



Seattle School Board Retreat
Saturday, June 4, 2016 10:00 am - 3:00 pm
Auditorium, John Stanford Center

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 am. Directors Burke, Geary, Harris, Patu, Peters, and Pinkham were present. Director Blanford was not able to attend today's meeting. Staff present was Superintendent Larry Nyland, Deputy Superintendent Stephen Nielsen, General Counsel Noel Treat, Associate Superintendent for Teaching & Learning Michael Tolley, Assistant Superintendent for Operations Pegi McEvoy, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources Clover Codd, Chief Partnership Officer Brent Jones, Chief Engagement Officer Carri Campbell, Chief of Schools Mike Starosky, Executive Director of Special Education Wyeth Jessee, Executive Director of Coordinated School Health Pat Sander, Executive Director of Government Relations & Strategic Initiatives Erinn Bennett, Director of School-Family Partnerships and Race & Equity Bernardo Ruiz, Director of Early Learning Cashel Toner, and Board Office Manager Theresa Hale.

Director Patu opened the meeting and welcomed Directors and staff. She noted the goals and deliverables for today and Superintendent Nyland thanked Directors and staff for being here. Director Patu reviewed the meeting norms and asked if there were any concerns. Erinn Bennett noted how the norm for truth also ties into candor and nuance, and Supt. Nyland read through the goals.

DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION: 2016-17 BOARD GOVERNANCE PRIORITIES & SUPERINTENDENT SMART GOALS

Superintendent Nyland opened the goals discussion and spoke to the work on the 15-16 goals, noting the processes used and how some goal work can take longer than expected. He noted the discussion at the May 24th work session, working to move closer to final goals.

Erinn Bennett reviewed the plan for this section of the retreat. In speaking to the timeline, she noted the past progress towards today's work. She went through the documents provided, highlighting that even if a goal isn't selected, it doesn't mean the work isn't happening. It just might take longer to accomplish the work, as it wouldn't be a primary focus. Ms. Bennett spoke to the work done at the March 12th Board Retreat, and the May 24th work session. She reviewed the goal voting that occurred on May 24th, noting that no new goals were identified, but College & Career pathways was called out for Goal #4, 24 High School Credits & Increasing K-12 Instruction 20 Minutes. She noted the additional information requested from that work session, and how the color legend on the graphic organizer has been updated based upon the May 24th discussion.

Ms. Bennett noted staff would now review the additional information they have gathered for each of the goals, based on the requests made on May 24th. Directors asked which staff were involved in the ranking process, and Ms. Bennett noted it was the Superintendent's small cabinet, and a few other staff directly involved with the specific goals.

For Goal #1, Michael Tolley noted staff's collaborative effort on this goal, reminding Directors about the March retreat discussion of the 15-16 Goals for Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)-A and – B, and the determination to put those together in 16-17 to concentrate on the whole child. The Theory of Action (TOA) is about the alignment of the work to combine those goals, and he spoke to the "If We, Then" statements. He then reviewed the cost and what would be done in support of this work, and noted the goal had a staff ranking of 2.

For Goal #2, Mr. Tolley spoke to how this goal is related to Goal #1, with a focus on adults, to create a positive impact on our African American students and students of color. He noted the cost related to this work, the biggest being 2 days of professional development (PD) for staff, including paying for teachers to attend. He then reviewed the "If We, Then" statements, how it is work to be done throughout the system, and noted the goal has a staff ranking of 1.

For Goal #3, Wyeth Jessee noted this was a shift of work from the last two years of providing systemic structures, procedures and accountability to have greater oversight of Special Education (SpEd) services, and now this goal is to work to transform how we structure, describe and implement sped services. It would have a dramatic impact on students with Individual Education Plans (IEPs), by not placing students in a program or service model, but thinking about the individual needs of every student and how staff and community wrap around students with special needs. He noted the PD that had occurred this year leads well into this work.

Goal #4, Mr. Tolley noted what this work would include and spoke to how 2016-17 is about planning and preparation for the 2017-18 implementation, which is noted in the TOA. He then noted the PD that would be required, as well as adjustments to Board policies, bell times, and high school schedules, plus the impacts on all schools for the additional 20 minutes of instructional time. He reviewed the cost associated and noted the staff ranking of 4.

For Goal #5, Stephen Nielsen noted the TOA remains the same, as this is a roll-over budget and we have limitations on our funding. He noted the costs included would be for community engagement and renewal of our membership in the Network for Excellence in Washington Schools (NEWS) program. He then noted the staff ranking of 3.

For Goal #6, Pegi McEvoy spoke about the work for this goal in relation to upcoming levies, and that the goal has a staff ranking of 8.

For Goal #7, Carri Campbell noted Goal 7 is an extension of a 15-16 goal, and reviewed the vision for the goal, its TOA, how components of this goal came from the family survey, the anticipated costs, and noted the staff ranking of 6.

For Goal #8, Clover Codd noted the intent of this goal to work towards solutions that are complex, and to do so in a collaborative way. She spoke to the training included in the suggested budget, how our grievances compare to a local district, and how this had a staff ranking of 5.

Ms. Bennett then opened it up to Director questions. Directors asked about Goal 3's staff ranking of 7. Dr. Codd noted the ranking was related to how that work would happen regardless of it being a goal. Directors spoke about possibly calling out part of this goal within the MTSS Goal #1, and noted this work is a cultural shift for how we serve our SpEd students. Mr. Tolley noted these are draft documents so they could incorporate components of Goal 3 into Goals 1 and 2. Directors and staff discussed the pieces that could be called out in Goals 1 and 2, to make sure it is clear in the MTSS structure on how important those students are. Mr. Jessee noted how MTSS is about each and every student, calling out the qualitative and quantitative data that is part of the work. Pat Sander spoke to the positive behavior intervention system (PBIS) framework and work being done in our schools in this area. Directors asked if Goal 3 could focus on a continuum of services, noting SpEd, career and technical education (CTE), and highly capable. Ms. Bennett said she would write that down as a possible add to the list. Directors then commented that there are more places where CTE could connect under Goal 4, but could dilute the work of Goal 3. Directors asked if the continuum just focused on SpEd or other services. Mr. Jessee noted they are using this language just to describe SpEd services, and has been using that in communications with schools, staff and families. Directors noted the continuum language is a part of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Directors asked if SpEd includes English Language Learners (ELL), and Mr. Jessee noted how some students qualify for both services, but they are separate things. Directors suggested keeping a SpEd continuum in place, even while addressing other types of learners. Directors asked about whether the

costs include staff, and it was noted that it is in addition to existing staff and budget items. Mr. Nielsen noted that these would likely be one-time dollars, focusing on one-time opportunities, and not specifically on staff. Directors noted the largest cost is for MTSS and asked about cost vs. results, also noting the same concern Goal 2. Pat Sander noted what the PBIS costs would include, to scale up the work into all schools. Directors asked why that work isn't filed under Goal 2 and Michael Tolley noted how the two goals are interrelated. Directors noted how Goals 1 and 2 are almost like a package that would have to go together, which would take two spots on goal list, and wished they were more discreet. Directors asked about the RULER (Recognizing, Understanding, Labeling, Expressing, Regulating) funding and Cashel Toner noted it was related to cohort 3, PD costs, including substitute release time, coaching support, and contractual services. Directors asked if the Common Formative Assessments, K-2 Assessment system, and Tier 2/Tier 3 Diagnostic would be \$600k in assessments. Mr. Tolley noted work done in this area and requests that have been made based on surveys and feedback, and how a lot of this work is interrelated, noting that they are various kinds of assessments. Mr. Jessee spoke about the differences between Goals 1 and 2, with Goal 1 for district-wide implementation of the MTSS system, and Goal 2 to address the culture in which that system lives. Ms. Sander spoke about conversations around this work and how it created greater understanding for staff. Directors wondered why PBIS and RULER aren't in Goal 2 and asked how many people would be included in the \$2M PD for Goal 2. Mr. Tolley noted it would be between 4-5,000 people. Directors asked if there is any economy of scale for that PD and Dr. Nyland noted that is a per-staff cost and only a small portion has economy of scale. Directors noted making sure to have opportunities for parents to engage in the training, to create understanding of the culture shift. Directors noted some discomfort with the costs and how to explain spending money in these areas when we can't afford middle school math materials. Mr. Nielsen noted the upcoming budget work session and how it will include work on trying to get to that understanding. At a macro level, we don't have funding for all of our needs, and getting to a way to prioritize items can be a challenging process with a lot of detail. Mr. Nielsen then noted how many things in the district are underfunded and today's conversation was to give a sense of scale to the Board and a perspective of the work needed. Directors asked how the color coding relates to the staff ranking, and also under Goal 2, what is the \$150k for school leaders, and Goal 7 what is thought exchange. Ms. Campbell noted thought exchange is an online tool to test with the community to see what is resonating to help drive internal decision making. Ms. Bennett spoke to how the staff rankings compared to the Board rankings.

Ms. Bennett then noted the 8 goals brought to the meeting and asked if there is anything to be added or if Directors are comfortable with the 8 goals. Directors asked to expand Goal 3 to include SpEd, CTE, alternative education, and ELL. Ms. Bennett suggested moving those areas to a new Goal 9, in case someone wants to vote for Goal 3 as it is. Directors noted how having an overview of district work can be very helpful. Supt. Nyland noted how some goals have been ongoing for multiple years, and others are newer goals with more work to be done. Directors asked if this also compiles other issues that have been coming up, and Supt. Nyland spoke to work previously suggested around start of school and how it wasn't funded, and there are multiple systems that could also use funding for improvement. Directors commented on a goal around building sustainable systems, and noted keeping SpEd in its own goal to maintain that focus. Directors further refined the description for Goal 9, speaking to Offerings, Evaluations, Equity, and Sustainability, to take a 30k foot aerial view of who we are and what we offer, if we do it well, and if we can do it tomorrow. Directors spoke about using "A Continuum of Offerings" and Michael Tolley noted there could be a goal for program review, what are the expectations, whether they are being met, and if not, what would it take to meet them, and if we are willing to invest in the work or discontinue. Directors spoke about framing the offerings with a lens to equity, and how to create a visual piece to show what different departments have throughout the district, to see what is happening where and identify where holes might exist. Clover Codd noted some of that would be a conversation related to Goal 4, including negotiations with our labor partners on what 24 high school credits and 20 additional instructional minutes would mean, what does it mean to our different pathways, and to use the discussion as an opportunity to look at what we offer and expand or focus, and get clear on how to move students through our system toward graduation. Ms. Bennett asked for confirmation that everyone understands the intent of Goal 9, and Dr. Codd noted her comments were on whether you can build out Goal 4 to include thoughts of Goal 9, or build out

Goal 9 to include Goal 4. Michael Tolley noted he thinks of these as separate goals, with Goal 9 outlining our portfolio of programs, and Goal 4 is to address a requirement that students must meet 24 credits for graduation and the labor contract item for increasing instruction by 20 minutes. Ms. Bennett asked Directors to reflect on their top 3 goals, and reviewed the next steps for this work at the June 29th work session.

When asked to select their top 3 goals, Director Pinkham selected 7, 2, 1, Director Burke selected 1, 3, 9, Director Geary selected 1, 2, 9, Director Peters selected 5, 9, 2, Director Patu selected 2, 5, 9, and Director Harris selected 2, 7, 9. Ms. Bennett noted Director Blanford's selections of 1, 2, and 4, and noted his comment for documents to reflect the actual problem statement on what problem we are trying to solve.

Ms. Bennett noted, based on the feedback, Goals 9, 2, and 1 as top priorities, and then Goal 5, and finally Goal 7, if we are identifying 5 goals today. Directors spoke about the budget goal and how it is a two-pronged approach, to first get full funding from the legislature, but to also dig deeper and audit of budget, to see how we spend the money, to be smarter with what we do. Directors asked for clarity on what is end goal of today, and Ms. Bennett noted to come out with 4-5 goals, and asked if they are comfortable with narrowing down the list to 4. Mr. Nielsen noted the budget evaluation project that will start this summer around school funding and how it dovetails well with Goal 9 and looking at the continuum of our offerings portfolio. He further noted the need to monetize what Goal 9 looks like by Wednesday's budget work session. Ms. Bennett asked Superintendent Nyland if he was ok with moving forward with 5, which he noted he is. Dr. Codd spoke about having a professional practice goal in prior years and Ms. Bennett noted the executive sessions held for the superintendent, where one goal would be discussed there, but we could have all 5 discussed publicly and hold the executive session for a separate conversation. Ms. Bennett noted staff would work to build and cost out Goal 9. Directors asked how to address staff input and Ms. Bennett noted staff's ranking was already provided, but Directors noted that Goal 9 was not a part of that list. Directors asked for staff to select their top three goals. Michael Tolley selected 1, 2, 4, Pat Sander selected 1, 2, 9, Supt. Nyland selected 1, 2, 5, Clover Codd selected 1, 7, 8, Noel Treat selected 1, 2, 5, Pegi McEvoy selected 1, 2, 5, Wyeth Jessee selected 1, 2, 5, Carri Campbell selected 1, 2, 7, Mike Starosky selected 1, 2, 9, Brent Jones selected 1, 2, 7, Cashel Toner selected 1, 2, 4, Bernardo Ruiz selected 1, 2, 7, Erinn Bennett selected 1, 4, 8, and Stephen Nielsen selected 1, 2, 9. Ms. Bennett noted how the results reflected Board and staff interest.

The meeting recessed at 11:45 am and reconvened at 12:03 pm.

DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Director Harris provided an introduction to this discussion and the work done with her and staff, and the desired end results for today. She noted the help that can be provided by the community, especially around the upcoming levies, and working to maintain community support. Today the work would create steps to implement the process. Carri Campbell spoke to three deliverables for today: guiding principles for authentic community engagement, a draft community engagement model, and a process to guide engagement levels.

Ms. Campbell provided an example of community engagement work, and the importance of having a deep relationship with each other to allow for tough conversations. She opened the team building exercise and gave instructions on the process.

After the exercise concluded, Ms. Campbell asked for attendees to speak to the things they learned about each other. Some responses noted how it helped people see others more deeply and having that conversation with Board members is different than usual interactions. Ms. Campbell noted the impact of deepening relationships.

Director Harris asked for input on what attendees want to accomplish today, and responses included creating replicable strategies and identifying the benefits from doing the work on the goals. Directors

discussed how the benefits could be identified, including survey responses and seeing academic improvements at our schools. Ms. McEvoy spoke about community engagement as a strategy to help make better decisions and educate the community, and to create a complete understanding of when and how to do engagement to inform decisions and build upon emerging practices like N2N (Neighbor2Neighbor). Director Harris asked Directors and staff if these deliverables met their expectations. Feedback included seeing defined channels and/or tools for engagement, clearer next steps and building upon successful models, including more community engagement information into Board Action Reports, being disciplined on how the model is used as we are creating a legacy, thinking about how to engage educators and labor partners that are closest to our students, developing a mission for effective engagement so people feel their input was used to create the model, taking an inventory of who is and who is not involved to note the voices not being heard, focusing the work to ensure that direction was effective, including steps for evaluation and lessons learned, aligning community passions and strategies with our goals, leaving today with a working community engagement definition and a methodology for engaging with those on the margins, having staff take a moment when discussing work to determine the depth of community engagement needed, and identifying the cost of the work related to implementation, and including time and effort. A community member noted they would like to see deliverable of a policy that encompasses made here. Director Harris noted this work is a first step, and we still need to engage the community.

Ms. Campbell noted the results of the community engagement survey completed by Directors and Cabinet members, and asked them to take 5 minutes to review the 10 principles of authentic community engagement, and the results of the survey. Ms. Campbell then noted that the survey section on guiding principles was called out as confusing and asked that they just look at the raw data. She then noted the Cultural Affairs Institute protocol that allows time and space to process data, and asked that discussions focus on ORID - Objective, Reflective, Interpretive, and Decisional.

As the first step, Ms. Campbell asked what was noticed about the data for either survey. Comments noted a downward trend in most measurable areas of district satisfaction, improvements in feeling children are safer, the purpose of community engagement related to decision making vs. a purpose to inform or gain support, a desire to see data disaggregated by different cultures, and a disparity in data points regarding overcoming culture barriers vs. a child being treated with respect. Also, schools rate better than the district, the district office does not have as much community support, family survey percentages went down from prior year in almost all questions, and importance of developing community engagement tools to effectively engage.

For the next section, based on survey data and family climate survey, Ms. Campbell asked what seems most critical to address. Attendees noted working on building trust with the central office, how people can be frustrated with a larger group but like individuals within that group, creating awareness around whose voice is not at table or who is being privileged by decision and who is negatively impacted by decisions, even if not intended, what is our identity as a district, through what lens do stakeholders view us, and should we accept that the central office won't be viewed as well as schools. Also noted was the bigger problem of how to engage families on how to best prioritize things, how it is good families are happy with their schools, the need to be mindful of the amount of high level community engagement because it is expensive, continuing to support schools to keep the families satisfied with that experience.

Ms. Campbell then asked attendees to speak to the implication of this data. Feedback noted if schools are central to families, then we need to work to keep that area functioning well and put the right resources where they are needed. Also noted was a need to see the data disaggregated, knowing the "why" to get to the root cause, and prioritization to identify which attributes to act on. Director Harris noted the different perspectives on the community engagement survey and how this is small sampling. She also noted a need to improve how to communicate that a process might be informational if we don't have funding, whereas other strategies happen mid-flux and we need the input to make a better decision, and we should be respectful when we ask the questions.

Ms. Campbell noted the next step would be for attendees to break into groups of 3 to begin the process for prioritizing the 10 principles of authentic community engagement. After the break-out groups, Ms. Campbell asked if there were any missing principles. Comments included not having communities of color or diversity specifically called out, how principle 7 is a strategy to close the opportunity gap, evaluating the effectiveness of engagement, and involving those stakeholders who are most impacted. Ms. Campbell then asked attendees to select their top 5 principles with the dots provided.

The meeting recessed at 1:36 pm and reconvened at 1:50 pm.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT (cont.)

Ms. Campbell reopened the meeting and introduced Communications Specialists Luke Duecy and Janae Frisch, who spoke to their roles at the district. Ms. Campbell then noted the votes on the principles, with the top 5 being #1, #3, #7, #9 and #10. Mr. Duecy spoke about public participation training staff had attended and how this process allows us to make the best, most informed decisions we can. Ms. Frisch noted how decisions have different levels of engagement, and how to uphold our promise to the public. Mr. Duecy noted the first step is to determine the decision to be made. Ms. Frisch noted per the five steps of public participation planning, we are at steps 2 and 3, and how the district had developed three steps, noted as community engagement tiers. Mr. Duecy spoke about the kinds of work that can be done at each level, and how each tier is as important as the others. He noted the need to decide where to operate that works for us and our stakeholders, and also where do stakeholders feel they fit within the tiers. Directors noted how they work as representatives and sometimes it is not appropriate to bring in certain groups, as there are things that the district has to do by law, and asked how we are transparent about things that work within the scope. Mr. Duecy noted how every decision made may not include stakeholder outreach and there is inherent risk there and we have to be willing at the end of process to close the loop on communications to explain to people why. Ms. Campbell noted maybe a pre-analysis could be conducted on how much influence the public can have, before we move through other steps. Ms. McEvoy noted that the tiers don't operate on their own but can be utilized together, and Ms. Campbell noted how large bodies of work may have critical decision points that would utilize different tiers. Directors noted we provide set of services that have some continuity and we don't always need community engagement to maintain continuity, but we do need to provide the community clear guidance on how to engage on those things. It was noted that Tiers 2 and 3 should not be included in anything other than a process change. Directors then asked how to address feedback for things that are our baseline work and for which we do not currently have more funding. Staff noted the "consult" tier could be used to get input on how we are doing and identify a return on investment for our work. Directors noted possible responses to the community to ask for their support to work towards solutions and discussed how to focus on the highest value/leverage items.

Ms. Campbell asked about our process for responding to unsolicited feedback and where would it fit on this model. Staff noted how higher tiers require more time and budget and there are difficulties in determining the level when the district has a different perception of the work from the public. It was noted that expectations need to be managed from the onset and during feedback. Pegi McEvoy spoke to the funding for the bell times work and how feedback is always appreciated but may not be targeted to the decision that needs to be made. Mr. Duecy noted another company's community engagement with a commitment to respond to every message received and how it took a long time to do the work. Ms. Campbell noted how Mr. Duecy's example ties into the guiding principles. Ms. Frisch noted the external and internal expectations worksheets. Directors asked at what level they would get involved without being perceived as micromanaging. Ms. Campbell thinks that is a longer conversation, and wants to make sure Directors are well supported when out in the community. Ms. McEvoy noted how she would like to build a model for staff to share the big issues with Directors so they can share the information with the community.

Ms. Campbell noted the next step includes the looking at the 3 tiers, the external and internal worksheets, and one pager community engagement expectation summary, with Directors and staff

breaking into groups to work through a decision to be made. She walked through the process steps and then Directors and staff discussed what decision could be used for the process, including how to address hearing from historically underrepresented populations, the differences between the terms stakeholders and underrepresented communities, and how the 360 degree tool would be great to use to vet decisions at the on-set to increase Directors' confidence in the information being brought to them. Directors noted the tool was to determine the level of engagement to use, but not the actual strategy. Michael Tolley noted if underserved groups are targeted for feedback, that will get us to the level of engagement we want to be at.

Ms. Campbell noted the next activity was to walk through the suggested tools using a known upcoming decision. Directors and staff discussed possible decisions and determined a focus on what role the district will have in providing alternative childcare options, when space needs to be taken back at schools to address growing enrollment. During the discussion, Ms. Campbell noted how the various ideas highlighted how important it is to know the decision to be made. Directors and staff broke into small groups to walk through the provided tools.

After the discussion, Ms. Campbell did a process check, asking where they landed on the tiers, if they think the model could work for SPS, and what are our next steps. The different groups reported out the levels they reached, most at consult/involve, and noted the importance to maintain promises made to the community. In whether this process could work for the district, Directors spoke to examples of where the process would have been very helpful. Directors also noted being careful in modifying a tool that has already been vetted, and modifying the tool could cause more expensive engagements. Directors asked how other districts have used these tools, and Ms. Campbell noted the example from the training was in a public works model. Staff advocated using tool as is, before trying to refine it, to see how it works, and to also run it through the race & equity tool kit. Ms. Campbell noted next steps, including having the model go through race & equity tool kit, and Directors noted some still need training on how to use the tool kit. It was agreed to use this model for now, with a foundation of the race & equity tool to vet it.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:03 pm.