

Board Special Meeting



2445 – 3rd Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134

Oversight Work Session: English Language Learners;
Work Session: Superintendent 2015-16 Annual Evaluation Part I; Work Session: Budget
Wednesday, October 26, 2016, 4:30-7:30pm
Auditorium, John Stanford Center

Minutes

Call to Order

Director Patu called the meeting to order at 4:31pm.

Directors Burke, Harris, Patu and Pinkham were present. Director Peters arrived at 4:35pm. Director Blanford arrived at 4:36pm. Director Geary was absent.

Staff Present were: Deputy Superintendent Stephen Nielsen, Associate Superintendent Teaching and Learning Michael Tolley, Chief of Student Support Services Wyeth Jessee, and Director for English Language Learners (ELL) and International Programs Veronica Gallardo.

Oversight Work Session: English Language Learners

Dir. Patu introduced Dir. Burke to lead the meeting for tonight.

Mr. Tolley opened the session.

Ms. Gallardo read the agenda in the slide presentation. In slide 5, Ms. Gallardo talked about the success of onboarding 32 new English Language Learners (ELL) Schools which are mostly in the North, Northwest and Northeast regions.

Dir. Peters came in at 4:35 pm and Dir. Blanford came in at 4:36 pm.

Ms. Gallardo continued to read slide 5 and Dir. Peters asked Ms. Gallardo to explain the Massive Open Online Courses (MOOC) and Hybrid MOOC. Ms. Gallardo explains that MOOC was developed by Dr. Kenji Hakuta and Jeff Zwiars from Stanford University. The focus was on instructional improvement and student learning related to both academic standards and ELL Proficiency standards. The Infused content included General Education (GEN ED) and ELL Teachers. The idea is to not isolate ELL teachers and to provide for more collaboration during core instruction time for the student. Staff discussed a Hybrid MOOC that combined the online and in-class courses to improve the students' abilities that are required in Common Core State Standards (CCSS). They discussed ways they support teachers with language acquisition. The ELL teams collaborate with Math and Science for Professional Development (PD) to infuse language performance with Core Content Instruction with CCSS.

Dir. Blanford asked for details regarding the onboarding of 32 schools.

Ms. Gallardo discussed the process of onboarding schools that do not have ELL students which then get ELL students the next year (Audit findings that ELL must be offered in all schools). ELL students do not come in one size fits all. Some are refugees, different proficiency levels from Level 1-3. Level

3 are long term ELL students who have been in the program for more than five years. CCSS and ELL has seen a shift in instruction to understand how to provide ELL instruction to all students.

Dir. Pinkham asked how many languages were tested in the Credit Proficiency test. Ms. Gallardo called on International Administrator Michele Aoki to provide further information on the oral proficiency test. Ms. Aoki responded that the oral proficiency test standards were developed by the Washington State of School Directors' Association (WSSDA) and State Board in 2010. She noted that a student can test for any language proficiency and get credit. Languages that need a test developed usually take about 4 months before the student can take the test. Standard-based Measurement of Proficiency (STAMP) Test can be accessed by phone. For less common languages, we are working with Avant Assessments to create a test. The test prompts can either be in English or the student's native language. There are usually three writing and speaking prompts. Ms. Gallardo also added that Denny MS has Somali Saturday classes which are ELL asset based.

Dir. Burke asked about the benchmark in slides 11 and 12. Ms. Gallardo remarked that there are new benchmarks every year. Dir. Harris asked for clarification on how the charts could be compared. Ms. Gallardo replied that during the year noted on the chart there were no ELL support services requested at South Lake.

Dir. Blanford asked for more information regarding slide 13 and the performance of students who are enrolled in ELL. Ms. Gallardo noted that the District has 1,200 long term ELL students who are in GEN ED 90% of their time. Dir. Blanford noted his observations while at the Seattle World School that there were differences between proficiency levels of the students. Dir. Patu mentioned the low scores in the Southeast region and asked how many GEN ED teachers were in that region.

Dir. Peters asked if there had been a comparison with California's successful ELL programs. Ms. Gallardo discussed how California has expanded their work to provide academic language in their curriculum which has led to a change in their way of thinking. She stressed that California is looking across the system to infuse ELL services for all students. Dir. Peters asked for more information on the results from 2016 as compared with the results from 2013. Dir. Harris asked about the data on the additional code identifier for Native American students and if it has led to additional funding. Ms. Gallardo noted that only students that self-identify as being Native American and do not meet the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) in Math and Reading are funded through Title III.

Dir. Harris asked about the sustainability of the Dual Language Program and noted that PTA money that funds these programs should also be identified in these slides in order to provide an accurate snapshot of the budget. Dir. Blanford agreed that there needed to be a place that identified the amount of PTA funding that was contributing to the sustainability to these programs. Dir. Harris expressed her concern that the statement on slide 5 about SPS ELL students surpassing State ELL in SBAC, contradicts the information provided in slide 13 and 14. She also requested more information on the cost of the upcoming London conference that four senior staff members are attending. Mr. Nielsen noted that the Global Cities Education Network (GCEN) London Symposium was something that Seattle Public Schools was invited to as a member of GCEN. He noted that only a handful of School Districts are invited to the Symposium and that the cost to the District will be minimal due to the trip being covered by the GCEN. Dir. Pinkham pointed to the information provided in slide 13 and asked if there was any further data that could show student performance over time. Dir. Peters vocalized that she would also like to see a separate column for PTA funds supporting ELL programs. Dir. Burke asked for more information regarding Slide 20 and discussed whether the investments focused around SMART Goal 3 were sustainable.

Work Session: Annual Evaluation of 2015-16 Board Governance Priorities and Superintendent SMART Goals

Staff Present: Deputy Superintendent Stephen Nielsen, Associate Superintendent for Teaching & Learning Michael Tolley, Executive Director of Government Relations & Strategic Initiatives Erinn Bennett, and Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources Clover Codd.

Stephen Nielsen started the meeting and Erinn Bennett outlined the structure of the work session and noted that there were various stakeholders present. Ms. Bennett noted the three SMART Goals that would be discussed and introduced Dr. Codd to provide an overview of the evaluation assessments of Goal 4.

Goal 4: Early Hiring at Seattle Public Schools (SPS)

Dr. Codd introduced Principal Pam Conyers from West Seattle Elementary and noted that this SMART Goal had three main objectives. She discussed each of the main objectives and discussed the data and evidence used to determine the assessment of meeting each goal. She discussed developing a structure that encourages mentorship and leadership from within. She noted the various meetings and professional development (PD) trainings that would encourage these relationship strengthening and successful hiring processes. Dr. Codd discussed the staffing targets met leading up to the start of the school year and noted the benefits to early hiring. She provided data on the efforts towards hiring diverse and qualified teachers and lead administrators. She acknowledged that this particular SMART Goal did not carry over to the 16-17 SY but that the Human Resources (HR) Department was planning to continue with this timeline and hiring goal and would continue to track its data.

Ms. Conyers provided feedback on her experience with benefiting from the Lead Up program. She noted the positive relationship and experience she has had with the HR department and the assigned HR Business Partner. Ms. Conyers highlighted the benefits to having a core group of diverse, thoughtful, quality and dedicated people in HR to assist with problem solving at her individual school. Ms. Conyers acknowledged the confidence building opportunities presented through PD programs and the supportive and focused adult teaching and learning network created. She highlighted the benefits of the “grow your own” teacher program which allowed her school to use the summer months to plan and join PD opportunities.

Dr. Codd reviewed the retention benefits to this recruitment goal. She discussed the Staff Training Assistance and Reflection (STAR) mentor program and the lessons learned from the Lead Up program. Dir. Pinkham asked how many teacher hires were teachers from the “grow your own” program and if the default in the demographics was “white” when people chose not to self-identify as one ethnicity or another. Dr. Codd verified that the default ethnicity was “white” when applicants did not self-identify. Dir. Pinkham asked that the default be changed to accurately reflect the ethnicity of candidates applying for positions with SPS. Dir. Harris & Dr. Codd discussed slide 7 and the challenges to filling unexpected teacher vacancies at the beginning of the year. Dir. Harris asked Dr. Codd to provide some further data on retention in a Friday Memo. Dr. Codd noted that a complete report would be provided at an upcoming Audit & Finance Committee meeting.

Director Peters asked if there was data on how many students of color go into teaching. Dr. Codd noted that they could get the national data but that they do not have data on how many SPS students of color have gone into the teaching field. Directors and staff discussed the decrease of interest in the teaching field and the history of recruiting programs for students.

Goal 1: Multi-Tiered System of Support - Academics (MTSS-A)

Michael Tolley provided a brief overview of SMART Goal 1 and introduced Chief of Curriculum & Instructional Support Kyle Kinoshita, Director of Early Learning Cashel Toner, and Wing Luke Elementary School Teacher Addie Keller. He discussed the rubric provided in the handouts and noted that most target behaviors received a proficient with the exception of not being able to reach as many schools as originally hoped. Mr. Tolley noted that this year more schools have been able to implement MTSS. Dr. Kinoshita discussed the Goal 1, Artifact D and explained the theory of providing a strong foundation to build on the long term success of the student. He explained the process of teaching the teachers how to collaborate and use the data gathered to set the appropriate pace. He discussed the PD tools used to provide a template for schools to build simple and powerful protocols to get teachers in the habit of thinking in this particular framework. Staff discussed writing common assessments and the use of the Formative Practices approach. Staff provided more information on the English Language Arts standards, how it is being implemented in the classrooms, and how it is changing the way teachers approach teach reading comprehension and writing.

Addie Keller provided feedback on how the Formative Practice Institute assisted in achieving a better understanding of the prescribed curriculum and allowed for clear expectations to be realized. She highlighted that the Institute provided teachers with tools to assist with student comprehension and that it allowed for everyone to be able to use the same language. She noted that the material was presented in a way that allows the teacher to breakdown the curriculum to better assess the student's level of understanding.

Director Harris asked how many schools had gone through the Formative Practice Institute. Ms. Toner noted that not all schools have had the opportunity to be a part of the Formative Practice Institute and implement the new method. She noted that the capacity to support more schools is growing each year. Dr. Kinoshita noted that around 40 schools are being served and that some of these schools have implemented both the cohorts. He noted that this is a voluntary PD tool and teaching model and that the hope is that as the program develops, so will participation. Ms. Cashel stated that she will provide the data that shows both cohorts' participation levels.

Director Burke asked about the sustainability and funding of the Formative Practice Institute as well as the requested assessment of the program. Dr. Kinoshita provided information on a couple of opportunities throughout the year that will assist in evaluating the impact of these processes. Directors and staff discussed the budget and teaching with fidelity while breaking it down to the individual student's needs.

Goal 2: MTSS-B – Transforming Attitudes, Beliefs, and Belonging to Recognize the Brilliance and Genius of Ever Child

Mr. Tolley provided an overview of the targets this Goal set out to achieve and introduced

Chief Strategy & Partnerships Officer Brent Jones and Director of School-Family Partnerships and Race & Equity Relations Bernardo Ruiz.

Mr. Ruiz discussed the journey of the Race and Equity Relations work and noted the timeline of policy and procedure development. He noted the aim to identify specific strategies designed to support each individual student and the development of a comprehensive plan to institute transformational practices that will close the opportunity gap. He provided information on the strategies used to increase the academic achievement of African American males and the focus of classroom support and decreased discipline. He discussed the importance of the change in the language used when approaching these initiatives. He introduced Denny International Middle School Principal Jeff Clark, South Shore K-8 teacher Britney Holmes, Wing-Luke Family Support Worker Helen Mitchell, and Emijah Smith a parent member of the Race & Equity Team.

Mr. Clark provided feedback on his experience at Denny with the Race & Equity Team. He noted the transformational experience that the PD has provided for his staff. He noted the effectiveness of having teaching staff leading the narrative and the trainings. Ms. Holmes provided feedback from her personal experience through the educational system and as a member of the Race & Equity Team. She noted some significant changes that have assisted in the progression of growth for how staff can more effectively serve students of color. Ms. Mitchell discussed the data around disciplinary action and the work towards reducing disciplinary levels. Ms. Smith provided input on the African American Male Advisory Committee and noted that she can see the work being implemented in her sons' school. She highlighted the importance of leadership in interrupting the school to prison pipeline.

Director Pinkham asked for further information on the impact of the Native American Curriculum adoption on this initiative. Mr. Ruiz noted that the Native American Education Program Manager Gail Morris, would be providing the data around those numbers. Mr. Ruiz and Mr. Tolley noted that this program is provided dual support through the Teaching & Learning and the Race & Equity Relations Departments. They noted the team effort that this work requires and acknowledged the support system in place for the Native American Education program. Director Patu asked if there was any curriculum on the subject matter of Race & Equity that would be adopted. Staff noted that there is not currently a set curriculum specifically on Race & Equity, but that they are working towards that goal. Mr. Ruiz noted that it is great to have tools however they are looking at ways to imbed cultural responsiveness and techniques into our educational systems. Mr. Tolley noted that the upcoming SMART Goal is focused on adult attitudes and that there are other streams of support that contribute to the sustainability over time. Mr. Tolley acknowledged that the MTSS A & B implementation has transformed how the District moves forward looking at the whole-child model of delivering supportive education. He noted that they are working on transforming teacher practices for the successful implementation of this model. Dir. Blanford clarified that the District is not currently searching for curriculum around African American males because there is nothing available for schools to use. Dir. Burke asked for further information on the areas where these programs are reaching students and families and what method is in place to evaluate those stories. Dir. Peters noted that this goal is supposed to measure success and wanted clarification on what evidence was being used to measure this goal. Mr. Jones pointed to the moratorium on suspensions and the impact that has been made through that initiative. He further noted that some of these implementations are new and that the data is still being compiled. Mr. Clark discussed how Denny, Aki and Mercer's partnership has provided evidence of success in this goal. Ms. Smith provided

feedback on the engagement and outreach to families that demonstrates success in the implementation and change of mind set. She noted these changes indicate the change is systemic and trickles down from the top administrative departments to the way teachers are instructing their class. Directors and staff discussed the benefits provided through the Nesholm Foundation funds and the potential to replicate the success of the Denny, Aki, and Mercer collaboration. Mr. Clark noted that some of the success of these programs can be attributed to continuity of staff and highlighted the importance of retaining quality employees. Director Harris asked about what type of data could be expected and when that would demonstrate the success of this goal. Mr. Jones noted that the information is currently being gathered for the District Scorecard and will be provided soon. Dir. Blanford clarified that the theory of action was to change the belief systems of the teachers to impact the students, but highlighted that there was no base line identified on the rubric to evaluate those changes. Mr. Ruiz discussed some of the established partnerships that have been created to assist with analyzing the information and will help to provide baselines and identify benchmarks.

The meeting recessed at 6:53 pm and reconvened at 7:02 pm.

Work Session: Budget

Deputy Superintendent Stephen Nielsen spoke about plans on how the budget is being built with possible deficits. Mr. Nielsen explained we have an opportunity to work with the legislature on how to work with these cuts. Many Districts in the State are facing the same cuts.

Assistant Superintendent of Business & Finance JoLynn Berge spoke about the Budget Guiding Principles. She explained the principles have been slightly amended since they were originally presented last year and she asked for comments to be sent to her via email by next Wednesday. Ms. Berge spoke about the draft budget development calendar. By December 15th Central Office and School Funding Model recommendations are scheduled to be finalized. Ms. Berge realizes this type of budget will be upsetting, Ms. Berge explained some of the problem was due to the levy cliff and we are not able to predict what the legislators will do. The budget that will be presented in December will be a worst case scenario. Mr. Nielsen explained we have to pass a budget by August 2017.

Director Harris asked about the Weighted Staffing Standards (WSS) and will the minutes of the meetings be put on the website as soon as possible. Ms. Berge explained they will be edited and put on the Budget site as soon as possible.

Director Harris asked if additional opportunities for public testimony will be offered. Mr. Nielsen explained more work sessions and additional community input will be available. Ms. Berge explained that feedback is being gathered from parents, WSS meetings, leadership and community organizations and will continue. A budget will need to be fairly well flushed out and priority items will need to be laid out by the first part of December.

Director Burke asked if public meetings were a touchpoint opportunity for people to put ideas and comments in writing to help streamline the process. Mr. Nielsen explained this input needs to be based on some level of context.

Director Harris commented that she sees meetings as an opportunity and depending on the

information it is much different than allowing people to write in and collect the information and have a two-way conversation. Director Peters followed up with she would like a check-in with the public to be earlier and not just a one-time check-in. Director Harris would like this to be in January or February. Ms. Berge explained we can allow time for additional feedback, but we would need to have a cut off by March.

Ms. Berge spoke about how in June 2017 the budget will be introduced, and adopted in late July/early August.

Director Burke asked if we are going through a process where a best and worst case budget is being developed. Ms. Berge explained we will have a worst case scenario with the decisions prioritized. We will have to move quickly and many staff situations will be unknown if the legislature doesn't finalize the budget until June.

Director Blanford asked Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources Clover Codd if it was correct we cannot hire someone if we don't have funding for that position. Ms. Codd explained we will always need special educators; we will always hire for the hard to hire positions and high needs specialty areas. Ms. Codd explained if we do have a reduction in force we need to be prepared. Director Blanford clarified if the worst case scenario occurs we will still be doing the same work but on a much smaller level. Ms. Codd confirmed that is correct.

Director Peters asked if on slide 7 item #5 Items funded for FY2016-17 only, if for the 24 credits are we able to ask for them not to be mandated. Mr. Nielsen explained the only way we would be able to graduate students is for the State law to change. Ms. Berge explained we having received some state funding to cover these cost but not a lot.

Ms. Berge spoke about managing expectations including a budget gap of \$71M; this is 10% of our budget, it would result in staffing shifts and there are concerns about time to react to potential good legislative news, as it could be too late for major staffing shifts.

Director Blanford asked if we say closing the achievement gap is important, how do you help the Board think through that process. Ms. Berge explained how she will meet with the Board to talk about specific goals and how to see that through.

Director Harris spoke about how what she values has to be under the specification of compliance, and what do we have left to choose from. It is a process to her and we may not be able to afford to do certain things. Ms. Berge explained we do have State and Federal requirements, we have had those discussions and people are aware and engaged in those discussions. Mr. Nielsen spoke about the flexible dollar's information that was handed out at the March Audit and Finance Committee Meeting.

Director Burke asked if we are looking at compliance, not just through a compliance lens but through a risk lens. Ms. Berge agreed with this statement.

Ms. Berge spoke about reducing Reserves and Fund Balance. Ms. Berge considers these items on the slide 15 as Level 1. If the levy amount is not reduced, we can utilize all of our unrestricted fund balance amount and would have between 3-5% of a budget deficit.

Director Blanford asked if we will be speaking about the opportunity cost, specifically as it relates to capital. Ms. Berge explained that yes that will be reviewed and discussed. Ms.

Berge explained \$5M is currently set aside for textbook adoptions.

Director Burke asked about indirect fees for grants administration. Ms. Berge explained that there is a cost of managing the grants.

Director Harris asked if there is a benchmark with that overhead and what would that percentage be and how do other districts and other nonprofits do it. Ms. Berge explained there is a Federal calculation that is followed. We currently use the restricted rate. If we were to move to this type of policy, we would want to ease into it vs. jumping right in.

Ms. Berge explained that programs are one area the Board members can make adjustments in if they choose to do so. Ms. Berge explained that special education is a large cost for our District.

Director Peters spoke about how we have a legal mandate to provide for special needs. Ms. Berge agreed, however we would want to review what we currently offer. Ms. Berge spoke about some of the worst case scenarios. Examples would be freezing K-3 class sizes, grade 9-12 class size back to 30:1 and reducing core staffing for all schools, etc. All of these can be weighted by poverty levels. These would all be based on what the Board determines as most important. Ms. Berge explained on slide 22 there is an example of a 2017-18 budget.

Director Burke asked would this be a roll over budget and are we at a deficit. Ms. Berge confirmed this is a roll over budget.

Director Harris asked what is the meaning of reducing the cost of implementing the 24 credit requirement by \$2M. Ms. Berge explained if we think the cost will be \$7M and we can reduce by \$2M then that is a savings. Ms. Berge reminded the Board these are just examples and not true numbers.

Ms. Berge explained slide 23, 2017-18 Budget Balancing, which is the worst case scenario. She noted that this slide showed a total of \$58M in reductions and we would still need to reduce by another \$12M. Legislative action in a timely manner would be a significant help to us. Ms. Berge is hopeful this gives an idea of how steep of hill we have to climb and went on to discuss the next steps. The November 16th work session will report on the feedback we have received. Ms. Berge has asked the Board to give her any feedback by then as well. November 22nd and December 3rd will also be more budget discussions. Director Peters asked why is technology not included in as an item we can cut. Ms. Berge explained those are capital dollars, and a lot of these have been done in previous cuts. And in the next work session we will review ways we have balanced the budget over the last five years.

Mr. Nielsen explained these are hard cuts and not easy to look at with no easy way around this. Ms. Berge explained at how things have been enhanced in the WSS and that we might want to look at those first.

Director Burke asked what our current CBA required. Budget Director Linda Sebring explained some things that have been listed are not protected by the collective bargaining agreement. Such as certain class sizes, elementary counselors and assistant principals and principals. A lot of our program enhancements are not protected, we are not bringing

those items forward as a good choice, but these are flexible and not covered by law or agreement. We will not bring anything to you that we cannot change.

Director Burke asked is there a legal mechanism that is covered by our CBA to make changes to it, or is that off the table due to the complexity of it. Ms. Sebring explained we have many things we can move before that and that we would have to ask for a reopener.

Director Pinkham asked about across the board cuts. He explained that would be helpful to see numbers for an across the board cut.

Ms. Berge explained an across the board cut would be hard, but more difficult for the WSS.

Director Patu announced at 8:10 pm that the Board was immediately recessing the special meeting into executive session to evaluate the performance of a public employee, which was supposed to start at 7:30 pm. As the work session ran late, the executive session is scheduled for approximately 30 minutes, with an anticipated end time of 8:40 pm.

Executive Session: Evaluate the performance of a public employee

Director Patu called the executive session to order at 8:16 pm. Directors Blanford, Burke, Harris, Patu, Peters, and Pinkham were present. Also present were Patty Eakes and Lindsey Mundt from Calfo, Eakes, and Ostrovsky, PLLC.

At 8:40 pm, Director Patu announced that the executive session to evaluate the performance of a public employee was now expected to go an additional 10 minutes, with an anticipated end time of 8:50 pm.

At 8:50 pm, Director Patu announced that the executive session to evaluate the performance of a public employee was now expected to go an additional 10 minutes, with an anticipated end time of 9:00 pm.

At 8:58 pm, Director Patu recessed out of the executive session and reconvened the Special Meeting.

Adjourn

This meeting adjourned at 8:58 pm.