

Board Special Meeting



2445 – 3rd Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134

Work Sessions: Board 2016-17 Goals, Superintendent 2016-17 Evaluation Check-In;
Wednesday, December 14, 2016, 4:30-7:30pm
Auditorium, John Stanford Center

Agenda

Call to Order

This meeting was called to order at 4:34pm. Directors Blanford, Burke, Geary, Patu, Peters, and Pinkham were present. Director Harris arrived at 4:37 pm.

This meeting was staffed by Superintendent Larry Nyland, Director of Policy and Board Relations Nate Van Duzer, and Executive Director of Government Relations and Strategic Initiatives Erinn Bennett.

Work Session: Board 2016-17 Goals

Mr. Van Duzer provided an overview of the history of the Board Evaluation and Goals. He discussed Board Policy No. 1820, Evaluation of the Board, and Board Evaluation purpose and process. He noted that there is a limited and growing body of evidence for conducting self-evaluations. Mr. Van Duzer discussed research regarding characteristics of an effective Board. Mr. Van Duzer noted the potential options for the Board to take in assessing the progress in meeting the Goals they set.

Director Harris suggested an additional option (option 7) that would provide a standing item at Board retreats regarding the Board's SMART Goals without the rubric. Directors and staff reviewed the options and how self-evaluations could be done. Directors discussed their preferences. Directors discussed the purpose of evaluations, what exactly is being evaluated, and how self-evaluation and goal setting overlap. Directors noted their dissatisfaction with a rubric evaluation system. Mr. Van Duzer discussed designing achievable goals and an evaluation process that assesses how the Board functions in its role.

Directors further discussed each goal noting they did not want to invest in a costly evaluation process and would like to set concrete and tangible goals. Director Patu noted that she would like to repeal the evaluation process as the public evaluates the Board every election season. Director Harris noted that other elected positions do not have an evaluation or goal setting process, that the process is time consuming when other work needs to be done. Directors discussed the value of self-evaluation and goal setting. Director Burke discussed using a 360 evaluation model as a part of surveys that are already going out to staff and public that focus on the Board. He noted this would be in addition to any of the evaluation options decided upon at this meeting but that it is important to get input from the people that the Board works with and for in order to get an accurate assessment of the Board. Directors and staff discussed the pros and cons to a 360 evaluation process.

Directors further discussed the options provided and frequency of check-ins on the progress of reaching the set goals. Staff and Directors discussed reviewing the WSSDA model on

evaluations. Directors discussed the difference between SMART Goals and the evaluation rubric and the effectiveness of these items in professional practice.

Directors discussed the development of concrete goals, the idea of a 360 evaluation and what that would look like, and receiving the Race and Equity tool training. Director Blanford noted that self-evaluations are a way of providing some sort of accountability and suggested having a small group of Directors to do some research and provide recommendations. Mr. Van Duzer provided a summary of the conversation, pointing out agreement around developing concrete goals and being provided professional development on cultural competency and the race and equity tool. Director Peters noted that it sounded like a consensus was made on community engagement and professional development goals. Director Harris provided clarification on her suggested option 7, as revising the current policy to remove the need for a rubric, to set goals and to have a standing item on Board Retreat agenda's to have thoughtful conversation on what the Board has been doing to meet the set goals and what work still needs to occur.

Mr. Van Duzer asked for volunteers from the Board who would be willing to do more research on the suggestions provided and work with staff to develop something for the whole Board to review and move forward on. He recapped that the consensus seemed to be having rolling goals and routine check-ins rather than the use of a rubric and Work Sessions. Director Patu volunteered to take on this role. Directors and staff discussed the evaluation cycle and process. Mr. Van Duzer discussed the current evaluation cycle and the potential and asked if there was an intention to align the Board evaluation cycle with the Superintendent's evaluation cycle, which is aligned with the school year. Directors and staff discussed the Board yearly schedule and previous conversations about changing the evaluation cycle. Directors noted if the rolling goal/evaluation check-in option was decided upon the annual evaluation cycle would not make sense. Mr. Van Duzer noted that he would work with Director Patu to solicit feedback by the first week of January and would present it to the full Board in January.

This session ended 5:35pm.

Work Session: Superintendent 2016-17 Evaluation Check-In

This session was staffed by Executive Director of Government Relations and Strategic Initiatives Erinn Bennett, Chief of Student Support Services Wyeth Jessee, Chief of Curriculum & Instructional Support Kyle Kinoshita, Chief of Strategies & Partnerships Brent Jones, Assistant Superintendent of Teaching and Learning Michael Tolley, Associate Superintendent of Operations, Capital & Facilities Flip Herndon, Assistant Superintendent of Business & Finance JoLynn Berge, Chief Engagement Officer Carrie Campbell, and Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources Clover Codd

Ms. Bennett provided an overview of this session and discussed the meeting structure. She noted the short time frame from when the goals were set to now. She pointed Directors to each of the Goals update documents and rubrics.

SMART Goal 1: Ensure Education Excellence for Each & Every Student – Multi Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)

Mr. Jessee provided an overview of this SMART Goal. He noted the work that had been completed under this goal and discussed the work that continued. Mr. Jessee discussed the targets reached and noted the delay in some areas, as the foundation continues to be built

and relationships that make this MTSS goal successful are still growing. Mr. Jessee discussed key points to the rubric and noted the factors that lead to the ratings provided on the rubric. He provided evidence to support how the development and implementation of the MTSS have occurred since setting this goal was set. He discussed the collaboration efforts with the community, staff, school leaders, and families and noted the excitement around these efforts. He discussed the creation of a taskforce, movement in assessments and leadership learning days.

Director Peters asked for clarification about overly differentiating. Mr. Jessee noted that they would like to be able to provide common tools to all of the schools and discussed how each school is different in their ability to implement MTSS and noted the challenges in meeting the school where they are at in their process of implementation. Director Blanford discussed the differences between gathering data and the application of the District Scorecard. Directors and staff discussed the data within the District Scorecard, how it is used, and building MTSS at each school that will support the individual school's capacities and student needs. Directors and staff discussed the financial factors and the progress in this roll out. Staff discussed the timeline of implementing MTSS at each school, data portal costs and associated costs with training, assessment tools, RULER and professional development. Directors and staff discussed the standardized format or MTSS and the ability to for it to be adjusted to meet each school's needs and capacities. Directors and staff discussed the student portal data and how it will bring data into one platform.

SMART Goal 2: Eliminate Opportunity Gaps in Students' Access to High-Quality Instruction and Learning Supports

Mr. Jones provide an overview of the goal and the rubric. He discussed the role of the Executive Director in assisting schools in this goal. He noted the opportunities partner with the Gates Foundation and the Casey Family program to secure resources that assist in the Districts work around discipline and chronic absenteeism. He provided information on the Race and Equity team, noting the positive relationships built. Mr. Jones discussed the rubric and the learning management system. He noted the goal of providing district-wide training and the costs associated with that. He discussed housing resources in a pace where educators could access them and utilize the tools we have when they need them. Directors and staff discussed the accountability pieces within the school improvement plans and the strategies used to address the culture within the school and assisting the principals in developing the plan that works best to fit their school's individual needs. Directors and staff discussed the Race and Equity team, the train the trainer method, and the ability to quantify the changes in people's attitudes and behaviors. Directors noted the feedback received from some who have taken on the train the trainer method and have found difficulty conveying the urgency to other staff about implementing these strategies. Staff discussed schools that have more ability to extract data due to the nature of their school environment; they noted the momentum behind the Race and Equity Teams and the steps to standardize how things are done to develop consistent programs across each school. Directors and staff discussed the difficulties in implementing this goal and obtaining the resources needed to obtain data. Staff noted that as the programs mature and more training occurs the data will grow. Directors and staff discussed utilizing the University of Washington to assist in data collection, the transition of these models to other students of color or students who feel marginalized in others ways. Staff discussed utilizing curriculum specialist to help build assessment models and expanding these models to other groups of students. Staff discussed the threats of and sensitivities to stereotyping within this goal and being cognizant of these things when collecting and interpreting data. Directors discussed the need to train the Board and leadership on these tools as well. Directors noted the focus of

building a strong training team within the District rather than using outside resources.

SMART Goal 3: Program Mapping and Review

Dr. Herndon discussed goal three and the work towards developing tools to assist in mapping all of the programs throughout the District. He discussed the work that has been completed on this goal and noted the next steps within the process. He noted the cost implications within this goal. Staff discussed the compilation of student data and measuring success through both quantitative and qualitative means. Directors and staff discussed the program review process and looking at why each program was developed within a particular school and analyzing each program's success. Staff discussed the n size and having groups of students smaller than 10, which provides too small of an n size to report on due to the risk of disclosing identifiable student information. Directors and staff discussed the usefulness of the data collected, especially when the n size is too small to be considered. Staff noted that not every program will be able to be reviewed due to costs and small group sizes. Directors and staff discussed the mapping of the data, the process of choosing which programs to assess, the timeline and the cost to the goal.

Goal 4: Funding

Ms. Bennett noted the discussions staff has been having with the legislature and the community engagement efforts around budget. Ms. Berge highlighted the request for meeting with Directors to have more in-depth conversations on this goal. Ms. Bennett provided feedback on the conversation with the Seattle delegation, which was mostly on capital funding and the levy cliff. Director Geary noted that they talked about the letter and noted that they understood and are all very aware of looking at ways to strategically put this in front of everyone and are looking at an effort to join districts to work on behalf of schools. Dr. Nyland gave feedback on meetings with Parent Teacher Associations. Directors and staff discussed the meetings with key figures around the levy cliff, funding concerns, messaging, and salaries. Directors and staff discussed methods for keeping the issue in the forefront of public eye. Director Geary noted the ask from the Seattle delegation for information and cheat sheets to aide them in the ability to do the work they need to do.

Goal 5: Engagement/Collaboration

Ms. Campbell noted the work around community engagement and discussed the progress made on this goal and discussed the steps being taken to develop deeper training tools that could be accessible as online learning modules. She further discussed the feedback and progress in changing the website to meet the needs of the end user. She noted the different improvements around communicating to families and providing tools that families can utilize, such as iCalender. Ms. Campbell discussed the challenges with meeting the goals around customer service.

Dr. Codd provided an overview of the work around collaboration and problem solving and noted the leadership trainings provided to staff. She discussed the efforts to work with PASS to build an interest-based process. She discussed the progress and collaborative efforts with SEA and Building Leadership Teams (BLTs). She provided information on the development of a Leader Institute training. Dr. Nyland provided insight into the theory of action behind enabling principals and leadership teams with problem solving tools. Directors and staff discussed building the capacity of the BLTs, recruitment efforts, and utilizing parent resources. Directors and staff discussed the role of Executive Directors of Schools (EDS) and building their capacities and providing them with tools to assist principals.

Directors noted concerns around job clarity for EDS's and not creating well defined boundaries as instructional leaders rather than ombudsmen. Directors discussed the need to define what instructional leadership is and to develop a broad base of problem solving skills in order to provide a stronger support to EDS's who will then be able to provide more support to the BLTs. Directors noted the need to have clear expectations of each role and their capacities.

Ms. Bennett asked for feedback on a plan for future check-ins on these goals, the documentation needed on the progress of the goals and discussed the evaluation timeline. Directors noted that any allotted time would be filled up, however having a 10-15 minute time allocation to discuss each goal seemed reasonable. Directors reflected on the evaluation process and theory of action on each particular goal. Directors suggested a potential one-sheet graphic that will assist in having an informative conversation. Directors indicated that the narrative is more useful than the rubric.

This meeting adjourned at 7:12pm.