

Board Special Meeting
Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee
Tuesday, August 22, 2017, 4:30pm
Board Office Conference Room, John Stanford Center
2445 – 3rd Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134



Agenda

Call to Order 4:30pm

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of agenda
3. Approval of June 12, 2017 C&I Policy Committee meeting minutes

Board Action Reports (Discussion and/or Action) 4:35pm

1. League of Education Voters Foundation (LEVf) grant to South Shore PreK-8 for \$1,000,000 for the 2017-2018 and \$1,000,000 for the 2018-2019 school year. (Stone, Intro/Action August 30)

Standing Agenda Items 4:50pm

1. Superintendent SMART Goals 1- Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports

Board Policies and Procedures 5:05pm

1. Policies 2145, 2420, C16- High School Graduation Requirements and credits

Special Attention Items 5:15pm

1. Cascade Parent Partnership Program Update (Gonder/Whitworth)
2. Math Adoption Update (Kinoshita/Box)
3. Seattle Preschool Program Update (Toner)
4. Assessment Calendar Update (Kinoshita/Toner/Roach)
5. Continuous School Improvement Plans Update (Starosky)
6. Advanced Learning Program Review Update (Anderson/Hanson)
7. C&I Policy Committee Work Plan

Adjourn 6:30pm

Upcoming Meetings

- Tuesday, September 12, 2017 C&I Policy Committee Meeting

(Please note that this is a working committee. Documents may change before the meeting and/or prior to introduction before the Board. Special meetings of the Board may contain discussion and/or action related to the items listed on the agenda).

Board Special Meeting

2445 – 3rd Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134



Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee

June 12, 2017, 4:00pm

Board Office Conference Room, John Stanford Center

Minutes

Call to Order

This meeting was called to order at 4:16. Directors Burke and Geary were present. Director Harris arrived at 4:27pm.

The meeting was staffed by Associate Superintendent for Teaching & Learning Michael Tolley, Chief of Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction Kyle Kinoshita, Chief of Student Support Services Wyeth Jessee, School Operations Manager Sherri Kokx, Executive Director of Curriculum and Instruction Cashel Toner, Director of Career and College Readiness Dan Gallagher, Executive Director of Government Relations & Strategic Initiatives Erinn Bennett, Manager of Education and Housing Kathlyn Paananen, and Principals Jill Hudson and Ruth Medsker.

Dir. Burke requested to move special attention item two to the top of the agenda out of respect for the principals in attendance to present this evening. Director Geary moved to approve the agenda as amended. Director Burke seconded. This motion passed unanimously.

Dir. Burke asked about the meeting minutes from the May C&I Policy Committee, noting that he thought he requested a list of district wide assessments. Mr. Tolley noted that list comes with the Assessment Calendar informational item in August and did not recall a request at the last meeting.

Director Geary moved to approve the May 8, 2017 meeting minutes as published. Director Burke seconded. The meeting minutes passed unanimously. Michael Tolley noted that information regarding the assessment calendar will be shared with the Board via Friday Memo this week.

High School Revisioning/24 Credit Update

Mr. Tolley introduced Principals Medsker and Hudson and acknowledged their leadership and their deep dive with principals on graduation requirements throughout the year. Ms. Medsker noted the state changing the graduation requirements and that currently Seattle Public Schools (SPS) is operating on a waiver of this requirement. She noted that the students entering High School next year would be the first students to need 24 credits to graduate. Ms. Medsker discussed a task force made up of instructional coaches, building staff, district leaders, principals and teachers and parents and students. Ms. Medsker noted the feedback, recommendations and example pathways as listed in the handout.

Director Harris arrived at 4:27pm.

Dir. Harris asked what socializing the recommendations means. Ms. Medsker noted how the information is shared to internalize the recommendations. Ms. Hudson noted getting students ready for the

innovation era, not the manufacturing age of the past. She noted the profile of the graduate included in the packet, and the list of characteristics from the principals. Ms. Medsker noted that principals shared this with their communities. Mr. Tolley noted that this information is also being shared with staff, parents and the community to discuss the changes at the high school level. He noted that this could be part of the foundational documents for the next strategic plan. Ms. Hudson noted a new high school and beyond tool that was launched this spring to help identify courses that students will take in high school, and noted other planning tools such as Schoology and the new Career & College Readiness tool. Dir. Burke asked how it works together. Ms. Medsker noted the connections between the planning tools with the state “high school and beyond tool” and the program that SPS will get.

Dir. Geary asked for 2x2s or a work session to spend some more time on this. Dir. Burke noted that it is a huge body of work and he prefers to have a work session on this foundational work. Mr. Tolley noted the work will continue over the next several years, and that school Board policies will need to be reviewed early next year and there will be a work session around that this fall.

Dir Harris asked for info on the feedback and asked if there is a community engagement plan. Dir. Burke expressed that we should be engaging outside stakeholders who will serve the graduates in the work places and colleges. Dir. Geary noted that the public is engaged and this is could potentially be a big issue and we need to be mindful of the process to educate city partners and find a way to keep them apprised of the work in process. Dr. Kinoshita noted this is one of the draft goals to be revisited in the next school year. Mr. Tolley noted that principals were trained on how to present to staff and communities and were asked to complete a survey online and provide feedback on the profile of a graduate. Each High School principal was required to complete those presentations by the end of the school year, and then compile the feedback to revise and take back to the community.

Board Action Reports (Discussion and/or Action)

School Board Resolution 2016/17-17, Ethnic Studies

Dr. Kinoshita noted this is being reintroduced from the last meeting, where Directors asked for more input and noted the updates listed on the Board Action Report. Dir. Burke noted the changes and noted the gist is that we recognize the need to be directed by the Superintendent to implement a plan. Dir. Burke requested that this would be moved forward for consideration in order to change some language around community engagement, to be more collaborative. He noted the Board is consulting and involving the community, yet for the work product, that it needs to be further collaborative and the work product be done with a tier 3 mindset. Mr. Tolley asked if we are going forward with the intent to have that changed done before introduction. Dir. Harris asked who is working on the community engagement plan. Dir. Burke noted that is a part of the task force work. Dr. Kinoshita noted that is what the task force’s purpose is to engage the community.

DECISION: Director Geary made a motion to move this item forward to the full Board with a recommendation for consideration. Director Burke seconded. This motion passed 2-1. Dir. Harris voted no.

Dir. Geary is voting to move this forward for consideration, and understands that community engagement is important, but to keep good faith from the community that brought this forward, to show them our commitment and seriousness.

Adopting Policy No. 2080, Assessment

Mr. Tolley noted the work on this policy over the past several months, and noted reaching out to community stakeholders and also meeting with Directors. He noted the requests from the last committee Minutes submitted for approval at the August 22, 2017 C&I Policy Committee Meeting

meeting to meet with directors and staff to listen and incorporate the feedback. Mr. Tolley noted the legal and operational limitations within the policy in regards to the recommendations. He noted in the packet, a summary document that outlines the changes since last month's committee meeting. Dr. Kinoshita introduced the feedback as listed in the packet, and read the additions to the policy.

Dir. Burke asked what is the definition of "all assessments for district wide use." Dr. Kinoshita noted all buildings at a particular level, and provided an example of all second grade students take a reading assessment. As opposed to assessments used by one classroom or one school based on their choice. Mr. Jessee noted that the intent of this policy is to clean up what is being used at schools and to move farther away from building level assessments. Dir. Burke asked for clarify regarding bullet three of the Superintendent Procedure, regarding the scope of this policy being only district wide assessments. Mr. Tolley noted that this policy is for all assessments administered district wide. Dir. Burke asked that if it is free or a million dollars, they would go through this process. Mr. Tolley confirmed. Dir. Burke said that "district wide assessment" is not defined, and it is imperative that that scope and definition be included. Staff noted the request.

Dir. Harris asked if we have heard from the Seattle Education Association (SEA) and the SEA assessment committee. Dir. Burke noted conversations but it was not formal. Dr. Kinoshita noted that Megan Bale who did the work and feedback is no longer with the district and he noted the feedback and engagement that she received. Dir. Kinoshita noted the remainder of the edits to the policy and procedure as listed in the summary document. Mr. Tolley noted these were in response to the feedback from Board members between last committee meeting and leading up to this meeting. He noted that between now and introduction, they will make the clarifying language changes as requested. Dir. Geary asked that expected results be written in as part of the adoption process during selection. Staff noted the request.

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

Mr. Jessee noted that in review of these types of policies across the United States that this is the most comprehensive one that he has seen, and with putting too many internal procedural and legal limitations, he is concerned that we do not want to be in violation of our own policy due to operational limitations at the district.

Review and Approval of Career and Technical Education 2017 Annual Plan Per Policy No. 2170

Dan Gallagher provided an overview of the Board Action Report. He noted the changes since the last meeting and the request for 2x2 meetings with Directors for further review. Mr. Gallagher highlighted the changes and affirmed the timeline of the approval process and the progress report update timeline.

Dir. Burke asked for clarification on the table on page 7 and confirming the number of students in SPS versus the State. Mr. Gallagher noted that the state uses enrollments in Career and Technical Education (CTE) classes is proportional in the data in the table. Dir. Burke asked at the Skills Center, is there a percentage of skills center versus the state. Mr. Gallagher noted it is tricky to find the proportion of skills center enrollment to potential, and it is tricky to find the numbers across the state. He noted our enrollment is lower than the state.

Dir. Geary asked which district is pulling the average up, and to look at those districts or outliers to see what they are doing. Mr. Gallagher knows the districts with a good reputation and from conversations

with other CTE directors in the state, but did not specifically look at the statistics. Dir. Harris noted the annual work session requires benchmarking. Mr. Gallagher asked the directors if they would like to see the benchmarking in this document or at the meeting. Dir. Geary noted she would like a paragraph to know what this document was created for, who is the intended audience and the intended results of the document. Mr. Gallagher noted the change to add the sentence on skills center enrollment, will add the benchmarking to the document. Dir. Burke asked to weave in that this report is governed by policy and has other internal and external use. Mr. Gallagher recommends that the next report be presented in January, on its usual schedule. Dir. Harris noted that she does not see labor partners included in this report. Mr. Gallagher noted the work of the partners and the outreach and noted the request to add.

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

Annual Approval of Schools

Mr. Tolley noted the packet of information provided for this item. He noted the timeline with the summer schedule and also allowing the principals to finish and have the Continuous School Improvement Plans (C-SIPs) uploaded to the website and available to view. He noted the new process and to make them a more living document and to better align with the district and professional development (PD) calendar. Mr. Tolley noted they are usually approved in the late fall, but now the intent is to have them approved in late spring to align with PD planning, budget considerations and before the school year begins. He noted the new Development Manual to assist building leaders to comprehensively complete their C-SIP. He noted at the last two LLD's, principals were presenting and getting feedback on their plans to continue to improve quality of the plans.

Dir. Harris asked if there was a specific role for Executive Directors of Schools (EDSs) in this action report. Mr. Tolley noted that they ensure implementation of the C-SIP and showed where it is listed in the document. She asked where the accountability loop is for holding EDS's being held accountable. Dir. Burke noted page 10 of the development-planning document where it specifically states the EDS's role. Mr. Tolley noted that monitoring of the C-SIP process is part of the role of the EDS, and that is part of their job throughout the entire school year.

Dir. Geary noted that Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports (MTSS) does not have a succinct definition and she would like it written in to the document. Mr. Jessee noted that he has a link to add to the document. Dir. Burke noted the hot topic of this, and noted it is a huge volume of work. He noted this is a change and has not heard candid feedback at the school level. Dir. Geary noted that the timeline should be introduced next school year after the summer, so engage to the communities. Mr. Tolley noted the engagement and Building Leadership Team (BLT) work is happening now and has been throughout the spring. Dir. Geary asked to move the timeline to introduction July, and then Action in September. Mr. Tolley noted that the plans will move forward as approved by the BLT. The school Board approval process is to verify that the school plans exist. He noted contractual agreements with SEA, and the BLT approves C-SIPs.

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

Amendment No. 1 Contract No. RFP09615 Student Data Portal for School-Based Implementation of MTSS

Mr. Jessee provided an overview of this item, to amend the contract with School Data Solutions, as aligned with SMART Goal 1. He noted the field test with 15 schools at all three levels across the districts. Mr. Jessee noted previous presentations to the committee regarding this portal and noted the need to start this process immediately in order to transfer the data and processes. Mr. Jessee noted the alignment with the Superintendent SMART Goals for 2017-18, he discussed the alignment with the Academic Data Warehouse, in order to have a common platform for all teacher and staff to find information about their students. Mr. Jessee noted the surveys from the field test, and included a summary of the outcomes, including position feedback.

Dir. Harris noted concern that the data in homeroom becomes a permanent part of the student's record. Mr. Jessee noted that we already have access to the information she is referring to and that this system just puts all of the information that we have in one place. Dir. Harris noted that the feedback does not separate out and note where the data came from and for her to find a way to rate the data in a granular way. Mr. Jessee noted he will summarize the findings and will get some information out in a Friday Memo to the Board.

Dir. Geary noted the story piece, with knowing every students strength and need. She asked what is the story that people will get out of homeroom. Mr. Jessee noted that it is their strengths, potential and where they are at currently. He noted their academic information, grades, attendance, chronic absenteeism, behavioral incidents, preventative reporting will be accessible. Dir. Burke noted a concern with an offer to provide training and log ins to look at a dashboard. Mr. Jessee noted that the Directors could attend School Leaders Institute in August for training.

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

Standing Agenda Items

Superintendent SMART Goals 1-3

Mr. Tolley noted that at this Wednesday's Work Session we will be reviewing all five SMART goals.

Board Policies and Procedures

Policy 2200, Equitable Access Quarterly Report

Sherrri Kokx provided an overview of this item. She noted this is an update since the April Quarterly report and noted the only changes were in Special Education (SpEd) due to changes in enrollment (actual and projected), and noted the report.

Dir. Geary noted she thought they were moving away from Service Model 2 (SM2). Michaela Clancy noted that implementation at the elementary is complete, it is the last continuation, and they will add access to secondary, and then determine the best services. SM2 is the old level system, the students need more repetition and intensity while in general education. Ms. Kokx noted the only other change is listed, is not required, but included regarding Youth family services, the contract expired and is not renewed due to not meeting required needs. Dir. Harris asked if they got push back. Ms. Kokx note this was last of many educational service centers due to low performance measures.

Special Attention Items

International Baccalaureate (IB) Coordinator Update

Colin Pierce at Rainier Beach High School acknowledged the context that IB operates nationwide, and there is disparity in participation across the county and it mirror the national setting as well as SPS. He noted the opportunity to become a national leader with putting some practices in place. Mr. Pierce noted tools being developed by the IB programs nationwide grant funded project. He noted our innovative work toward equity. Theresa Carins at Chief Sealth High School noted the three schools represent the full spectrum across all three schools in regards to equity and the desire to have students ready for college rigor and stewards of a global perspective. She noted data that shows the gains toward scholarship and their progress through college. Guy Thomas at Ingraham High School noted the clear vision at each of the schools in meeting the pedagogically and equity goals, but we are missing a clear vision from the top leadership of the district. He noted the need for sustainable support in both human and fiscal resources. Mr. Thomas noted it is not cheap to run these programs at the schools. Mr. Pierce noted the value of the implementation of the program and the research shows a high return on investment, and requested support of the Board.

Dir. Harris noted her advocacy for this program, but is also concerned that we have not had the sponsorship in this building and have not been sharing the data to show the case for the belief in the value of the program, and bring the community to work toward reaching the goals within the constraints of the budget deficit. Dir. Geary asked for uniform formatting for her to review the data and see the advocacy on the state level, and how much money we are saving, and the return on investment data. Mr. Tolley noted the previous position in leadership around this program was a grant funded position. Dir. Burke noted the Lincoln community meetings and the community ask for it to be an IB school. Dir. Geary noted scheduling monthly conference with a Board member to give feedback with uniform data. Mr. Pierce noted the need to provide data proactively and the research studies. He noted the difficulty with tracking within our student information system.

Dir. Harris noted a recent grant that was renewed, and asked if it is going toward IB or spread out at Rainier Beach. Mr. Pierce noted it was going toward Diploma coordinator position.

Early Learning Update

Cashel Toner noted feedback in the past with working in the early learning space, and she noted that some can go in to a Friday memo and is trying to walk the line and wants feedback on the venue for the update. She noted working on enrollment for the seventeen Seattle Preschool Program (SPP) classrooms, some of which are full inclusion. She noted the first year of partnership, they were not fully enrolled on the first day of school, and they have worked hard to correct that. They are tracking toward full enrolment by the start of next school year. Ms. Toner noted a nuance with the SPP+ programs, and building the system on how to enroll the students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and those with typical development within the same class. She discussed outreach and collaboration with families and teachers, and district stakeholders. She noted two teams will be sent to the Herring Center for an inclusion seminar, and they will develop mission, vision and action plans for the SPP+ programs. Ms. Toner noted after Board approval, they worked with staff to co plan and co create what the classrooms will look like at the inclusion sites and have been holding meetings since the spring. She noted planning an Early Learning Summer Institute this summer for common training.

Ms. Toner noted the family connection visits that will start the school year for family engagement. She noted the need to build capacity in the program, and they submitted a grant to fund new positons to support the early development program to create a continuum from Pre-K to fifth grade. It is a two year grant through the Gates Foundation, and she noted the timing should the grant be approved. She noted

bringing this to the committee, even though it is under the funding threshold, but she wanted to be transparent. Dir. Harris asked that it be included in the Friday Memo as well.

Ms. Toner noted SPS's SPP meeting all of the performance targets for this year so far, which releases funding from the city and they will be getting full reimbursement from the city for the year. Dir. Harris asked that we follow up on the 25% hold back from the city as she heard feedback that we could possibly get rid of that.

Dir. Burke noted that he appreciated the in person update. Dir. Geary asked Ms. Clancy for some information about the SPP partnerships and the Experimental Education Unit (EEU) supports. Ms. Clancy noted that she could provide that information in a Friday Memo.

Seattle Housing Authority/Seattle Public Schools Partnership Update

Kathlyn Paananen was introduced by Mr. Tolley. Ms. Paananen noted the foundation of the partnership with SPS and the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) to provide access to a challenging and thriving educational opportunity and that education is the gateway out of poverty. She noted the SHA students are missing a lot of instructional time through chronic absenteeism. She noted the next two years plan to build on the relationship and implement activates together to address this toward the goals of improving educational outcomes, support families and understand barriers, and improve systems to increase equitable access. She noted the Gates Foundation set aside funds three years ago for the SHA to work together with districts to drive the work, and that SPS is a sub grantee of this Gates Foundation grant.

Dir. Harris asked about sustainability of the gates grant. Ms. Paananen discussed the timeline and that the grant will sunset in September, and they have asked for continuation in the amount of \$650,000. The SHA receives the funding for this, and SPS is a sub-grantee. Dir. Geary asked for data that shows if the SHA work aligns with the schools of distinction, and if it is actually closing the gap. Ms. Paananen noted that the relationship allows us to see the aggregate data only. She discussed the specific schools as listed on the map for where these students live and go to school. Ms. Paananen noted her role at the district and with the SHA and this is a new position that other districts do not have, so it is a learning process. Dir. Geary asked if given the density in certain areas, if we see a difference in outcomes there versus where there is a community that is relatively unsupported through our educational practices. Ms. Paananen noted a pilot to partner with the attendance department and schools to see what best practices are across the district. Dir. Harris noted the work with the Delridge families and thanked them for their support, and for getting Cedar Park started.

Special Education Contracts- Informational Only

Ms. Clancy noted that this information was brought to the A&F Committee meeting last week, and that there are five action reports for contracts coming to the full Board. She provided an overview of the summary document provided in the packet and noted the history of the contracts presented and what they can expect moving forward.

Dir. Geary noted that pogrom at Old Van Asselt and if reinvested in the program we would see a reduction in the NW Soil contract. Ms. Clancy noted that would be a process to move from that program. Dir. Harris noted to be explicit of the challenges and explanations of the progress when it comes to introduction. Dir. Geary noted the balance of liability and to run it by legal due to the rights of these students and families. Ms. Clancy noted the work on oversight with the behavioral specialist and they have seen some real gains for our high need students. She noted that Meany has a repurposed classroom specific to social and emotional needs of those students. Ms. Clancy noted the nature of some of these contracts is specific to preventative services, agency contracts, and ready to provide services right away.

Dir. Geary noted a request to have the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) reports provided in a Friday Memo. Ms. Clancy noted that she would provide that update.

Adopted revisions to Superintendent Procedure 2161, Special Education and Related Services for Eligible Students

Trisha Campbell provided the update to transportation required by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR). She noted the new language is in the highlighted section of the memo document, part of voluntary resolution agreement. She noted there is a 504 Superintendent Procedure around this and the transportation department will be updating their materials to all align and the drivers and teachers /building leadership.

Dir. Geary asked about the new American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) lawsuit against the state. Ms. Clancy noted that this just came out and she had not read through it, but it was about a funding. Dir. Harris noted that it is with funding out of Eastern Washington and will be setting the standards.

Dir. Burke asked for the timing. Ms. Campbell noted to present a training at School Leaders Institute (SLI), SpEd newsletter, coordinating with transportation, and communicated to families. Dir. Harris asked that this be uploaded to our Facebook and other channels to get it out there in the community. Ms. Clancy noted that this process has been a great deal of coordination and interdepartmental coordination.

C&I Policy Committee Work Plan

Dir. Burke requested that dates for the future months be listed on the work plan. Dir. Burke asked for math adoption update at the August meeting, and asked if anything is going on between June and August. Dr. Kinoshita noted the feedback was received and that there will be one more meeting.

Adjourn

This meeting adjourned at 7:25pm.



SCHOOL BOARD ACTION REPORT

DATE: August 1, 2017
FROM: Dr. Larry Nyland, Superintendent
LEAD STAFF: Michael Stone, Director of Grants, mastone@seattleschools.org; Michael Tolley, Associate Superintendent of Teaching & Learning, mftolley@seattleschools.org

For Introduction: August 30, 2017
For Action: August 30, 2017

1. TITLE

Acceptance of the League of Education Voters Foundation (LEVf) grant to South Shore PreK-8.

2. PURPOSE

This Board Action Report is to accept the LEVf grant of \$2,000,000, \$1,000,00 for the 2017-2018 school year and \$1,000,000 for the 2018-2019 school year for South Shore PreK-8 School.

3. RECOMMENDED MOTION

I move that the School Board authorize the Superintendent to accept the LEVf Grant of \$2,000,000 for South Shore PreK-8. Immediate Action is in the best interest of the District.

4. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- a. Background** This partnership between the School District and The New School Foundation (merged with LEV in 2011) was formed in 2003. It began with a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that evolved into a Partnership Agreement in 2006. The school's first year, 2002-2003, began with PreK and K. In each subsequent year, the school grew by one grade until it reached its current size, a PreK-8. The funding source of the grant was a private individual who chose to be anonymous.

The program supports a child's whole mind, body and spirit by providing integrated PreK, reduced class size and additional staff in grades K-3, a wellness component and other enrichments. Additional details of program investment areas are included in the grant document attached.

Initially, the grant was governed by a Partnership Agreement that provided for an annual grant renewal subject to review of the program success and an integrated budget. The funding made up a significant portion of the school's budget (86% in 2002-2003). Funding peaked in 2006 at \$1,556,000 (40% of the school's budget). Over time as the school has grown and other funding sources have been secured, LEVf funding has decreased to an annual pledge of \$1,000,000, which is about 20% of the school's budget, excluding Special Education programs which were added in 2010.

With the expiration of the original partnership agreement, and the lesser size of the funding, it makes sense to revisit how the collaboration between LEVF and the School District is formalized. Under the original agreement, there were multiple grant documents generated each year including a Letter of Intent, an integrated budget and budget guidelines. By incorporating these into a single grant document which still includes the relevant pieces of the original agreement, the process is streamlined.

- b. Alternatives** Not accept the funds. This is not recommended, as the loss of these funds would severely impact the health and wellbeing of the students at South Shore, as well as reduce the number and quality of supplemental educational supports available to some of our students with highest needs.
- c. Research** The grant agreement and associated outcomes for 2017-2019 are being jointly developed with LEVF, the Executive Director of Schools Southeast Region, and South Shore PreK-8.

5. FISCAL IMPACT/REVENUE SOURCE

Fiscal impact to this action will be \$0.

The revenue source for this motion is League of Education Voters Foundation.

Expenditure: One-time Annual Multi-Year N/A

Revenue: One-time Annual Multi-Year N/A

6. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

With guidance from the District’s Community Engagement tool, this action was determined to merit the following tier of community engagement:

Not applicable

Tier 1: Inform

Tier 2: Consult/Involve

Tier 3: Collaborate

7. EQUITY ANALYSIS

The Equity Analysis Tool was not used for this Board Action report, as in this case, the donor specifically requested to donate the grant funds to South Shore PreK-8. South Shore PreK-8 has approximately 620 students from around the Southeast Region of Seattle. The school has a diverse population of students, 11% Latino, 23% Asian/Pacific Islander, 45% African American

or African descent, 9% White and 10% identifying as two or more races, and with 63% qualifying for free and reduced lunch.

8. STUDENT BENEFIT

The LEVF funding helps support the whole child at South Shore PreK-8 through therapeutic and Social Emotional supports for all students to access. As well, it will provide instructional coaching support for all teachers.

9. WHY BOARD ACTION IS NECESSARY

- Amount of contract initial value or contract amendment exceeds \$250,000 (Policy No. 6220)
- Amount of grant exceeds \$250,000 in a single fiscal year (Policy No. 6114)
- Adopting, amending, or repealing a Board policy
- Formally accepting the completion of a public works project and closing out the contract
- Legal requirement for the School Board to take action on this matter
- Board Policy No. _____, [TITLE], provides the Board shall approve this item
- Other: _____

10. POLICY IMPLICATION

Per Board Policy No. 6114, acceptance of grant funds and contracts in excess of \$250,000 require School Board approval.

11. BOARD COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

This motion was discussed at the Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee meeting on August 22, 2017. The Committee reviewed the motion and _____.

12. TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Upon approval of this motion, budget will be loaded and hiring of staff will occur.

13. ATTACHMENTS

- League of Education Voters Foundation Letter of Intent
- South Shore PreK-8/LEVF Grant Agreement 2017-2019 DRAFT
- South Shore PreK-8 Budget proposal for LEVF funds

June 28, 2017

Dr. Larry Nyland
Superintendent Seattle Public Schools
Office of the Superintendent
MS: 32-150, P.O. Box 34165
Seattle, WA 98124-1165

Dear Dr. Nyland:

LEV foundation is pleased to launch another year of partnership with the Seattle School District through approval of a grant of up to \$1,000,000 per year for the 2017-18 and 2018-19 school years. Of this amount, we \$950,000 will be paid through the school district and \$80,000 paid directly by the foundation to service providers and vendors for the benefit of the school.

This grant will be restricted to support of the South Shore School, as an enhancement to the regular funding it receives from the school district. This letter is intended to enable the South Shore School to create comprehensive budget for 2017-18 that includes these grant funds.

Our total amount of funding, based on reimbursement of actual grant expenses, may be less than \$1,000,000. Foundation funding commitments in excess of actual grant expenses incurred cannot be carried forward to future years.

We look forward to another year of healthy partnership in support of our shared goal of providing excellent education to students in the Rainier Beach neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Chris Korsmo
President and Executive Director

Cc: Kristin DeWitte, Principal
Kristina Harding, Budget Analyst
Michael Stone, Director of Grants, Fiscal Compliance & Strategic Partnerships

GRANT AGREEMENT

This Grant Agreement (this “Agreement”) is entered into by and between **LEV Foundation**, a Washington nonprofit corporation (“LEV”) and Seattle School District #1, a political subdivision of the state of Washington (“Grantee” or “the District”). This Agreement shall be effective as of September 1, 2017 (the “Effective Date”).

RECITALS

- A. LEV has fiduciary responsibility and is the project manager for restricted private funding for up to \$2,000,000. Such funds are intended to cover two school years beginning September 1, 2017 and ending August 31, 2019;
- B. The purpose of the Grant is to provide financial support to Grantee solely for the benefit of South Shore School (“South Shore”) to enhance its educational program and help attain high academic achievement for all students in the school with the intention that many students from low income families will benefit. South Shore will demonstrate how a school where students and their families are known, engaged and supported; where learning challenges are prevented or identified and mitigated early; and where a school’s academic program is intentional, supported by on-going professional development, and evolves constantly in response to feedback from assessments and families, can produce extraordinary outcomes. This approach to education will ensure equity of opportunity and outcomes for all students to a degree that is more difficult to attain in regularly funded public schools.
- C. Grantee has agreed to undertake certain activities and obligations and make certain covenants;
- D. LEV desires to make a grant to Grantee to be given pursuant to the terms and conditions in this Agreement;

NOW, THEREFORE, LEV and the Grantee hereby agree as follows:

1. Grant; Use of Grant Funds. LEV shall award Grantee grant funds in the amount of up to \$2,000,000. Such grant funds shall be given in accordance with the Grant Budget and on the following schedule:

2017-2019 League of Education Voters Grant			
Payment Date	Payment Amount	Deliverable	Due Date
School Year 2017-2018	Up to \$1,000,000	Twelve monthly invoices for reimbursable expenses agreed upon as part of the approved grant budget (see Obligations of Grantee)	Monthly beginning October 15, 2017 for prior month end
School Year 2018-2019	Up to \$1,000,000	Twelve monthly invoices for reimbursable expenses agreed upon as part of the approved grant budget (see Obligations of Grantee)	Monthly beginning October 15, 2018 for prior month end
Award Total	Up to \$2,000,000		

Grantee may not use funds provided under this Agreement (“Grant Funds”) for any other purpose other than those agreed to in the Grant Budget, nor may Grantee use Grant Funds to reimburse any expenses incurred prior to the start date of the Agreement, or the specified school year.

The District shall continue to be responsible for and shall provide maintenance, custodial, and capital funding, PK-8 transportation, including all supplies for a basic classroom, including district-adopted curriculum materials, to South Shore.

There is no carryover of unused Grant Funds from school year to school year, nor upon termination of this agreement.

The District will maintain adequate accounting records related to South Shore. The District will make such records available to LEV upon request to enable LEV to monitor and evaluate how Grant Funds have been used.

2. Tax-Exempt Status. Grantee confirms that it is exempt from federal income tax under section 170(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the “Code”).

3. Obligations of Grantee. Grantee agrees to support program elements and activities, including, but not limited to the following:

South Shore Program Priorities

- Maintain the original goals of LEV funding which include lowered class size and academic supports to Pre K-2 classrooms. This will ensure adequate academic growth and maintain social emotional regulation.
 - Continued improvement in academic outcomes, as evidenced by standardized tests
 - PreK-3rd literacy program alignment
 - Hands-on learning, such as garden, music, environment, arts
 - Support for school newcomers, especially students in the 4th and 6th grades and new teachers
 - Continued improvement of the Wellness Program through program review, the RULER framework, and integration of physical health resources
 - Support for families through before/after school programs
- Add to the Multi-tiered System of Support in tiers two and three for social emotional learning to optimize the learning environment for all. South Shore will take an “early adopter” role in implementing trauma informed practices to ensure that South Shore remains a safe, kind, respectful learning environment that prepares students for high school and post-secondary education.
- South Shore will proactively develop alternatives for students of color that negate the early onset of special education services, particularly the overrepresentation of African American males that are served in programs that label students as Emotionally and Behaviorally.
- Continue to use funds generated for South Shore in ways to push the work forward to a great degree in SE and Central Seattle so that other students in need may also benefit from what we are learning.

South Shore Program Review and Evaluation

LEV will work with South Shore Leadership to plan and execute regular visits to South Shore. Their purpose will be to observe and reflect on recent accomplishments, to discuss grant goals for the next year, and to consider modifications to the grant program that might help attain objectives. The visiting committee should be comprised of LEV staff and board members, District administrative leaders and other interested parties as approved by LEV and South Shore’s Principal.

LEV may hire an outside consultant to assist with the evaluation of the effectiveness of the South Shore relative to program goals. The District will provide to the LEV copies of documents that show, without personally identifiable student information and to the extent permitted by law, South Shore test scores, attendance information, school demographic data and other wellness data including but not limited to school climate surveys and baseline academic testing results to aid in the evaluation. South Shore leaders and staff will cooperate with reasonable evaluator requests for interviews and data collection. The evaluation will be designed with full consultation of South Shore leaders and staff, as well as interested district personnel, to assure that the evaluation collects information that the school will find valuable. LEV will share all evaluation reports and findings relevant to South Shore with South Shore and District.

South Shore Program Goal Setting and Budget Process

For each school year covered by this grant, and in accordance with the District's annual budget calendar, South Shore and LEV will agree together on program goals and the grant budget. South Shore's building leadership team will be involved in the process of setting these goals, and integrating the grant funds into South Shore's annual budget. LEV will determine a preliminary grant amount to South Shore to enable South Shore to complete the budget process. LEV's final grant amount will be confirmed only after LEV has had an opportunity to review South Shore's submitted budget by the school principal.

If at any time budget revisions affecting LEV's grant is necessary, South Shore will submit a written request to LEV.

South Shore Principal and Assistant Principal Selection

LEV will have a meaningful opportunity to participate in the selection process of a principal and assistant principal by: participation by a representative of LEV in the site-based selection process, and a separate opportunity for LEV to interview the finalists and provide input to the Superintendent before the Superintendent makes the final selection.

5. Grantee Covenants. Grantee covenants as follows:

- a. The District will not penalize South Shore's public funding and opportunities to apply for grant funding through the District in any way by being jointly funded with private funds from LEV. South Shore will be considered on a par with all other applicants for grants or other funding opportunities without regard to funding by the LEV or other funding sources. Grantee agrees that private funding provided to South Shore will supplement, not supplant, public funding for the school;
- b. The District will fund South Shore on the same basis that it funds its other PreK-8 schools, including basic education funds, state and federal compensatory funds (e.g. LAP and Title I), bilingual education funds, special education funds, local operations and capital levy funds, and Families and Education Levy funds, and any other public funds that become routinely available to students and schools in the District. South Shore will also receive school grants, central instruction funds, and other support funds, on the same basis as they are allocated to other schools. South Shore will receive notice of all opportunities to apply for grant funding through the District for which they are eligible to compete.

5. Termination. LEV has the right at its discretion to terminate or suspend the grant if (a) LEV is not reasonably satisfied with Grantee's progress on Grantee's obligations with respect to South Shore; or (b) significant leadership or other changes occur that LEV believes may threaten South Shore; or (c) Grantee fails to comply with any term or condition of this Agreement. If termination as provided herein occurs between September 1, 2017 and April 30, 2018, continued funding by LEV Foundation, shall cease as of the conclusion of that academic

year on August 31, 2018. Should termination occur on May 1, 2018 or thereafter, LEV shall only be obligated to provide sufficient funding to enable the school to fund the positions as agreed to in the grant budget for the subsequent school year.

6. Compliance with Laws. In carrying out the grant obligations, you will comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and rules.

7. Relationship of the Parties. Nothing in this Agreement shall constitute the naming of either party hereto as an agent or legal representative of the other party for any purpose whatsoever except as specifically and to the extent set forth herein. This Agreement shall not be deemed to create any relationship of agency, employment, partnership, or joint venture between the parties hereto.

8. Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original and all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument.

9. Entire Agreement. This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement among the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof; it supersedes any prior agreement and understandings among the parties as to such matters, oral or written, all of which are hereby cancelled.

10. Assignment. This Agreement or any rights or obligations under this Agreement may not be assigned without LEV's prior written consent. An assignment includes (a) any transfer of South Shore, (b) an assignment by operation of law, including a merger or consolidation, or (c) the sale or transfer of all or substantially all of South Shore's assets.

11. Severability, Amendments. The provisions of this Agreement are severable so that if any provision is found to be invalid, illegal or unenforceable, such finding shall not affect the validity, construction or enforceability of any remaining provision. This Agreement may not be amended or modified, except in a writing signed by both parties hereto.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused their duly authorized representatives to execute this Agreement as of the Effective Date.

LEV:

LEV Foundation, a Washington nonprofit corporation

By: Chris Korsmo

Its: President and Executive Director

GRANTEE:

Seattle School District #1

By: Larry Nyland

Its: Superintendent

South Shore K-8 LEVF Grant					
Current Year	2016/17 Budget	Actuals as of 04/30/17			
Pre-K	\$190,000	\$129,101			
Teaching	\$428,925	\$273,734			
Instructional Support & Enrichment	\$180,000	\$126,763			
Wellness	\$105,000	\$67,433			
Administrative Support	\$1,960	-			
TOTAL	\$905,885	\$597,031			
2017/18 Budget Proposal					
<i>Revised Proposal</i>			<i>Original Proposal</i>		
	\$1M Option (New)			\$1M Option (Original)	\$850K Option (Original)
Wellness			Wellness		
0.2 MS Counselor	\$17,752		0.2 MS Counselor	\$17,752	\$17,752
1.0 Therapeutic Counselor	\$100,681		1.0 Therapeutic Counselor	\$100,681	\$100,681
1.0 Therapeutic Counselor	\$102,808		1.0 Therapeutic Counselor	\$102,808	\$102,808
0.5 Nurse	\$35,099		0.5 Nurse	\$39,599	\$39,599
Teaching			Teaching		
1.0 Grade K-5 Above Model	\$104,858		1.0 Grade K-5 Above Model	\$78,229	\$78,229
0.5 Head Teacher	\$53,124		0.5 Head Teacher	\$63,221	\$63,221
1.0 Literacy Coach	\$104,858		1.0 Teacher-Elementary	\$96,627	-
0.7 Interventionist	\$55,099		1.0 Teacher-Elementary Spe	\$104,858	\$104,858
			0.7 Interventionist	\$55,099	\$55,099
Instructional Support & Enrichment			Instructional Support & Enrichment		
1.0 Youth Service Worker	\$54,905		1.0 Instructional Assistant	\$52,191	\$52,191
1.0 Instructional Assistant	\$60,168		1.0 Instructional Assistant	\$60,168	\$60,168
1.0 Instructional Assistant	\$51,538		1.0 Instructional Assistant	\$51,538	\$51,538
1.0 Instructional Assistant	\$50,020		1.0 Instructional Assistant	\$50,020	-
Extra Time - Certificated	\$20,000		Extra Time - Certificated	\$30,000	\$30,000
Supplies	\$39,090		Supplies	\$57,209	\$53,856
Contracts - Tilth and Kids Co. (15k ea.) and Seneca (70k)	\$100,000		Contracts	\$40,000	\$40,000
EcoNorthwest	\$50,000				
			Total	\$1,000,000	\$850,000
TOTAL	\$1,000,000				
Paid by LEV					
Kidsco	\$15,000				
Tilth	\$15,000				
EcoNorthwest	\$50,000				
	\$920,000				

These amounts are projected based on estimated rates for the 2017-18 school year.

2017-18 Multi-Tiered System of Support

Primary Work Streams

- **Data-Informed Collaboration:** Collaborative teams will use structures the student data portal (Homeroom) and Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to engage in meaningful data-inquiry and decision-making. Teams will receive professional development, coaching, and guidance on how to learn students' stories, strengths, and needs, and how to align supports and resources for maximum positive impact on student outcomes as listed in their Continuous School Improvement Plan (CSIP) goals.
- **Professional Development (PD):** All schools will access coordinated, high-quality professional development that targets strong core instruction and supports. Offerings include an instructional summit in August, district-wide coordinated PD plan and calendar, Leadership Learning Days, and ongoing support for MTSS and PLC teams using tools and resources available.
- **Tiered Supports for 24 schools:** 24 schools have been selected to receive individualized, targeted, on-site supports from an MTSS Lead and Learning Support Team. Schools were selected based on established data points that demonstrated a high potential for impacting student outcomes and eliminating gaps. Teams will work with School Leaders to accomplish their CSIP goals.
- **Targeted Implementation Support for 20 schools:** Targeted support will be provided to 20 schools who have demonstrated emerging MTSS structures, in order to help them develop representative MTSS team that meets regularly and strengthen implementation. These schools will receive three half-day releases to implement MTSS with central office supports.
- **Field Test for Interim Assessments:** We are prepared to field test a next-generation benchmark assessment tool with 10-20 schools in Math and English Language Arts, aligned to common core state standards. This tool will drive instructional practice, assist in providing intervention and monitoring progress, and help students prepare for summative Smarter Balanced assessments.

Timeline

	Completed Prior to Start of School:	School Year Work:	Calibration and planning for next year:
Collaboration and Teaming	Homeroom access provided to all schools 20 emerging schools identified for additional implementation support	Coaching, support, and training provided around data inquiry, decision-making, and best practices within MTSS and PLC structures Three ½ day releases and regular progress checks to strengthen their MTSS team structures and MTSS implementation strategies	Goal evidence will be collected from each school Tools and resources will be reviewed and updated
High Quality Instruction	Instructional Summit Applications for field test received and reviewed	Targeted professional development provided through district-wide course catalog and calendar Interim Assessment field test	Regular and ongoing reviews of summative and student specific data to evaluate progress and adjust
Tiered Supports	Leads/Teams identified and oriented on how to successfully partner with schools	Teams partner with schools on CSIP goals targeting specific student outcomes and eliminating gaps Regular central office data-dives and consultation	Input/feedback from field test schools will inform decisions and plan for assessments



To: Curriculum and Instruction Policy Committee

From: Dr. Caleb Perkins, Director of College and Career Readiness
cbperkins@seattleschools.org

Date: August 15, 2017

RE: High School Policies

Dear Committee Members,

At the April 3, 2017 and May 8, 2017 Curriculum and Instruction Policy Committee meetings, the following policies were discussed among other policies related to attaining high school credits:

- No. 2415, High School Graduation Requirements
- No. 2420, High School Grade and Credit Marking Policy

At the August 22, 2017 C&I Policy Committee, we will briefly revisit these two policies and preview some components that need to be discussed in light of the 24 credits required by the state starting with the class of 2021. These components include the district's requirement to complete 60 hours of service learning and to attain at least a 2.0 or above GPA in Policy No. 2415 and to have 150 hours of planned instructional activities per high school credit in Policy No. 2420.

It is anticipated that this brief preview will be followed up with potential policy revisions for consideration and a larger discussion of the high school re-visioning work during the September and October Board Committees and/or Work Sessions.

Links:

1. Current Board Policy No. 2415:
http://www.seattleschools.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_543/File/District/Departments/School%20Board/Policies/Series%202000/2415.pdf (for reference)
2. Current Board Policy No. 2420:
http://www.seattleschools.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_543/File/District/Departments/School%20Board/Policies/Series%202000/2420.pdf (for reference)

Briefing Paper: Cascade Parent Partnership Program

Background:

Cascade Parent Partnership Program (CPPP), formally Home School Resource Center (HRC), is a Priority School for high school graduation rate as determined by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). This is the unfortunate result of two significant changes, a shift in the instructional program and a student coding issue. CPPP resolved the coding issue.

CPPP is a K-12 school. However, CPPP works in a limited capacity with formerly home-based instruction (HBI) 11th and 12th grade students who wish to access Running Start. Currently, CPPP supports a K-8 instructional program with no other high school classes or services offered.

HBI students who want to attend Running Start must enroll with their neighborhood high school or through CPPP. Until recently, CPPP had between 40-50 HBI Running Start students. However, in the last two years, the number has decreased to under 20.

As of July 14, 2017 students enrolled at CPPP grades 11 and 12 come from the following schools:

Home Attendance Area	11	12	Total
Ballard	1	0	1
Chief Sealth Intl	1	2	3
Garfield	1	1	2
Nathan Hale	1	0	1
Rainier Beach	1	1	2
Roosevelt	1	3	4
West Seattle HS	2	0	2
Franklin	0	1	1
Total	8	8	16

Problem Statement/Question:

CPPP is not staffed to support the HBI Running Start students and will continue to be on the State's Priority list unless changes are made to the system.

How can HBI students receive the best support in Running Start classes in the SPS system?

Proposal or Option:

Plan A: HBI students would continue to be allowed to enroll in 11th and 12th grade at CPPP and attend Running Start. In this option, CPPP staff work with students, families and the community colleges that serve students to provide the services needed to ensure high school completion. Students are correctly recoded to HBI upon end of 12th grade year, ensuring they are not reported to OPSI as non-graduates. This option would essentially be keeping the status quo in terms of enrollment but working to improve services and support.

Briefing Paper: Cascade Parent Partnership Program

Pros/Benefits	Cons/Costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students have K-12 planning and continuity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would change CPPP philosophy and instructional focus. CPPP Running Start students are HBI, enrolling only to access community college and have no intention of graduating from high school. Many of these HBI students need special education services, evaluations and counseling that CPPP staff is unable to provide. HBI students are unable to access guidance counseling, health services and afterschool extracurricular activities including athletics, band and orchestra, which are not offered at CPPP.

Plan B: End the enrollment of CPPP's 11th-12th grade students in Running Start immediately and reassign them to the reference area high schools beginning fall of SY18.

Pros/Benefits	Cons/Costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would satisfy the requirements by OSPI in terms of CPPP's responsibility in meeting the graduation requirements for the 17-18 school year and beyond. Continuing this action leaves CPPP vulnerable to OSPI Priority Status if any errors in coding students are made. Immediate special education services, evaluations and counseling that CPPP staff is unable to provide high school students. Easy access to health centers, special education services, and career counseling at their neighborhood high school. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some students choose CPPP because of reservations with their neighborhood high schools. Having families make the decision to enroll at this late date at the neighborhood high school could be very stressful for families. The home schooling community is very closely linked and this sudden decision would not be well received. Students have submitted fall quarter RS paperwork to Cascade, so it would be confusing to change at this point.

Plan C: In SY18, Cascade Parent Partnership Program continues to serve the current students in grades 11-12 through Running Start in local community colleges. In SY19, only students rolling up from grade 11 to grade 12 would continue as HBI students. All other HBI Running Start students would be directed to their neighborhood high schools. In SY20, CPPP would be a K-8.

Pros/Benefits	Cons/Costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would allow the current 11th-12th grade students to continue in the current system. Transition to RS through neighborhood high schools would be done over next two years, allowing time for additional coaching and support for students and their families. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students would still not receive the academic, career and counseling support they need until they make the transition to the comprehensive high school. CPPP may be a Priority School until these students matriculate out.

Briefing Paper: Cascade Parent Partnership Program

Pros/Benefits	Cons/Costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Comprehensive high schools are able to provide SPED and health services, athletics, college & career counseling, not available at CPPP.	

Actions: CPPP recommends Plan C and proposes that HBI students who started with CPPP in fall of SY18 continue to be able to access Running Start, using CPPP as their district school. However, in SY19 school year, we propose that CPPP only work with remaining 12th grade students, who have rolled up as continuing HBI Running Start students. In SY20, CPPP would serve only K-8 students. Future HBI Running Start students would access the Running Start program through their neighborhood high school.

Next Steps for Plan B and C:

1. Change the Superintendent Procedure 3130 SP p. 58 by removing Cascade Parent Partnership Program as an option for HBI students who want to enroll in Running Start
2. Cascade community meetings on Sept. 20, 2017 and Oct. 5, 2017 to further vet the plan
3. Update the CPPP website and Family Guidebook

To: Curriculum and Instruction Policy Committee

From: Anna Box, K-12 Math Program Manager,
ambox@seattleschools.org
(206) 252-0992

Date: Friday, August 11, 2017

RE: Middle School Math Textbook Adoption Update

Dear Committee Members,

At the August 22, 2017 C&I Policy Committee meeting you will be receiving an update on the middle school math textbook adoption process.

As you know from previous updates, adoption committee members reviewed materials following Policy 2015 and in keeping with the goals and commitments outlined in Policies 0030 and 0010.

As shown in the attached status report, other than final communication, all of Round 1 of the adoption process is complete.

Round 2 of the adoption process begins with a pilot of the textual materials programs that are still being considered. Round 2 includes further opportunities for committee and community review. To ensure student success and provide timely data for the final adoption recommendation, that pilot is on track to begin at the beginning of the 2017-18 school year.

As a reminder, here are the typical steps in Round 2 and beyond:

- Fall 2017 – Pilot of materials under consideration
- Fall 2017 – Materials on display at various middle schools around the city for review and comment
- Fall 2017 – Feedback solicited from students, families, teachers and administrators
- Winter 2017 -18 - After a thorough review of feedback and more review of textual materials, the adoption committee will make a final recommendation of a textual material for adoption
- Spring 2018 - Submission of final recommendation and accompanying BAR
- Spring 2018 – Purchase of materials
- Summer and Fall 2018 – Teacher professional development
- Fall 2018 – Textual materials in use at schools

Attached, please find the Middle School Math Adoption Schedule of Events and Timeline

Finally, as a companion to the adoption process, as you know my office completed a study of the practices at the gap narrowing middle schools: Aki, Denny, and Mercer. As per request from Director Burke you will be receiving the executive summary of that study.

Anna Box 8/8/2017

Seattle Public Schools, Middle School Math Adoption Schedule of Events and Timeline

Date	Activity	Audience	Communication channels	Procedures/Notes	Status
January 2017	Web page created to outline process	Families, community, staff	Direct emails, SPS homepage post, social media, Principal Communicator, School Beat newsletter	Website created and linked to Academics page. To request committee participation, emails sent to families, teachers through School Messenger and also to media; requests posted on the district newsletter, homepage and social media. Principals and central office staff asked to reach out to school communities.	Completed
February 2017	Deadline to join materials adoption committee	Families, community, staff	Direct emails, SPS homepage post, social media, Principal Communicator, School Beat newsletter	Website created and linked to Academics page. To request committee participation, emails sent to families, teachers through School Messenger and also to media; requests posted on the district newsletter, homepage and social media. Principals and central office staff asked to reach out to school communities.	Completed
Feb 2017 - April 2017	Input needed on materials priorities	Families, community, staff	Survey/email/webpage	Committee designs survey on materials priorities; emails families and staff.	Completed
March 2017	Review materials for budget compliance	Math program area	Report to committee and SPS purchasing	SPS Math content area staff review submitted materials for budget compliance. Materials well outside SPS budget office's guidelines are not to be considered. SPS purchasing notified.	Completed
March 2017 and ongoing	Committee progress	Committee, families, community, staff	Adoption webpage, C&I Policy Committee monthly updates	Documents will be posted on an ongoing basis: meeting minutes, survey data, application forms, etc.	Completed
Mid-March 2017 - late May 2017	Materials on display in the JSCEE professional library and School Board Office - first round	Families, community, staff, school board	Homepage, social media, School Beat newsletter, principals, Friday Memo	Announcement posted to homepage, in School Beat and on social media. Principals will be provided with an invitation to share with school communities. Feedback forms will be available. Materials Review Open House in mid-April.	Completed
Mid-March 2017 - late May 2017	Develop adoption committee understanding of the charge of textbook adoption	Committee, families, community, staff	Published to adoption webpage when finalized	Study policy 2015, develop decision making protocol; decide on categories for review, criteria within categories, and weights of categories and criteria. Ask for IMC approval.	Completed
Mid-March 2017 - late May 2017	Develop review documents for committee and larger community	Committee, families, community, staff	Published to adoption webpage when finalized	Develop screening documents to be used in review of materials.	Completed

Date	Activity	Audience	Communication channels	Procedures/Notes	Status
Mid-March 2017 - late May 2017	Gather community feedback on Round 1 textbooks through paper forms, open house, electronic survey, and/or community meetings	Committee, families, community, staff	Homepage, social media, School Beat newsletter, principals, Friday Memo	Publicize (in multiple languages): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Open house to review Round 1 Materials. Translators present ▪ Opportunities to review materials at JSC ▪ Opportunities to review on-line ▪ Community center meetings 	Completed
May 2017	Committee reviews for anti-bias	Committee	Published to adoption webpage when finalized	Main agenda item for 5/2 meeting	Completed
May 2017	Committee reviews using its review criteria	Committee	Published to adoption webpage when finalized	Main agenda item for 5/16 and all following meetings in Round 1	99% Completed
May 2017	Recruit teachers to field test materials on the short list	SPS middle school math teachers	Principal communicator, department chairs, schoology, adoption webpage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communicated in PC, to department chairs, on adoption webpage, and on middle school Schoology pages. ▪ Application finalized and posted to adoption webpage 	Completed
May 2017 – June 2017	Adoption Committee narrows selection	Families, community, staff, school board	Homepage, social media, newsletter, principals, Friday Memo	Committee will compile evidence and rating scores of reviewed materials and narrow list of instructional materials for Round Two (including field test.)	99% Completed
June 2017	Field Test process	Families, community, staff	Adoption webpage, Homepage, social media, newsletter, principals,	Field test process confirmed; sites notified. Community informed of field test process.	In process; 60% completed
Summer 2017 and ongoing	Feedback from under-represented communities – possibly	Families, community, staff	Community meetings, church groups, civic groups, etc	Assuming under-represented groups do not participate in the survey or open house, actively gather feedback from under-represented groups if needed	In process; 25% completed
August 2017	PD for field testing teachers	Families, community, staff	Email, adoption webpage, principals	PD provided by vendors for teachers at field testing sites	In process; 25% completed
Sept-October 2017	Field Test conducted of Round Two materials	Families, community, staff, school board, students	Homepage, social media, newsletter, principals, Friday Memo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Feedback solicited from students, parents and teachers at field test sites ▪ Community will be updated on field test process ▪ Community reviews short listed books in Round 2 	Not started; on track to begin in September

Date	Activity	Audience	Communication channels	Procedures/Notes	Status
October 2017	Second-round materials on display in JSCEE library, School Board office, and selected schools in all five regions	Families, community, staff, school board	Homepage, social media, newsletter, Principals, Friday Memo	When materials are ready, announcement posted to homepage, in newsletter and on social media. Principals provided with an invitation to share with school communities. Feedback forms will be available.	Not started
Early November 2017	Panel Discussion with Field Test Teacher Participants	Open to public	Homepage, social media, newsletter	Audiences will be invited to panel discussion.	Not started
Mid-December 2017	Committee makes recommendation	Families, community members, staff, school board	Homepage, press release, social media, newsletter, Principals, Friday Memo	Documents will be provided directly to the school board. An announcement will be posted to the homepage, in the family newsletter and on social media. A press release will be shared.	Not started



To: Curriculum and Instruction Policy Committee

From: Kyle Kinoshita, Chief of Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction,
kdkinoshita@seattleschools.org
(206) 252-0050

Date: Tuesday, August 15, 2017

RE: 2017-2018 Assessment Calendar & 2017 Executive Summary of Recommendations

Dear Committee Members,

At the August 22, 2017 C&I Policy Committee meeting, you will be receiving the 2017-18 Assessment Calendar and 2017 Executive Summary of Recommendations developed by the Seattle Schools Assessment Steering Committee. Please find attached the 2017-18 Assessment Calendar and 2017 Executive Summary of Recommendations presented as components of the Seattle Schools Assessment Steering Committee's final report to the Superintendent.

The Seattle Schools Assessment Steering Committee was assembled in spring of 2016 as part of the 2015-2018 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between Seattle Schools and the Seattle Education Association Certificated Non-Supervisory Employees.

Each year of this contract, the committee collaborates with departments within central office to develop a proposed districtwide annual assessment calendar for the upcoming academic year. The proposed assessment calendar is vetted by managers, executive directors and chiefs before being approved by the superintendent. The district-wide assessment calendar was finalized and approved per the contract due date of August 15.

This year's calendar will include Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments. The Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment was selected for its wide use across schools in our district as well as its ability to complement the new K-5 ELA adoption, which lack a robust assessment to carry out the goals of Multi Tiered Systems of Supports (MTSS). Additionally, these assessments will support elementary and K-8 schools in using assessments and data to drive instructional decision-making and monitor the progress of students in English Language Arts (ELA).

These district assessments have been approved by OSPI to serve as a replacement for the state assessment required of all 2nd graders- Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS).

Also attached are the assessment policies for MAP and Title I/LAP which detail state and federal assessment requirements.

Attachments:

1. 2017-18 Assessment Calendars
 - o Grade K-8 Assessment Calendar
 - o Grade 9-12 Assessment Calendar
2. 2017 Executive Summary of Recommendations
3. Title I Assessment Policy
4. MAP Assessment Policy

Kyle Kinoshita 8/15/17



Grades K-8 Assessment Calendar 2017-2018

District Assessments

MAP

K- Required: December 1-15 (Optional: September 11- Oct 20 & May 7- June 11)

Grades 1 & 2- Required: May 7- June 11 (Optional: September 11- Oct 20 & January 8- February 9)

Fountas & Pinnell

K- Required: Independent levels reported by June 11 (Optional: January 3-February 3)

Grades 1-5- Required: Independent levels reported by November 17th and by June 11th (Optional: January 3-February 3)

State Assessments

WaKIDS

K- Required: Checkpoint 1 completed by October 30

Smarter Balanced or WA-AIM (ELA & Math)

Grades 3-8- Required: March 5- June 8 (Smarter Balanced)

Grades 3-8- Required: October 16- April 6 (WA-AIM)

Washington Comprehensive Assessment of Science (WCAS) or WA-AIM (Science)

Grades 5 & 8- April 16- June 8 (WCAS)

Grades 5 & 8 - October 16- April 6 (WA-AIM)

ELPA-21

Grades K-8- TBD- Required: February 5 – March 23



Grades 9-12 Assessment Calendar 2017-2018

College Entrance/Placement

PSAT

Grades 10 & 11: October 11

SAT

Grade 11: March 7

AP & IB

Grades 9 -12: May 7-18 (for students in these courses)

State

EOC (Math)

Grade 12: January 2- February 2 & May 7- June 8

Smarter Balanced

Grades 10-12: March 5- June 8

Fall 2017 Retakes for Grades 11-12: October 23- November 17

Washington Comprehensive Assessment of Science

Grade 11: May 4- June 8

WA-AIM (ELA, Math and Science)

Grades 10 & 11: October 16- April 6

Fall 2017 Retakes for Grade 12: September 11 - November 17

ELPA-21

Grades 9-12: TBD- February 5- March 23



Seattle Schools Assessment Steering Committee August 2017 Recommendations Report - Executive Summary

Background

- Assembled spring of 2016 as part of 2015-2018 CBA
- Primary Tasks:
 - Develop recommendations for reducing the impact of testing on instructional time and student access to resources
 - Review and identify standardized or common assessments, to recommend for building, regional, or district-wide use
 - Collaborate with departments within central office to develop a proposed districtwide annual assessment calendar for the upcoming academic year
- Membership:
 - 4 SEA Members
 - 2 PASS Members
 - 2 Central Office Staff
- Meeting Overviews:
 - 4 meetings held in Spring 2016
 - Discussion of scope of work, district policy, existing assessment framework, state testing requirements, current implementation issues, notes from the field.

Recommendations for Minimizing Disruptions

- 1.) The district will provide district-based guidelines for testing time.
- 2.) The district should develop model Smarter Balanced testing schedules.
- 3.) The district should develop and distribute a list of best practices related to ensuring students do not lose out on instructional time due to testing.
- 4.) The district will provide professional development related to the common core state standards and alignment to the Smarter Balanced assessment.
- 5.) The district should continue provide extra technology and technology support for schools.

6.) The district should provide funding and guidelines for building assessment coordination.

Assessment Recommendations

- 1.) Adopt and implement Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark assessments to complement the new K-5 ELA adoption.
- 2.) Continue use of Smarter Balanced interim assessments with option to use alternative interim during 2017-2018 school year
- 3.) MAP – change required testing window for K to accommodate HCC
- 4.) Previ K-2 Formative tasks – offer district-wide

Additional Recommendations

- 1.) The district needs to provide guidance and communication around how to effectively use different types of data and assessments in addition to providing training and support to build the assessment literacy of teachers and administrators.
- 2.) The district needs to support the use of assessments in building a comprehensive MTSS framework in schools.

Next Steps

- Committee will reconvene fall 2017 – seek additional members
- Committee will continue working on select recommendations in partnership with additional departments and district stakeholders:
 - Develop district-based guidelines for testing time
 - Develop model Smarter Balanced testing schedules
 - Develop and distribute a list of best practices related to ensuring students do not lose out on instructional time due to testing
 - Work with Curriculum and Instruction to develop professional development related to the common core state standards and alignment to the Smarter Balanced assessment

MAP Testing Policy for 2017-18

Required MAP Testing

MAP testing is required District-wide in primary grades (K-2nd) and for Title I and LAP identified students in grades K-8*. MAP is used to help place students in interventions, measure growth, and screen for highly capable services and advanced learning programs.

- Kindergarten: required *once a year* in the WINTER only
- 1st and 2nd grade: required *once a year* in the SPRING only

Schools are NOT required to administer MAP in grades 3rd and above.

Exception: All new students to the District without an achievement test result from the previous spring (either a MAP, MSP or SBA score) AND all Title I and LAP identified students*.

Kindergarten: **All Students:** 1x/year in both subjects (Winter)

- Math Primary Grades Common Core 2010 V2
- Reading Primary Grades Common Core 2010

1st – 2nd grades: **All Students:** 1x/year in both subjects (Spring)

- Math Primary Grades Common Core 2010 V2
- Reading Primary Grades Common Core 2010

3rd grade and up: **Not required** – *except* for a new student to the District up to 8th grade and/or Title I and LAP identified students*.

- Math 2-5 Common Core 2010 V2 (aka Survey w/Goals)
- Reading 2-5 Common Core 2010 V2 (aka Survey w/Goals)

Optional testing in 3rd grade and up

Although there is no policy limit on the number of students who may be (optionally) tested per school, the District has allocated limited funds to support MAP testing in 2017-18. Schools preferring to continue testing MAP in grades 3rd and above are encouraged to test only a subset of students rather than all students this upcoming year – e.g., below grade level students, students in special programs.

*** Please see the Title I and LAP Testing Policy**

Title I & Learning Assistance Program (LAP) Testing Policy for 2017-18

Mandatory Assessment

State law stipulates schools receiving Title I & LAP funding are required to:

- 1) Identify all students eligible to receive Title I and LAP services at the start of each school year
- 2) Provide pre and post assessment scores demonstrating growth of identified students

It is mandatory that all schools receiving Title I & LAP funding adhere to the following assessment schedule and report final growth information no later than June 8, 2018.

Required assessments for all Title I and LAP identified students:

Kindergarten

Literacy: 1x/year (Winter) MAP - Reading Primary Grades Common Core 2010

Math: 1x/year (Winter)

MAP - Math Primary Grades Common Core 2010 V2

1st – 2nd grades

Literacy: 2x/year (Fall & Spring)

Fountas & Pinnell **Or** MAP - Reading Primary Grades Common Core 2010

Math: 2x/year (Fall & Spring)

MAP - Math Primary Grades Common Core 2010 V2

3rd- 5th grades

Literacy: 2x/year (Fall & Spring)

Fountas & Pinnell 3-5 (Fall and Spring) **Or**

MAP - Reading 3-5 Common Core 2010 V2 (aka Survey w/Goals)

Math: 2x/year (Fall & Spring)

MAP - Math 2-8 Common Core 2010 V2 (aka Survey w/Goals)

6th-8th grades

Literacy: 2x/year (Fall & Spring)

MAP - Reading 6-8 Common Core 2010 V2 (aka Survey w/Goals)

Math: 2x/year (Fall & Spring)

MAP - Math 6-8 Common Core 2010 V2 (aka Survey w/Goals)



To: Curriculum and Instruction Policy Committee

From: Dr. Eric M. Anderson, Director of Research & Evaluation
emanderson@seattleschools.org
(206) 252-0050

Date: August 11, 2017

RE: Advanced Learning Program Review Update

Dear Committee Members,

At the August 22, 2017 C&I Policy Committee meeting you will be briefed on the status of the pilot program reviews that were conducted during the 2016-17 year in accordance with Superintendent SMART Goal 3. The program review for Advanced Learning includes two phases of work:

- Phase 1: Descriptive analysis of “current state” Advanced Learning programming
- Phase 2: Design study of high-growth practices for students above or well above standard

Key Findings from Phase I Report: Descriptive Analysis (delivered June 2017)

Enrollment

- There has been an increase in the districtwide percentage of students eligible for Advanced Learning over a three-year period, from 9.4% in 2015-16 to a projected 11.3% for 2017-18.
- White students remain significantly overrepresented and historically underserved students of color remain significantly underrepresented. Disproportionality has not significantly decreased in the last 3 years
- The Northwest region currently has the highest concentration of the district’s Advanced Learning/Highly Capable students (30%), while the Southeast region has the lowest concentration (6%).
- There has been a steady decline in the percentage of AL eligible students enrolled in Spectrum Program, driven mainly by declining number of students attending Spectrum designated schools. The decline is most noticeable among elementary grades, where the proportion of students enrolled in Spectrum Program dropped from 40% in 2014 to 28% in 2016.

Achievement

- Proficiency rates for AL and HC identified students are over 90%, and Historically Underserved AL eligible students perform equally as well as their white, Asian, and multiracial peers.
- Differences in student growth are however evident for black students who are AL eligible. Although there are far fewer students in this group overall (n=95), only 32% were “high growth”, which is far lower than the district average for all AL students (43% high growth)

Key Issues Raised by District Stakeholders

- Issue 1: Stakeholders want high quality, rigorous instruction for students who are not in self-contained environments: Stakeholders, particularly families, expressed concerns about the availability of challenging instruction and content for students who were AL eligible but not in the HCC program. They cited teachers who did not have adequate supports for differentiation, and schools that were not well prepared to meet the needs of advanced learners.
- Issue 2: Stakeholders want solutions to ensure racial equity within Advanced Learning: Stakeholders, particularly the Racial Equity in HCC Team – and principals alike recommend the following changes to increase access to AL programs for underrepresented students:
 - Make equity-focused changes to testing policies
 - Provide better in-school access to Advanced Learning Opportunities
 - Encourage more Advanced Learning referrals
- Issue 3: Stakeholders want a cohesive plan to guide the future of Advanced Learning programs and supports. Any comprehensive plan must address the following:
 - Lack of definition for the Spectrum designation
 - Lack of community engagement during district decision-making
 - Poor customer service from the Advanced Learning department
 - Unarticulated pathways for HCC students

Principal Perspectives

- Only 4% of principals said the District should continue designating certain schools as “Spectrum schools.” Over two-thirds of respondents believes the District (68%, 46 principals in total) should discontinue this practice. The rest (28%) were “unsure”.
- In open-ended responses, these principals cited two main concerns:
 - Maintaining a Spectrum designation perpetuates inequities in the district, benefiting families privileged in terms of both race and socioeconomic status.
 - All schools should be able to accommodate Advanced Learners as part of the district’s Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports (MTSS).

Forthcoming Phase 2 Report: Design Study (expected October 2017)

The Design Study will detail findings from seven (7) school visits detailing approaches to instruction for students who are above or well above standard, but who are not in a self-contained HCC program.

School visits included principal interviews, classroom walk-throughs, teacher interviews, and student focus groups. Research & Evaluation will deliver the Phase 2 Design Study report summarizing key findings to the Board in October.

**Seattle Public Schools
Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee
2017 Committee Work Plan**

Charter guided by Policy 1240, Committees & Policy 1010, Board Oversight of Management: • Develop, review and recommend academic policies • Review status, consistency, and availability of curriculum and assessments • Ensure leveraged use of Policy 0030, *Ensuring Educational and Racial Equity* • Review academic program performance • Review processes and status for training all certificated staff in curriculum, standards and the district’s Theory of Action • Oversee the instructional materials adoption process • Develop an annual committee work plan

	January 9	Feb13	March 13	April 3	May 8	June 12	Jul	August	Sept	October	Nov	Dec
Policy and Board Reports	Equitable Access Annual Rept (Policy 2200)			Equitable Access Qtrly Rept (Policy 2200)		Equitable Access Qtrly Rept (Policy 2200)	X			Equitable Access Qtrly Rept (Policy 2200) ALE Schools/ Programs Rept (Policy 2255)	Program Evaluation and Assessment (Policy 2090) Waiver of Instr Matls (Policy 2020)	
Board Policies and Procedures		3121 – Excused and Unexcused Absences 2163, 2090, & NEW – Assessments and Program Evaluation	3121 – Excused and Unexcused Absences C26.00, .01 – Instructional Materials	2163, 2090, & NEW – Assessments and Program Evaluation 2415, 2420, C16 – High School graduation requirements and credits CTE Annual Plan (Policy 2170)	2163, 2090, & NEW – Assessments and Program Evaluation CTE Annual Plan (Policy 2170) 3240, D82.00 – Student Discipline 2415, 2420, C16 – High School graduation requirements and credits	2163, 2090, & NEW – Assessments and Program Evaluation CTE Annual Plan (Policy 2170)	X	2415, 2420, C16 – High School graduation requirements and credits	3240, D82.00 – Student Discipline 2161, C62, C69 – Special Education Repeal F20.00, .01, .02 – School governance	2161, C62, C69 – Special Education Repeal F20.00, .01, .02 – School governance 2415, 2420, C16 – High School graduation requirements and credits E14.04 – Research Activity and Test Admin.	E14.04 – Research Activity and Test Administration	
Curricula, Assessments Training							X					
Standing Agenda Items	SMART Goal Update	SMART Goal Update	SMART Goal Update	SMART Goal Update	SMART Goal Update	SMART Goal Update	X	SMART Goal Update	SMART Goal Update	SMART Goal Update	SMART Goal Update	SMART Goal Update
Special Attention Items	Advanced Learning Update		Preschool Program update CSIP Update		Native American Education Update		X	Advanced Learning Update	Native Amer. Credit Retrieval Program Update		Advanced Learning Update	Prioritize for following year work plan

**Seattle Public Schools
Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee
2017 Committee Work Plan**

	January 9	Feb13	March 13	April 3	May 8	June 12	Jul	August	Sept	October	Nov	Dec
	Assessment Policy Format Feedback		Advanced Learning Update		Student R&R Approval (Policy 3200)		X					

From 2016 C&I parking lot: (New) Policy 2196, Academic Acceleration; Policy C54.00, Alternative Education; Policy 2024, Online Learning; Policy A02.00, Performance Management; (New) CSIPs Policy

Recent WSSDA updates (applicability to SPS still under evaluation): 2162, Education of Students with Disabilities under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973

DRAFT