

Board Special Meeting  
Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee  
Tuesday, December 12, 2017, 4:30pm  
Board Office Conference Room, John Stanford Center  
2445 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134



Minutes

Call to Order

This meeting was called to order at 4:30pm. Directors Burke, DeWolf and Patu were present.

This meeting was staffed by Associate Superintendent for Teaching & Learning Michael Tolley, Chief of Student Support Services Wyeth Jessee, Director of Career & College Readiness Caleb Perkins, Director of Policy and Board Relations Nate Van Duzer, Executive Director Government Relations & Strategic Initiatives Erinn Bennett, PE Program Manager Lori Dunn, Contracts Manager Dianne Navarro, Math Program Manager Anna Box.

Director Patu moved to approve the agenda. Director DeWolf seconded. This motion passed unanimously.

Director DeWolf moved to approve the November 7, 2017 C&I Policy Committee meeting minutes. Director Patu seconded. This motion passed unanimously.

Board Action Reports (Discussion and/or Action)

Exercising option to extend the contract for Middle School and High School yearbooks with Herff Jones for an additional year.

Diane Navarro provided an overview and noted the contract with Herff Jones, discussed the competitive procurement process, and noted that this is the second extension of the third option to extend the contract.

Dir. Patu asked how many of these companies we received proposals from. Ms. Navarro noted in 2015 there were five requests for proposals (RFPs). Dir. Patu asked what makes this ones stand out. Ms. Navarro noted evaluations from the schools, best value, wide array of services, plus discount on top of the competitive price that was included. Dir. DeWolf asked about the equity analysis and asked if the language could be added in. Dir. DeWolf asked if this was a local company. Ms. Navarro noted they had local representation but not sure of where the organization originates.

**DECISION: Dir. DeWolf made a motion to move this forward to the full Board for approval, as amended. Dir. Patu seconded. Motion approved unanimously.**

Approval of agreements adding an adaptive cycling and pedestrian component to the SDOT Let's Go Bike and Pedestrian Safety Education Program.

Lori Dunn provided an overview of this item. She noted the original contract with SDOT, Cascade Bike Club and Seattle Public Schools (SPS) was for \$214,000. This would add the adaptive program, which increases accessibility and more adaptive for students. Ms. Dunn noted that the increased revenue in the program due to speeding tickets in school zones, which has allowed the increase funding and services and amendment the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)/Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). She noted Minutes for approval at the January 9, 2018 C&I Policy Committee Meeting

the need in our adaptive population to be successful in the program. Ms. Dunn noted that SDOT worked with the partners to increase the services: purchasing 8 fleets of bikes, training, curriculum, pedestrian safety component and an adaptive program (2 adaptive specialists). She discussed the timeline since the original MOU as listed in the Board Action Report (BAR).

Dir. Patu asked where the funding is coming from. Ms. Dunn noted the SDOT payment schedule in the packet. She noted the invoicing and payment by SDOT. She noted working with the legal department to secure the funding and invoicing. She noted working on the sustainability for the physical activity programming as part of our PE policy, and helping all kids be successful.

Dir. DeWolf is excited about the positive program. He asked about engineering projects as listed in the BAR. Ms. Dunn noted the Vision Zero alignment with the City, this is a collaborative education for our students to be safe and grow alternative transportation in the City of Seattle. Dir. Patu asked what is the cost to the district, for the training. Ms. Dunn noted that we provide the professional development (PD) and discussed further teacher development through community partnerships with the Cascade Bike Club. She noted that there are typically 10-20 new teachers a year, and are looking to provide additional refresher training for continuing professional development.

Dir. DeWolf noted there is an equity issue and adding adaptive needs, and asked how is the determination made. Ms. Dunn noted that teachers have identified which students need additional supports through their own teaching and relationship with students. She noted that the students are measured for a fit for them at their own school and they continue from grade to grade. Dir. Burke noted that as a district this hits a lot of the equity and story of what we are trying to provide to our students. He asked if there was a potential to do a press release. Ms. Dunn noted that Carri Campbell held a press conference last year at Madrona and that information is posted on our website.

**DECISION: Dir. DeWolf made a motion to move this item forward to the full Board for approval. Dir. Patu seconded. Passed unanimously.**

### **Standing Agenda Items**

#### Formula for Success- Superintendent SMART Goal 1, Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports (MTSS)

Wyeth Jesse and Audrey Roach provided an overview of the item. Mr. Jessee noted the work around MTSS, one major bucket is to have information about our students, which is critical so we are not guessing what our students needs or what their strengths are. He noted a common assessment in schools and during school visits, he noticed a need for schools to have support with utilizing the assessment data. Mr. Jessee noted the process last year, where 20 schools rose to the occasion by participating in field testing for interim assessments. He noted that it is a great check-in to see how students are doing and developing perseverance testing, to be college and career ready.

Mr. Jessee noted the data going in to Homeroom to capture the academic and SEL for each student. He noted that these 20 schools are using the assessments for reading and math. Some are doing it for all students and some are doing for all students in a particular grade. He noted PD and the kick off sessions to answer questions along the way. Mr. Jessee noted this tool helps create a platform, like a common curriculum, so it is aligned as best as possible to standards.

Ms. Roach noted the window for the second assessment will be in January. She noted that she has been pleasantly surprised that the implementation went very smooth, the platform is great, the data analysis is

thorough and informative, as compared to other interims that she has seen. She noted math is going really well, and that there are some hiccups in English Language Arts (ELA), which can be common (rigor, bias, and stereo types) which has been occurring all across the country. She noted working with the vendor on this issue.

Dir. DeWolf asked if the first assessment shapes the second, and do they build. Ms. Roach noted that they are based on scope and sequence standards, dictated by the windows of SAS, where are kids right now, what can we do to fill the gap. She noted that this is not a teach to the test type of thing. Mr. Jessee noted they are curricular based, comprised on the standards on all three sections and there can be atrophy of skills along the way. He noted that it is not meant to test on everything that the teachers are teaching, but what do the students know right now.

Dir. Patu asked about various assessments, what differentiates this one from others in the past. Mr. Jessee noted that types of assessments, such as norm based assessment, which is a predictor of how this student is doing compared to nationwide. But, it does not show how this student performed on a particular skill, so does not help inform instruction. Ms. Roach noted that the reporting on this assessment is much more informative than others that she has seen, and from her experience as a teacher, she feels she could take the data and change her instruction the next day.

Dir. Burke asked what will make this successful and are there risk factors that we need to get out in front of to prevent it from being the third assessment tool we invest in that goes by the wayside. Dir. DeWolf asked if this information is internal for teachers viewing and that the factors of risk would not necessarily be there. Ms. Roach noted that this is currently a field test so would not be uploaded for parent consumption, but used by schools to inform instructional practices. Mr. Tolley noted that we can anticipate rolling it out district wide for math and will have a component of sharing that information with parents at that point. Mr. Roach noted that the various reporting that occurs with the SBAC and provided examples of reporting. Mr. Jessee noted that the district is involving way more educators to get more information to try to get through a continuous improvement process, lessons learned, and recognizing that not everything is perfect. He noted that the educators are the ones who have to sell this, and in the past the educators had a hard time with the program, so that started the downfall. He noted that the instructors are involved in the process they are giving feedback in order to make changes during the pilot. He provided some examples at the schools by talking with principals and getting buy in.

## **Board Policies and Procedures**

### **New Superintendent Procedure 2331SP, Controversial Issues and Guest Speakers**

Mr. Tolley noted the current School Board Policy 2331 and noted that there has been increased interest in certain topics such as Black Lives Matter and the Gender Identity Books. He noted that due to this, a Superintendent Procedure was created to provide guidance to schools on how to be prepared. Mr. Tolley noted these procedures were developed through benchmarking with other districts, discussing with staff and the Seattle Education Association (SEA), and the Principals Association of Seattle Schools (PASS) review. He noted that as this is a Superintendent Procedure, staff is not requesting approval, and that this is for the Board Directors' information only. Mr. Van Duzer noted the meetings with PASS and SEA, they just wanted to know the clarity on who is in what role, and how to express personal opinion in a classroom environment, how to prepare and do the advance work of how might the conversation go and how to keep kids safe in the conversation.

Dir. Patu asked if there have been any issues to this with guest speakers that prompted this. Mr. Tolley noted occasionally, last year at Garfield a guest speaker who made some comments that the student Minutes for approval at the January 9, 2018 C&I Policy Committee Meeting

athletes took offense to what the speaker was saying. He noted that these occasions are typically handled at the building level, this is just to provide guidance for them. Mr. Van Duzer noted that if this becomes extreme, that the school is the person to ask the guest to leave and notify administration.

Dir. DeWolf asked on controversial issues, what is considered controversial. Mr. Van Duzer noted that it is defined in the policy as if the larger community would feel it was controversial. Mr. Tolley noted in the black lives matter issue, it was considered controversial in the national context and that there was added impact to the Seattle community. He noted that although many staff and schools may not have seen it that way, but the national impact was there.

## **Special Attention Items**

### **Math Adoption Pilot Update**

Anna Box and Patrick Grey provide an overview of this item. Ms. Box noted an update that went out in the Superintendent's Friday Memo last week, and she noted that the materials adoption committee has made their decision. She provided some background with working on the pilot and the community feedback. Ms. Box noted the benefits in differentiating, student outcomes and analysis of pre-and post-test for those that participated in the pilot, and that there were stronger gains with this particular book. She noted this is the one students in the pilot felt it helped them when they were struggling.

Dir. DeWolf asked about the positive feedback, what was the makeup of the students in the pilot and how is that measured. Mr. Grey asked teachers to deliberately identify students of color, those in support classes, a sample of both male and female, English spoken at home and those where it is not spoken at home and students above and below grade level. Ms. Box provided context of the adoption process and noted the last adoption in 2006, and the previous curriculum that preceded this selection. Mr. Grey noted he taught from the curriculum for several years in his career, he noted that it required expert teachers, however, the deficits were with parents trying to help their kids at home, it was hard to find practice problems to work through, and it was challenging for non-expert math instructors. He noted that standards changed and they have since been working with pieces of different curriculum and using supplemental materials which was a large equity issue throughout the district and also the need to provide quality, consistent instructional experiences. He noted that the current 8<sup>th</sup> graders have not had an official curriculum since they have been in school.

Ms. Box noted launching early 2017 with the selection committee, she discussed the two-stage process to seek instructional materials adoption, noted the criteria with anti-biased screener, taking in community feedback, and the pilot with 32 teachers and receiving books to have 9 weeks of instruction. She noted the committee reviewed the pilot data, teacher data, community feedback and further review of the instructional materials.

Dir. DeWolf asked what are we looking for from the community, since some are experts and some are not. Mr. Grey noted to receive feedback that staff/teachers did not think of, and to see how this works in their home. Mr. Grey noted that some responses included that they did not feel they had expert feedback, but provided it anyway. Ms. Box noted the Seattle advanced and involved citizenry and they can also be experts. Mr. Tolley noted that this selection has not gone through the Instructional Materials Committee (IMC) yet, who must review the process to insure all of the procedures were met and achieved. There is a meeting scheduled with them on January 5<sup>th</sup>, and the Board Action Report will likely come to the committee in early February depending on when the IMC can meet and review.

### New Course Offerings Update:

Caleb Perkins provided an overview of the New Course offerings update item. He noted every year there is interest in revising courses and adding courses to the High School course catalog. Mr. Perkins noted that within the Superintendent Procedure SP2026, there is a distinction the process between new and revised courses. He reviewed the SP2026 with the legal department and out of the 12 courses coming up, none were considered new. He provided examples of the revisions and shifting content areas. Therefore, there is no Board action necessary for these 12 courses. Mr. Perkins noted that staff is currently conducting a review of courses in the last five years, to do a thorough review to see if there are courses meet the new or revised status and may need school Board approval for high school course credit. He noted that he anticipates that most will not be considered new, and that perhaps in January we may know when the review will be completed and if it will come to the Board.

Dir. Patu asked if these would go forward to all high schools. Mr. Perkins noted that there is a course catalog, with hundreds of courses that any high school can currently access. Dir. Patu asked if there was a uniform course naming for all high schools. Mr. Tolley noted that there are course objectives and definitions, for example ELA is common across all high schools. He noted that there are quite a few that are not consistently offered across every high school due to need and demand.

Dir. Burke asked what is the governance unit, that defines it as unique. Mr. Tolley noted the number, objectives and course description would be consistent across the district. Mr. Perkins noted that the code defines the bucket and there may be 4 versions of ELA12, as there may be Advanced Placement (AP), course credit, etc. Dir. Burke asked if it is a state wide code or is it just across the district. Mr. Perkins noted that he can look in to that.

Dir. Patu asked where we are with our Ethnic Studies curriculum. Mr. Tolley noted relationship building and working with the Ethnic Studies Task Force, which is now a work group, who came to an agreement to move forward with defining the blue prints from our current courses and they have begun to pilot the framework and building that out. Mr. Tolley noted the partnership with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) on this work, and finding examples of what is being taught in our schools right now, but that have not been replicated in other schools. They are looking to build a framework off of the work already in our district and working on how to take this to scale.

### Instructional Materials Adoption Process and Materials Cycle Planning:

Mr. Tolley thanked the Board members for the support to provide instructional materials to our students. He noted at the school Board retreat, where they discussed the state of instructional materials in Seattle schools, and the fact that we did not fund on an annual basis. He noted that our policy calls for an adoption cycle, which has been a long process, and now we have to do a lot of catch up. Mr. Tolley noted that the topic today is to get to review the many needs that the schools have and doing what we can to get materials to the students that will align with standards. Mr. Tolley noted a Pilot at Mercer to use Amplify online resources, and others schools arose as wanting to use it. He noted that a grant opportunity came forward, and with no time to do a full adoption, and to be transparent, those schools submit a curriculum waiver.

Ms. Box noted backwards mapping for the purchasing process to get the materials into students' hands by the start of school in September, and noted all of the steps with an RFP, procurement, testing the materials and so on. Ms. Box provided examples from the recent Math and ELA adoption process.

Dir. DeWolf asked if there would be able to do more than one at a time due to the backlog. Mr. Tolley noted staff capacity and funding constraints, that we could possibly due math and science at the same

time in two different departments, but it would ultimately would come down to funding. Ms. Box noted data from the pilots and that perhaps that is more than is necessary and could be abbreviated.

Dir. Burke noted there is a lot of needs for curriculum, so how do we balance the priorities and can we be more nimble. Dir. DeWolf noted needing to prioritizing by the Board and that needs to be added on to this timeline. Mr. Tolley noted Dr. Kyle Kinoshita is currently working on a sequence of curriculum adoption priority at a high level, what can we afford and put that list in order and see how far we can move forward. He noted the desire to present this priority list to the Board for their approval so that staff can generate RFP's at will from there to start an adoption process without the Board initiating every start of an adoption process. Dir. Burke noted that we are playing catch up from starving in the system in the past.

C&I Policy Committee Work Plan, Planning for 2018:

Dir. Patu noted that she has received feedback that he 2.0 GPA requirement for graduation went away, and she would like to review that. Mr. Tolley noted that before the Board approved the change in policy, staff conducted a survey of the principals to see who had concerns, there were two that were not in support. Dir. Burke noted to put a placeholder for the accountability measures piece. Mr. Perkins noted to have a discussion on how to help the principals on guidance in the special attention items, rather than a discussion on the actual policy.

Dir. Patu left the meeting at 6:02pm.

Staff discussed policies to potentially review for 2018. Mr. Tolley noted the Policies and Procedures that might be due for review, and noted a Program Review, as there was not enough staff previously do to the work required. Dir. Burke asked where to put a new program review. Mr. Tolley noted to look at the impact it is having with our students and the outcomes, and suggested that Advanced Learning be a new program review, as before it was a design study, and primarily of Spectrum, not the Highly Capable. Mr. Tolley recommends that it not be done in-house, and done by external experts to do the review and provide information, someone with a strong research foundation.

Dir. DeWolf asked if ethnic studies could be thrown in on special attention items. Mr. Perkins noted also moving to 32 credits by fall of 2019, and that we will need a lot of engagement on that soon, and perhaps it is listed as a special attention or with Policy 2415.

This meeting adjourned at 6:26pm.