



Seattle School Board Retreat

Saturday, September 10, 2016 10:00 am - 3:00 pm
Auditorium, John Stanford Center

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 am. All Directors were present. Staff present was Superintendent Larry Nyland, Deputy Superintendent Stephen Nielsen, General Counsel Noel Treat, Associate Superintendent for Teaching & Learning Michael Tolley, Associate Superintendent for Facilities & Operations Flip Herndon, Assistant Superintendent for Operations Pegi McEvoy, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources Clover Codd, Assistant Superintendent for Business & Finance JoLynn Berge, Chief Partnership Officer Brent Jones, Chief Engagement Officer Carri Campbell, Chief of Schools Mike Starosky, Chief of Student Supports Wyeth Jessee, Chief of Curriculum, Assessment & Instruction Kyle Kinoshita, Executive Director of Government Relations & Strategic Initiatives Erinn Bennett, Director of School-Family Partnerships and Race & Equity Bernardo Ruiz, and Board Office Manager Theresa Hale.

Director Patu opened the meeting and noted the items on today's agenda. Superintendent Nyland noted the importance of the strategic plan and keeping a focus to those priorities. He noted the progress made in the last few years to refine the number of goals to put a spotlight on key areas. He then spoke to the 5 goals proposed for 2016-17, to be discussed in today's meeting. Supt. Nyland noted conversations around the district around closing the opportunity gap and increasing the focus on that area. He spoke about a recent revamp of our transportation systems related to the new bell times and the positive impact on parent concerns. Directors, staff, and guests introduced themselves. Director Patu confirmed the meeting norms with the attendees.

DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION: BUDGET OVERVIEW/PROCESS AND UPDATE

JoLynn Berge opened the discussion and noted how the conversation would go, reviewing the agenda for this section. She first spoke to the guiding principles from the prior year and ways they could be updated for the 2017-18 budget process. Directors asked what it means that "McCleary is not funded" and Ms. Berge noted part is around what we give up to pay for having teachers in the classroom. Supt. Nyland noted how a large portion of our budget goes to pay for salaries, and every year we have less money to spend on the most important thing, and we can't because the state is not paying what it should. Directors asked about the changing of priorities and how that could impact the budget.

Ms. Berge reviewed the budget development calendar, noting there may need to be two budgets developed, based upon whether or not the levy cliff will impact the budget, and how that information may not be known until later in the process, highlighting the plan for bringing the 17-18 budget to the Board. She then spoke to the projected 17-18 budget and noted how some items will continue to adjust through the year, while others may not change. Directors asked if there is a tally of unfunded state mandates, noting that it could be useful to have when talking to legislators. Directors asked if there is a place to look for a legal challenge of unfunded mandates that do not put our students at risk, like class size reduction. Stephen Nielsen noted that could be done and spoke to the impacts of doing that and the message it could send to the legislature. Noel Treat noted exploring those kinds of opportunities can be useful, coming together with other districts, but we would want to see what the next phase of McCleary is before taking any steps like that. Directors asked if that is built into the McCleary work and Mr. Nielsen noted it could be framed as a cost of compensation. He then spoke about a meeting yesterday with other districts where more information being given to the legislature on true costs to districts puts pressure on the legislature. Directors asked if there are any indicators in

district financials that our investment in these mandates might have negative impacts in other ways and Ms. Berge noted that comes up later in today's presentation. Director Harris spoke about a request for relief on damages for "loaning" the money and Mr. Treat noted how McCleary is forward looking, and does not include a repayment of past funds.

Ms. Berge reviewed the slides for our revenues split by source, and then by state and local funding over time, noting a larger gap for special education, and the largest gap for English Language Learners (ELL). For expenditures, she noted how it is split by program and by activity. When asked about 'compensatory education', Ms. Berge noted that ELL and Learning Assistance Program (LAP) are the two biggest programs, as defined by the state accounting manual. She noted a third way to look at the budget is by object. She highlighted the slide of expenditures by activity as compared to our peers. Directors asked if central administration was a comprehensive list and Ms. Berge noted she believes that is the case. Mr. Nielsen noted that true central admin is usually most of those, but it is hard to have an apples-to-apples comparison since districts handle this differently. Directors asked if all salaries in the John Stanford building are covered there and Ms. Berge noted that while many staff are based here, some are for delivery of services in schools. Directors and staff spoke to the balancing act of having the staff to provide supports and deliver to the needs of the classroom. Directors asked if the central administration line is the same across districts, and Ms. Berge noted it is defined per the state's accounting manual, but there may be slight variations.

Ms. Berge noted expenditures by object and Directors asked if there is alignment between revenues and expenditures. Ms. Berge then reviewed the district characteristics slides, related to enrollment, poverty in Seattle, and the ELL population. As compared to other districts, we have the highest expenditures per pupil in General Education, Special Education, and ELL. Directors asked if poverty numbers include homeless students and Ms. Berge noted that students who qualify for Free/Reduced Lunch (FRL) drive the poverty number. Directors asked if this could be handled more proactively by using the state's certification. Director Blanford spoke to the poverty numbers and the power in showing the number of schools that have changed, where they are in district, and have that to take out to schools. Director Peters noted pockets of poverty in some schools and asked if this calculation is based on each school's threshold. Ms. Berge noted some funding for LAP is by school, and others qualify by other factors, and spoke to the different ways schools are identified as a poverty school.

Ms. Berge then noted the prototypical school model – an allocation method that the state uses to determine how to fund districts, how it is a guideline and sets how our allocation comes to us. The district's Weighted Staffing Standards (WSS) should reflect our values and how we want to fund schools. Supt. Nyland noted how 10-12 years ago, the state got a report on how it should fund education, and then cut 20% as they couldn't afford the full amount. They told the state supreme court that is what they could afford, and that is what the court is holding them to with the McCleary decision. Mr. Nielsen spoke to this model and how it would have put us at 24th out of 50 states in funding, and it has gone down since then. Director Harris noted how the current supreme court could change based on the upcoming elections, and asked if this was a comparison with states that fund with income taxes. Mr. Nielsen noted it was for all 50 states with all types of resources. Ms. Berge explained how the "actual" columns on slide 26 are determined. She then spoke to the school model related to staff and how the allocation doesn't align to what is actually needed in schools. Ms. Berge reviewed the Maintenance Supply and Operations Costs (MSOC) funding, and then the WSS for this year, noting the differences from the state funding allocations. Directors asked if the first WSS chart matches our reality, and Ms. Berge noted that is how we fund. Directors then asked why some schools are reported as higher, and Ms. Berge noted there are school level decisions made that impact class sizes. Director Peters asked that at some time Directors be provided an explanation that could be given to communities. Mr. Nielsen noted that some Executive Directors of Schools could speak to some allocation decisions made at schools, and Supt. Nyland noted staff will get that information to the Board. Director Harris spoke to the balance between site-based management and accountability in the district, and would suggest an enhanced opportunity in our Continuous School Improvement Plans (CSIP) to explain if a school is deviating from this.

Ms. Berge noted the variation of categories in WSS depending on size of school, and that we fund for certificated core staff, which the state doesn't fund. She then spoke to the WSS for middle schools and high schools, and then spoke to the MSOC funding at different grade levels, and according to poverty levels. In reviewing slide 35, she noted this was a comparison of prototypical allocations and how we allocate funds. She noted instructional aides are not funded in the WSS but schools can choose to fund that area. Supt. Nyland noted how we have a 3-day cleaning cycle for schools, but we have larger square footage. Directors ask why the librarian allocation is less than prototypical, and Ms. Berge noted that is what the WSS rolled out. A librarian is an allocation to the school itself, and each school has a choice on how to spend their funds, which could include shifting between a librarian and a counselor. Directors asked if the prototypical allocation reflects state funding, but the actual amount is less than our per-FTE cost. Ms. Berge stated that every unit the state "provides" is around 30% less funding than how we fund those positions. Directors asked if a cost of living adjustment could also be included there to reflect the challenge we face in Seattle.

In looking at Levy funding, Ms. Berge reviewed the areas funded through levy dollars. Mr. Nielsen suggested moving to slide 49, and Ms. Berge did a brief review of the expenditures in the different categories, and Directors asked to revisit these slides at a future discussion. Directors asked what our revenues are for these to show where we are spending funds beyond state allocations, and asked for data on how the staff are placed in schools versus the staff who might be in the central office. Directors then asked about the cost of special education services. Ms. Berge noted it depends on how many programs we are funding, how many 1-on-1 aides are provided, and it can also depend on a district's philosophy. Wyeth Jessee noted urban areas like ours attract students with intense service needs, as there are more facilities in the area, which impacts our expenses. Also, it is more difficult to compare to other districts in our area, and instead when we are compared to other urban districts, they are either matching or exceeding our spending. Ms. Berge spoke to the programs with additional enhancements budgeted for this year, which reflect the values of the district and to meet students' basic education needs. Supt. Nyland spoke to how these kinds of programs have funding challenges on a yearly basis, due to being underfunded by the state. Directors spoke about past concerns of transparency with the WSS committee, and needing to bring partners to the table early and often to help alleviate those concerns. Supt. Nyland spoke to how to balance funds to try to meet as many needs as possible. Directors spoke about looking at where we might not be spending our money as efficiently, through a program evaluation and reconsider those that aren't performing well.

Ms. Berge spoke to the three tracks for outreach in the budget process, with an overarching question of "What do you value?" Staff will collect that feedback and bring it to the Board to help inform decisions. She then noted the next steps in the process and Mr. Nielsen revisited the calendar for the work to highlight when key steps would happen. He also noted how some funds are allocated to specific areas that can't be spent elsewhere, speaking to a Directors comment on the funding for technology. Directors spoke about how to evaluate the programs and understand if these are working, as well as the different initiatives that have been started. Director Peters recommended a guiding principle of "prioritize expenditures and investments that clearly value the students in the classroom." Director Harris asked for a Friday Memo on the WSS Committee, who they are, and how their meetings are run.

The meeting recessed at 11:43 am and reconvened at 12:03 pm.

DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION: 2016-17 BUDGET

Supt. Nyland opened the discussion and revisited the proposed goals for 2016-17. Erinn Bennett spoke to the purposes of this section, looking at each of the goals, rubrics, and budget detail, around Goals 1, 3, 4, and 5. She called out that the 1:50 pm section today will dig into the remaining \$4M. The 1 pm presentation will be on opportunity gaps, which includes goal 2. She reviewed the documents in the packet for this section, and how staff will be presenting each goal in this discussion. She noted the rubrics are drafts, as some work is budget-dependent, so they may change based upon funding availabilities.

Goal 1: Wyeth Jessee introduced this goal, which would go district wide to address the needs of all students, and spoke to how the rubric is organized, reviewing each area. He noted the steps that have already been taken related in this work, and the steps moving forward. Director Burke commented on the importance of this goal and noted some concerns for how things are weighted in this goal, calling out the importance of the basis of tools and procedures, and how it feels like strategies are around the environment and assessment pieces, but not the delivery. He noted he would like to see more emphasis around establishing common tools and procedures that display success, and how they are used in other categories, and would also like to see a reference to CSIPs. Mr. Jessee noted a team has been building out the common tools and procedures, and some schools have already been using particular tools so we don't want to disrupt what they are using and publishing for other schools to use, but to rather give them a menu of tools to use. Directors asked if the use of the term "common" was "common to the district", which Mr. Jessee confirmed, but also noted some differences at different levels, like between elementary and high school. Michael Tolley agreed to the need to include information on CSIPs, and noted that is also in Goal 2, calling out that for 16-17, Goals 1 and 2 are interrelated. Directors asked if supports we are offering are applicable to all students, and Mr. Jessee noted how Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) is about each and every student and their growth potential in both academic and socio-emotional aspects. Directors then asked when staff is considering how to carry out the plan, to monitor and intervene along MTSS – is it a leveled approach or growth approach, and what are measures. Mr. Jessee noted that has a long answer, and that is different in the context of each school, where you need to determine where to focus, who is in most need. And also at a classroom level for the teacher to address the needs of each student. Directors asked how Exec Directors interface with this, and if there is a feedback loop. Mike Starosky noted the need to scale this up but that needs to be determined – the plan is to start with specific tools that each school uses, common language and tools that we are asking principals to use and share among each other. For some principals, it is work already being done, and for others it is big growth, and we want to have consistency among levels. Director Harris asked that we report on a regular basis in the Friday Memo on that kind of work, and where we are on the path. Mr. Starosky also noted the September 28th Oversight Work Session for Executive Directors of Schools, where they will be presenting to the Board on their role.

Ms. Bennett noted the next steps for this work is to introduce these to the Board at an upcoming Board meeting, either 9/21 or 10/12, depending on the amount of changes needed.

Goal 3: Flip Herndon noted this was a more recently determined goal, which has a three-fold desire: 1: create and identify a mapping tool that exhibits programs that exist in the district, 2: clearly identify what types of resources they have and outcomes, and 3: evaluation of those programs, which are succeeding and not, to look at how we fund areas. He then noted the tools within program mapping, and coming up with a definition of what is success for a program. Director Geary noted a desire for an overlap of programs in the district, once we can do an interface with demographics and programs, and then looking with the demographics to see what success would be for the different groups. Dr. Herndon talked about the tool they are looking at to address this goal, and how it can serve multiple purposes. Directors asked about the tool and whether we would rely on the software to provide us efficacy of programs. Dr. Herndon noted that work has to be done by us and then we can make informed decisions once we understand the success of our programs. Mr. Tolley spoke about staff conversations on how to first go out and gather information on program descriptions and expected outcomes, and then go through the process to see if all the pieces are in place, and then evaluate success. Directors asked which programs to date that we have replicated, and Mr. Tolley noted he would point to the success of Mercer and Denny, with the strategies at Mercer around mathematics applied at Aki Kurose. Mr. Jessee noted those attributes that Eric Anderson put out there is around having common assessments so it is an apples-to-apples comparison, and sharing strategies and success, adjusting as needed, and addressing which resources and interventions work for that school. Supt. Nyland noted trying to find lessons learned, identifying best practices from research or as they emerge in our schools, and spoke to work done at summer training this year to help share and spread best practices. Directors asked for finer granularity in the document, as Dr. Herndon had provided a

better description. Director Burke noted the strategies don't show a higher priority of implementing Policy No. 2090, Program Evaluation & Assessment, and the rubrics of what we want to achieve in each program identified needs to be called out here. Director Peters noted maybe adding a reference to Policy 2090, and would like to see the word 'integrity' here. She also asked if the word 'portfolio' could be switched for something else.

Goal 4: Stephen Nielsen noted the work already discussed earlier in today's meeting, the work still to come around the Legislative Agenda, and the help of groups in the district that support this work. Director Peters spoke about having more of an auditing/analysis of our budget and how our resources are allocated and if that is reflected here. Mr. Nielsen noted it is and it isn't, and we are in the process of hearing from the Board and the public on what they want. Director Peters noted it needs to add the next step on how we allocate our funds. Ms. Berge noted how some of that work is part of the coming budgeting process. Director Harris noted the earlier conversation around WSS and fleshing out the details, and asked that the language in this goal be changed to be more proactive, such as instead of review, say analyze. Supt. Nyland spoke to how this process could occur to help facilitate making thoughtful decisions. Director Geary asked that it include a report of efficiencies found.

Goal 5: Carri Campbell spoke about the purpose of this goal and its theory of action, noting the three strategies for the work. Clover Codd spoke to the different strategies recommended and the impacts of the work. Directors spoke about how the strategies are aligned, and emphasized the importance of leadership training, also noting challenges in governance at our schools. Director Harris noted the funding ask for leadership and Building Leadership Team (BLT) trainings and asked how that fits into the existing BLT bylaws and team structures. Dr. Codd noted that the last BLT training was 16 years ago and this training would bring teams together to teach them things they need to know, and how to lead changes in their schools and navigate difficult conversations. Director Blanford noted the importance of increasing transparency and engaging with more stakeholders, and expressed concern that if we figure out more avenues to allow more people to communicate with us, we could bias decision making processes to those who are already advantaged. He asked staff to think about that within the scope of this work, how to expand the pie, and how to privilege those who do not have privilege to start with. Ms. Campbell noted how strategy three is to expand the people at the table and how we need a full array of tools to quickly gather feedback from the community, which we will dig into later today. Director Harris noted the engagement conversation from the last retreat.

Ms. Bennett noted, based on the feedback, the goals may come to the Board at the October meeting.

DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION: ELIMINATING THE OPPORTUNITY GAPS: STRATEGY AND UPDATE

Superintendent Nyland opened the discussion and reviewed the objectives for this section, reviewed the key questions, and noted the district's Strategic Plan. He spoke about a topic of discussion at the Summer Leadership Institute this year and speaking to why we do the work we do, noting his particular story. He then reviewed the three key messages on slide 7, noting the assessment results in English Language Arts and Math, as compared to the state. He also reviewed data around how white students perform as compared to black students in assessments, plus the slides on assessment results and absenteeism. Director asked if the multi-racial category can be broken out, and also by FRL status. Supt. Nyland then reviewed disproportionate discipline, where there continues to be a gap between black and white students. He noted positive outlier school research and the results of school survey questions, and how Olympic Hills ranks higher than many other schools. Directors asked if we have worked the data to reformulate assessment numbers based on opt-outs, and also based on special education. Eric Anderson spoke about the opt-outs being removed. Mr. Jessee noted that we do have data on special education. Mr. Nielsen noted the key role of Dr. Joung and where schools that have changed the trajectory for kids of color, speaking to the high correlation to strong instructional leaders.

Supt Nyland gave another example of positive outliers for middle school math, and replicating what is being done. He then reviewed the work being done in Goals 1 and 2. Director Peters spoke to the possibility of smaller sized schools being a positive outlier, and Dr. Nyland noted some of the others noted are large schools. Directors asked what the data shows us for the right size of school in terms of giving each student the kind of focus they need, and also looking at districts of similar size and demographics. Director Burke noted the importance of instructional leadership in buildings, but that is not necessarily the principal, just someone with high enough level of authority. When looking at outliers, look at where they put these leaders.

Brent Jones asked Directors and staff to break into groups to discuss what other information we need to look at and why, and also what else do we need to tell the story. After the breakout groups came back, Dr. Jones asked if there were common themes seen. He first spoke to where we are in our current state, the components of the desired state, noted as "Seattle Ready," and the boundary of the opportunity gap and how to move past it. Dr. Jones spoke about Board Policy No. 0030, noting its main tenets. Director Pinkham spoke about our changing population, getting Seattle ready for the students coming in, rather than having students come in getting ready for Seattle, in the areas of preparing leaders today for the changing demographic of our students and being more welcoming of minority students. Staff was asked to break out each of four Seattle Ready definition bullets to define what each means. Director Blanford then spoke about the prior retreat on cultural competence and the discussion on why each person thinks that African American students are performing the way they are. As a leadership group, we need to figure this out and not put the solution ahead of the problem definition.

Dr. Jones then spoke to the district's evolution in gap closing. Director Harris asked if staff could develop an action plan based on Director Blanford's point – Why is it that we have the size of gaps that we do in Seattle, with a caution to not get caught up in poverty, and look at what we have control of that is part of the problem to which we can apply our effort. Director Peters expanded to say why does this gap exist and what can we do or are we not doing. It was noted that there was not time today to discuss these points and Director Harris noted it was just to brainstorm how to address those questions. Supt. Nyland asked if it would be helpful to do a presentation on what we are trying to do, and then come back to the group on how to respond to those ideas. Director Blanford noted that would be proposing a solution when we haven't defined the problem. Director Geary commented that what had been decided was to find the data pieces that correlate to the problems to use data to identify the problems. Mike Starosky spoke to the Cycle of Inquiry (COI) work, and that is what he is hearing Director Blanford saying, and that is what they are working with school leaders on. COI is a way of behaving, and informs our culture in the district. Director Blanford noted how principals are engaging in that work with their teams, but it isn't at the district level and how to reinforce and enhance the work happening in the schools – until it is a district wide discipline, you will have that friction. Director Patu noted this is an ongoing problem, and the importance of implementing the solutions identified and being consistent in using the solutions.

Dr. Jones noted we are beyond the allotted time, and he could schedule Director 2x2s with his team to have deeper discussions and also identify more information that they want. There is still the intent to develop talking points that Directors can use in the community. Director Geary noted the Board would like training on the race & equity tool. Bernardo Ruiz spoke about the trainings with principals and central staff, and learnings around the tool that it should be used for certain key decisions, but not all. We are working to include the equity piece into Board action reports, and developing a system to ensure racial equity. Director Harris asked that when staff has research or articles to share the information with Directors. Director Patu noted for those Directors who want to have race & equity training, to connect with Erinn Bennett and Theresa Hale.

Dr. Jones noted there is still more work to be done, more understanding. He then noted the strategies identified for Goal 2. Directors asked why the professional development did not include the Board and Dr. Jones stated they could work that in too. Mike Starosky spoke about the school leaders training, which could create opportunities for Directors to join, but noted the possible impact of all 7 Directors

attending. It could be a benefit to all learn together at the same time and it could be powerful for our leaders. Director Blanford called out the unique role the Board plays, and the Board needs to be about governance and particular aspects of closing gaps that happen at governance level. Directors asked for a bit more detail on how to improve outcomes of students with more student-focused metrics. Mike Starosky noted the need to be mindful of scalability, how quickly and accurately a thing can be implemented, and also sustainability to outlast the people who implement the systems. Dr. Jones noted the impact of changes in leadership and how a key person leaving could influence maintaining work being done, and the need to have a mechanism that keeps the legacies of the work being done. Mr. Ruiz spoke about having a repository of professional development training through videos, etc., that principals and leaders could use. Having more resources increases the capacity to do the work. Director Harris noted how some articles and research could be used to give good tips and information, and also suggested that principal coaches be trained based on their reach. Mr. Ruiz also noted career ladder teachers that need to be worked with.

DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION: 2016-17 BUDGET – USE OF REMAINING ONE-TIME FUNDS

Erinn Bennett opened the discussion and asked for each Director to provide a minute of feedback. We started at \$11M of one-time funds, and now we are at \$4M. Michael Tolley spoke to the documents provided on instructional materials adoptions, noting that staff is strongly recommending middle school language arts, last adopted in 1994. Directors asked Ms. Berge to speak to where we stand next year if the worst case plays out with the 17-18 budget. Ms. Berge noted it would be about a \$70M budget shortfall. Directors asked about items authorized by the Board for compliance, and how it includes the athletics funding. Mr. Nielsen noted compliance was put in two categories – new legislation, and costs associated with decisions that were made that are ongoing, highlighting that many are identified as estimated. Directors asked what is the variance if we overspend these numbers and if the Board is notified. Mr. Nielsen noted they are looked at monthly, and could be looked at through the Audit & Finance Committee as flagged categories. He noted that prevention and intervention specialists are another unfunded mandate. Directors asked who would be addressing that and Ms. Berge noted it is a measure of evaluating risks. Director Blanford noted how for athletics transportation, the Board had given guidance last year for cost-neutral bell times implementation. Pegi McEvoy noted it was to be cost neutral for to and from school, but not athletics. This money is trying to honor the commitment for the Pay to Play money we received, where the contribution from district is going up. Also, schools felt they didn't have enough money to pay for transportation without pulling students out of classrooms early, and they need to use charter buses to keep athletes in classrooms longer. Directors asked how that comes under compliance and Mr. Nielsen noted it may not be compliance but could be called an unfunded activity that needs to be addressed. Directors asked if there is wiggle room with these and Mr. Nielsen noted we could look at that possibly in January. Ms. Berge noted we had a commitment with a donor to provide funds for Pay to Play, and transportation for athletics is a policy call, and these funds are not yet in the budgets. Directors asked if some of these could be funded with technology capital dollars, noting that it would displace other things on the list. Director Burke spoke to funding for a middle school math adoption and the importance of middle school (MS) math on performance in high school (HS) math. Michael Tolley spoke to the endorsement requirements for MS and HS math teachers. Eric Anderson spoke to data points for HS math performance, and the impact of the high refusal rate for the Smarter Balanced Assessments, noting they are not sure there is evidence of a drop off in HS. Director Burke also made points around our outlier schools of distinction and how many of those are using our MS math adopted materials. Many of our schools can get funding from parents to use other materials, which impacts the ability to equitably provide resources to schools.

Stephen Nielsen noted staff can revisit the middle school math question, and if the Board wants to move forward with adoption, staff could dig into that further.

Ms. Berge asked if the teachers' Collective Bargaining Agreement includes language about curriculum adoption and reduction in force (RIF) in same time frame. If the levy cliff does not get funded and we have to do a RIF, that could be in conflict with adopting a new curriculum. Staff are looking into

whether that might be there. Director Peters noted we could go through process and suspend adoption for a year if needed. She also noted her support in moving forward with this. Director Harris spoke to the importance of math, and how students can get to college and need to take remedial math, and how we need to address that occurrence. Director Blanford spoke to his experience with his student, how he is not hearing an urgency from teachers on a MS math adoption, and noted the projected deficit for our district next year. He asked why we are having these conversations when we are hearing from staff that this is not the way to go, and if the worst case scenario comes to pass, we would have to explain to constituents this kind of decision when other cuts will need to be made. Directors asked, when looking at the timing of legislative process, if we could change mid-stream, or does it get locked in. Staff noted the 18-month process recommended for a curriculum adoption, and how faster timelines can create issues. There have been recent adjustments to the procedures for adoptions and field tests, we need to consider community engagement, and the procurement office recommends an 18-month process.

Director Burke moved to set aside a maximum of \$3M for MS math adoption. Director Harris seconded. Director Geary commented on how a MS math adoption would address the high end of the gap, but there is nothing to show those underperforming students would benefit from this kind of adoption. She noted feedback from teachers is not showing a need for this adoption. Director Pinkham spoke about his close work with the math department at UW and teacher frustration for students coming out of high schools without all of the math skills they need. Where do students get that foundation – in middle school. Director Peters also noted a disconnect in the conversation on which schools have been succeeding in closing gaps, noting Mercer, and asked what it uses for math. Director Harris asked that her vote for MS math not be taken as a negation for the Goals ask or a lack of appreciation for hard work staff does. Director Patu reflected on today's discussions and things that may occur in the spring if we have a significant budget shortfall. She noted she is impressed with the work of staff to prepare the discussion items today. What is best for our kids is to give them the best opportunities and closing the gap is most important. She is pleased with steps being taken to close the gap. Director Burke gave his summary of the discussion so far for the \$11M one time funds.

Director Patu asked for clarity on whether money could be found in capital funds to possibly pay for some of the Goals work, and Mr. Nielsen noted there isn't enough there to cover all of the request, and many of the Goals' asks are not capital funds eligible. Director Pinkham noted some of the questions today that haven't been answered leaves some information still to be needed, and also whether a school who is having success not using the math materials the district adopted would still be able to do so if we got new materials.

The motion did not pass by a vote of 3-3-1 (Directors Burke, Harris, and Peters voted yes; Directors Blanford, Geary and Patu voted no; and Director Pinkham abstained).

Director Blanford left at 3:13 pm.

Directors asked if the math adoption could be done for a lesser amount. Michael Tolley noted there are too many factors to be able to say if that would be possible.

Director Peters moved to have a set aside of \$2M to get started on the process for a MS math materials adoption, and \$2M for SMART goal funding. Director Harris seconded.

Directors discussed the adoption process and what positive outlier schools are doing. Director Patu noted that materials are very important, but when compared to equity pieces, we need to address the needs of all of our students, and sees we are making progress and would like to see that continue. Director Peters spoke about how MS math builds upon student success with math in HS. Addressing the gap starts earlier than high school, and we need to give them stronger materials to master the work. Director Geary feels like this is meddling within the schools, at this point everyone knows the math curriculum isn't great and have developed their own, and by pushing this on them and wiping out current materials to adopt a whole new curriculum and do all the work to adjust to that for each school

community. This would also take away from what staff is asking for in other areas. Director Burke noted ongoing conversations in the Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee meetings, and how bloated instructional materials have become, where publishers benefit the most. One of his requests was to shape the adoption process to match our needs, to allow schools to innovate and save money. The ask of staff is if we can structure the process with an investment of money, and then the Committee has more of an advisory role and make a recommendation.

Director Patu moved to call the question, and this motion passed unanimously.

The vote on the Director Peters motion passed 5-1 (Directors Burke, Harris, Patu, Peters and Pinkham voted yes; Directors Geary voted no).

DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION: BOARD CODE OF CONDUCT

Theresa Hale noted the history of the Code of Conduct, and the recent discussions by the Executive Committee and in a Board work session, but a decision has not been made on whether to keep a Code in place. She asked Directors to comment in their interest in maintaining a Code of Conduct for the Board.

Director Harris confirmed with General Counsel that the Code is not required. Director Burke noted he is fine with having a Code. Director Peters noted she does not feel it is needed, and it could take away valuable time from Directors to update it with the current Board. Director Patu noted her agreement with Director Peters.

Ms. Hale asked Directors to indicate their interest to maintain the Board Code of Conduct, or to discontinue the Board Code of Conduct. Director Burke indicated he would want to maintain the Board Code of Conduct. Directors Geary, Harris, Patu, Peters and Pinkham indicated they would not want to maintain the Board Code of Conduct. Based on this feedback, the Board will no longer maintain a Code of Conduct document.

The meeting adjourned at 3:38 pm.