

# Board Special Meeting

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



## **Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee**

Monday, February 13, 2017, 4:30 – 6:30 pm  
Board Office Conference Room, John Stanford Center

### **Minutes**

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

Directors Burke, Geary, Harris and Patu were present.

Dir. Geary made a motion to approve the agenda as posted. Dir. Patu seconded the motion. The agenda was approved unanimously.

Dir. Geary made a motion to approve the minutes from the January 9, 2017 Curriculum & Instruction (C&I) Policy Committee meeting. Dir. Patu seconded the motion. The January 9, 2017 minutes were approved as published, unanimously.

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

#### **Highly Capable Students Program Comprehensive Plan**

Stephen Martin, Kari Hanson and Wyeth Jessee provided an overview of this item. Mr. Jessee noted the annual update to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) regarding Highly Capable services which is mandated by Washington Administrative Code (WAC) to provide overall description of Seattle Public School (SPS) services. Mr. Martin noted the change to OSPI requirements regarding the plan which no longer requires an annual plan to be submitted, unless there are significant changes to the plan, policies or procedures. Mr. Martin noted that this is the same plan submitted in the 2015-16 school year, and was fully compliant. He noted that this item requires a Board vote to stay current. Mr. Martin noted that SPS is accepting funding allocation from state totaling over \$500,000, received in a monthly allocation adjusted to full time equivalent (FTE). He noted that the Board action report explains the requirement. Mr. Martin noted questions from Dir. Burke regarding the data in the form package regarding the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) achievement testing box is checked. He noted that it is not administered to all students K-8, but to those from private schools or those who lack Measurers of Academic Progress (MAP) or Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA) data. Mr. Martin noted the question regarding page 10 where the gifted values box was checked in one section and not another. He explained the differentiation was whether the test was administered in a self-contained classroom, or general education classroom. Mr. Martin further explained the reporting through academic warehouse and the testing administration in the classrooms.

Dir. Geary noted that she did not have this document in the 2x2 sessions and the work session, which would have allowed for a much richer conversation. Dir. Burke asked for the timing for this document being submitted and reviewed, and how does it influence our implementation of highly capable. Mr. Martin noted this was submitted in the Spring of 2015, and it is the same

form package from then, since there were no significant changes to policy or practice. Mr. Jessee noted that it is State mandated that the approval goes through the School Board, even if it does not need to be submitted to OSPI. He noted annual oversight and i-Grant reviews that go back to OSPI. Mr. Jessee noted this plan could be a part of the conversation if the Directors want it as a discussion. He noted that the district is not out of time to use this in future conversations, and the assessment portion is what drives most of this conversation.

Dir. Patu noted that this was going to the Board through approval, and if something has to go to the Board, they need two weeks to look over the documents and takes time to digest. Mr. Jessee noted that this information went out with the regular packet in advance as standard procedure prior to committee meetings. Dir. Burke noted that this comes through every year, and noted that there is a lot of information to digest. Mr. Tolley noted that at the Oversight Work Session there is a template presentation document as to what is to be presented, and that in the past this information had not been provided. He noted that if this is the desire of the Board, then it is something staff can work towards. Dir. Burke noted that perhaps a reference to this plan as a reportable document.

Dir. Harris noted mentorship under Cedars 35, #12 as reference to the International Baccalaureate program where she has heard feedback from the public that it is not as robust as they were lead to believe. She noted that she felt the box was checked without understanding the meaning of mentorship and differentiation with respect to highly capable or advanced learning. Dir. Harris noted there is a confusion between site based decisions versus district.

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

Dir. Geary asked to have this document be used in terms of considering options in the future, as a memory jogger and inquiry tool. Dir. Burke agreed.

### **Standing Agenda Items**

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

Mr. Jessee provided an overview of Goal 1 and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS). Mr. Jesse noted the three handouts in the packet. He noted the MTSS overview as a visual, one-pager with the timeline for the year. Mr. Jessee noted that this links with the Superintendent SMART goals in the coloring for uniformity. He noted the current timelines and that the tools shown with regards to professional development and school based workings. Mr. Jessee stated that an MTSS lead was assigned to each school this school year. Mr. Jessee noted the work that the MTSS leads are doing with each school on these implementation milestones, as listed on the handout. He reviewed the document and the data points, and noted that the data is being collected from every school, and provided examples.

Dir. Burke asked how many components are within the tool. Ms. Hanson noted the four components within whole child framework, and noted 16 different indicators that the schools demonstrate evidence for. She noted that this is an excerpt for principals to see the evidence over time. Mr. Jessee noted this will be communicated broadly and the expectation is that schools and leads use this over time, as some schools are just emerging in on this work. He noted that at a future meeting, he will discuss the roll out next year and the accountability structure.

Dir. Burke asked how many indicators total. Ms. Hanson noted this document is still under review, and that at this time there are approximately 16 indicators for each of the four components.

Mr. Jessee noted the MTSS task force and parents who are providing feedback on elements of this data portal, worksheet, assessment, and overall work.

Dir. Geary asked what group within the district are the leads from. Mr. Jessee noted the leads are from special education, coordinated health, the English Language Learners department, and career ladder. Dir. Geary asked if they are assigned pieces at each school. Mr. Jessee clarified that each person is assigned a few schools, they are the point person that checks in with the school and aligns with the Building Leadership Team (BLT). He noted that the components within the evidence collected as in on the document, and to align the work and support the school with getting the work done. He provided examples of the type of work that the leads are doing within the schools. Mr. Jessee noted every school has a common expectation and they have the support of the lead person for their school, who have been trained to look at the data profile and the Continuous School Improvement Plan (C-SIP) to support the school. Mr. Jessee noted the data portal handout that shows the trainings for the schools that are a part of the field test to have common data and reports across the schools (elementary, middle and high schools). He noted that he will send dates for the trainings that will be conducted.

Dir. Harris asked where the Executive Directors of Schools (EDS's) fit in and where does the C-SIP fit in. Mr. Jessee noted the C-SIP is the binding document for the goal and focus areas and central office will help support and progress monitoring. He noted that the EDS's will be contacted when issues arise and the lead person will work alongside the EDS to loop in on the work.

Dir. Burke asked if we applied the MTSS guide to the outlier schools, would they all score 3 and do they have all the tools that we are asking of other schools. He further asked are we asking buildings to create things from scratch that already exist at some buildings? Mr. Jessee responded by stating schools are in different stages of development as there are dozens of elements on the MTSS guiding document – nobody has all “3s”. Ms. Hanson noted the project work is to build out the toolkit and the process which will roll through schools via professional development and the actual toolkit. Dir. Burke asked to see it. Mr. Jessee noted it could be brought to committee in March. He noted that tools will come along over time. Mr. Tolley noted that Superintendent SMART Goal 2, eliminating opportunity gaps, we are working a framework which will be shared with the full Board at the March 8 work session on Superintendent SMART Goals. He noted the framework takes a look how MTSS, Goal 1 and Goal 2 are connected and interdependent. Mr. Tolley noted the components that staff are focusing on with the whole child framework, which is being built out right now.

In regards to Smart Goal 3, Michael Tolley noted the program mapping and the program review and evaluation over the last few months. He noted that Dr. Eric Anderson has shared updates with the committee in the last few months. Ashley Davies noted just wrapping the request for proposal (RFP) process for the mapping software. She noted the Guide K-12 program provides boundary planning, transparency, community discussions, overview of school locator within the software and other benefits. She noted components that would allow SPS to do internal data and impact analysis on student populations, and also allows families to search for schools with

specific program offerings around the district. Ms. Davies played a video from the Guide K-12 website. She noted the work that the software can assist the district and the community with.

Dir. Geary asked if Ms. Davies finds this tool to be helpful to her for her own work, and how does she see it being helpful between how the work is done now and with the tool. Ms. Davies noted that the tools are much more accessible with this program, and will allow greater accessibility and would be more responsive to feedback. Ms. Davies noted that currently there are a few enrollment planning staff who can look up this data, which slows the process and delays our responsiveness to families. She noted that this program would allow those staff more time for the operational side of things, not just using the old tool. She noted that the Board would be able to go in to the system and apply various scenarios and take that data to their community meetings.

Dir. Harris asked about the sustainability of this program and what other districts are using this program. Ms. Davies noted Kent is looking at it, and Bainbridge is getting ready to implement it. She noted many in Oregon are using this, as this is an Oregon based company. Ms. Davies noted that in terms of funding sustainability, the quote was \$1.25 per student, which is a little over \$60,000 annually and as the district grows, the cost will also. Dir. Harris asked about training costs. Ms. Davies noted that is a onetime cost up front, and those staff that get trained in the initial round can then train others in the future. Ms. Davies has talked to other school districts who utilize this program and has heard how responsive the company has been about the service. Dir. Patu asked what will be eliminated by using this tool. Ms. Davies noted this allows us to have more flexibility in looking at scenarios, and manipulate streets more easily, and better responsiveness to questions from the community and from the Board. She noted that this program makes the data more accessible and timely in order to communicate better to the Board and the community. Ms. Davies noted the school search will be very easy for families to search by using their address and the school based offerings within the district.

Dir. Burke noted that the Academic Inventory chart provided in the packet will be accessible via this tool.

### **Board Policies and Procedures**

#### **School Board Policy 3121 – Excused and Unexcused Absences**

Pat Sander and Brad Fulkerson provided an overview of this item. Mr. Fulkerson noted a fully routed Board action report coming next month to committee, and noted that this is a preview of what is to be presented next month. He noted the memo that explains the surface level changes on language that is aligned to how SPS communicates to the community.

Dir. Harris asked if we could get rid of the wordiness on the action reports and the procedures. Mr. Fulkerson noted that he will strive for brevity. Dir. Burke noted that the policy is generalized and the Superintendent Procedure is quite lengthy. Dir. Burke highlighted that there is an opportunity to infuse this policy with the intent changes on positive behavior intervention, and that attendance is a large part of this. He noted to not soften the importance, but use the positive behavior lens in this work. Ms. Sander noted that the prosecuting attorney's office noted that we were not filing as many petitions as they expected, that they need to have the petitions filed, which generates work on their end. Ms. Sander noted the attendance work in the state of Washington is one of the more punitive ones out there, and is a bit of a conflict with our less punitive work at the district. She noted looking in to family-based community truancy boards in partnership with Seattle Housing Authority at Jane Adams Middle School (JAMS) to work with families as a family unit, not just a single student to be more supportive.

Dir. Patu asked how they decided on the sites. Ms. Sander noted this is a pilot with the truancy board, and JAMS had indicated an interest, and they will move forward with more community truancy boards in the future.

Dir. Harris noted asking the Prosecuting Attorney's office to come work with us, and add to the restorative justice piece. Staff made note of the request.

#### School Board Policies 2163, 2090, & NEW – Assessments and Program Evaluation

Dr. Kyle Kinoshita, Wyeth Jessee, Cashel Toner and Megan Bale provided an overview of this item. Dr. Kinoshita noted this is the first draft of a new assessment policy and staff is working to seek clarity on the different policies in regards to program evaluation and MTSS. He noted trying to resolve the issues of overlap with Policies 2090 and 2163. Dr. Kinoshita noted the other piece was a draft of community engagement plan for the policy and the steps on the community engagement. Dr. Kinoshita noted a change from what is reflected in the memo and that the committee meeting of the whole will be on March 16, not the 13. He noted the work of Erinn Bennett and Nate Van Duzer in assisting with the development of this policy. Dr. Kinoshita noted the research of many districts in the state and across the country, which is included in the packet provided. He read through the draft policy and made note of the reasoning behind the language chosen. Dr. Kinoshita noted in the policy wording a reference to the Seattle Education Association (SEA) bargaining agreement which includes sections on the joint District-SEA assessment committee, that it reviews assessment selection and develops a calendar of assessments. He noted that the following section provided distinctions between types of assessments, and the broad range of tools that keep track on how students are learning. Dr. Kinoshita noted that the section distinguishes between those that are district wide and administered as mandated by state and federal law, and by Board Policy and those that are administered at the classroom level.

Dir. Harris noted the assessment resolution, and asked how much of this was used when working on this draft assessment work. Ms. Bale noted that Ms. Bennett had noted that the language was taken from the resolution and the Board action report. Dir. Harris noted the collaboration of the work, and asked what would be found in common if the documents were placed next to each other, to show the hard work that they had done meant something. Dr. Kinoshita noted that it would be reflected in the language on student rights, and that what they tried to do in thinking of the resolution is to isolate what type of assessments that the district has control over and those that we do not.

Dir. Burke requested that when this comes back to committee, that this information has been considered. Mr. Tolley noted on March 16 there will be a Committee of the Whole to walk through the draft and receive specific feedback from Directors.

Dir. Burke noted some great content, but struggles with the feeling that it is not actionable and that it is more like a definition document or more like a procedure, instead of a policy with adoption process and reporting structure. Dr. Kinoshita noted to line up all three policies to show that there is language within those that address that concern.

Dir. Geary noted that the resolution they referenced to the elimination of duplicate testing, or to those that took up too much classroom time. She noted that there is no pushback written in here, as a breaking point or balance of factors, that allow us to do the analysis on the vetting

process. She asked what are the factors that drive the interference to the curriculum. Dir. Burke noted to send comments to the team to work on before the committee of the whole. Mr. Tolley noted the feedback and the changes to be made to the draft. He noted the draft will be sent to the Board in advance of the work session in March. Dir. Harris asked that there be 10 minutes at the committee of the whole on the March 16<sup>th</sup> to invite folks that have strong feelings about testing to get their input as well. Mr. Tolley noted that he would take that up with staff to review this request. Mr. Jessee noted that we are using the new engagement tool as part of the plan. Ms. Toner noted the community engagement plan which includes the engagement of stakeholders within the community. Ms. Toner noted they put some thought in to the groups and put it through the engagement tool.

### **Special Attention Item**

#### **Ethnic Studies Resolution discussion**

Rita Green, John Greenberg, Tracy Gill and Tess Williams on behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) presented a Resolution to the Seattle School Board regarding Ethnic Studies. Ms. Green noted data showing that ethnic studies will close the gaps. She noted the feedback that she has received from students is that the curriculum is not something they can identify with. Mr. Greenberg noted a Stanford study that showed attendance, grades and test scores increased when ethnic studies were incorporated in the curriculum. Ms. Williams noted that when students are engaged, that there is less classroom disruption. Ms. Gill noted ethnic studies can be incorporated in to current courses already taught within the district. Mr. Greenberg noted that there are thematically based classes that ethnic studies can be imbedded in to.

Ms. Gill noted that she teaches 6<sup>th</sup> grade ancient civilizations. She incorporates ethnic studies by comparing ancient issues to modern day issues. Ms. Gill noted other teachers who incorporate ethnic studies within science and math in the outlier schools. Mr. Greenberg noted working with the community to build partnerships by creating the curriculum together.

Dir. Burke thanked the group for bringing this forward and noted that this aligns with a lot of the work that the Board is doing. He noted it is an amazing body of work.

Dir. Patu noted that ethnic studies used to be taught at Rainier Beach as students wanted to hear about what is happening now in our country and our state. The students refused to go to class unless the curriculum was taught. She noted that the students want to learn about other students that are in class with them. Mr. Tolley noted that staff has researched our current curriculum and the sequence of courses that are required in the district. He noted partnering with our community to see what they are asking for. Mr. Greenberg noted that this is a part of the civil rights movement, and it is not just wanted from the ethnic students, but from the white students as well, as there is so much going on in our communities. Ms. Gill noted that it is about justice, not just race, and that all students are interested in learning about this. She noted that teaching ethnic studies creates a place of empathy that can start in the classroom. Mr. Greenberg noted that to create a community you have to honor pieces of culture.

Dir. Geary asked for links to the studies that they are referencing to assist in creating something bigger. She noted that we need to run this resolution through our internal race and equity process, and through the community engagement tool. Dir. Geary noted her own experiences of learning the history that was taught to her from a humanistic perspective. Ms. Green noted the endorsements from the community that they have received, and they continue to collect.

Dir. Harris noted the teach in on Saturday at Garfield High School and noted that she would have liked to have seen more people there, but as it was a Saturday and on their own time there was a lower turnout. She noted the funds needed for professional development in order to deliver this type of training to teachers. Dir. Harris noted brainstorming to have curriculum on the intranet to have provide more access. She noted that not all teachers have been trained the Since Time Immemorial curriculum, which is state mandated. Dir. Harris noted the need to find a grant to brave these issues to get a stronger professional development for our teachers. Mr. Greenberg noted work with the Center for Race and Equity to find ways to get this information to the union members.

Dir. Burke emphasized a lot of wishes and a lack of funding, and that there needs to be work around civics that can work toward. He noted that the community engagement process that staff will look at through our tool, and the race and equity tool. Dir. Burke commented that ultimately we need to come up with a plan to move the work forward, and do an inventory of the work that is currently being done across the district to understand where we are now, and figure out how to enhance it from there. He noted working with Dr. Kinoshita and Kathleen Vasquez. Dr. Kinoshita noted existing channels of professional development that will continue even with our current budget and will be looked in to.

Dir. Harris asked for the next step. Dir. Burke noted that this is a resolution, although not an SPS resolution. He noted that to adopt such a resolution, Directors and staff would have to take this material and run through the internal process. Dir. Burke asked if the Directors want to move forward with this. Dir. Geary asked that staff look through this and see what areas will capture the goal and not create conflict and align the work to the policies. Dir. Burke asked if this could be brought back to committee next month. Dr. Kinoshita noted the process has already started on the inventory piece.

#### Math Adoption Update

Anna Box provided an update on the process and timeline. She noted the handout on the timeline from the purchasing department, which she reviewed for the Directors. Ms. Box noted that by close of business today, the step one of the request for proposal (RFP) has not launched, although it is close to being done. She noted gathering a committee per policy to meet the criteria before materials arrive in order to review the proposals appropriately. Ms. Box pointed out the “duration” column, that “C&I” does not refer to this C&I Policy Committee, but another reference within purchasing. Ms. Box noted that on the SPS website there is information and forms ready to solicit committee membership to the adoption committee, and the timeline as it stands depending on the RFP process.

Dir. Patu asked about previous math adoptions that did not go well. She referenced one where the books were ordered, but did not fit well within the schools, and another adoption where the materials were not used. Dir. Patu is concerned this does not happen again and that the materials will be used for all students that they are ordered from. Ms. Box noted the huge investment that is not being taken lightly. She noted to follow procedure with the committee and vet the materials to ensure that the process is followed through.

Dir. Burke noted this is non-trivial challenge, and noted the work of the English Language Arts (ELA) adoption committee. Ms. Box noted the work needed to get there, and the desired outcomes. Dir. Harris asked what materials are being purchased for new schools opening next year. Ms. Box noted there has not been a declaration of the materials as of now. Dr. Kinoshita spoke to both planning principals and the dilemma with the timeline of this adoption cycle. He

will be meeting with them again and perhaps there will be a stop gap measure to tide these schools over until the actual adoption goes through. Dr. Kinoshita noted Engage New York, an online material, that may satisfy that need which is being considered. Ms. Box noted it is an open resource that is copy write free.

Dir. Harris noted a recent committee of the whole where finances and middle school math adoption was discussed in order to find a creative way to fund math adoption and online learning. She recalls waivers for other curricula, with Engage New York, and noted these are bigger issues and expressed her concerns that are being left in the wake. Dr. Kinoshita noted a revision to the waiver process that will be coming forward next month. He noted that several meetings ago we talked about what to do with the schools with old curriculum, and that staff surveyed the other schools and noted the district would do waivers for those schools that we are unable to update at this time. Dr. Kinoshita noted that “online learning” is not the same as the online materials that he was referencing previously- it is basically printing hard copy materials from an online resource.

Dir. Harris asked about using the outlier schools and asked for an update. Ms. Box noted that this update was provided at last months’ C&I policy committee meeting, and summarized what the report was with the outlier schools. She noted the positive outlier schools are using materials that they created themselves from a variety of materials and that their work is materials independent. Ms. Box noted that they found that the successes were due to allocating funding, professional development, positive student relationships, scheduling, and other factors. She noted closing the gap, to scale and replicate good MTSS work, not just the curriculum.

Dir. Burke noted that at last month’s meeting they asked for the supplemental materials list, and asked if that got sent out. Ms. Box noted that the work changes every day, and she could take a snap shot of what happened that day. Dir. Burke noted that educators have their favorites and asked for staff to find the commonality. Ms. Box noted she could ask for the teacher favorites. Dir. Burke noted supporting the structure and providing guidance in a unique opportunity for core tools to provide to schools. Ms. Box noted that she will ask the school sites.

Ms. Box noted that the purchasing office will be ordering a set of books during the RFP process and asked if the Directors would also like a set of their own, or would be okay with the set that will be placed in the professional development library. Dir. Burke noted he would climb the stairs and save the money.

Dir. Burke asked if we are staying within the \$2million budget. Ms. Box noted the RFP draft language says that we are looking for a \$2million or less product, and the budget office has noted not to categorically decline the RFP based on that amount.

Dir. Geary asked for some assistance with being involved in the adoption process and to go through the materials as a review. Ms. Box noted she will work with Kathleen Vasquez to align the work and process.

#### English Language Arts (ELA) Adoption Update

Dr. Kinoshita noted that planning template which will be used by the CAI department is about planning the adoption, now that it has been Board approved. He noted wanting to be proactive and have a plan in place, although they are still unsure on the budgetary piece. Dr. Kinoshita noted that by using the planning template, staff is connecting planning with the ability to evaluate

what we are doing. He noted a conference he attended around the work on implementing this exact process. Dr. Kinoshita noted this is a type of anchor document that can be used in future implementations and provided an overview of the handout in the packet.

Ms. Vasquez pointed out features of the planning tool in the packet and provided an overview on the various headers and sections. She noted the work of the adoption committee to align what the community had asked for in the tools that they were selecting, as listed on the left side of the handout. Ms. Vasquez noted the process of evaluating the effectiveness of the materials, resources and the instruction. She noted a new group called the ELA Cadre comprised of a primary and secondary teacher at each school will assist with the evaluation piece. Ms. Vasquez noted they are using the people who are on the ground, in the classroom, to help us evaluate the areas that we need to target, and allow the ELA department to calibrate implementation from building to building.

Dr. Kinoshita noted this work will help us with work in the classroom and is connected to implementing MTSS goals, and the work done to have less students needing interventions.

Dir. Patu asked about the accountability piece. Dr. Kinoshita noted that is the evaluation piece in the handout and in the tool.

#### 2017 C&I Work Plan

Staff noted that Advanced Learning update was not presented this month, but that would be added to next month's committee meeting. Directors had made an earlier request to bring the Ethnic Studies Resolution back as an update after running through our internal tools.

Dir. Burke adjourned the meeting at 6:37pm