

# Board Special Meeting



2445 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134

Work Session: District Scorecard/Operations Data Dashboard  
Friday, November 6, 2015, 4:30 PM – 6:30 PM  
Auditorium, John Stanford Center

## Minutes

### Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:36pm. Directors Blanford, Carr, Martin-Morris, McLaren, and Peaslee were present. Director Patu arrived at 5:49pm. Director Peters was not able to attend. The meeting was staffed by Superintendent Larry Nyland, Deputy Superintendent Charles Wright, and Acting General Counsel John Cerqui.

### Work Session: District Scorecard/Operations Data Dashboard

#### **District Scorecard**

Dr. Eric Anderson provided an overview of this item. He noted this is the second year presenting these measures, which used to be called the academic scorecard. He noted the focus is primarily on academic milestones, district-wide improvement systems and engagement through customer service surveys. Dr. Anderson went through the documents that he provided for Directors, as well as the process to develop the scorecard. He noted 31 measures, which give a comprehensive data profile. He noted the scorecard targets or stretch targets set during planning phase. He noted an item that was new, and the overall progress with the tracking system. Directors asked if the early program was in English only. Dr. Anderson noted that he believes so, but will check. He noted the Core Academic Development and the drop in score, as this is a new assessment suggested from the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). Directors asked about the Science Standards being a part of the past assessment. Dr. Anderson noted that it was included and discussed on-time graduation results and the explanation on where the targets are and where Seattle Public Schools (SPS) fits in to the state results. Dr. Anderson noted that there is a positive story to tell, and they will dig deeper in to the diagnosis for the results. Michael Tolley noted that the 9<sup>th</sup> grade graduation credit attainment is directly related to the Graduation Rate numbers. Dr. Anderson noted that the students have several opportunities to repeat the assessments, as only 58% pass by 10<sup>th</sup> grade. Directors asked about the 3-year low in graduation rates. Dr. Anderson noted a Friday Memo that went out regarding 10<sup>th</sup> grade Early Learning Assessments (ELA), and the analysis done. In the past year, students had to pass both reading and writing Smarter Balanced Assessments and the grade requirements were set by the state. Dr. Anderson noted that there were about 200-300 students who opted out, and are being shown as yet to pass the ELA. Directors asked about which students are seeing more success on the tests. Dr. Anderson noted that some schools have a higher participation rate. Dr. Nyland noted that if the students didn't take the test, they received a zero on the score, which drives the overall results down. Directors asked how many opted out of the 10<sup>th</sup> grade test. Dr. Anderson noted that they are working to find out, since it is normally reported by the state, but it was not at this time.

Dr. Anderson noted the college and career readiness numbers, targets, and SPS's scores. This is a large improvement for 12<sup>th</sup> graders from years past. Mr. Tolley noted that many high schools now have an expectation that students take college level coursework. Dr. Anderson noted the measures that have been left out, due to some scores not being reported, many due to opt-outs. Directors asked what test was not taken. Dr. Anderson noted it was the 11<sup>th</sup> grade Smarter Balanced Assessment; however, it was not required in that cohort. Directors noted that it was argued in the past to not include the scores of those that opted out, and not include those as a zero score, as they make the results

statistically imbalanced. Dr. Anderson noted that it was a small sample size that had opted out. Directors asked how many students who took the test actually passed the test. Supt. Nyland noted that 25% of SPS students took the test, and of those, 42% passed. He further noted that these results don't take into account whether or not students took it seriously, as it was not required for graduation.

Mr. Tolley noted the data on the back of the large data sheet, which shows the results broken out by race and ethnicity, as well as other categories, relative to the state-wide average. Dr. Anderson noted that the Data Appendix is new this year. He further noted many measures that are shown are in relation to closing the opportunity gaps for underserved students. Dr. Anderson discussed SPS's Commitment to Equity, and that due to this, there was a new baseline score (as noted on the Data Appendix, slide 15) established for closing the opportunity gaps. Dr. Anderson noted that the gap did widen as a consequence of the new assessment. Directors noted that this is not the outcome they were looking for. Dr. Anderson noted slide 18 in the Data Appendix, that there is a downward slope, which is a positive outcome for reducing suspensions in secondary schools. Directors asked if that's an apple to apples comparison, or is it that the suspension codes changed to the point that it looks different. Mr. Tolley noted that there has been a rising of expectations in the primary schools, and the definitions for the suspension codes haven't changed. Directors asked about the strategies used from out-of-school suspension to in-school suspension, and if that is what showing the change in numbers. Dr. Anderson noted that this data includes both in and out-of-school suspension numbers. He further noted a research partnership with the University of Washington to investigate the reliability and consistency in data on this topic. He noted SPS is doing better at providing equity data to the schools for them to benchmark their progress and goals in this area. He noted there is some discretion involved in suspensions, and that they are getting smarter in how they are handling it, as more attention is being paid to it. Supt. Nyland noted that although we are playing closer attention at the district level, that he is not entirely sure what the schools are doing in their reporting that may affect the data. Directors asked about the reporting from OSPI and if it is consistent in data sets. Dr. Anderson noted that it is 99% consistent, although there are always discrepancies, and something that we need to be aware of, so as to be clear and consistent on how we measure and report. Supt Nyland noted one of the biggest differences is whether we measure unique students, or each instance of discipline. For example, the difference in looking at all of the discipline divided by the number of students being disciplined or every instance of discipline, no matter if one student was disciplined multiple times. Supt. Nyland noted that both numbers are important and they tilt the playing field in a different manner. Dr. Anderson noted that this specific report is unique student's instances; each student is only counted once, no matter how many times they were disciplined. Mr. Tolley noted the importance of recorded suspensions, and they are going to analyze time out of the classroom for when the student is suspended. He noted that staff wants to understand the reason behind the behaviors, to see the root cause and deal with that.

Dr. Anderson noted the equitable access and opportunity slide. He clarified that SPS doesn't have full ownership of this program, and that staff is working with the City to partner. Due to this, SPS cannot report accurately, as it's not reliably reported from the City. Dr. Anderson noted that for students of lower income, approximately 28% of the classes are taught by a distinguished teacher; versus 32% for the students who are not Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) students. Directors asked about the Department of Education definition of highly effective/distinguished teacher. Dr. Anderson noted that it is our own internal definition. Directors noted that statistics on matching highly rated teachers with low rated students shows considerable growth, and that the way to close the opportunity gap would be to pair the two together. They noted that the ratings issues between one principal to another could be affecting these numbers. Directors asked about barriers in pairing of distinguished teachers to disadvantaged students. Mr. Tolley noted that the limitation is that teachers apply to the school building itself, so they self-assign to which schools they apply. The principal is responsible for matching the teacher within the school to which classrooms. Directors asked more about the specific matching that drives the principals to look at the students when matching the teachers. Mr. Tolley noted that is not an evaluation point for Principals but is a best practice. Mr. Tolley noted that in the new Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), for level one designated schools, there is an incentive in the contract to pay a higher stipend for teachers in those schools. Dr. Anderson noted that we are not able to negotiate a stipend for the distinguished only, that it's any teacher that goes to those schools. Brent

Jones noted the CBA is a place where we need to place emphasis, and there is also a standard that we want to set, to ensure great teachers are with students that need it the most, and that SPS needs to keep having this conversation with the labor partners. Directors noted that the equity team is a place to have that conversation. Mr. Jones noted that they are pushing hard to get that group up and going. Directors noted that the vast majority of our struggling students are at our level 3-5 schools.

Dr. Anderson noted the section in the dashboard on effective teachers and leaders and their retention rates. He noted the data sets, evaluation ratings, and the retention rates in the various teacher and leader categories. He then noted the Positive School Environments scores, surveys, and school climate, in which there has been a slight increase in the satisfaction score. He noted, however, a decline in the overall climate in schools as a whole. Dr. Anderson noted some new tools to help schools set goals around culture and look at the data protocols and analysis. He noted the data is pretty abstract, but it gives SPS an opportunity to dig a little deeper. Directors asked for a report on the responses from the surveys that are the most negative. Dr. Anderson noted slide 20 in the Data Appendix, which is more granular in nature. He noted that families didn't feel the district was responsive to their needs, and a few other data points. He noted working with Jacque Coe to address this. Directors thanked Dr. Anderson and his team. Directors asked about the refinement of the methodology to gather information, and that the caution would be to not change the questions so much, so that we are sticking to a survey to get better results year over year. Dr. Anderson noted a school/staff survey was missing from the appendix, and that he will send it out. Directors asked that the updated slide deck be sent out and posted for archival purposes.

Director Blanford left the meeting at 5:37pm.

## **Operations Data Dashboard**

Charles Wright provided an overview of the 2014/15 Operations Data Dashboard results, as required from Board Policy 1010. The dashboard is intended to be a number of carefully selected matrices. He noted that slide 4 shows a new metric that will be presented to the Board, and that staff will be available to answer questions on each metric as needed. Mr. Wright noted that the outcomes are only as good as the process of the data collected and that SPS need better systems to collect the data.

### Goal 1: High Performing Staff

Brent Jones noted Performance Measures 1-5 for Goal 1, and provided an overview of this item. He noted that leadership continuity is important for our students to have success. Mr. Jones noted turnover is higher at the schools with higher instances of minorities, and is an indicator of what we need to focus on next year. He noted a new hire to work on recruitment, retention and rehire. Directors noted being pleased on the upward trajectory on 3 of the 4 performance measures. They further discussed that looking year to year, that teacher evaluations are being done on time now, which links to their pay and performance opportunities. Directors noted the up and down nature of the teacher retention metric and we need to explore what is behind that. Directors and Staff noted the retention numbers for all school leaders, being tied to the rest of the district turnover. Mr. Jones noted #2 and #5 are trending upward, and looking over the years, they continue to be increasingly important metrics to analyze. More importantly, the quality of the interaction of the evaluations is where we need the emphasis in the next iteration of the goals. Mr. Tolley noted #3, which is a new metric that speaks to quality feedback from teachers on their school leaders. Directors noted the factor of unrest around standardized testing, and that putting resources toward educating teachers on formative assessments, which is outside of these metrics, but important to look at to address these systemic issues. Mr. Tolley noted that although this has increased, it's not exactly where we want to be with professional development. Until we are able to provide consistent materials for our teachers, we will not be at where we would like. Mr. Jones noted that loss of instructional days due to teacher absences is very important, and it has a large impact on student learning. It is important to note it is getting better. He also pointed out no-shows of substitutes creating challenges. Mr. Jones noted that SPS wants to ensure that the central offices don't have high turnover, and noted that in the non-profit sector, the annual rate is 16% and we are higher than that. This raises concern in the department. Mr. Jones noted the central office evaluation on-time rate is back on pace from previous years.

Betty Patu arrived at 5:49pm.

Directors noted the rate of pay in central office perhaps being an issue. Mr. Jones noted we are doing a study now to ensure a competitive rate of pay. Mr. Wright noted that our culture is working people really hard and long, and they get burned out, and get a high paying or equal pay job, with better quality of life somewhere else. Directors asked about the 7% loss in instructional days, and what the number means. Mr. Jones noted that there have been different methodologies in looking at this year by year. Sometimes just sick days, sometimes coupled with other days out of the office. He doesn't have the delta numbers available right now.

### Goal 2: Community Support

Mr. Tolley gave an overview Performance Measures 10-12 for Goal 2, and discussed the parent surveys involved. He noted that we have gone down in the area of positive responses for if parents felt SPS was preparing their child well for the future. He noted that although SPS arise doing a better job at preparing the students, we need to do a better job at communicating that to the parents. Mr. Tolley noted the connection to the work of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and collaboration with teachers on student results and progress monitoring. He noted that SPS has been more intentional on providing resources to our students, yet we need to do a better job communicating that to parents.

Bernardo Ruiz noted the family engagement survey and the increase of 3.2% and that the team believes it's partly due to lack of professional development on the dual capacity framework, and perhaps the schools are not ready for the family engagement. Mr. Ruiz noted the Family Engagement Institute that visited Harvard, and what they learned on engagement. Directors asked if the approaches learned were being used at all of the schools in the district, or are targeted to certain schools. They noted that if engagement is focused on the FRL families, which is 30% of families, and the other 70% are not seeing the strategies from the District, we are contributing to benign neglect. Mr. Wright noted that Clover Codd would be working on this with the support groups on how to reach families and where we are focusing to close gaps. Directors asked if this data is disaggregated for seeing who is giving the negative responses versus the positive responses, as this may show where communication has been successful and where it is not. Directors asked for when the results would be calculated. Dr. Anderson noted it would be complete in May 2016. Mr. Ruiz noted an increase in 4% to schools meeting their objectives as outlined in the Family Engagement Action Team plan due to the special education piece for allocating a Full Time Ombudsman role specific to Special Education. He noted that SPS is doing better at engaging families in this area. However, that meant they lost a full time person in their family engagement department to achieve this. Mr. Wright discussed central office responsiveness, and noted that now is the time to dig in and see what this really means. He noted an increase in numbers on page 24 and the efforts underway. Pegi McEvoy provided an overview on the percent of students who responded to surveys about feeling safe at school. She noted that 25% of students do not feel safe in their school. Ms. McEvoy noted that in laying out the map of the district, the areas with the highest crime rates were the areas where students didn't feel safe. They are working on initiatives to getting students to and from school safely. Directors asked staff to explore the safety of these neighborhoods, not just the school, and to look into partnerships with policy departments and other community partners to patrol during school start and end times. Directors asked what was defined as "safety," and Ms. McEvoy noted that it was up to the student for interpretation, but seems to be mostly social and emotional issues. Directors asked about the climate survey, and the reason for the decline from last year. It was noted that the survey was in May, and that there won't be an interim reporting cycle and we will find out again in May. Mr. Wright noted that our job this year is to seek more feedback and trends to see where we need to go. Directors noted that for performance measure #14 on website access, issues may have arisen due to the website conversion for ADA compliance.

### Goal 3: Fiscal Integrity

Ken Gotsch provided an overview of Performance Measures 16-23, and noted that 16 and 18 go together. He reviewed the data points in the presentation, which are below target, but in a positive

upward trend. In both cases, we have spending going up in some areas and down in others. Directors noted a memo discussing central office spending changes. Mr. Gotsch noted the memo was to point out percentage toward budget. He further noted the spending on instructional support, and that over half went to teacher stipends. Directors noted the drop off in the completion of the audit findings and asked for clarification. Mr. Gotsch noted numbers 19 and 20 will be combined into one measure in the future. There were four audit items, 2.5 out of 4 measures were resolved, and they were state audit items. The others remained open due to half completion on capital spending; making sure we are properly recording. Another item not completed was transportation, in which the audit was to improve fleet usage, and there was a discrepancy in what was completed. The last item is overtime, and he noted the union contracts stated that it even if sick time was taken during the week, and the employee worked the weekend, they could still get overtime pay. Mr. Gotsch discussed the General Fund item. Directors asked about the jump. Mr. Gotsch noted it was due to Human Resources administrative leave being charged to this area, and also instructional stipends. He noted that is where they charged it, and under state activity code #21. Directors noted that this doesn't really reflect actual administrative funds. They further noted that this is often where we are criticized by the public and it would be nice to have a true number shown. Mr. Gotsch noted that we cannot define the categories, it's the state that defines the categories and what dollars are charged there. Mr. Gotsch noted the strategic sourcing item and the positive trends and the numbers associated on the goal. Directors asked for definition of strategic sourcing. Mr. Gotsch noted it is aggregating the procurement of supplies and equipment for the schools. He noted that on Standard & Poor's non-tax versus tax goal, that the district maintained at a high rating, and that SPS is on target. As for the OPSI financial indicator index item, Mr. Gotsch noted this is a state defined measure, and well above the state's financial warning level and above target for our district. Mr. Gotsch noted the scores and associated triggers for concern which define what our standards and goals will be.

#### Goal 4: Efficient Processes

Brent Jones provided an overview of Performance Measures 24-34. He noted the increase from last year on item 24, but noted numbers are not where they were before. SPS is on an upward trend and are trying to do early hiring for 2016/17 to make sure we are tracking for that. Directors asked for a definition of the letter "p" on the goal. Mr. Jones clarified it stood for people. Pegi McEvoy provided an overview of measure 24 and noted this is with security and doing walkthroughs. The focus has been on crime prevention, and a check sheet, as it was filtered into the BTA process for cameras and security. Dr. Flip Herndon noted that items 24.1 and 26.2 are work orders that can be flooding, or other emergencies. On the lower priority items, SPS doesn't have the funding to respond to all of those, so they feed into the maintenance back log. He further noted that capital levies are used to address as much as possible. Dr. Herndon noted the percentage of on time and on schedule work orders took a dip this year. He has a breakdown on this year for on-time versus on-budget. Dr. Herndon noted that most work orders were done on-time, and only some are slightly above budget. He noted an example being a project of \$79K and we are going to be \$200.00 over budget. Directors asked for the overall dollars for which this shows. Dr. Herndon noted that some are anticipated costs, and haven't been finalized yet, as they have an estimated completion at this time. Dr. Herndon noted the challenges in increasing accuracy for measure 28. Directors asked how this could be controlled. Dr. Herndon noted that part of this is making sure all the enrollment paperwork is implemented before the first day of school. He noted that we can't control when parents come to the district late, but the goal is to be as accurate as possible in making sure paperwork is completed in a timely manner. Ms. McEvoy noted data between 2011 and 2012 and how outreach has helped to improve the numbers. Directors noted the positive trajectory of the data.

Ms. McEvoy spoke to measures 30.1 and 30.2 and how participation rates have dropped, which may be related to overcapacity and not enough seats at lunch, as well as menu changes. Directors asked for clarification on some measures. Ms. McEvoy noted she could provide them that information but did not have it with her now. Directors asked if this was for "grab-and-go" meals. Ms. McEvoy spoke to pilot programs which aimed at providing a variety of options. Directors asked about overall poverty levels dropping in the district, and the impacts on the Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) numbers. Ms. McEvoy noted that is why the data includes a breakdown between free, reduced, and paid meals. Ms.

McEvoy also noted auto-qualification of students who had qualified siblings. She noted that overall the 34% measure is how many students who eat lunch, and the percentages below are of that overall picture. Ms. McEvoy noted that she would get further clarity on these numbers.

Ms. McEvoy noted the target for safe driving and miles between accidents, and noted how the district performed much better in this area. Carmen Rahm spoke to performance on the measure regarding technology help desk resolution rates, and the increase in performance from the prior year. Directors asked why the goal was set lower when compared to the performance. Mr. Rahm noted a need to change this metric to put more tools in the hands of the users so they can solve issues on their own, using a service catalog. He also noted that a higher number could be related to the extra planning for possible Smarter Balanced Assessment issues. Dr. Herndon spoke to the space utilization tolerance levels, and noted the different measures associated, enrollment divided by capacity, and how construction takes some capacity offline. He further noted that portables are included, and could increase the schools' levels of capacity. Regarding the district wireless proliferation measure, Mr. Rahm noted that this should be removed, since we don't expect to drop below the 100% achieved in 2014-15. He noted that SPS has moved past other districts in our implementation.

Charles Wright referred back to the District Scorecard slide for the 2014-15 results highlights slide, with coming back to the new Board with a revised Operations Data Dashboard, to identify the appropriate metrics. He noted that SPS has hit some metrics, but missed more. He asked if this is the right metric to track, and is the additional effort the right thing to move the needle. He suggested creating an exit memo to the new Board on where we are with these two reports to get them up to speed. Directors spoke about the value play on whether it is worth it to be doing the work to get where the district wants to be and Directors should send their input to the Board Office. Directors asked staff to show the history of how many measures were hit last year and the year before, to see if SPS is hitting more targets or hitting less. They noted that a historical perspective is important for the new Board to identify priorities. Directors discussed looking at the value of achieving a higher metric, and does it actually drive operational efficiency. They suggested finding a link to see if it is doing something to drive up overall satisfaction of principals with the central office and to make a connection on that measure. Directors also noted that for the parents, if operational efficiency drives greater parent satisfaction, they would like to link the cause and effect. They noted that with performance evaluations, the aim is not to get everything to 100% for the sake of compliance, but the value should drive improved leadership and effectiveness in the district. Directors thanked staff for their hard work in this process, and noted that they are not thrilled with some of the results, and want to look at why the district is not doing better and moving things forward more effectively. Directors noted that possibly SPS is setting targets too aggressively, or maybe set targets beyond one year. Directors discussed possible reasoning behind the lack of improvement in various areas.

The meeting adjourned at 6:57 pm.