

Minutes

This meeting was called to order at 4:30pm. Directors Burke, Patu and Mack were present. Dir. Geary joined over the phone. Dir. DeWolf was unable to attend.

This meeting was staffed by Associate Superintendent for Teaching & Learning Michael Tolley, Chief of Curriculum, Assessment & Instruction Dr. Kyle Kinoshita, Chief of Student Support Services Wyeth Jessee, Director of Career & College Readiness Caleb Perkins, Director of Policy and Board Relations Nate Van Duzer, Executive Director Government Relations & Strategic Initiatives Erinn Bennett, Math Program Manager Anna Box, Math Curriculum Specialist Patrick Gray, Science Program Manager Mary Margaret Welch, Assistant Superintendent for Business & Finance JoLynn Berge, Director of Student Support Services Kari Hanson, Executive Director of Curriculum & Instruction and Early Learning Cashel Toner.

Director Patu moved to approve the agenda. Director Mack seconded. This motion passed unanimously.

Director Patu moved to approve the January 9, 2018 Curriculum & Instruction (C&I) Policy Committee meeting minutes. Director Burke seconded. The minutes passed unanimously.

Board Action Reports (Discussion and/or Action)

Adoption of Middle School Math Instructional Materials

Anna Box, Patrick Gray and JoLynn Berge provided an overview of this item. Ms. Box noted the history of the adoption process and noted a survey of families that guided the work through their feedback. She noted the work and thorough review of the adoption committee, and noted enVision was chosen as it met the criteria of the feedback, alignment to state standards and noted the pilot process and the data received. Ms. Box noted overwhelming evidence that the consumable materials, in which students are able to write in the book, were the preference from the pilot. Ms. Box noted the purchasing process and pricing structure for the materials over a nine year cycle.

Dir. Patu asked if it is normal amount of years to spend on materials. Ms. Box noted national standard is 7 years, and large districts generally look at the 8 or 9 year mark to review for new materials. Dir. Mack asked for clarification that there are hard back materials for teachers and consumable for students. Staff confirmed. Dir. Burke asked on the outlay of funds, do we prepay or annually over time. Ms. Box noted that the \$1.2M is paid in year one. He asked that if we decide to change course in five years, then we will have already paid for the full nine years. Ms. Berge noted the risks were weighed, and even though the goal would be to do a cycle every seven years, that it is not typical, and this is a better deal to go with regardless. Ms. Box noted that this nine year plan is still a better amount than the original contract amount of \$1.7M. Ms. Berge noted it is a good business deal, the company wants the cash up front and we are getting a savings.

Dir. Patu asked for evaluations on the materials. Ms. Box noted the attachments with the reviews of student growth, noted a pre and post test, feedback from teachers, noted the gains from the students were higher with envision, and further explained the comparison chart as listed on attachment i.

Dir. Burke noted that looking at the data for Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA), the distinction between the different curriculum, there is a significant difference in student outcomes for only three months of use. Ms. Box noted that the Research and Evaluation department reported statistically significant evidence of meeting or exceeding standards on the assessment with the enVision materials.

Ms. Berge noted a learning process for staff and in future processes, we will ask for a price for a non-consumable, as getting to a non-consumable for every curriculum in the future would get expensive over time and would leave us with no curriculum over the years. Dir. Geary noted that there is a long replenishment cycle at the district for curriculum, that in 10 years our schools may be hobbling along. Dir. Burke asked if Dr. Kyle Kinoshita is comfortable with this plan with his overall scheme of adoptions. He confirmed that his draft plan only looks out six years and that this would fit it well with that plan. Dir. Burke thanked the team for his work with this process, and it is the first math adoption that he has seen that hasn't been a full brawl.

DECISION: Dir. Patu made a motion to move this forward to the full Board for approval. Dir. Mack seconded. This motion passed unanimously.

Approval of City of Seattle Department of Education and Early Learning/Seattle Preschool Program Service Agreement 2018-19.

Cashel Toner provided an overview of this item. She noted a snapshot of the partnership, race and equity, community partnerships and the proposal. Ms. Toner noted that this fits under Pre-K enrollment under Key Performance Indicators on the Formula for Success. She noted the fourth year of the partnership and discussed the three original classrooms, and this year at 17 classrooms. Ms. Toner noted enhanced programming, at direction of the Board, by instilling a Pre-K Task Force, created the Seattle Preschool Program Plus (SPP+) classrooms with special education inclusion classrooms. Ms. Toner noted under tier 2 of the community engagement process- the city partners, community task force, parents and school principals and teachers, all provided input for next steps and having impact on kindergarten readiness. Ms. Toner noted feedback loop from teachers who teach the SPP+ programs and asking them what professional development (PD) they need and what assistance they may need.

Ms. Toner noted the intentional nature of starting this program years ago in the communities that are most highly known as underserved, and she noted the demographics of the Seattle Preschool Program (SPP) classrooms and the diversity of the communities that we serve. Ms. Toner noted this action report has motion A and motion B, and discussed the differences between the two motions. She noted a table in the background section on the action report that shows the current and proposed new sites. Ms. Toner noted the funding milestones of the 75% that must hit for the full funding. She noted that Seattle Public Schools (SPS) has met every milestone up to date and that the seven potential new classrooms would be addressed with the underspend in the last three years.

Dir. Mack is concerned with the offset for the cost of the facilities that are used in a capacity constrained systems. She asked about BF Day and Green Lake being overfilled and the talk of moving the boundary, and that capacity may be an issue. Ms. Toner noted that capacity for K-12 is the core mission for SPS, and noted a mandate to serve students with special needs at a certain age even before Kindergarten. She noted that there is language in the proposal that states that if there is a capacity issue, that we will cut back the funding received and would discontinue the programming if capacity became an issue at any location.

Dir. Patu asked if they are looking elsewhere for a backup, to not have to back out of a program or closing it. Ms. Toner noted at Old Van Asselt (OVA), we have known that Wing Luke would need to move that program, and so we opened the program knowing that we would have to move it eventually and make sensible decisions.

Dir. Geary noted if we are looking at eventually having to shut down a program, that we are looking planning ahead with a two year program and look to a roll out instead of shutting down. And not creating a disruption. She noted the results of the SPP program that the statements are general. Mr. Toner noted that the data was discussed in the 2x2 meetings with Directors. She noted that the sample size is only of 8 classrooms as of now, and that when the 17 classrooms from this year go in to K, that we will have a larger sample size with more statistically significant data. Mr. Tolley noted that the Department of Research and Evaluation stated the sample size was so small at this point, therefore the statement was left general.

Dir. Mack asked about what time the decision is made for capacity. Dir. Burke asked the criteria to decide between either four new or seven new classrooms. Ms. Toner noted the decisions are in regards to the time frame needed to start a program and having the funding stream set, the capacity issues at schools, balance between the City of Seattle funding of SPS and head start and other community based organizations. Ms. Toner noted that in the past, we have discussed in the 2x2, then come to committee with the best proposal and that changes can be made prior to introduction and action. Dir. Burke asked to put demographic information in the equity section. Staff noted the request. Dir. Burke noted the budget estimation section, he noted for the 17 continuing, the numbers do not seem to add up. Ms. Berge noted she would look in to the charts.

DECISION: Dir. Mack made a motion to move this forward to the full Board for consideration. Dir. Patu seconded. This motion passed unanimously.

Standing Agenda Items

Formula for Success

- Superintendent SMART Goal 1, Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports (MTSS)

Kari Hanson noted a review of the essential practices within Goal 1 and the four critical areas working with schools to implement this year. She noted the intentional processes for teams and school leaders around academic and social/emotional work- bringing it together for the whole child framework. She noted the MTSS teamwork has been extremely complex, and noted identifying 16 schools that needed continual support and noted the PD for the essential practices in the schools for targeted support. Ms. Hanson noted goals for intensive support in the PD is to help schools look at whole school impacts and groups of kids. She noted that this is long term complex work that will take many years to flush out. She noted in collaboration, schools are on track and established in this area. 24 schools are receiving this support since the start of the year and the collaboration has been foundational.

Ms. Hanson noted responses from the school leaders and felt that they felt “strong to high confidence” and felt their schools were on track. Perception from principals is that this is where they need to be. She noted the support approach this year – resources for all, training for some and services for a few. Ms. Hanson noted there are tiered supports structure for the schools that need it most, adding up to MTSS coaches at 80 of the schools. She noted site visits for schools and noted a mid-year self-assessment to assess current practice done in the MTSS teams. She noted measuring progress, and evidence collection to begin in March, through May. Ms. Hanson discussed the materials available for schools to guide this progress, and noted that progress needs to be observable in the model. She noted an end of year status

report with feedback from Principals to set the pace for next year and where to stage up the supports based on what we see this year.

Dir. Patu asked if this was for all high schools. Ms. Hanson noted it is at 104 of SPS schools. Dir. Burke asked how to assess the impact with the tiered model to post intermediate data and the growth at the intermediate schools to engrain in culture. Ms. Hanson noted implementation data 30, 60, 120 days. She noted that it is completely aligned to the structure built last year. Ms. Hanson noted the data will be layering this year; data from schools pre/mid/post school year. She noted that will be the marker where we know it will be effective to impact student results that can be measured and seen- through student performance data.

High School Update

Caleb Perkins noted this is a new standing item for this committee, around secondary revisioning work. He noted this will be a preview of tomorrows work session that will dive more deeply in to the work. Mr. Perkins noted three areas- common foundation with the Board of where we have been and where we are trying to go and what is the plan. The second is to dive deeply in to the rationale for the change to school schedule to meet the needs of our students. And, noted a book end work session on February 28th as well to address questions and concerns. Mr. Perkins noted the chart today is an attempt to show what the implementing looks like and what is the role of the Board Directors in the process. He further reviewed the implementation chart and discussed the policy guidance from the Directors, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) approval process and improving new content. Mr. Perkins noted working with various departments on the work involved along the way and there may be revolving circumstances that may adjust or shift some of this work, which will continue to be discussed at upcoming work sessions.

Dir. Mack asked if they are presenting a proposal of what the schedule will look like now or is that in process. Mr. Perkins noted the current rationale is there are two main goals, expand credit earning opportunities and expand credit blocks throughout the day. He noted a potential for an A/B rotation of classes that have been discussed with principals, but is up to the CBA bargaining process for teacher schedules. He noted the plan and outline for the next two work sessions this month. Mr. Tolley noted conversations with Board Directors in meetings to give additional information and inform their decision making.

Instructional Materials Update

- Report on draft 5-year Curriculum Adoption Plan

Dr. Kinoshita noted a high level map of what a five year cycle might be for the district. He noted rather than marching through year by year, he wanted to highlight the reasoning behind the sequence presented here. Dr. Kinoshita noted areas that are required for graduation and are there gap areas that need to be filled for students to be ready with new state requirements- science and world language for examples. He noted achievement gaps in the data to inform the reasoning, as well as our own internal capacity. Dr. Kinoshita noted the level of time commitment to do an adoption, which was used to determine this plan. He noted addressing the most outdated curriculum and supporting equity in areas where appropriate, to build in ethnic studies to address gaps. Dr. Kinoshita noted consulting with Dir. Burke on this, and fill in gap areas of civics and altering social studies. He also noted the steady build of Career and Technical Education (CTE) and innovation in our curriculum. Dr. Kinoshita noted the surrounding work, and this five year core will provide context for other areas of improvement on course sequencing and create a backbone to see how technology can support instruction and not just be filling in, but purposely build in the technology to the curriculum and instruction and be more intentional about budgeting.

Dr. Kinoshita noted that the Board recently had decided that there would be \$7M to use for this, and that that new funding has not been built in to his plan to expedite other curriculum adoptions. Dir. Burke noted that he appreciates this as a target and the intentional commitment to plan and that there is a great need for it. He noted that we are trying to get this on a regular cadence and that all of these adoptions would be to begin. Dir. Burke noted that the committee needs to understand that the work has been taking place over several months, so that the intent is that every January we look at the curriculum adoptions and that we can have a target to start moving on priorities.

Dir. Geary noted that with English Language Arts (ELA) and middle school math with community engagement, and have we run this plan through the community engagement process with having a realistic timeline. Dr. Kinoshita noted that the purchase would not take place until the spring, over one year after the process started, which is realistic. Dir. Burke noted that these do not all have to start in January, some are smaller scale, like a Spanish adoption, and there is an element of scale to each of these, and Dr. Kinoshita has built that in to some of these and that there is a good starting point to have those conversations. Dr. Kinoshita noted that the idea is to start adoptions in September to have a full year to go through the process and would be ready by late spring to purchase for the next year would be an ideal cycle.

Dir. Mack noted the importance of getting materials for our teachers and students, and on the last chart, there are really distressing dates. Dr. Kinoshita noted that some schools pick up things that meet their individuals needs. Dir. Mack asked about High School science standards. Dir. Burke noted that is under special attention item 2 later in the agenda. Dr. Kinoshita noted that is why this is a draft and there are circumstances that may change this document over time. He noted that the prospect of additional funding will help acceleration certain things. Mr. Tolley noted they would like to come back in March for a proposal to approve the plan, sequencing and adoption cycle for this, and the perhaps request a Board work session.

English Language Arts Adoption Study

Dr. Jessica Beaver noted that the Department of Research and Evaluation has undertaken a study to look at the implementation of the Center for Collaborative Classroom (CCC) instructional materials. She noted an advisory committee that has convened to review the implementation in partnership. Dr. Beaver noted the handouts and discussed the curriculum adoption process and the research to perhaps make course corrections along the way in the implementation, if needed. She noted looking at student achievement and closing opportunity gaps, particularly the traditionally underserved students and particularly English Language Learner (ELL) students. Dr. Beaver noted the three year plan and the survey that went out, where SPS has already received 500 responses. Dr. Beaver discussed the plans over the three years as listed on the slides, with assessments data used to inform the work. She noted an impact analysis on student achievement in year three.

Dr. Beaver noted the logic model and theory of action guiding the work, and discussed the practices and processes that they will study at the district, school and classroom levels. She noted this summer, a year 1 report and informing the team at regular intervals and make shifts in real time with implementation. She noted Dr. Kinoshita's presentation at Leadership Learning Day (LLD) today to get information out to school leaders. Dr. Kinoshita noted the immediate benefits already with the first step of this study. Dr. Beaver noted that this study is one part of the program review plan for the district.

Dir. Mack noted that the teachers that she hears from is that they are excited about the new materials. Dir. Burke noted that in all of the instructional materials adoptions, and some people say that materials do not matter, and he would like it noted that instructional materials do matter.

Board Policies and Procedures

School Board Policy 2195, Kindergarten

Ms. Toner provided an overview at a potential revision to Policy No. 2195, Kindergarten. She noted this is an introduction to a change that will be coming in an action report next month. Ms. Toner noted that this policy is outdated and that Kindergarten is a full day for all of our students and state wide. She discussed two potential options for making the revision. Ms. Toner noted with staff time, the recommendation would be to just remove the last line of the policy. She noted that community engagement may inform what decision that they make.

Dir. Patu noted this is outdated and why do we have this in our policy. Ms. Toner noted that in the past, full day kindergarten was fee based and that is why staff is coming to the table for a revision. Dir. Burke asked for pros and cons with deleting version changing. Ms. Toner noted state law and the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) involved. Directors agreed that is the direction that they would like to go.

Special Attention Items

District Research and Evaluation Action Plan

Dr. Eric Anderson and Dr. Beaver provided an overview of this item and noted that this is a milestone for the Research and Evaluation department for the type of research that they are doing for a systematic approach to research. He noted that this is a process to articulate how the research agenda is developed and more transparency as to what is being studied and for what purpose. Also looking at a better way to produce results and noted a new research newsletter that will be forthcoming. He noted that with having only two researchers, they have had to leverage relationships with the University of Washington (UW), John Hopkins and Spencer Grant for other analysts to support the work.

Dr. Anderson noted the goals of having a common language and classification of the projects/studies and noted language as listed on the action plan in the packet. Dr. Anderson noted the work to align the projects to the SMART goals and is listed on the chart. He noted two that are focused on MTSS, five focused on Eliminating Opportunity Gaps (EOG) and three on Program Review Category on efficiencies on instruction and instructional technology. This update is to set the stage for a more regular process each year for the Board. Dr. Anderson noted two sections to get feedback from Directors, one would be on the International Baccalaureate (IB) program to do initial scoping and data collection in the spring and impact analysis over the summer. He discussed assessments and analysis to determine longer term impacts for our students.

Dir. Mack asked if the data links from college back to high schools. Dr. Anderson noted that this is our data, it is not publicly available data and is not being sharing, there are very strict protocols for our data and personally identifiable info is not listed. Dir. Patu asked what we are looking at with the IB program. Dr. Anderson noted they are continuing to scope out the process and will continue to look at the review. He noted at the core is to look if this rigorous curriculum really makes impacts on high school graduation and student outcomes. Mr. Tolley noted that purpose is to find out if we are getting the results that we expect, if so, great, if not, why not. He noted using this data to inform decisions to invest additional supports and or resources in areas, and to inform our decisions.

Dr. Anderson noted issuing a request for proposal (RFP) for contractor to research ELL/International Students to do an external program review, it is more high profile and may be better for external services to take a look.

Dir. Mack noted that this work seems to fall under guidance of Policy No. 2090 and asked for clarity. Dr. Anderson noted that it is not yet, but perhaps that it can be added. Dr. Anderson noted to embed that in the program summary work and create a robust spreadsheet to summarize with data and budget. Dir. Burke noted the inspirational work of this plan and wants to be deliberate that we do not pull too many of those things in to the Research and Evaluation team and that we have identified which specific programs and a filtered set. Dr. Anderson noted the appreciation that the department cannot do it all, and that perhaps there are specific areas that they can help with the production of student data for the needs of other departments.

High School Science Alignment Plan

Mary Margaret Welch provided an overview of the intention of this update and noted the documents that were provided. She noted that the Next Generation Science Standards began in 2013, and the year prior SPS started working through the frameworks document. She noted that the new standards were to make sure every student has the opportunity to get a full science education and to be equitable. Ms. Welch noted a history of the work with collaboration with science teachers. She noted a shift in the program since that time, and that right now the physical science is much more closely aligned to standard, due to the shifts that have been made over the years. Ms. Welch discussed the differences in the physical sciences taught in our schools and the need to align the curriculum. She noted an alignment team that has been reviewing this over the last few years. She noted the collaboration with local colleges for the alignment.

Ms. Welch noted there has not been an adoption for many years, and that teachers are creating units of study, framed together in to a unit. The colleges and teachers have been collaborating for the unit development, which is usually done in the summer to be ready for the start of school. She provided examples of units, such as animals- with synthesis, cellular division, molecules, etc. Ms. Welch noted that what is different now is bringing the concepts together and bringing life to them so that the students understand them. She noted the current freshmen will be taking three years of science now as the State of Washington has said that all students will have 2 years of lab science, and 1 year of elective science. To provide the student with fundamental learning so the students can make choices for the elective year. Ms. Welch noted that the bundles are inclusive of what the students need.

Dir. Burke noted that we have been doing this work and we have the pieces in place for the work, and yet he hears that we have to change, and he does not see the connection. Dir. Burke noted that for this physical product that everyone is working, it becomes a set of instructional materials without the vetting on the same level of an adoption. Dr. Kinoshita noted for context, if you look at the prior map on adoption science, and noted that standards changed three times over the last seven years. He noted the emergence and pressure with Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM), our science department has been trying to fill huge gaps to bring our instruction up to standards level. We are hopefully beginning an adoption cycle which puts these conversations in their proper order, and that instructional materials, and pedagogy align to standards and assessments.

Dir. Mack noted going down to meetings with the Washington State Directors' Association (WSDA) and they are against the alignments of the standards that have changed so many times and students graduating over the last several years have all had different standards. She noted that WSDA now says to not link standards to sequencing and she feels that we do not have the curriculum vetted. Ms. Welch noted that this is what we were already doing in the classrooms and these adjustments have been made over the last five years. She noted it is more around naming conventions, not changing the instruction. Mr. Tolley noted that we are teaching our students to have master standards, and the teachers are aligning their work for what the students need to meet student standards. Dir. Mack noted she does not understand the need for change. Dir. Kinoshita noted we could call it Physical Science or Phys A and Chem A. This has

been in place for many decades. One of the critical changes is that some of the physical science that used to be taught in high school is now the standards that belong in middle schools. Dr. Kinoshita noted the idea is to upgrade what is under the current standard of 9th graders, and now it is getting down to labeling. Ms. Welch noted that the teachers have been coming together and working with universities to collaborate to make the very best instruction for the students every day.

Dir. Kinoshita noted that what has not been required up until now is that a student could stop their high school science after the second year. And, now the state has required a 3rd year. Ms. Welch noted that this is a moment of equity, and we have not structured our course in a way to engage our learners so that they all achieve those higher standards. She discussed examples of course sequencing at schools for science, and there is a need to make sure that students have the chance to have students get in to the classes that they need in order for students to meet state standards and be career and college ready. Mr. Tolley noted that perhaps the Directors need additional information to be walked through to understand the rationale in this area.

Dr. Kinoshita noted we are about to embark on a Science Adoption process. He noted that he has been in other districts to see what has been going on and noted that our SPS science department has been doing an excellent job at keeping us up to date, where we are not five years behind without funding for instructional materials.

Ms. Welch noted that the state gave us standards, that we are obligated to align with for our students. She noted that teachers came in good faith, with no adoption on the horizon, to prepare excellent materials on behalf of the learners. Ms. Welch noted that the teachers have already transitioned to teach to state standards. Dir. Burke explicitly noted that this is not a request to go backward, but also to have amazing, vetted tools, and put that through an adoption process. Dir. Burke noted that Directors and educators have to rely on the community to see where we missed things, and he sees both sides of the recent conversation in the community on this topic.

The meeting adjourned at 7:02pm



3/13/2018