



Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee

Monday, April 4, 2016, 4:30 – 7:30 pm

Auditorium, John Stanford Center

MINUTES

1. **Call to Order:** Director Rick Burke called the meeting to order at 4:34 p.m.
 - a. Directors Burke, Geary, Harris and Blanford were present. Director Pinkham did not attend the meeting. Associate Superintendent for Teaching and Learning Michael Tolley staffed the meeting.
 - b. **Approval of Agenda:**
Director Geary called for a motion to approve the agenda and Director Blanford seconded. The agenda was approved unanimously.
 - c. **Approval of Minutes:**
Director Geary called for a motion to approve the minutes and Director Burke seconded. Director Blanford was not present during the committee meeting and did not approve the minutes for this portion of the meeting. Director Blanford approved the minutes from the Committee of the Whole meeting. The minutes were approved unanimously.

2. **Agenda Items:**

a. **BAR for 2015/16-15 – Resolution to Consider Alternative Summative Assessments and Reaffirm Student Opt-Out Rights:**

1. Director Burke explained this is a resolution to consider alternative assessment and reaffirm student opt-out rights. We are at an assessment crossroads and for the first time, under the students succeed act, there is a possibility of influencing that. Florida is working to implement the PSAT/ACT as part of their assessment. The other component is the opt-out and reaffirming position as the School Board. We want to make sure the School Board is receiving clarity, voice, flexibility to families and students. The resolution is calling for the district to take a role in the accountability system.

Director Burke asked his Colleagues for questions and comments.

Directors would like to see the resolution include audit language to identify objectives of tests and determine if the test is fulfilling objectives mandated by the state as well as what we want. We need to make sure students have the academic education necessary to take the test as well as technical needs. Parents/families should be notified of the consequences.

Directors explained that many of the arguments were made in the past and wonder what has changed (federal policy, etc.)? Ronald Boy explained the changes made were to

federal law to allow alternative use. The state is still directing the type of assessments to be used.

Director Burke mentioned the time constraints and we cannot wordsmith the entire document. The way the resolution is structured is for the 2016-17 school year to work with state authorities to create pathways for students. The Board Action Report will need a motion to move it forward for introduction/action.

Directors asked is the idea that until state law has changed is there any way in the law that allows for a waiver that is not covered by federal law? We need to know if there is a waiver mechanism that we can use now.

Director Burke explained this is not an ask to use a different assessment, but to work with the state to identify another pathway. Director Burke hopes to identify what we think is best for our students and give it to the state as an ask.

Directors suggested that the appropriate time to have this conversation is when the School Board is creating the legislative agenda (district priorities) for the year (fall). Directors would like more clarity before moving forward. There is concern about financial implications.

2. DECISION of the Committee:

- i. Director Burke withdrew the Board Action Report for additional discussion.

b. BAR for University of Washington Experimental Education Unit (EEU) Interagency Agreements:

1. Wyeth Jessee, Executive Director of Special Education, introduced Beth Carter, Early Childhood Supervisor for the Special Education Department. Wyeth explained that he is bringing forward a Board Action Report (BAR) for the Interagency Program agreements for the Experimental Education Unit (EEU). The BAR highlights the recommendations and motion for approval for three separate agreements because of the different services that will be provided (Kindergarten, Preschool and Technical Supports Services). The three agreements will still need to be reviewed by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). The estimated cost is \$1.2 million. The OSPI will send their feedback to Wyeth this week.

Directors asked if there is a cost differential between Preschool and Kindergarten? Wyeth explained the Preschool and Kindergarten services have different ratios and funding mechanism. The state helps to fund Kindergarten due to the general education services. The Levy as well as federal dollars helps fund Preschool services as we are required to provide special education services for this population.

Directors asked if the technical support and training is new. Wyeth explained this is about going out and working with elementary or K-8 schools. The special education team is working with staff to help provide services at the three school sites. The school sites have not been identified.

Directors asked about the criteria that will be used to identify schools. Wyeth explained the criteria will be around the continuum and if schools are ready to do the work as well as the needs in the three regions. The goal is to get out to all five regions.

Directors asked if there is consideration for multiple-years. Wyeth explained that it has always been year to year. Staff is working on the projections.

Directors asked if Wyeth will bring the EEU team to the table or put it on the agenda for the upcoming task force. Wyeth explained that the City has had a conversation on the EEU. Wyeth will meet with the City later this week.

2. DECISION of the Committee:

- i. The Committee moved this item forward with a recommendation for approval by the full School Board.

c. SMART Goal #1, MTSS-A:

1. Shauna Heath, Executive Director of Curriculum, Assessment & Instruction, explained the last time we talked about this was in February. Formative practice Institute will meet in May. Planning has started for next year, so the cohort can continue. The plan is to take a deeper dive. Professional development will happen this summer. Staff has started soliciting interest in schools to start a new cohort. In addition, later this evening we will be looking at Policy 2163 as the policy to imbed what is being proposed in Policy 2090.

As mentioned in the February 4th Friday Memo, we do not have a consistent measure for students across the district. Without consistency, it is hard to provide intervention supports. Schools have been provided with a list of progress monitoring tools. We are continuing to use innovation configuration – Self assessment of schools. After each meeting, schools are asking for more time to collaborate together.

Directors asked about the new cohort starting this summer and the number of schools participating. Shauna explained there will be approximately 30 schools and 1 teacher leader participating in the cohort.

Directors asked if this is part of a conversation that schools have been having on the Weighted Staffing Standards (WSS). Shauna explained that schools will have that conversation with their Building Leadership Teams (BLTs).

Directors asked if we have a menu of choices when presenting the WSS to schools. Do schools know about this as part of their options? Michael Tolley explained that WSS is for basic education. Schools may have LAP/Title dollars and that becomes part of the conversation. Free, reduced and discretionary dollars are part of the budget conversation. Each school will be looking at it differently based on financial resources and requirements that are attached to them.

d. Special Education Update:

1. Wyeth Jessee, Executive Director of Special Education, spoke about the continuous work of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Staff is continuing to work with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) on verification for the central region. The Special Education Department has to pull additional samples when the requirements of the MOU are not met. Staff is working on the issue with the Executive Directors of Schools. Everyone is working hard in the schools and central office. Wyeth expects to hear back from OSPI in the next two weeks. The verification process for the northwest and southwest regions has been completed. He should hear about verification for the northeast region sometime this week. The site verification process for the southeast region will take place at the end of the month. Wyeth feels that

he is getting the support he needs from the Executive Director of Schools. Filling the special education teacher positions is key.

Directors recommended a future session that might include change management and how Wyeth is leading the change in culture – Share and provide feedback. There is a lot of research that can be used.

Wyeth spoke about the last northwest region meeting. He met with the Special Education Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA) to discuss moving ahead and solving issues. The Special Education Department is working on developing parent partnerships.

The Special Education Department is working on providing day treatment services at SPS. Each year around three dozen heavily impacted students requiring services are sent to outside facilities (e.g., Overlake, Northwest Soil, CHILD, etc.). The special education staff is thinking about how to start bringing back students to SPS and connecting them to their home school. This is about the quality of service, connection and family. This will start with a small group of students (5th – 8th graders).

Directors would like the history on why the day treatment program was dismantled - Why we made that change. Directors are excited about hearing this.

e. Policy A01.00, Instructional Philosophy:

1. Michael Tolley mentioned the need to have two additional meetings on Policy A01.00. Staff would like to receive guidance from the Directors today on the language to bring back for the May 9th C&I Policy Committee meeting with that language incorporated to have a near to final draft. To what degree is the community engagement desired by the Directors? The plan is bring the policy to the School Board for action in June.

Michael spoke about the draft of Policy A01.00. There is a notation where we need guidance in the opening paragraph and three bulleted points.

Directors do not believe that the statement, "The Board of Directors of SPS believes that every student is capable of learning at grade level and beyond," is an accurate statement of every child's ability."

Directors do not see the word safety – It needs to be added. It is SPS responsibility to keep the students safe and educate them.

Directors suggested having a few School Board members work on amending the policy in the future. We should make this something that we think is representative of right here and now. If someone is interested in doing a re-write, recommend doing this next year.

Michael spoke about the bolded section and asked for guidance from the Directors.

Directors suggested including language that recognized the fact that we cannot do the work of educating students in SPS by ourselves. However, we can control the time they have in the classrooms.

Directors can live with the bulleted points.

Michael asked the Directors to review and provide feedback on the second bullet.

Directors suggested adding minimally aligned to standards.

Directors are concerned about the alignment to standards being over prescriptive. Can it be deleted? It is an imperative to our philosophy.

Directors feel SPS have an obligation to ensure what we are teaching is aligned to what the state says we should be teaching. We want our diplomas to be meaningful. If we take out the language, it may be great, but not close to what other districts are doing.

Michael asked the Directors to review and provide feedback on bullet #3.

Directors like responsive.

Michael asked the Directors to review and provide feedback on bullet #4.

Directors suggest state and district performance.

Directors think college and career readiness. Suggest reviewing the language from other districts to figure out how to phrase this. It means different things to different people.

Michael explained that when we use the terminology, we are preparing our students for these standards.

Directors would like to see something more aspirational.

Directors suggested going out to look at other language and bring college and career aspects to it.

f. Annual Report – Policy 2200, Equitable Access Quarterly Report:

1. Sherri Kokx, Manager of School Operations, presented the quarterly report for Policy 2200. These are all the known changes for the 2016-17 school year. There will be service changes in the special education area. There is collaboration between the Special Education, SPS/Seattle Education Association Task Force, Capital Planning & Facilities, Human Resources, Budget and Transportation Departments working together to notify building principals to work with their Building Leadership Teams (BLTs) around staffing. Many of the changes come from the continuation of the new contractual agreement.

There is one high school change. Cleveland High School is adding a classroom. Eckstein Middle School will not have Deaf/Hard of Hearing (DHH) – It will be a program at TOPS K-8 School. The Special Education Day Treatment services will be added to the Equitable Access Report for next school year.

This is information not required by this procedure, but there will be changes in the delivery of Spectrum program at Whittier Elementary and Lafayette Elementary Schools. The program will be moved to a blended model - Will not be self-contained.

Directors asked if there is a description of what this reconstituted Spectrum program looks like. Sherri explained schools will distribute the Spectrum students throughout the general education classrooms (cluster model).

Directors asked if schools have identified what services look like to families. Sherri explained that families have been informed.

Directors asked what resources are we giving teachers. This may be an equity issue. Shauna explained that MTSS, professional develop and have three curriculum specialist offering services to make the transitions.

Directors asked if we have the tools to make it work. Is there a disconnect? Shauna explained this is a Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) issue. We are still continuing to work on it. Sherri explained that it is part of the evaluation process. They should be able to differentiate. The principals will be able to find the appropriate support for teachers.

Directors asked if these are teachers that have differentiated under MTSS? Sherri explained we did not staff them differently.

Directors are concerned that we are taking a program that defined and provided services for particular students and putting them in general education classrooms. We have an obligation to provide clarity.

Directors feel there needs to be a better way to identify and have an overall picture.

g. 24 Credits Recommendations:

1. Shauna Heath explained the Class of 2021 will be required to have 24 credits to graduate high school. Right now students are required to have 21 credits. To gather expertise, the 24 Credit Task Force, High School Steering Committee and additional representatives were pulled together to focus on the High School and Beyond, High School Schedule, High School Supports, Credit Retrieval Process and Alternative Pathways/Opportunities for Credit.

The task force consists of teachers, representative from the Seattle Education Association (SEA), counselors, parents and administrators. A survey was provided to engage parents. 700 students participated in focus groups.

The final recommendation will go to the Superintendent. Shauna will bring the recommendation and cost information to the C&I Committee meeting on May 9th. Then go back to SEA for contract negotiations.

The six recommendations that will be forthcoming are:

- High School & Beyond Plan
- Time for Planning & School-Based Supports
- High School Schedule
- Extended Learning
- Digital Learning
- Supporting Policies, Contract & Data Collection

Directors suggest recommendation #5 will need a deeper dive. Shauna explained that we should have a consistent framework in the district.

Director Burke suggests the Directors arrange a 1:1 with Shauna.

h. Policy 2090, Program Evaluation & Assessment/Policy 2163, Supports & Interventions:

1. Michael Tolley explained that during the School Board Work Session there was a consideration of Policy 2090 that talked about assessment. We are trying to clarify this and move the assessment to imbed it in Policy 2163. There has been policy drafting and editing. Eric Anderson, Director of Research & Evaluation, is here to speak to Policy 2090. Shauna Heath will speak to Policy 2163 and how we incorporated the language around assessment.

Eric Anderson introduced Jessica Beaver, Senior Research Scientist. The idea is to move assessment and focus on program evaluation. This is an annual cycle. The Research & Evaluation Department will be working on developing a logic model of goals, objectives and investments to support it. There will be an annual report including student outcomes and possibly a stakeholder satisfaction survey.

Directors explained that in the previous language, the School Board was to provide feedback. Now the expectation is for the Superintendent to provide to the School Board with feedback. Is there a particular justification for this? How can the School Board be more helpful? Eric explained this can be built in – What the process looks like. There should be an opportunity for the School Board to provide feedback.

Directors asked if the School Board approves/rejects the Superintendent's evaluation. Eric explained this is something that needs to be clarified. We are not addressing ELL, Special Education, International Schools, etc. The team is planning to design a technical assistance workshop to support program managers to have clear expectations, etc. Staff is working on the right way to do the district's intensive program evaluation.

Directors need a visual tool to help understand the process. It does not feel that the policy language is clear on how each policy builds into each other. Directors need something that better communicates the scopes in this area. What is the recommended timeline? Eric deferred the question to Michael Tolley and Erinn Bennett.

Michael explained the intent to clarify the language, focus on the program evaluation, present and receive feedback and guidance, and bring the policy back to the committee meeting.

Directors do not feel like we have a clear structure on how these things go together. Suggest rewriting Policy 2090 to better match the policy and the direction from the School Board/Committee is to rewrite the policy. What is the policy for choosing evaluation tools? We do not have the same level of guidance for assessments. What is it used for, how is it picked, etc. Think clarity around how Teaching & Learning feels they get the most value out of our assessment tools would be helpful.

Shauna explained Policies 2163 and 2090 are the procedures and the policies do not match. Eric explained he took 2090 which is research and took assessment out to add to Policy 2163 to make it a more comprehensive policy. One of the reasons for changing Policy 2163 is to hear what the Directors want to keep.

Directors would like clarity provided before we move into Policy 2163.

Directors explained the program evaluation piece goes to accountability. We need to be consistent. Keep in mind the framework and priorities.

i. Policy E14.04, Research Activity and Test Administration:

1. Ronald Boy, Assistant General Counsel, explained this policy was on the calendar for review for this year and it was taken off and placed in the “parking lot”. Staff commented to Ronald that we do not have anything solid to point to when they conduct research. We need to look at it and have a set policy that we can go to - This is what we do when we get a request.

Eric Anderson explained that Jessica Beaver has been working on revamping and guidelines around research for the last two months. Jessica is working on developing process diagrams to share with Cabinet. There is a plan to provide guidance – Rights and responsibilities.

Ronald Boy will start looking at this and bring a draft back to the C&I Policy Committee meeting. What is the philosophy of the district and goals?

Directors asked if we are pulling different school district policies. Can you share the other policies with the School Board to have meaningful input?

Directors suggested putting together talking points and put the information in a Friday Memo.

Directors asked if Ronald see us going forward with attention to identifiable information, swapping numbers to identify students. Ronald explained that the policy will lay out the philosophy, goals and procedures will accompany it.

Directors would like Ronald to provide specific direction on where this fits in the C&I Work Plan.

Director Burke called for a 5 minutes recess at 6:46 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 6:50 p.m.

j. Since Time Immemorial Rollout Update:

1. Gail Morris, Native American Education Program Manager, spoke about Senate Bill 2533 that passed in April 2015. Teacher trainings started on August 24, 2015. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) paid for clock hours. Training for the librarians took place on October 13, 2015 at Washington Middle School.

The Since Time Immemorial is an unfunded mandate. The district provides teachers the resources to teach. We would like to work with OSPI to create an assessment tool to

determine what teachers in each school are teaching the Since Time Immemorial curriculum. Gail welcomes principals to invite her to provide staff training in schools.

Directors asked if we can get Senator John McCoy, Tulalip, to come to the school district to give a presentation to principals about the Since Time Immemorial curriculum. Senator McCoy is the senator that pushed the House Bill through to make it mandatory for Washington schools to teach it. Directors would also like to be apprised of future trainings and suggested working with communications to celebrate progress we have made.

Directors explained the need to capture the progress that is being made.

Directors feel this is a great frame when talking about assessment. We want common language and common tools.

k. C-SIP Update:

1. Michael Stone, Director of Grants & Strategic Partnerships, mentioned that the C-SIP update can be added to the Friday Memo. There could be changes around CSIP components coming from the state level as we transition into Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). There is a work group that will meet at the end of April through the summer around accountability and school improvement. Our goal is to work with the Executive Directors to enhance the program sections, align the goals to the theory of action and build in the components/tools.

Directors thanked staff for the work to get this going. This is something that we identify the milestones to get to the goal.

Michael Stone explained that consistency in all buildings is the goal for next year. As the state rolls out the new law, they may have a tool for this from the state level. The state currently has licenses for Indistar, which is an Idaho based company.

l. K-5 ELA Adoption:

1. Kathleen Vasquez, Program Manager of Literacy & Social Studies, explained that the adoption committee has met twice to review policies that govern the work and to ensure that all participants have an understanding of their roles and responsibilities as well as generate criteria to be used in the evaluation process.

On Thursday, April 7th the Instructional Materials Committee (IMC) will meet to approve the criteria, communication plan and the timeline for the adoption. The Request for Proposal (RFP) went out last Monday due to a delay to add language. Materials will not be available for review until after April 25th. The committee will meet again on April 27th.

There were concerns expressed from the committee regarding the last math adoption and a request to reach out to the School Board. How can we make sure this does not happen? Kathleen invited the School Board to attend a meeting to observe what is happening and think about how to work together to come up with common goals – Welcome ideas and suggestions from the School Board.

The committee has followed the policy in using the same criteria for both review rounds. During the first round of criteria use, the committee is looking for sufficient

evidence. During round 2 of the criteria use, the committee is looking for a wider range in their findings, moving from a 2 point scale to a 5 point scale. This will show a wide discrepancy between the finalists.

Erica Caldwell, Manager of Library & Instructional/Technology Services, explained that the key point is that the criteria is approved before the materials are reviewed. The materials are kept in the library because there is space to review.

Kathleen asked the vendor to submit packets to place in the School Board Office. The information will also be available to review online. The materials will be placed in the old Van Asselt building where the committee will be meeting.

m. HB 1418 Legislation Partnership with Learning Center Northwest:

1. Shauna Heath explained that the Learning Center Northwest (Interagency Program) is part of the community colleges. The plan is to extend the partnership and open it up to students who have not earned the credits to graduate. Students can earn their GED and attend two years of college for free. There are partnership issues currently at Interagency Program that is being looked in to.

Michael Tolley explained that we want to ensure that we are meeting student needs and pay attention to lessons learned.

Directors asked about the downside. Shauna explained that the district will not receive funding if students drop out of school/program. Ronald Boy is reviewing the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) using Monroe School District as a model. Monroe School District would like to partner with SPS.

Shauna explained that if we can work with the colleges to see if we can get what we need and if the School Board agrees, we can move forward with this. The location will be in the central region – Seattle Vocational Institute (SVI) on South Jackson Street.

n. Committee Work Plan and Goals:

1. Director Burke spoke about the changes that were made to the C&I Work Plan. Superintendent Procedure 2190SP, Highly Capable Services & Advanced Learning Programs Update moved to May 9th. Policy 2163, Supports & Interventions, was added to the Policy 2090, Program Evaluation & Assessment conversations on April 4th and May 9th.

Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Decision/Follow Up Items
<i>1. Decision: Director Burke withdrew the Board Action Report for additional discussion.</i>
<i>2. Decision: <u>BAR for University of Washington Experimental Education Unit (EEU) Interagency Agreements</u> - The Committee moved this item forward with a recommendation for approval by the full School Board.</i>