Action Report templates. Mr. Ruiz noted the training to capital staff over two days, and noted the newly developed calendar for all departments. Mr. Ruiz noted training in the central office on how to complete the Board Action Reports to have all decisions made through an equity lens. Mr. Ruiz noted that a reminder would be sent out with future meetings.

Ms. Bennett noted the program mapping and inventory through a compressive school list/mapping software to map the schools' services for use by internal and external stakeholders. She noted that it has been a month since this was approved. Dir. Burke asked for timeframe to integrate the tools. Ms. Bennett noted that there are six more months of these goals and she will have staff address that at the work session on Wednesday. Dir. Burke noted that he reviewed a webinar on the tools and noted that it is a very valuable tool.

Wyeth Jessee noted the handout regarding the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) progress update and project management plan. He noted four areas under this goal, four primary elements of MTSS. He highlighted the document and read through the document provided. Mr. Jessee noted the need to shift culture and systems, and needing representation from different teams for this process. He noted wanting to establish a culture of collaboration. Mr. Jessee noted that when teams come together with diverse backgrounds, skills and interests, they are very passionate about what they are producing. He noted this week, closing on a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a school based data portal, with many involved stakeholders including the City of Seattle. He noted the finalization next week of the choice, as they are still doing reference checks with School districts. Mr. Jessee noted the types of assessments- screening, formative, common, teacher developed, interims, state standard assessments. For an example of Professional Development (PD), up to 30 schools have been at Leadership Learning Day (LLD) with

principals in support of them implementing MTSS. Mr. Jessee noted a time of transition with C-SIPs to likely be the guiding document and the next step is getting out to help schools. He noted two sessions today with all 99 schools and identifying leads for working with each school, and identifying which schools need what level of assistance in the areas of coordinated health, Title I, etc. He noted that the work of the leads to collect evidence of their implementation of the work around Goal 's rubric to build success consistently across the district.

Dir. Geary noted confusion on what Mr. Jessee meant about identifying people to work within the district, and where are the ED's in this. Mr. Jessee provided examples of how the teams are working with school teams to build consistency. Mr. Jessee noted that there had been a lot of overlap where there was dual work being done by multiple departments, so now they have assigned a lead to reduce confusion as to who is leading the work. He noted that the EDs are looped in on the work being done, with the shared accountability network to have them support the schools. Mr. Tolley noted the EDs are doing work with the principals and when they identify an issue they loop in the leaders of the work teams to address the concerns.

Dir. Geary asked if there is a right hand, left hand issue with different people working with the Principals. Mr. Jessee noted the tools that help align and provide a common understanding. He noted the scale of 99 schools that MTSS is very complex with many layers. He noted a focus on a handful of schools where Central Office staff uses as a case study to identify data points and a process for working with the schools. Mr. Jessee noted staff working to be on the same page with working with leaders at the schools.

Dir. Pinkham asked about early warning indicators, and make sure we are looking for the good that is happening with the students and the schools, not just looking at the deficits. Mr. Jessee noted that is in the work and using the whole child framework to find the students' strengths. Dr. Kinoshita noted that in addition to what Mr. Jessee just summarized, the Leadership Learning Days will have a MTSS leadership component to it, with Principals and EDs to move forward and differentiate the learning to ensure building leaders have all had the appropriate training.

#### Advanced Learning Update

Mr. Jessee noted the Advanced Learning (AL) work, which in many ways aligns with MTSS. He noted that an update was in the last Friday Memo to the Board. Mr. Jessee noted needing to do a thorough job at engaging stakeholders, to cover across the district as much as possible, including a longitudinal study. Mr. Jessee noted needing a data profile to find outcomes of students to drill down on. He noted the equity tool analysis of Stephen Martin and his team. He noted a six-month timeline for training, working with stakeholders, working with the equity tool and having a solid plan. Mr. Jessee noted that all decisions will be communicated out, in preparation for the 2018-19 school year.

Dir. Burke asked that the commitment be to put AL in every school, to service students in their neighborhood schools. He noted that from feedback from the community is that it is not consistent across the District. Dir. Burke noted that whether urban myth or fact, families feel they can get a richer experience at a different school than their neighborhood school. Dir. Burke noted that feedback has shown that this is an ongoing challenge, and asked how we identify the magnitude and reality of this problem and asked if it needs to take a year's worth of deep dive to identify. Mr. Jessee noted a discussion at the School Board Work Session that directors had noted people are not happy with spectrum services and to make these adjustments. He noted that it will take a year to get this work done right. Mr. Jessee noted an important question to ask is what are families looking for, as there have been so many changes over time, and to get back to the fundamental questions of what families are looking for and expecting, and why did they

choose to have their child tested. He noted also the need to identify what students feel in regards to their experiences in being labeled as a “Spectrum student”. Mr. Jessee noted an identity safety issue, and the students who are labeled by not getting in to Spectrum. He noted the focus of balancing the needs of every student and to find out the story of the students in the District. Dir. Burke sees a great process that touches a lot of people and getting perspectives, but right now, in our data system, there is enough information to make an assessment and find out if they are doing better in their higher grades than the students who are not in Spectrum. He noted wanting to get part way to the understanding with less time and resources regarding the spectrum label. Mr. Jessee noted reporting monthly on this information and that he believes that the equity tool alone will take six months for training and application, and then over the summer without represented employees, there isn’t money for extra time to get the work to move forward. Mr. Tolley noted that there will be monthly updates that will be presented, and that staff can provide additional information prior to the timeline given. Stephen Martin noted that phase 1 is already in process and conversations around data with Eric Anderson are already taking place to see the actual effect on student participation for those students in AL and spectrum classes. He noted the training that is coming up on the equity tool, as well as PD and collaboration that is in place at the next meeting on Wednesday. Mr. Martin noted that there is much of the work that is in progress.

Dir. Burke asked for incremental progress updates and milestones along the way, not just at the end of this timeline. Mr. Jessee stated that he planned to provide monthly updates at C&I. Mr. Jessee noted that staff has added on the work of a comprehensive review of Spectrum, there is a capacity issue with the work that is being done, and that the data is difficult to run/analyze- with the daily work that is being done and moving forward. Dir. Burke asked what could be cut to fit within the resources of the department and district, and what is being prioritized. Dir. Geary appreciates how big this work is, and noted that if we want to do this right it will take time, it should become a SMART goal in its own right. She noted the various layers which are the real story of AL students and that we need to get information from those that we do not typically hear from if we want to make the changes that we are needing as a District. Dir. Geary noted wanting to see a system that works for all of the SPS students.

## **Board Policies and Procedures**

### School Board Policy 2020, Waiver of Basic Instructional Materials- Annual Report to the Board

Dr. Kinoshita noted that when coming on board to SPS, he worked hard to track down where waivers are at, and discovered that there were five more waivers than were listed in last years’ report. He discussed the handout which is a spreadsheet of the waivers- current and expired. Dr. Kinoshita noted 11 math waivers, and 2 that were expired and the schools were continuing to use the waived materials. He will have conversations with the principals to discuss intent. Two schools no longer needed the waiver, as they were using the adopted Math in Focus curriculum. Dr. Kinoshita noted that others were using the Montessori materials and the waiver was still in process. He noted waivers in schools with AL at elementary schools where the request was to use middle school materials for their advanced students.

In English Language Arts (ELA), there were five waivers, all of which were in place until is an ELA adoption, in which case they will use those district adopted materials. He noted a policy, without an accompanying procedure. A procedure was developed in 2012, but found it had vague deadlines and evaluative processes. Dr. Kinoshita noted working through the Superintendent Procedure to revise to current standards with specific deadlines addressed, tighten up the rationale

to ensure it adds to gap closing and state standards, includes a community engagement portion, tightens up record keeping and includes a standard form.

Dir. Geary asked if there are schools under their own waiver and if there is a process to communicate to them that they need to use the provided curriculum, and do we have the ability to do that analysis. Mr. Tolley noted that the current K-5 ELA adoption, the Pegasus curriculum was adopted in the 1990s, and they are no longer available for further purchase, and that no one is using these materials. He further noted that as the district has not provided a standard ELA adopted curriculum and text, schools are working on their own curriculum.

Dr. Kinoshita noted that if they find that there is something they find in addition to supplemental materials that there is inquiry done and a conversation with that school.

Dir. Geary noted if there is a new curriculum, that there has to be a point where the lack of using the materials needs to be tracked to find outcomes for student measurements to be apples to apples. She understands that now with the dated materials it is difficult, but requests that moving forward that there is a process to have a mechanism to check this. Dr. Kinoshita noted looking at materials orders, especially the consumable materials, where it will be indicative if the schools are truly utilizing the materials or not.

Dir. Burke noted that materials waivers procedure makes him nervous when we put block out times and non-negotiables in the process, as he feels that blocks innovation from taking place. He noted the unintended consequence of squashing innovation. He noted building in the innovation and if a school is asking for a waiver of the purchased materials to collect data as to why they feel it is not meeting needs so the district can assess further.

### **Special Attention Items**

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

Dir. Burke noted some good feedback at his community meeting regarding the ELA adoption process. Kathleen Vasquez noted the committee meeting last Friday and noted that Dir. Burke had come in to the meeting. She brought the reports in the handout, and noted that the vendor names are purposefully left off, as the process has not been approved by the Instructional Materials Committee (IMC) yet, as the meeting is tomorrow. Ms. Vasquez noted that this document shows where we are headed and why we are heading in that direction. She reviewed both handouts – family survey results and the staff survey results. She noted the alignment in the survey results within categories and the three vendors. Ms. Vasquez noted the evaluation on a four-point scale to get a stronger sense of where the breakdowns were, and noted the average scores that are listed on the handout. Mr. Vasquez reviewed the results on the handout. She noted the unanimous decision to eliminate the third option as the fell short on every category but one. She noted a stakeholder data group that looked at data from a specific stakeholder perspective and render a rank order of the remaining two vendors. In every case there was a clear number one choice. Ms. Vasquez noted the request to bring one recommendation forward to the Board, from one specific vendor, which has ranked highest, and was the first choice out of the gate. She noted it was a unanimous decision across stake holder groups. Ms. Vasquez noted going to the IMC tomorrow with a full report of process and communication efforts and engagement, then a Board Action Report will come to the January C&I Policy Committee meeting.

Dir. Burke asked if there is a minority report. Ms. Vasquez noted policy requires a pro/con of the top choice, but they are compiling an evaluation tool for all three choices. Dir. Burke asked if there will be qualitative feedback as to each, is that already in the works. Ms. Vasquez noted that each vendor will get their evaluation tool and feedback, within the vendor report. She noted a series of comments from families and staff that show up as themes or patterns, which will be included in the various components of the evaluation tool to be better aligned and showing due diligence on what they set out to rate.

Dir. Burke noted Mr. Jessee had noted formative assessments that roll up in to the instructional materials. Ms. Vasquez noted the con in the top choice is not as strong as the other two finalists with the assessment component. She noted needing to address that at some point, but will likely cost more money. Ms. Vasquez noted it has been a concern, although this vendor ranks very highly in other areas. She feels there is a remedy in sight that may not be too costly. Dir. Burke asked when the budget impact is going to be made known to the Board. Mr. Tolley noted that the purchasing department will work on negotiations and will be separate from the approval process by the Board. He noted the clear separation with what goes on with C&I and what work is being done in purchasing. Ms. Vasquez noted the amount will be noted in the Board Action Report. Dir. Pinkham asked if there are demographics on the respondents of the survey. Ms. Vasquez noted there is, but was not included in this short summary. She noted working hard to work with communications to get wide spread feedback and noted that the survey was translated in to five languages, but the respondents were very few from underrepresented groups.

Dir. Pinkham asked about the staff respondents regarding the racial aspect of the materials, and noted that it depends on what offends various cultural groups that responded. Ms. Vasquez acknowledged the challenge. She noted concerns and that many options that are out there were excluded due to this very reason, and that these are the best of the options. Ms. Vasquez noted that they will do their best to ensure that it is addressed by the teachers if there is anything found. She noted that she cannot promise that those types of things will not come up, but that in general, these options were pretty mindful.

#### Math Adoption Update

Dr. Kinoshita noted the handout provided in the packet. He noted that the finance division normally works on an RFP. However, a step was added to the process to issue a Request for Information (RFI) first to solicit price and general information due to the current budget situation and to see the scope of what we are dealing with in terms of cost, then to seek confirmation from the Board in regards to budget, and seek additional funds if necessary. Dr. Kinoshita noted the RFI will be issued before the holiday or just after the new year. He noted in March there will be expenditures in the process being incurred, so we would have needed to know whether to move forward by then.

Directors noted their agreement with this process. Dir. Burke noted that with the budget implications and the ELA adoption process that has been going on for a year, which may need to change due to the budget constraints. He is uncomfortable holding the process hostage at this point, and based on funds available they can procure and not waste time. Dir. Burke noted the process of doing the RFI for the \$2million allocated will be an interesting exercise, but could also limit the options. Dr. Kinoshita noted the process that has been mapped out already and can proceed or not due to what is found. Anna Box noted that January 2017 is the target date on many of these items, and the process of the adoption launches with purchasing with formal RFP that cannot be done until the Assistant Superintendent signs off on the process, and she will not

until the Board has been presented the RFI's and makes the decision that they are okay with moving forward in every budget scenario and is made a School Board priority. Dr. Kinoshita noted the tie to the budget discussion. Mr. Tolley noted anticipating that the State will at some point make a decision, and the question is what is the criteria in re-investing in the schools in the District, and that instructional materials will be right at the top of priorities with instructional staff.

#### Prioritizing for 2017 C&I Work Plan

Nate Van Duzer noted the documents at the back of the packet, and bringing the 2017 draft agenda today to review. He noted that it will come back in January in the case there is a change in the committee assignments. He noted the additions listed to the 2017 work plan, due to Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA) updates that have come up, to review old letter policies for update and/or repeal, and the work that was on the parking lot from 2016. Mr. Van Duzer noted assessments, program evaluation, and new policies. Dir. Burke noted the gap in skipping over April, as it is a two-month body of work. Mr. Van Duzer noted the desire to push this up, and that he is working with staff on this. Mr. Tolley noted that there is parallel work on interim assessments and that one body of work cannot be completed without the other. Mr. Van Duzer noted the graduation requirement policy, and noted that has been a discussion with the committee this year. Dir. Burke asked for clarification on this policy within the budget. Mr. Tolley noted the community engagement and the task force recommendations and that some work within the policy work will be implemented in the 2018-19 school year.

Mr. Van Duzer noted the upcoming edits to the excused and unexcused absences policy and minor policy questions raised in that policy that staff is surveying principals on. He noted instructional materials older policies in the 90s and 80s that are not relevant or can be added to a current policy. Mr. Van Duzer noted the student discipline policy language update coming with the student rights and responsibilities document to reflect the shift to a less punitive approach in the work actually being done. He noted school governance policies that is parallel in nature to the BLT work and it has caused confusion with families, most of this could be pulled off to avoid confusion. Mr. Van Duzer noted the Special Education C series policies that can be wrapped up in to current policies, but would not be a major change. He discussed research test activities, which is being circled back after program assessment and evaluation is settled. Mr. Van Duzer noted to let him know if there are any additions or suggestions for the possible new committee.

He noted the footer showing possible additions with new WSSDA policies regarding homeless students and Education of Students with Disabilities under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Dir. Burke noted the Career and Technical Education (CTE) Annual report showing on May, instead of the typical January, as there were significant changes within the strategic vision and there was a request from staff to move to a later month to accommodate the reporting and ensure it is done well.

Dir. Pinkham noted that he would like the Native American update to occur more than once a year. Mr. Van Duzer noted that it comes to committee once in May and to the entire Board in December/January. Mr. Tolley noted the standing agenda item that has been updated from last year.

The meeting adjourned at 6:46pm.