

Board Special Meeting

2445 – 3rd Avenue South, Seattle WA 98124



Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee

Monday, January 9, 2017, 4:30 – 6:30 pm

Board Office Conference Room, John Stanford Center

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 4:32pm.

Directors Burke and Geary were present. Dir. Patu was unable to attend.

Dir. Geary made a motion to amend the agenda to allow for the Advanced Learning discussion to occur directly after the Update on 2016-17 Superintendent SMART Goals 1-3 due to staff schedules. Dir. Burke seconded. The motion to amend the agenda was approved unanimously.

Dir. Geary made a motion to approve the amended agenda. Dir. Burke seconded the motion. The amended agenda passed unanimously.

Dir. Geary made a motion to approve the minutes from the December 12, 2016 Curriculum & Instruction (C&I) Policy Committee meeting. Dir. Burke seconded the motion. The December 12, 2016 minutes were approved as published, unanimously.

Items Requiring Board Action or Informational Board Action Reports

English Language Arts Curriculum Adoption

Kathleen Vasquez provided an overview of the Board Action Report (BAR) for the English Language Arts (ELA) Curriculum Adoption. Ms. Vasquez asked for the level of detail that the Board Directors would like in today's update, as much is redundant due to providing regular monthly updates to the committee.

Dir. Geary asked without being able to identify the name in the past updates, what parts of the discussion were possibly left out previously, as now there are names associated and picked.

Ms. Vasquez noted the materials are aligned to much of the State Standards, and have only been out for a few years, therefore research study on how students could accelerate learning through the standards has yet to be completed. Ms. Vasquez noted the pros and cons handout, which tells the best story for the Center for the Collaborative Classroom (CCC). She noted that CCC aligns to the District's commitment to a Balanced Literacy Framework that teachers have used to guide instruction in the past 12 years. She noted the preliminary survey data showed that parents and teachers desired to have resources that support instruction in phonics and phonemic awareness. Ms. Vasquez noted CCC's diverse mentor text, which are engaging, respectful and relevant. She noted the ease of use in this curriculum- it's clear, teachers love it for the ease of execution, and the instructional materials clearly laid out. Ms. Vasquez noted teaching points for every day skill point, strategy point and social/emotional development- every day, every lesson. She noted field testers stated the curriculum gets students into appropriate learning

routines, fostering equal access to participation. The curriculum also has a vocabulary development component, which was absent in previous resources. Ms. Vasquez noted the curriculum's vocabulary and oral language components are particularly important to English Language Learners (ELL). Ms. Vasquez noted field testers flagged that this curriculum is strong for students with special needs, and high success with the diverse populations of students. Highly Capable Cohort (HCC) and spectrum teachers have noted the need for work around the social/emotional portion of curriculum, which this selection has imbedded in the curriculum along with the academic portion.

Kristen Nichols noted that the research had shown that this selected curriculum embeds strategies for closing the achievement gap, particularly the daily teaching of academic behaviors and talk routines that the other two finalists did not have. Ms. Vasquez noted the strong elements of the other options that were not chosen, and noted that the ease of use was not as strong, which would be a challenge for newer teachers. She went on to say that field testers noted the implementation was more difficult in the number two selection than in the recommended.

Dir. Burke noted the recommended motion, and the piece on the contingency on the legislature providing funding, and he would like that portion addressed. Michael Tolley noted the desire to move forward with the adoption portion, and that there are budget restrictions on purchasing the materials without ample funding from the State. Mr. Tolley noted "ample" is a question mark, and that this is currently a draft to the committee and staff would like feedback and guidance. Dir. Burke noted his understanding that the funding for the adoptions was a discussion item, but not yet a contingent decision on ample funding. He noted that this may be subject to revocation in this path, and noted the discussion of priority in the Wednesday Work Session on Budget. Dir. Burke noted that there could be a possibility of adjusting priority, and asked if this is an all or nothing decision. JoLynn Berge noted that the way the budget is shaping up, that staff would recommend to suspend any adoptions at this point, and that staff is open to language edits. She noted that there may be a more definitive idea after the Board Work Session on the Budget on Wednesday, January 11, 2017. She noted the language could be changed after that discussion has been held. Dir. Burke asked if the timeframe is set in stone or can this be brought back next month. Ms. Vasquez noted that staff went to the purchasing department last week and talked to Craig Murphy, and he believes if the orders go through in the end of April, or early May, we could get the materials in house in time. However, it could throw a wrench in the Professional Development (PD) in the spring in order to have teachers prepared to teach the new curriculum in the fall. Ms. Vasquez noted that PD in the summer would not be ideal as teachers are not in the classrooms.

Dir. Burke noted possibly taking another month to explore an incremental roll out, identify high need schools that we can get part way there for next year. Dir. Geary noted she is unaware of how the companies work with the critical mass of purchasing. Mr. Tolley asked if there was still a possibility to continue with the first part of the motion to adopt the curriculum, and then work on the second part of the funding at a later time. Dir. Burke noted that would be a possibility. Mr. Tolley asked to move this forward, and continue to work on the second part of the motion for the purchasing aspect of the motion. Dir. Geary noted to amend the motion to not have to redo the whole process in the future. Ms. Berge noted there are two stand-alone motions within this BAR, one is the adoption, the other is the expenditure. Mr. Tolley noted to work with staff on the language after the discussion at this week's Board Work Session.

Dir. Burke made a motion to move this item forward for consideration by the full Board, and to amend the second paragraph of this motion after the Board Work session on Wednesday, January

11, 2017 per staff recommendations regarding the budget. Dir. Geary seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

DECISION: The English Language Arts Curriculum Adoption was moved forward for consideration by the full Board.

Standing Agenda Items

Update on 2016-17 Superintendent SMART Goals 1-3

Wyeth Jessee noted an update on Goal 1, and the bigger picture about developing processes and tools that assist families and staff in knowing the stories and strengths and needs of every student. He noted getting information to the right people to assist in this work. Mr. Jessee noted the data portal, which gives enough information to work in coordination to assist our students. He noted 15 schools identified to field test the data portal, out of 28 who applied. Mr. Jessee noted the selection criteria to have schools in different regions and grade level bands. In a couple of weeks there will be an orientation, and noted that the chosen contractor is “Home Room” which has a great reputation and many districts in the State also use this product.

Dir. Burke asked for what that looks like in regards to implementation at the school level. Mr. Jessee noted that the program is only as good as the data that goes in, which is a critical component. He noted that it is a common site, one platform, to see the student strengths, needs and stories are and to speak apples-apples within the school. He provided some examples of the types of information that would represent the student’s story. Dir. Burke noted that it has been a common dream for a while from schools. Mr. Jessee noted that data management and access has always been a top ask from Principals. He noted the request for proposal (RFP) for interim assessments that is still coming through for English Language Arts (ELA) and math, to feed the data portal with additional data points.

Dir. Geary asked about the roll out, with 15 field tests, how will it be rolled out to schools after the testing portion of time. Mr. Jessee noted the hope is to roll out for all schools next year, but the price tag is \$300,000-400,000 for all 99 schools, depending on the amount of training levels and sequences. He noted that funding is going to be an issue. Dir. Geary asked how much the field test is costing. Mr. Jessee noted about \$120,000 for the portal, staff time and training. Mr. Jessee noted that the cost is about \$5 per child, and is an annual subscription cost. He noted there is about \$45,000 in back office technical support for the transition and for data integrity testing. Mr. Jessee noted that there are more bells and whistles that can be added at a later time. Dir. Burke asked if this is a web based service and is it updated and secure. Mr. Jessee noted it is web based, and the data is updated daily and (Department of Technology Services) DoTS tested for the safety of the server. Dr. Eric Anderson noted that the server is off site, and that staff will look in to further questions from the Directors. Mr. Jessee noted that the schools and the district office can see what is going on in the school site and can conduct evaluations to make sure we are all looking at the same data points.

Advanced Learning Update

Mr. Jessee noted ensuring consistent services at all 99 schools, and working on processes to work with staff and families to understand what the services are and what they should be. He noted this is part of the year long process and the engagement work that has been presented in the timeline to the C&I Policy Committee. Mr. Jessee noted a meeting on Friday to discuss constructing reliable and valuable surveys and questionnaires to go out in spring and summer. He noted that data can sometimes provide further questions to research and dig in to along the way. Mr. Jessee noted the project plan will have more details on Phase I at next month’s C&I Policy Committee meeting in February.

Dir. Burke noted the last discussion on what we can glean from the data that we have now, and how to cast a bigger net to the communities. Dir. Burke noted that there is a commitment to advanced learning in all of the schools and if we do it right, it can reduce some disparities in the schools, and what does that look like. He noted the inconsistencies over the past year, and would like to help inform the School Board and building leaders about the offerings under the old structure. Mr. Jessee noted the Work Session back in October regarding Spectrum, and in order to truly evaluate this, we have to really find out what the truth is behind what is being said, and what is actually going on for the students and in the classrooms. Dir. Burke noted the focus on formative assessment, and the effect size is the same as acceleration, and we have to figure out how to accelerate our students while doing formative assessment.

Mr. Tolley directed the conversation to Superintendent SMART Goal 3 and noted Dr. Anderson is here to discuss the selection process with the mapping and review. He discussed the components of the goal and the approach to continuous improvement of program offerings, and noted there are many layers. Dr. Anderson noted the independent internal evaluations that will be done, at first in a pilot session this first time around. He noted the handout and discussed the analysis approaches that can be done for specific outcomes. Dr. Anderson noted the techniques in order to tease out the information that they are looking for, and other various methods of analysis. He noted formative data, working with program managers, analyzing the data and reporting the findings to provide to decision makers to create a clearer process. Dr. Anderson discussed the handout and the charts regarding the types of programs and models within the schools. He noted in the pilot year the focus will be on student services and program services and models. Dr. Anderson noted the criteria for selecting and prioritizing the assessments that will be reviewed annually, or at other specified timeframes. He noted data development phases, and provided some examples for service delivery models for students. Dr. Anderson provided options for future assessment and provided examples as listed on the handout. He noted the importance of the pilot year to have the program managers on board with participating in the pilot for the proof of concept that they are looking for. Dr. Anderson noted preliminary discussions with staff to develop a clear set of research questions and to partner with staff to take the program designs to the next level. He noted to continue to provide the committee with updates to the on the data collection activities and will present preliminary findings along the way for regular communication.

Dir. Burke asked with the continuous improvement department, are we structurally jeopardized to move this work forward and have departments do their own continuous improvement process. Dr. Anderson noted the work with Dr. Kyle Kinoshita on the math adoption process. Dr. Kinoshita noted that middle school math work that he will be providing an update on later in this meeting is a great example of what Dr. Anderson is discussing regarding continuous improvement and assessments, and that the work is not being jeopardized, rather is a compliment to the work.

Board Policies and Procedures

School Board Policy 2200, Equitable Access Annual Report

Sherri Kokx noted the Annual Report being presented to the committee today, and noted changes that were made to continue adding a continuum of services to the schools, enrollment driven decisions, and one to special education at Whitman Middle School, where the third Service Model 2 (SM2) classroom was not needed. Ms. Kokx also noted some upcoming decisions to the Student Assignment Plan to make Madison Middle School the designated Highly Capable Cohort (HCC) pathway in West Seattle. Ms. Kokx noted other pending Board Approval decisions that would be noted in this report.

Ms. Kokx noted that Seattle Vocational Institute program with Seattle Central College program where there are some SPS students, and other districts' students as well. She noted there are some changes that are not required by Board Policy, but are included here to make Directors aware of some changes, as listed in the annual report. She noted that in the October quarterly report there was mention to changes to the Student Assignment Plan (SAP) that are still pending in the SAP. Ms. Kokx noted the language immersion pathway recommendation to make Chief Seal the language immersion pathway, which is also still pending in the SAP. She noted that she is not aware of any upcoming changes that are not mentioned in this document. Ms. Kokx noted the linked services documents have not changed since the beginning of the school year.

Dir. Burke asked in regards to Chief Seal language pathway what is the commitment under the budget challenges, without knowing how many students will take advantage of this program. Ms. Kokx noted that there is currently an international program at that school, this gives students at Mercer a guaranteed seat if they choose that option. Dir. Burke asked about Whitman as an HCC pathway and asked if there is any traction on this, as he has not seen an amendment. Mr. Tolley noted that was a conversation that was a possibility to come forward, but was not a viable option. Ms. Kokx noted that this report was written prior to the meeting last week, where it was determined that was not an option and can be removed from the final report.

Dir. Geary asked about the services model, do we now have the ability to serve every student on their continuum for their middle school feeder. Mr. Jessee noted that for access services, Whitman was added and that Meany will be opening next year, otherwise services are available. He noted the numbers do not yield having access services at Washington and they will be offered at Meany. Mr. Jessee noted the service placements and the Individual Education Plans (IEPs) the needs of the students are not always met as labeled service placement at some sites. Dir. Geary wanted to make sure we keep students in their peer groups as they progress. Mr. Jessee noted Aki was also added this year.

Ms. Kokx noted that Dir. Burke had a previous question on the tie breaker column on the chart. She noted it is for Spectrum services, and since most schools are at capacity, it is used as a tie breaker for priority.

Special Attention Items

Preschool Update

Cashel Toner noted meeting with the Directors in 2x2s in early January to discuss the Seattle Preschool Program (SPP). She noted it is year 2 with the SPP, funded by the City of Seattle in a program model of a teacher and program assistant with about 20 students in each of the 8 classrooms. Ms. Toner noted Directors asked staff to create a Task Force, to examine funding, program models, outreach and locations in the City. She noted the work of the Task Force on these topics and inclusion at the preschool level. Ms. Toner noted the options for expanding services, and that the Task Force recommendations will be presented to the Superintendent to explore next steps. She noted that moving forward the partnership agreement with the City of Seattle, that decisions need to be made in March with the contract time frame, which is why the discussion is coming to the Directors now. Ms. Toner noted ensuring the cost of the programming is non K-12 dollars. She noted getting ideas from the 2x2s with Directors for the upcoming Board Work Session on January 25, 2017. She noted that at the February 2 Executive Committee meeting that a Board Action Report will be discussed, and if the committee moves it forward, then this item will be introduced at the February 15 Regular Board Meeting and acted upon at the March 1 Regular Board meeting.

Dir. Geary asked for the percentage of students identified with age range, for a comparison of the preschools in our buildings and to get the bigger picture, and also to build in assurances in the contract language. Ms. Toner made a note of the request and thanked Directors for their feedback.

Assessment Policy Format Feedback

Erinn Bennett noted the start of the framework of parameters of federal, state, collective bargaining agreements (CBAs), and resolution passed by the School Board in May of 2016. She noted the handout, and noted the format (or buckets) as staff are early in the process of this discussion topic. Ms. Bennett noted benchmarking against other districts, and these were the common buckets throughout her research. She is asking Directors for feedback at this time to develop language within each section as we move forward. Ms. Bennett noted coming back to the committee in February with draft language, and bringing some benchmarks to discuss. She noted in March/April a full Board conversation is planned on assessment, and in April staff will be coming back to committee with revised policy language. Ms. Bennett noted revising current policies and what the next steps would be to align the new and current policies.

Ms. Toner noted conducting internal and external engagement through this process and asking Directors on any other key external engagement partners so that staff may build that in to the engagement process as they move forward.

Dir. Geary noted assessment is geared by legal mandates and to have that built in to this framework so people are aware of this focus. She then noted looking at partners outside of our locality, Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA) and State flexibility, and outward partnerships based on feedback that we are currently getting. Ms. Bennett noted the resolution from May 2016, there was language on advocacy, and asked Dir. Geary if she is asking for separate or aligned policies with other districts. Dir. Geary noted the shifting in this process and is not sure how to work that in to the policy work, and potentially in flux to things that are happening outside of our control and staying in line with the movements of the State. She noted groups out there that we can align with and have alignment with the partners. Dr. Kinoshita noted a task force related to assessment and Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) that might influence one portion of this work, and provided examples. He noted that some aspects are very specific to our district with regards to assessments. Dir. Geary also asked to get input from students, as she feels students do not understand the process of assessments and do not see inherent value in the process. Ms. Toner reiterated the ask from Directors to include student input, consider state mechanisms to align with and get feedback from, and asked if these buckets were a reasonable place to start.

Dir. Burke noted to provide the scope of assessments and various types, and to note which policies address which portions of the work. He noted not to go to the quiz level of assessments, but to address what is the intent. Dir. Burke noted that his intent was to put the same level of scrutiny on assessments as to what we do for adopting a curriculum. He noted the level of engagement and processes as a type of rights and responsibilities in assessments. Dir. Burke noted looking at peer districts, and then looking at it with an internal lens for the engagement process.

Dir. Geary noted wanting to take this through the engagement and race and equity tools. Ms. Bennett noted that this item will be a Board Action Report, so that all aspects will be addressed as appropriate.

Math Adoption Update

Dr. Kinoshita noted staff will first provide a brief update on the adoption process, then they will provide an update on the math outlier study.

Anna Box noted after the School Board had committed to \$2million for the adoption, the budget office had required staff to provide some viable options within the dollar amount and with the Board commitment to this budget allocation in every budget scenario. Ms. Box noted that she worked with the purchasing office to produce a request for information (RFI) at the beginning of the year. She noted vendors have until January 19th to respond to the questions regarding their products. The following week, staff will review the list of the materials, the options for curriculum, professional development and other budgetary factors. Dr. Kinoshita noted the next update will be at the February 13 C&I Policy Committee meeting. Dir. Burke asked if his questions regarding the process have been addressed with the RFI process and asked if the process is being held hostage. Dr. Kinoshita noted upcoming conversations ~~that~~ are scheduled regarding the budget and the RFI outcomes.

Dr. Kinoshita noted the intent of the outlier study is to add to the earlier outlier study that had been conducted in the past. He noted the questions to still be addressed is leadership, professional development and closing the gaps in addition to the whole child factors. Dr. Kinoshita noted that these are observations and not yet findings. There will be a more complete picture of the reasons for the schools' success and implications for leadership. Ms. Box noted the trends as listed in the document provided. She noted the focus on the principal's leadership at the schools. Ms. Box noted another trend was emphasis on expectations and standards, clearly mentioned in bullet points in the document.

Dir. Geary asked about expectations, and asked whether the principals have expectations for teachers, then the teachers convey to the students. She asked if there are some teachers that do not convey the expectations in an equitable manner? Have these schools done more work with their teachers or are those type of teachers not present at these schools? Marni Campbell noted that principals conveyed that it took time at the schools and noted the commitment of the school leaders to have a different approach to the work and the high level of work expected of their teachers as well. She noted the team helps to keep people focused. Ms. Campbell noted the construction of math identity and how teachers create a space in which a student can think of themselves as a mathematician. She noted both shoring up teachers and weeding out teachers to get to this level.

Dir. Geary asked if we can find a way to replicate this type of leader, as it is an art in leadership. Dr. Kinoshita noted it is not a list of things that specific leaders do, but it is a skill in analyzing the environment and making clear strategic and impactful decisions. Ms. Campbell noted that these leaders also have resources like a strong math Assistant Principal. She noted that these schools have a different focus that they are working on and the district needs to message that it is okay to focus on the students who are not doing so well. Ms. Box noted to look at things that are replicable and scalable, and provided some examples as listed in the handout. She noted that additional time, funding and resources all make a difference in the schools.

Dir. Burke noted the general feedback and themes seem consistent, but he struggles with taking a bunch of experiences and rolling it up to general themes, and he is missing the grounding of what does that really mean in the classroom in terms of specificity. Ms. Campbell noted that what is missing from the research will come out in the transcription of the interviews, which is being done right now, where they will be able to pull quotable quotes and additional themes. Dr. Kinoshita noted the need to not have a fixed mindset for students.

Dir. Burke asked if one of the lines of questioning did it lead back to championing math, and the role of leader. Ms. Box noted that about 75% of the math faculty at these three schools are high school endorsed, which gets at that question, and will be looked at as a means for further research. She noted the size of the school is large, so they can staff 10 math teachers, versus some schools that have maybe 2 or 3. Ms. Campbell noted the teachers knowing the standards and the sequence of the standards coherence being critical. Ms. Box noted the teacher relationship with the students and noted bullet points to that effect on the handout.

Dir. Burke noted that all of this work was done at the launch of the math adoption entry point, how does this work guide us in materials adoption. Dr. Kinoshita noted that will be part of the recommendation process. He noted that much of what has been done can be done with older materials, but a lot of this can also be done with new materials and that a new adoption does not preclude this work being done at the outliers. Dr. Kinoshita also noted the implications for development of work across the system and development with Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), tier one instruction and ensuring that it is high quality. He noted these three outliers also had a high level of cooperation between the schools, which is significant findings. Dr. Kinoshita noted the London school's system greatly improved by setting up intentional collaboration between schools and allowing knowledge to flow back and forth. He noted looking for the mechanisms to get this knowledge out to other middle schools across the district, and the need to develop that work to distribute to other schools. Mr. Tolley noted how important context is with this information that is gathered. He noted when he was an Executive Director of Schools (EDS), he encouraged collaboration between schools, however the population of schools was so different and the work did not always translate to success at other schools. He noted the need to have the MTSS structure at our schools, and that depending on the school and the population, they may need other types of supports.

Dir. Burke asked about the named digital tools, and asked if there was a list of supplemental resources being used. Ms. Box noted that she is unsure at this point, and can come up with a list of the supplemental materials, but it is constantly being added to. Dir. Burke noted to find trends in the materials- both provided and supplementary- and understanding the foundation of what those educators have built from. Ms. Campbell noted that the process of creating the materials is what has made an impactful difference, it was not just the materials and the supplemental resources, but the collaboration and learning together that made the lesson planning work. Ms. Box noted a topology of schools at varying levels of readiness.

2017 C&I Work Plan

Dir. Burke noted that the Work Plan is a fluid, working document. He noted the Assessment Policy work in listed for February, and that we are ahead on the work plan. Dir. Burke noted the big body of work on the high school work in April through June coming forward. Dir. Burke noted in October/November the research and test activity items will come forward, which was deferred from last year. He noted the special education policy work in the fall. Dir. Burke asked for feedback on this working document from Directors and staff. Dir. Geary asked about the Special Education update that is no longer a standing item. She also noted other parent groups involved in race and equity population and asked how to get the input when it is not a topic that is on fire. Dir. Burke noted a possibility of a School Board Work Session where there is a community engagement component. Mr. Tolley noted there has not been a structure for this in the past, and noted an annual Oversight Work Session for Special Education, and the possibility for input from community groups and stakeholders. Mr. Tolley noted that he will have a conversation with the Superintendent, and noted that the Executive Committee sets the discussion for what is included in the Oversight Work Sessions.

Before a motion is made to approve the work plan, Dir. Burke noted that it is with the understanding that the Committee Chair and Lead Staff can update the work plan by mutual agreement. That means we do not have to have a formal committee vote of approval every time a change is made.

Dir. Geary moved to approve the work plan as it stands, and with the understanding that the committee chair and staff may make edits to the plan. Dir. Burke seconded. The work plan for the C&I Policy Committee was approved unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 6:38pm.

Board Action Report Decisions/Follow Up Items

Board Action Report for English Language Arts Curriculum Adoption

DECISION: The English Language Arts Curriculum Adoption was moved forward for consideration by the full Board.

C&I Policy Committee Work Plan

DECISION: The C&I Policy Committee was approved as it stands, with the understanding that the Committee Chair and Lead Staff may make edits as needed.