



Board Special Meeting

Work Session: Tiering Supports and Oversight for All Schools, Budget;

Executive Session: To Evaluate the Performance of a Public Employee.

RCW 42.30.110(1)(g)

March 4, 2020, 4:30 – 8:15 p.m.

Auditorium, John Stanford Center

2445 – 3rd Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134

Minutes

Call to Order

Director Rankin called the meeting to order at 4:34 p.m. Directors Mack, DeWolf, Hersey, Harris, Rivera-Smith, and Hampson were present.

Work Session: Tiering Supports and Oversight for All Schools

This work session was staffed by Superintendent Juneau, Chief of Schools & Continuous Improvement Wyeth Jessee, Chief of Student Support Services Dr. Concie Pedroza, Director of Student Support Services Kari Hanson, Executive Director of Coordinated School Health Pat Sander, and Executive Director of Schools Dr. Michael Starosky.

Mr. Jessee started the presentation with information on the strategic moves that Central Office has been making in order to align more efficiently and effectively in support of schools and the Strategic Plan. He explained how these moves would make the strategic plan more successful. Continuous improvement has been happening for years, it is not just happening.

Mr. Jessee gave a history of what was happening in schools – central office support was siloed and supports for schools were often not coordinated. Initiatives would start and sometimes would not last an entire school year. Continuous School Improvement Plans (CSIPs) were viewed as a compliance document. There is a need to address the alignment work in central office, working with labor partners, the racial equity teams, within the context of each school as well.

Mr. Jessee provided background, as well as the past and present states of the actions happening within the Schools of Promise workstreams. This current year has 37 schools identified. We are now working together as teams, have action plans for each school which concentrates efforts on a focus goal (e.g., 3rd grade reading goal in elementary and K-8s) which has made it easier for schools to focus. These focus goals are supported by common core curriculum and assessments as well as social emotional behavioral frameworks.

Director Harris asked if there is a list of schools. Response: Yes, we will send out the list.

Director DeWolf asked if the 3 groups, Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Early Literacy 13, and Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS) make up the list of the 37 schools. Response: There are some schools that can check more than one box.

The actions plans do speak to the professionals that are doing the work.

The next portion of the presentation moved to the challenges –*How we are getting this work done* We are working to better streamline school-based actions with the result being improved student outcomes. Currently, a school tries to juggle all of the initiatives and expectations from variety of sources. To this point, we have relied on a principal to make sense of all of this. While there are some principals that can handle it, most principals need support. We need to address how to support principals. We need to reign in the initiatives and provide a narrower focus.

Dr. Starosky spoke to the process schools use to create their CSIPs. There is now a team lead to help support implementation of their CSIP where before there used to be only a single person.

Dr. Pedroza discussed how departments within Student Support Services, (e.g., advanced learning and special education), are part of a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) team. It has been helpful to know who the point person is in order to coordinate services.

Ms. Sander talked about how our MTSS teams have allowed us to focus on the whole child and gives us an opportunity to use common language and know what is going on across schools. We have common language practices that we use across departments. Student safety is paramount. Mr. Jessee talked about his experience as a lead, and what his team was able to accomplish coaching teachers with classroom management. This is just one small part. The team was able to broker a relationship and really work with the school.

Moving on to the slide around a focused CSIP goal and what the process would look like, Dr. Starosky explained the illustration. The Focus CSIP goal provides central office with a starting point, hence it being in the center. If we are co-constructing, then we need our leaders to have the support needed to work on their action plan. We now think of support as not being just a “one-time thing”, but rather support over time. We have also learned it is not an isolated event and is not being viewed as central office giving timely feedback and support so that educators are able to monitor and adjust.

Director Harris pointed out that there are a lot of acronyms.

CSIPs serve 2 purposes - 1) public facing school plan, 2) an action plan which is aligned to the strategic plan and is a detailed, living, binding plan. Currently, for the public facing plan, a school starts reviewing their current plan in January, and are asked to start creating a new plan, February for the following year, prior to having had time to finish the current one. By moving to a 3-year CSIP plan, we believe that schools would have time to create and work the plan that would get better outcomes for students. Ms. Hanson explained that the current CSIP is not designed and cannot serve both purposes. A Focus CSIP plan should explain what impact school-based actions will have. For the practitioner the action plan is much more detailed and shows strategy descriptions; it shows us practices and gives a more detailed level than the traditional CSIP.

Ms. Sander discussed the Safe and Welcoming goal for the Strategic Plan. Looking at the school climate survey that is given yearly, April, with interim assessments available to schools in November-December, and February. This change has allowed schools set school climate goals and use student climate data differently so we see how students are viewing their environment throughout the school year and can monitor and adjust practices.

Director Hersey – Thank you, this is an interesting take around the bottleneck that happens with so many initiatives. There is a bottleneck not only for the principal but also for the director of schools. If there is an issue and the principal doesn't bring it to the team, what are the options? What if the principal is the issue?

Director Rankin – That issue needs to be brought to the Director of Schools. Response: Currently, we do not have a mechanism for the directors of schools. Now would like to get clear about the accountability. Not every issue is for the director of schools.

Director Harris – This has been a long-standing conversation over what the directors of schools job is. It has not been very well defined. Need to get feedback and have accountability so that questions and concerns don't go to die.

Dr. Starosky talked about the role of his department – the Lead Up team. This office receives a large amount of information that often needs to be redirected. They have been trying to be more clear and provide a better defined line of communication around who/what should go to whom. For instance, if an issue involves a teacher, did this person talk to the teacher, and if it was not handled, the principal, and then the director of schools. Climate Review Committees (CRCs), which are manifestations of staff climate and the principal's ability to address issue is greatly diminished. Labor partners (PASS, and SEA) along with human resources, and schools need to come up with clear codes of conduct and chain of command. There are a number of things happening (e.g., staff may not be happy with a decision, may not feel safe), and everyone has a role to play, not just the directors of schools.

Director Harris – What is the chain of command? When people attempt to get feedback from the director of schools there is a vacuum. Mr. Jessee said that the division will own that and that as early as last spring, central office started to look at the process. When it is finished there will be a clear process as well as an escalation process that will be on the public website.

Director Rankin – This should not just be for families, but also for staff. Very clear understanding will be very helpful. People need to know who to go to for what.

Director Mack – There is concern about the words chain of command. It is very authoritarian. She had concern about the framing. People need to know who to go to for what.

Director Rankin – My interpretation is that the team is meant for the principal and staff. She is hearing that there is an additional need for families. There is a need for another contact that is for families.

Director Hampson – This reiterates that it seems counterintuitive that these teams would also be able to support families. A note of concern from academics and social-emotional to whole child is that we are not providing social work unless licensed to do so. We are careful about that means in an educational environment. Wondering if during the tier's assessment of leaders in buildings, if an assessment has been done for the directors of schools. It may be that the director of schools is not in the correct position. What is the process for making sure that the director of school is the right person? On the outward facing document what isn't addressed is the Building Leadership Team (BLT) and if it isn't being done here, when is it done and why/when does community engagement come in?

Director Rivera-Smith – If principals are not in charge of the custodial staff, are they part of this team?

Director Mack – Wanted to raise the issue that she has been hearing anecdotally that when we use the MTSS framework, we are not directing students that may need special education services. The district needs to be identifying students who may need the services.

Dr. Pedroza assured Director Mack that Student Support Services is well aware of the need to identify students who may need services, and informed the board directors that the district just did a training to schools around 504 plans, and will be doing more trainings around special education services.

Mr. Jessee moved on to talk about the learning support team and what they do. After 2 years of central office support teams partnering with select schools, Research, Evaluation and Assessment (REA) did a study. The study showed that there is some traction and the increase in outcomes for students furthest from educational justice. There is still an issue with attendance. There is a need to really coordinate the cross-departmental teams and have consistent teams to support schools. We are trying to lessen who is going out to schools. Mr. Jessee talked about the different departments and their staffing supports. Dr. Pedroza talked about tiered supports. For instance, currently special education still supports by region, so with tiering we will change so that the department is supporting schools differently. The department is trying to align the work and have support be coherent.

The departments that traditionally fell under Teaching and Learning (Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction, Student Support Services, and Schools and Continuous Improvement) have done work with the University of Washington and have come away with some guiding principles about how we collaborate.

Director Harris – What happens when you don't do it?

Mr. Jessee went over the roles and responsibilities of the learning support teams, department heads, and senior leadership. Dr. Pedroza talked about how we are being proactive in our work, to get ahead of situations, how we are aligning specialists and coaches that work with teachers, and are collaborating in our training of staff in central office.

Dr. Starosky talked about directors of schools and how the role of this position has changed. He covered the key responsibilities. Some of the responsibilities that principal supervisors are handling now should be shifted to other areas. Central office needs to change in order to help schools. Directors of schools are just one role that is needed to support schools.

Mr. Jessee then jumped to tiering structures. There will be one lead and team at the same group of schools – a coordinated approach.

Director Rankin – Would like to talk more about support for building leaders, and about retaining teachers of color.

Director Hampson – When the data is disaggregated, are the outcomes coming from one concentrated source? Mr. Jessee – It says 17 out of 25 schools have met their goal which show we are making some changes, but the challenge is that there are still schools that despite having support are not being as successful as we would like.

Director Mack – A principal's job has changed dramatically, so there needs to be clarity around what their role and responsibility is. Otherwise it makes it difficult to do the work. Getting clarity around the principal's job and responsibility is important. Dr. Starosky anticipates that the central office will be

coming together around the principal role of which the current job description may be outdated and not describing what they are required to do. The Association of Washington State Principals (AWSP) is coming up with new standards.

Director DeWolf – Could the Board be provided information in a Friday Memo that would clarify how this supports the work around student safety. How can the Board help?

Director Harris – Could there be dates and page numbers on the slides? Would like to hear more about REA’s research. How can we replicate what is being done for the schools that are lagging, and where is the accountability? Would like to have a job description for the directors of schools that has been vetted.

Director Rankin – It is exciting to see this work.

Superintendent Juneau appreciates the work that has gone into this work and the collaboration is evident. She has made a promise to school leaders that there would be changes.

The meeting recessed at 6:07 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 6:16 p.m.

Work Session: Budget

Director Hampson called the meeting to order at 6:16 p.m. Directors Mack, DeWolf, Hersey, Harris, Rivera-Smith, Hampson, Rankin were present.

This work session was staffed by Superintendent Juneau, Chief Financial Officer JoLynn Berge, Chief Operations Officer Fred Podesta, Chief of Equity, Partnerships & Engagement Dr. Keisha Scarlett, and Chief of Public Affairs Carri Campbell

Chief Financial Officer JoLynn Berge spoke about the agenda and reviewed the possible outcomes. Chief Operations Officer Fred Podesta spoke about how operations goals have little fiscal changes currently and have more programmatic changes. Operations focus areas for 2019-20 transportation and early learning. Transportation goal was to improve Yellow Bus service. He explained in the month of February 2020 the District was at 98% average on time performance. Control center performance is also something being monitored with calls and customer service. Supporting early learning in the capital services group that provides educational spec that provides more preschools in new building layouts.

Director Mack asked how the District will pay for new preschool classrooms. Mr. Podesta explained how the master plan and the design will be used to find out if our buildings have space and can support the additional rooms.

Mr. Podesta spoke about how the budget is being determined and the various teams at the school and central office level he is working with.

Director Harris asked if Operations was receiving funds from the next year budget. Mr. Podesta confirmed.

Chief of Equity Partnerships Engagement Keisha Scarlett spoke about the goals. She explained students of color are represented on the leadership cabinet providing a collaborative relationship with district leadership. She spoke about the families in communities and how the District can help to have parents

as partners. She explained how the plan to de-silo schools and build up inclusive and authentic engagement. Ms. Scarlett explained the need to have a well-rounded team that supports the stakeholders.

Director Harris asked can the community engagement tool be resent to all directors. Ms. Scarlett will send that document out and explained how the District is building on the engagement tool plan.

Director DeWolf asked do other departments have community engagement that is absorbed into their work. Ms. Scarlett explained the central office wheel and how does the District build community engagement and trust. Stakeholder engagement is community engagement, and professional development is about central office and family engagement is at the school-based level.

Chief Communications Officer Carri Campbell explained Public Affairs includes multiple departments, including SPS TV, customer service, and communication. She reviewed the budget asks for the Public Affairs department which included, Seattle super readers program, culturally responsive workforce, Seattle excellence communications support and research and data. She reviewed what each cost will break down to for the 2019-21 school years. She spoke about the Let's Talk online application that staff and families can use.

Director Harris asked for a Friday memo to show graphics of the Let's Talk program.

Director Hampson has requested her fellow directors to begin thinking of requests for budget items.

Ms. Berge has spoken about Weighted Staffing Standards (WSS) allocations for Librarians, Counselors and Nurses. She explained the bottom-line numbers for elementary schools and that they have more allocations for librarians than for a counselor for schools. At the secondary level we have counselors and nurses are something we are still working on.

Director Mack asked if most of the elementary schools do not have a ½ time counselor. Ms. Berge confirmed that is correct. She explained Counselors are being distributed by the equity tiering. She added we do provide a certificated core FTE and they can buy what they feel is appropriate if they are a larger school who receives this allocation.

Director DeWolf asked if at Thurgood Marshall doesn't have an allocation. Ms. Berge explained it is being developed and it will be added as more is known. Many of the schools that are not funded do have performance dollars that they have been hanging on to and will need to be spent if they do not receive city funding.

Ms. Berge spoke about the indirect costs and what is the methodology behind the calculations.

Director Rivera-Smith asked who made the decision for it to be 13%. Ms. Berge explained it is calculated by rules given to the District from the federal government. Ms. Berge explained it is about \$5M of revenue from indirect costs.

Ms. Berge spoke about the three budget inquires that were received and explained how they have now been added to the work list.

Director Harris asked about what happened to the \$1M that were given for infrastructure system changes. Ms. Berge explained Human Resources has budget for infrastructure. They only spent 450K.

Ms. Codd explained automation of the Neo Gov. More will be included in the upcoming Friday memo. Ms. Codd explained that all \$1m is accounted for and was not wasted.

Director Mack asked for clarification around Highly Capable student assignments. Ms. Berge explained it is up to Curriculum & Instruction. Senior Advisor to the Superintendent Sherri Kokx, added it is being evaluated by the enrollment department. Director Mack would like this to go through the student enrollment committee prior to it coming to the board.

Ms. Berge spoke about the current legislative update, she explained District transportation funding was reduced. We are trying to work the issue as best as we can, and Office Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) and legislature are currently in discussion. We don't expect much of an increase for special education funding. The Highly Capable bill is currently still sitting, and we are monitoring that situation.

Ms. Berge reviewed the preliminary capital fund dollars, with a strong emphasis that its early and the numbers will be changing. She spoke about the Fiscal Year 2020-21 project expenditures. She spoke about the technology project expenditures. She reviewed the budget assumptions that had been previously spoken about at the January budget work session. They included recommendations for elementary science, economic stabilization fund and strategic plan.

Director Harris asked if the economic stabilization fund can be used for the possible health epidemic outbreak. Ms. Berge explained we have a smaller budget contingency fund that would be drawn down first before we use the economic stabilization fund, but it could be. We have a COVID 19 virus budget fund and we are tracking the costs that are being incurred across the district.

The meeting recessed at 7:47 p.m. and immediately reconvened into the Executive Session.

Executive Session: To Evaluate the Performance of a Public Employee. RCW 42.30.110(1)(g).

Director DeWolf announced at 7:47 p.m. that the Board was recessing into executive session to evaluate the performance of a public employee under RCW 42.30.110(1)(g) and the executive session was scheduled to for approximately 45 minutes, with an anticipated end time of 8:32 p.m.

Director DeWolf called the executive session to order at 7:57 p.m.

Directors Harris, Mack, Rivera-Smith, Rankin, Hampson and Hersey were present. Superintendent Denise Juneau was present.

At 8:32 p.m., Director DeWolf announced that the executive session to evaluate the performance of a public employee under RCW 42.30.110(1)(g) was now expected to go an additional 7 minutes, with an anticipated end time of 8:40 p.m.

At 8:40 p.m., Director DeWolf recessed out of the executive session.

Adjourn

The Special Meeting reconvened at 8:42 pm and there being no further business to come before the Board, Director DeWolf adjourned the special meeting at 8:44 p.m.