Board Special Meeting
Work Sessions: District Scorecard and Operations Data Dashboard; Board Evaluation
Wednesday, November 8, 2017, 5:30 - 7:30pm
Auditorium, John Stanford Center
2445 – 3rd Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134

Agenda

Call to Order	5:30pm
Work Session: District Scorecard and Operations Data Dashboard	5:30pm
Work Session: Board Evaluation	7:00pm*
Adjourn	7:30pm*

*Special meetings of the Board, including work sessions and retreats, may contain discussion and/or action related to the items listed on the agenda. *Times given are estimated.*

District Scorecard and Operations Data Dashboard

November 8, 2017
School Board Work Session Cover Memo
Lead Staff: Dr. Eric Anderson, Director of Research and Evaluation; Stephen Nielsen, Deputy Superintendent

Purpose

During this work session, staff will be presenting the District Scorecard, which includes Year 4 results for metrics aligned to current District Strategic Plan (2013-2018).

During this work session, staff will be presenting the District Annual Operations Data Dashboard. This is mandated by Policy No. 1010 (Board Oversight of Management), which states that a report will be prepared and presented to the Board each November. The Operations Data Dashboard is separate from and in addition to the district academic scorecard, and includes a limited number of carefully selected indicators from key oversight areas.

Outcomes

At the end of the session, the Board will have a better understanding of the degree to which the district has achieved its outcome goals and targets in the Strategic plan, and the overall operational health of the district.

Next Steps

Staff recommend refreshing the District Scorecard and the Operations Data Dashboard when the District strategic plan is updated, so our metrics are consistent with priorities identified in the plan and School Board goals. Until the new strategic plan is created, staff will continue to monitor and manage the operational health of the district using the current metrics.

Seattle Public Schools

2016-17 District Annual Operations Data Dashboard

Dr. Larry Nyland
Superintendent

November 8, 2017

1

Why are we here?

- The District Annual Operations Data Dashboard is mandated by Policy No. 1010 – Board Oversight of Management. The policy goals are:
  - Evaluate each oversight area's implementation plans, goals and objectives.
  - Enable the board to perform appropriate oversight of management of each oversight area by monitoring progress toward performance indicators.
  - Ensure the district has qualified personnel overseeing its programs.
  - Ensure compliance with state law and board policies and procedures.

- Policy No. 1010 states that the board will develop and use a district annual operations data dashboard for monitoring all oversight areas, which shall be separate from and in addition to the district academic scorecard.

- The operations data dashboard consists of a limited number of carefully selected indicators that communicate the operational health of the district. The dashboard shall include key performance indicators for each Oversight Area.

- District annual operations data dashboard is one of the tools mandated by Policy No. 1010. This policy also identifies other ways the School Board is able to maintain management oversight including Oversight Work Sessions, Committees, receiving monthly financial statements, internal audit reports, other annual program oversight and performance reports, and others.

Goal 1. High Performing Staff

Nbr	Performance Measure	2013-2014 Actual	2014-2015 Actual	2015-2016 Actual	2016-2017 Actual	Change from last year (up = improved, down = declined, sideways = less than 1 percent change)	Business Owner
1	Percent of school leaders returning to their schools	72%	76%	75%	82%	▲	Clover Codd
2	Percent of Principals' evaluations completed on time	93.0%	99.5%	100%	98% (z)	▼	Clover Codd
3	Principal leadership metric (a) (b)	N/A	62.8%	62.3%	68.0%	▲	Mike Starosky
4	Five year retention rate of teachers	70%	63%	67%	73%	▲	Clover Codd
5	Percent of Teachers' evaluations completed on time	95%	97%	100%	99.6%	◄► (0.36% decline)	Clover Codd
6	Percent of positive responses from teachers indicating that they have access to strategies and materials to support all learners in our classes (c)	56.1%	61.5%	59.6%	62.0%	▲	Michael Tolley
7	Percent of lost instructional days due to teacher absences (d) (e)	7.0%	3.4%	9.0%	7.0%	▲	Clover Codd
8	Annual retention rate for central office employees	88%	76%	84%	82%	▼	Clover Codd
9	Percent of Central Office evaluations completed on time	72%	94% (v)	99.9%	99.7%	◄► (0.22% decline)	Clover Codd

Notes:

(a): This is a metric created in 2013-2014, part of the Center for Excellence Education CEE principal leadership survey, to assess the effectiveness of a principal's learning-centered leadership behaviors, aligned to the Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP) leadership framework adopted statewide for principal evaluation.

(b): This was a new metric when reported for 2014-2015, thus a baseline was established as 62.8%.

(c): Data is collected from the climate survey administered every year to all teachers

(d): A lower number indicates better performance or result

(e): Includes all reasons for absence, except vacancies or long-term leaves. Classroom teachers only.

(v): Preliminary data

(z): 100% of all evaluations were completed, with 98% of them submitted by the due date.

Goal 2. Community Support

Nbr	Performance Measure	2013-2014 Actual	2014-2015 Actual	2015-2016 Actual	2016-2017 Actual	Change from last year (up = improved, down = declined, sideways = less than 1 percent change)	Business Owner
10	Percent of positive responses "The school is preparing my child well for the future" (f) (g)	73.9%	72.3%	80.9%	81.0%	◀▶ (0.12% improvement)	Michael Tolley
11	Percent of families indicating that teachers know how to meet the specific learning needs of their child (f) (g)	68.4%	66.3%	73.6%	74.3%	◀▶ (0.95% improvement)	Michael Tolley
12	Positive family responses to family engagement survey (g)	71.8%	68.6%	72.0%	73.4%	▲	James Bush
13	Schools meeting their objectives as outlined in their Family Engagement Team plan	93% (43 of 46) (h)	89% (41 of 46) (i)	93% (28 of 30) (j)	95% (18 of 19) (bb)	▲	James Bush
14	The district central office is responsive to the input and concerns of families (g) (k)	27.9%	26.0%	21.5%	28.2%	▲	Carri Campbell
15	Percent of students responding that they feel safe in a school (g)	75.9%	76.0%	70.8% (n)	69.4%	▼	Wyeth Jessee/ Pegi McEvoy

Notes:

(f): This metric is part of the Center for Excellence Education CEE principal leadership survey, used to help assess the effectiveness of a principal's learning-centered leadership behaviors. The survey questions are aligned to the Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP) leadership framework adopted statewide for principal evaluation.

(g): Part of climate survey

(h): For 2013-2014, 43 of the 46 or 93% Family Engagement Action Team (FEAT) schools met their FEAT plan objectives. We did not meet our 100% target because we added two new schools from for the 13-14 SY. We only had 43 FEATs when we created the 100% target metric at the beginning of the 13-14 SY.

(i): For 2014-2015, 41 (89%) of the 46 FEAT schools met their Family Engagement Team plan objectives . We did not meet our 100% target because we

(j): Due to large turnover of Principals and teachers we were forced to reduce the number of Family Engagement Action Teams we have at our schools to 30 from 46. We are adding 20 new teams (high and middle schools this year as part of the Engaging Families on High School Success grant) for this school year.

Goal 2. Community Support (continued)

(k): Result based on responses to the following survey item on our annual family climate survey: The district central office is responsive to the input and concerns of families. Percentage shown is percentage of favorable responses (strongly agree + agree). For 2016-2017, total responses = 9,797; total positive responses = 2,761; total neutral responses = 4,772; total negative responses = 2,264.

(n): Per the Research & Evaluation Department: The order of response options on student survey forms was reversed in 2016. This likely contributed to systematically lower results on subsequent surveys compared to prior years. Specifically, "Strongly Disagree" is now the first option (reading from left to right on the form), whereas in previous years the first option was "Strongly Agree." Research shows the order of response options can have significant effects.

(bb): The 16-17 academic year was the year we were expecting to have at least 64 FEATs. Due to unforeseen circumstances, we went from a 3.5 FTE to a 1.5 FTE which dramatically impacted our ability to ensure that we met our intended goal. We course-corrected by assigning our 0.5 FTE to do a deeper dive with four schools. Previously, the 0.5 was assigned fifteen (15) schools in the South end. Our 1.0 FTE was assigned 19 schools, several of which were North end as well as Southwest. Many of the North end schools were not Title I Schools and therefore not bound by Title requirements. Consequently, we had a total of 19 active schools. Partnership teams are instrumental in how a school can organize its engagement work so the school can chart its progress and redirect its focus when needed. We have not parsed through data to see if there is any correlation between academic outcomes and active, high functioning FEATs.

Goal 3. Fiscal Integrity

Nbr	Performance Measure	2013-2014 Actual	2014-2015 Actual	2015-2016 Actual	2016-2017 Actual	Change from last year (up = improved, down = declined, sideways = less than 1 percent change)	Business Owner
16	Percent of budget spent on instruction (s)	77.2% (y)	78.0%	78.8%	On hold until November	TBD	JoLynn Berge
17	Percent of Fund Balance - General Fund (t)	4.1%	4.3%	4.1%	On hold until November	TBD	JoLynn Berge
18	Central Office administration as a percent of total expenditures (d) (u)	5.8%	6.4%	6.2%	On hold until November	TBD	JoLynn Berge
19	Percent of Prior Years' Audit issues resolved	81.0%	62.5%	68.9%	72.0%	▲	JoLynn Berge
20	Audit findings resolved as determined by subsequent audits (w) (x)	86.0%	73.0%	78.3%	91.3%	▲	JoLynn Berge
21	Strategic sourcing as a percent of total spend	17.0%	21.6%	25.7%	17.1%	▼	JoLynn Berge
22	Standard & Poor's non-tax vs tax; Moody's non-tax vs tax bond ratings	AA/Aaa (y)	AA/Aaa (y)	AA/Aaa (y)	AA/Aaa	◄► (no change)	JoLynn Berge
23	OSPI Financial Indicator Index - Below 1.5 is "Financial Warning"	3.25	3.25	3.40	TBD by OSPI in Mar 2018	TBD	JoLynn Berge

Notes:

(d): A lower number indicates better performance or result

(s): Source is F-196 Statement of Revenue, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance.

(t): Defined as (Committed to Economic Stabilization + Unassigned FB) / Non-grant expenditures.

(u): Source is F-195 General Fund Summary, and F-196 Activity Expenditure Summary.

(w): Metric 20: Minor change is to remove the word "state". Original metric name: 'Audit findings resolved as determined by subsequent state audits'. The new metric's name: 'Audit findings resolved as determined by subsequent audits'. The District's new Audit Response Manager feels the consolidated measure address the core of the issue: How timely the district closes out audit issues.

(x): Metric 20 definition: Audit issues include all Financial, Federal, Accountability, Performance, and Investigative findings as measured by Audit Reports issued by the State Auditor's Office (SAO) and by the Seattle Public Schools internal auditor. Per Audit Standards the District must report on the status of prior audit findings. The data comes from the Audit Log prepared by the Audit Response Manager.

(y): Data revised from previously reported performance.

Goal 4. Efficient Processes

Nbr	Performance Measure	2013-2014 Actual	2014-2015 Actual	2015-2016 Actual	2016-2017 Actual	Change from last year (up = improved, down = declined, sideways = less than 1 percent change)	Business Owner
24	Percent of Teacher vacancy on 1st day of school (d) (l)	3.1% (90 p)	2.4% (77 p)	3% (94 p)	2.2% (80 p)	▲	Clover Codd
25	Percent of schools with comprehensive safety inspection completed (m)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	◀▶ (no change)	Pegi McEvoy
26	Percent of emergency facility work orders completed on time (r)	99.0%	99.9%	99.97%	99.86%	◀▶ (0.11% decline)	Flip Herndon
27	Percent of high priority facility work orders completed on time (r)	80.0%	84.6%	89.5%	88.5%	▼	Flip Herndon
28	Percent of capital projects on schedule and on budget	88.2%	81.0%	94.0%	87.5%	▼	Flip Herndon
29	Percent of students enrolled prior to first day of school	96.3%	98.8%	99.97%	99.21%	◀▶ (0.76% decline)	Flip Herndon
30	Accuracy of District enrollment projection (aa)	99.65%	99.30%	98.58%	99.99%	▲	Flip Herndon

Notes:

(d): A lower number indicates better performance or result

(l):   p = number of positions

(m): In 2016-17, targeted security audits were completed to ensure qualification for upcoming grant opportunities.

(r): Department goals are 99% on emergencies and 88% on high priority work orders. In 2016-17, there were 699 emergency orders and 5712 high priority orders.

(aa): This metric compares the June enrollment projection adjustment to the official October 1 count.

Goal 4. Efficient Processes (continued)

Nbr	Performance Measure	2013-2014 Actual	2014-2015 Actual	2015-2016 Actual	2016-2017 Actual	Change from last year (up = improved, down = declined, sideways = less than 1 percent change)	Business Owner
31	Percent of Breakfast Participation (o), (p)	Breakfast 12.4% Free: 28.4%, Reduced: 21.7%, Paid: 2.1%	Breakfast 12.1% Free: 28.7%, Reduced: 21.0%, Paid: 2.4%	Breakfast 11.9% Free: 29.0%, Reduced: 23.2%, Paid: 2.7%	Breakfast 11.5% Free: 30.3%, Reduced: 22.2%, Paid: 2.4%	▼ overall, mixed for subcategories shown	Pegi McEvoy
32	Percent of Lunch Participation (o), (p)	Lunch 34.4% Free: 64.3%, Reduced: 63.7%, Paid: 13.9%	Lunch 32.6% Free: 62.8%, Reduced: 59.9%, Paid: 13.8%	Lunch 30.8% Free: 60.8%, Reduced: 57.8%, Paid: 13.6%	Lunch 28.5% Free: 60.4%, Reduced: 56.1%, Paid: 12.7%	▼ overall, ▼ for subcategories shown	Pegi McEvoy
33	Safe driving – Miles driven between accidents (q)	63,430	79,063	82,546	82,746	◀▶ (0.24% improvement)	Pegi McEvoy
34	Technology Help Desk first contact resolution rate	73.9%	76.0%	79.0%	77.8%	▼	John Krull
35	Percent of schools within Space Utilization tolerance levels (i.e. between 85%-120% of capacity) - includes the use of portables	District: 75% ES: 78%; MS: 56%; HS: 73%	District: 86% (y) ES: 90%; MS: 60%; HS: 83%	District: 80% ES: 84%; MS: 60%; HS: 69%	District: 73% ES: 76%; MS: 70%; HS: 62%	▼ overall, mixed for subcategories shown	Flip Herndon
36	District Wireless Proliferation (% of schools with full Wi-Fi)	60%	100%	100%	100%	◀▶ (no change)	John Krull

Notes:

(o): Percentage of total enrolled students had breakfast or lunch in school

(p): Percentages of all students who qualify for free, reduced or paid meals that had breakfast or lunch in school. For example in 2016-17 SY, of all students that qualify for free meals, 30.3% had breakfast in school.

(q): Metric 31 is reported both to State of Washington and the Council of Great City Schools CGCS. Metric definition: Total number of annual miles driven divided by the number of annual accidents.

(y): Data revised from previously reported performance.

Next Steps

- The District's strategic plan runs from 2013 – 2018. Staff recommend refreshing the Operations Data Dashboard when the new strategic plan is created so our metrics are consistent with priorities identified in the plan and School Board goals.

- On October 4, 2017, the School Board approved an extension of the current strategic plan for one year, through the end of the 2018-19 school year.

- Until the new strategic plan is created, staff will continue to monitor and manage District progress using the current metrics.

2017 Board Evaluation

November 8, 2017
School Board Work Session Cover Memo
Lead Staff: Nate Van Duzer, Director of Policy and Board Relations

Purpose

To fulfill Policy No. 1830, Evaluation of the Board, this session is an opportunity to reflect on the goals established by the Board for its own work in 2017.

Outcomes

Staff will collect feedback from directors to inform the evaluation narrative.

Next Steps

Taking feedback from the meeting, staff will draft a short evaluation narrative.

On December 13, 2017, the Board will hold another work session to discuss goals for 2018.

Photos by Susie Fitzhugh

Board Self-Evaluation – 2017

November 8, 2017

Policy No. 1820

Policy No. 1820, Evaluation of the Board

"At the conclusion of each school year, the Board shall evaluate its own performance in terms of generally accepted principles of successful Board operations and in relation to its annual goals and objectives. The Board's self-evaluation shall address performance in the key functions of school Boards - vision, structure, accountability and advocacy. The results of the self-evaluation shall be used in setting goals for the subsequent year."

2017 Adopted Board Goals

1) **Community Engagement**. Each quarter, each Director will aim to:

    a. Reach out to and meet with a community group s/he has not met with before.

    b. Meet with a school leader s/he hasn't met with before to hear about the joys and challenges of that particular school community.

    c. Meet with a group of students s/he hasn't met with before. This could be observing and participating in a classroom activity, meeting with students in a particular club, or in some other environment.

At each quarterly Board retreat, a short amount of time will be set aside so that each Director can take a few minutes to report on the meetings that were held and any insights or perspectives from the individuals with whom the Director met.

    2) **Leadership Development**. At each quarterly retreat (or in a separate work session in place of time at a retreat) the Board will receive training or leadership development, focusing in particular this year on topics related to racial equity or cultural competency.

Evaluation Narrative

Some questions for directors:

-What did the Board accomplish in these goal areas in 2017?

-What were challenges to achieving these goals?

-How might the Board build on this work in 2018?

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Looking Forward

Narrative will be drafted and distributed by staff for comments

Work Session on 2018 Board Goals/Evaluation:

- Wednesday, December 13, 2017

Seattle Public Schools:
Every Student. Every Classroom. Every Day.