



Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee
Monday, May 9, 2016, 4:30 – 6:30 pm
Board Office Conference Room, John Stanford Center

MINUTES

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 4:31pm.

1. Directors Burke, Harris and Pinkham were present. Director Geary arrived at 4:35pm.
2. Staff present were Michael Tolley, Shauna Heath, Pat Sander, Bernardo Ruiz, Brad Fulkerson, Wyeth Jessee, Theresa Hale, Casey Henry, Shawn Cook, Ronald Boy, Erinn Bennett, Cashel Toner, Erik Anderson, Gail Morris, and Kathleen Vasquez.
3. Approval of agenda
Director Pinkham made a motion to approve the agenda and Director Burke seconded. This agenda was approved unanimously.
4. Approval of April 4, 2016 meeting minutes
Director Burke recommended to have approval of this item deferred until Director Geary arrives.

Agenda Items:

1. **BAR for Student, Rights & Responsibilities (Sander/Fulkerson)**
 - a. Pat Sander and Brad Fulkerson provided an overview of this item. Ms. Sander noted the provided Board Action Report for the annual Student Rights and Responsibilities. She noted the overview of proposed changes and the engagement that has been taking place since January. Ms. Sander noted bringing the student voice to the table in this edited version. She noted that staff has met with Equity and Race Advisory committee as well as the Superintendent Advisory Committee, the City of Seattle Race and Social Justice Roundtable and African American Male Think Tank, Safety and Security, Principal association, various school student groups, Special Education, the legal department, the MENDER committee and the partnership committee with the City of Seattle. Director Geary arrived at 4:35pm. Ms. Sander noted the new cover design. She also noted the changes to definitions of various offenses per feedback received.

Directors asked if this was the same document that was presented at the Operations Committee meeting. Ms. Sander confirmed that it was, and it was at that committee just for informational purposes. She noted there were suggestions; however, the changes have not yet been made. Directors noted that under student rights, she suggested the language changes in the document regarding expectations and responsibilities. Directors noted the

list of student responsibilities is large, and yet the school responsibilities are much smaller. Directors noted that he felt that what was missing is primary responsible to create a high level of instruction and in a safe and positive environment, and made note of his suggested language change. Ms. Sander noted that this section is new waters and the school responsibilities hadn't been included in the past. She noted an example of student behaviors and the bigger picture. Directors asked about the individual violations and if they are tracked by code. Ms. Sander said yes they are tracked and broken down. She noted the behavior resolution from last fall and noted that offenses have been significantly reduced, and noted the particular offenses for suspension at the elementary level.

Directors asked for a report format to help with the understanding of the offenses that are being reporting. Directors asked about the D series offenses vs. E series, and noted that the D series ones were not listed in this particular document. Directors noted that the beginning of the E series, the suspension is listed as the default, but in the D series section, there isn't a default listed. Ms. Sander noted that the matrices for those allow some school flexibility and are not mandated that they must be done in order. She provided an example of an offense that occurred today in which the school felt the offense didn't match the list. Ms. Sander noted the chart was to allow for some consistency, but are not mandated. Directors noted that it would be helpful to know where to find the information. Ronald Boy noted that the review and editing this year was focused on the front portion and the introduction, and the back section regarding the disciplinary codes was largely untouched. He recognized that there may be some inconsistency as the feeling or voice might not match due to the changes made in only some sections. Mr. Boy noted the matrix is a guide, and schools are encouraged to do what is appropriate for their own students.

Directors asked how restorative justice and disproportionality and other lenses play in to this, as there is still so much discretion out there. She noted that students counter institutional racism, and asked how it's addressed in to this document. Mr. Boy noted working on trainings at the schools. Ms. Sander noted the restorative justice trainings at 25 schools by the end of the year, and that will be continuing next year. Mr. Boy noted the work on getting the administrators the tools that they need to have less matrix reliance, yet making sure they are educated on applying discipline appropriately at their schools. Mr. Boy noted the future work that is still needed. Directors noted there is a lot of work to get done and noted asked for the timeline and scheduled for action on June 16. She noted translations and printing and other processes that need to be done. Directors and staff discussed timelines with bringing back to the committee and moving forward to the full Board, and discussed the various options. Michael Tolley noted that this will be a work in progress for years to come, and asked what the Directors' expectations are. Directors asked for Gail Morris's perspective on the Native community. Directors noted throughout the document references "unintentional" actions and intervention approaches, and noted to look at them more carefully. She provided examples within the document where she sees areas of opportunity. Directors noted inconsistent application of discipline policies, and provided areas in the document in which she is concerned with. She noted to add language on addressing bias with discipline and to have set standards for principals when administering discipline. Directors noted the issue on student dress codes not being addressed with recent issues at schools. Directors noted wanting the report on student violations to help focus the level of attention to where to mitigate most risk. He noted the lack of consistency with this document and the moratorium on out of school suspensions. Directors didn't see a lot of progressive discipline and provided examples within the document where it was lacking. Mr. Boy noted the mediation process and noted that the consequences can be shortened if certain steps are followed by the student. Ms. Sander noted the document lived this way for many years, and as changes in staffing have come in, the department has been looking at specific parts of the document that needed the most changes. She noted that the spirit was to focus on those most needed areas.

Director Geary made a motion to move this item to the full Board for consideration at the May 18th Board Meeting, pending the amendments discussed, and request that the action be scheduled for June 15th. Director Pinkham seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Directors noted that there are big lens issues, and recognized that with the timeline on production that the Directors cannot expect perfection as this is a multiyear process. Ms. Sander asked to send her an email to ensure that the issues they brought up are prioritized. She noted that this is a legal document with legal definitions and they are trying to make the shift in increments.

4. (continued) Approval of April 4, 2016 meeting minutes

Directors noted that Director Harris needs to be added to the attendee list. Director Geary noted that she has suggested edits to the minutes, regarding Policy A01.00, as the minutes stated "Directors do not believe that the statement "The Board of Directors of SPS believes that every student is capable of learning", is a true statement." When at the committee meeting, it was stated that "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 requested page numbers to be added to the minutes.

Director Geary moved to approve the minutes as amended. Director Burke seconded. The minutes, as amended, were approved unanimously.

2. **BAR for Policy A01.00, Instructional Philosophy (Heath)**

- a. Shauna Heath provided an overview of this item and discussed the outcomes from the last C&I Committee meeting. Mr. Tolley noted the committee of the whole and provided an overview of the committee of the whole work session outcomes. Directors noted her thanks for bringing all of the other policies and documents to the last work session, which sparked good conversation. Directors asked for clarification on the introductory language, and noted that he doesn't agree with the language. Ms. Heath pointed out that he was reading the original, not the amended policy language.

Director Geary made a motion to move this item forward for consideration by the full Board. Director Pinkham seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Standing Agenda Items:

1. **SMART Goals #2, MTSS-B (Ruiz/Sander)**

- a. Bernardo Ruiz provided an overview of this item. He noted the fourth school racial equity team training, where they were looking at different practices to transform the culture of the school to have long lasting impact. He noted the next training scheduled is focused to help make decisions that positively impact students. Mr. Ruiz noted that the Neighbor2Neighbor program with the African American Think Tank ended last Tuesday and the report will be provided shortly via Friday memo or the Superintendent will determine how to communicate to the full Board. Mr. Ruiz noted the first meeting of the African American Male Scholars meeting will be held June 16 from 4-7pm, and that there are 65 members, which will be divided in to four subcommittees to look at the Superintendent SMART goals. Mr. Ruiz noted the next training will be Saturday, May 21st from 8:30-1pm on the equity teams in the John Stanford Center auditorium. Directors asked if this training is subsequent or a new training. Mr. Ruiz noted that it is subsequent and adds on from prior training. He noted that the Directors could attend without attending prior meetings and noted the equity tool is a new concept for everyone to be learning.

2. Special Education Update (Jessee)

- a. Wyeth Jessee provided an update on the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) since the last C&I Committee meeting, in which the site verification was received back from NE and Central regions and both met the criteria. This means that the district has received back \$1 million from the monies withheld. Mr. Jessee noted that in the South East, OSPI completed the site based verification in April and there were questions on discipline data and timeliness. Mr. Jessee noted some of the regions struggled with one area of the criteria in the MOU and that other regions had challenges with others. Mr. Jessee provided examples of errors in data entries that lead to misunderstanding with discipline that is being worked on and corrected through training and process. He noted in the SE, the most common issues had to do with filling jobs, and providing interpretation at some Individualized Education Plan (IEP) meetings. He provided examples of the improvements that are being made. Mr. Jessee noted the work that is still to be completed by the end of June.

Directors asked about the planning of recognition and celebration for once they are completed. Mr. Jessee noted signed cards go out to each region and that accomplishments will be celebrated. Mr. Jessee noted that in therapeutic services, it's taking a lot of time, and that it requires a job description change and posting of the job. He noted that these tandem services with outside resources for unique services are complex, which has delayed the timeline. Directors noted that at the race and equity conference there was an example of the dismantling of the therapeutic program in Minneapolis, and she noted the specific issues that they faced. She wanted to make sure SPS are creating something transparent and that it'll be a program that is equitable. Mr. Jessee noted that up to 30 students at any given time in SPS are placed in these type of services, and that the aim is to place students in high quality programs and keep them at their home site. He noted the plan is that the team follows the student, and noted they always are thinking of disproportionality. Mr. Jessee added that they are also faced with mental health issues which make this a very complex situation. Directors asked about the connection with the Central District completing the audit with the issues she's heard regarding Steven's Special Education program. She also noted emails on the program placement policy should contain the Special Education program, and wants to know the connection. Mr. Jessee noted he will be addressing the services/program placement question in the Friday Memo and that he could meet with Directors to discuss and talk in depth regarding the one particular school.

Board Policies and Procedures:

1. Policy E14.04, Research Activity and Test Administration (Heath/Anderson/Cook/Boy)

- a. Eric Anderson, Jessica Beaver and Ronald Boy. Dr. Anderson noted that a Superintendent Procedure could be of value to discuss the new testing administration. He noted that Dr. Beaver was hired to add value in this area by developing a coordinated research and evaluation agenda for closing opportunity gaps; this includes a mix of district research work and partnerships with external researchers. Dr. Anderson noted that existing efforts and partnerships are aligned to MTSS-B goal and have been developed. Dr. Beaver outlined the changes to the research review process, and walked through the document that was provided. She noted the need for clear expectations for principals and staff regarding requests for research based activity. Dr. Beaver noted improving the existing guidelines from 2012, and discussed the changes that are being made. Dr. Beaver noted the added value by ensuring the research proposals adhere to stricter standards for rigor and relevance. She noted the need to understand and track the research studies that are coming in and to make sure the district is learning from the quality research that is going on. She suggested creating a blog or quarterly research brief to update the public. Dr. Beaver noted the goal areas as listed on the handout and provided examples of the

goals, the implementation, and the communication strategies. She noted the materials are ready to go, including an FAQ for school leaders and central office staff. Dr. Anderson noted that there are references in regards to testing and assessment which are on hold, and noted that the testing activity portion of this policy could potentially be separated out and in to a new policy. Mr. Boy confirmed that they could be separated out as two policies. Dr. Anderson noted that it is unusual for a request for research to also include testing, and that perhaps these two areas do not fit together in the same policy.

Directors noted a concern with testing at the schools with International Baccalaureate (IB) testing and how it's administered. Ms. Heath noted that the decision to test is from the parents, and their choice to sign the students up, it's not a school choice. Ms. Heath noted the components of the exam, and noted that the school has to decide how the testing is administered, as there is specialized training in the IB testing process. Directors noted that this is not in scope of what we are discussing right now, and is coming up later in the meeting. Directors asked for clarification on the assessments and are they discussing new or already conducted assessments. Mr. Boy noted that this policy combines the research activity and the testing within the schools, and that perhaps they are not as closely related and can be covered under a different policy. Mr. Anderson noted that the parental consent for research activities, and that in a rare case, there is an assessment/test that is included and that if it were to occur, they would take the parental consent in to consideration. Dr. Anderson noted that the research institution has strict requirements on parental consent, fingerprint requirements and background checks if they have direct contact with students, and provided further detail of clearances for these institutions. Dr. Beaver noted that it's similar to the process with the partner organizations and that there is a rigorous process to ensure consent and she noted the parental consent forms have additional information and follow all the legal rights and responsibilities.

Mr. Tolley noted the Superintendent Procedure that goes with this Policy that has further information regarding the specifics on consent regarding research activity. Directors asked how many of these research activities can be supported with capacity. Dr. Beaver noted that she has had ten requests since January, and that it could change once the guidelines are uploaded on the website, and they could see a rise in requests. Directors asked at the school level, if they are contacted for a free offer, how do the schools know where to draw the line. Dr. Beaver provided the process of application to review and noted the differences between the offers that could be coming in. Dr. Anderson noted that this Policy isn't specifically speaking to piloting of curriculum adoption. Directors asked to have that written in to the policy as a guideline. Dr. Beaver gave more clarification on notification and a communication between schools and the department to recognize the grey areas within this process. Directors noted the last paragraph, and would like the word "must" to replace "should." Dr. Anderson noted that with these suggestions that they would need to make some changes to the policy and then perhaps bring this to the whole Board. Directors noted that they feel that there should be separate policies, and that they recognize that there is overlap. Mr. Boy noted that the cross referenced policies are written in the footer of all of the policies.

2. Policy 2090, Program Evaluation & Assessment/Policy 2163, Supports & Interventions (Heath/Anderson/Cook)

- a. Dr. Anderson noted that per the last conversation, that perhaps these two policies can also be separated. Mr. Tolley noted to be mindful of the last policy and those corrections would naturally transition to what would need to take place on this item. Dr. Anderson noted a draft of Policy 2090 regarding program evaluation that was presented at the last C&I Committee meeting. Dr. Anderson noted that with current staffing that it would be more strategic to provide support instead of adding a full time employee (FTE). He provided examples of the support that they could provide in this area. Dr. Anderson noted the communication that would be presented to the Board. Dr. Anderson noted the

strategies in Policy 2090, they are objectives to improve instructional development, research and evaluation, and then organize the findings of all of those activities and communicate that out to the Board. He noted the goal to provide a thematic presentation annually to the public to discuss findings.

Directors noted that the district lacks specificity in program evaluation, and that he heard Dr. Anderson say multiple tools, and noted it's important to tailor the level of investment to the number of students impacted. Directors asked for more granularity. Dr. Anderson noted that the district cannot do that level of granularity with the current level of staffing, but can provide more support and rigor to assist central office departments with their process. Dr. Anderson clarified with the cohorts that they would support annually, but the department itself would not do the actual evaluation and that the department is more managing the process. Directors noted a concern with the lack of matrix and timeline in the policy, as she feels it is less than transparent. She noted that she doesn't see a plan to get traction to get ahead of program evaluations as there is a lot of ground to cover. Dr. Anderson noted the limitations on the department and the amount of work to be conducted.

- b. Regarding Policy 2163, Shawn Cook noted the State mandated assessments, program eligibility, etc. listed on the first paragraph on the policy. He discussed the Learning Assistance Program (LAP) growth, and providing the data to schools. Mr. Cook discussed the MTSS updates to the assessments within that area to differentiate on which students need specific programs, and further noted the changes to the language in the policy regarding LAP funding. Directors asked why this is coming to the Board. Ms. Heath noted that it doesn't need to come to the Board right now, this is for informational purposes. Mr. Tolley noted that the assessments policy was combined with 2090 and that perhaps to separate them as different policies and that the idea was to ask for feedback from the committee. Directors discussed that it's much cleaner to have the policies separated out and divided in two policies. They would like more clarity on the assessment reporting, and provided examples of the language to include. Directors asked to see something to monitor for redundancy and have that be included with stronger language in the policy. She noted wanting to see information on the resolution to advocate for assessments that make sense for the district's population, as part of the review process. Directors noted a concern in the first sentence for program eligibility and noted opinions that she's heard that there are racially biased tools in assessing for eligibility in advanced placement. Directors noted a superintendent procedure that discusses the eligibility piece that they could reference for the language piece. Directors asked for clarification on the wording of the section regarding transitional bilingual instructional program. Directors discussed adding accessible learning issues and providing access. Staff made notes of the recommendations from the committee.

3. Policy 2415, High School Graduation Requirements/Policy 2420, High School Grade & Credit Marking/24 Credits Discussion (Tolley/Heath)

- a. Michael Tolley noted the three documents provided that pertain these items. He noted the changes that will need to be addressed in Policy 2415 regarding the 24 credit increase and that were suggested by the 24 credit task force. He discussed waiver of some of the credits in certain circumstances, and noted a site-based decision that could be made. Mr. Tolley asked if the committee is okay with the flexibility for schools to have added credits beyond the state requirements based on site-based decisions. He provided examples from requests for additional credits beyond what the state requirements. Ms. Heath noted a five period trimester system that this would be able to occur in. Directors noted that he didn't see the recommendation from the task force on these higher requirements under the discretion. Mr. Tolley noted the recommendation was to have the high schools be more aligned. Ms. Heath noted an upcoming work session and the consideration for schools to

do their own schedules if they were meeting the requirements. Ms. Heath noted the equity issues with the credit earning opportunities and balancing out the budgets, and noted that it would be difficult to manage. Directors noted that he is not understanding why a school would want to require more credits. Mr. Tolley provided an example at Nathan Hale academic program that allows for increased credit earning opportunities, which is unique to that school. He also noted the Cleveland high school program where they can earn 32 credits, and discussed the opportunity versus requirements, and noted the discussions from previous Boards.

Directors discussed uniformity versus equity issues, and fostering innovation and flexibility. Directors asked what the ramifications are on making this decision. Mr. Tolley noted that if the policy is open for revisions, that there are opportunities to take a look at many aspects to consider and discuss. He recommended discussing this further at the upcoming work session. Directors asked about Center School, Interagency and other unique programs. Mr. Tolley noted that service learning opportunities is beyond state requirements, and noted the change of the additional GPA requirement calculation for graduation. He discussed the history of the language areas that previous Board's did not want to change and noted that this can be a topic of discussion at the work session to look in to changing. Directors asked about #3 addressing athletic eligibility and asked about equity issues. Mr. Tolley noted that falls under a separate policy and noted that he has heard this had been discussed in the past.

- b. Policy 2420- Mr. Tolley noted this policy describes what a credit is and how SPS grades. He discussed the change at the bottom of the first page regarding defining a credit with instructional time. He noted that the state law has this portion removed in years past, but that the previous Board wanted to keep it in the policy, and had instead allowed for schools to request a waiver for that requirement if they desired. Mr. Tolley provided examples of the waiver at certain schools. Directors asked if this was also to be discussed at the work session. Mr. Tolley confirmed that it would be.

Special Attention Items:

1. Native American Education Update (Morris)

- a. Gail Morris noted the Student Ethnicity and Race enrollment form that will be rolled out this summer. She thanked Mr. Ruiz and Carmen Rahm for their assistance in producing this document. Ms. Morris reviewed the document and noted the better reporting that they will have in the future. She noted the Title VII grant funds to help reduce high school drop outs. Ms. Morris noted those students visiting colleges and going to a summit at Highline Community College. She discussed Native students touring the University of Washington to visit the intellect house to learn about the college application process. Ms. Morris noted the City grant for the fall that will be used for after-school programs in the 2016/17 school year. She noted the Muckleshoot grant that was received. Ms. Morris noted the Native American Education services update where students are writing and publishing their own stories and putting together an event to share with families and the community. She noted certificated staff that work with teachers and leaders to work on behalf of students and families in the classroom. Ms. Morris discussed the changes in staffing in the department, as written on her update that was provided to the Committee. She noted working with the budget analyst and with Human Resources, as these are specialized positions in the Native community.

Ms. Morris noted the textbook adoption committee work that is being done and that they feel that this can be aligned with the Since Time Immemorial curriculum. Ms. Morris noted two summer school programs that will be running this year and provided an overview. She noted a staff retreat in which they were aligning their departmental goals with the Superintendent SMART goals. Ms. Morris noted that homelessness is one of the biggest issues in this community, and discussed the work done with families. Directors asked for specifics on the social studies teachers getting training. Ms. Morris noted that 70% of the K-12 teachers

received the training. Directors asked for the list of the teachers and noted he would like to see the Principals also go through the training. Ms. Morris noted an Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) training on May 29 to look at the links on the Since Time Immemorial website, which is maintained by OSPI. She noted that SPS receives a lot of calls regarding errors.

2. **K-5 ELA Adoption Update (Vasquez)**

a. Kathleen Vasquez noted that under Policy 2015, regarding stereo typing and biases, that the adoption committee is looking at text to ensure they are free of bias in certain areas. Ms. Vasquez noted several of the vendors were found to have issues with bias. She noted that staff, parents and community are saying in the survey they are concerned with diversity in the text and want more representations of what their communities look like. Ms. Vasquez noted the screening for anti-bias, and she noted that the instructional materials committee screened out six of the ten. Ms. Vasquez noted a concern with doing a deep dive to find more evidence and themes. She provided examples with different texts and materials. She noted that many are not authentic texts, they are to teach kids how to read more specifically, not regarding the actual content. Ms. Vasquez noted other issues with the lack of richness of the graphics and pictures of some of the materials. She noted the committee is doing their best job to identify the best set of resources, and that not everything will be completely perfect.

Directors noted this topic was brought up at the ~~race and equity committee~~ [Road MAP Project Race and Equity Conference](#), and another large city ended up scrapping an entire curriculum due to these specific issues. Directors left the meeting at 7:03pm. Ms. Vasquez discussed the identification process for identifying biases in which they will pull materials. She noted that SPS is a balanced literacy district and discussed the framework that the resources that have come through. Ms. Vasquez noted feedback from parents on their desire to have text to cover general and special education and English language learners, and noted that SPS is a general education adoption district. She discussed trying to address adoption materials concerns, and discussed translation services. Directors noted an experience with some materials that he has found with the biases. Ms. Vasquez and Gail Herman discussed the work of the adoption committee. Ms. Herman discussed her experiences with the adoption committee and noted she could write an op-ed piece on what they've been seeing in the selection process. Ms. Herman noted that the work that she has seen with the group has been phenomenal. Ms. Vasquez noted an upcoming meeting at Old/Original Van Assalt on May 19th.

3. **Initiate Middle School Math Adoption (Heath/Caldwell)**

a. Ms. Heath noted the budgetary analysis that has been done up to this point and noted the lack of specificity as the books have not yet been selected for purchase. She noted the range between 1.6 and 2.4 million, and noted that it could go up from there if the more expensive text is selected. Ms. Heath noted that the publisher has not yet come back with their best and final offer, and that the quote does not include professional development. She noted another FTE that would need to be added to run the adoption. Ms. Heath noted there is only .5 person ordering all materials for the district and that can pose an issue, as with this amount of materials ordering, there would need to be additional support to do the work. Directors asked what this person is responsible for. Ms. Heath noted the work that needs to be done for the ELA orders, the Math orders, the capacity orders and the orders for the newly opening schools, which is beyond the capacity of a 0.5 person. Ms. Heath noted that it's not unique to the math materials. Directors noted that in his experiences, there are many years of costs, and asked for clarification on the budget years they are discussing. Ms. Heath noted that there will be seven years of costs associated, as the math materials are a consumable. She noted that literacy curriculum materials are not the same, as there is barely anything consumable, so wouldn't be costs over time. Ms. Heath noted that purchasing in the past has had difficulty with the request for proposal (RFP) if there is a commitment to the monies, and that if the commitment is not there, then they may not launch an adoption. Ms. Heath noted that in the past, that adoption materials would not even launch without having the RFP and

commitment of the funds, as it poses a risk. Directors noted to not take risk to the students, and to take the risk on the procurement process to get the materials timely. Directors noted to have a budget ask to the Audit & Finance department to allow for this work to continue.

Director Burke made a motion to request a \$3million allocation for the middle school math adoption to the 2016/17 budget. Director Pinkham seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Heath noted that desire to have the allocation by June/July to not have a condensed timeline for Anna Box and allow time for curriculum development.

Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 7:22 p.m.