

Board Special Meeting

2445 – 3rd Avenue South, Seattle WA 98124



Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee

Monday, June 13, 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, Pinkham and Harris were present.

b. Approval of Agenda:

Director Burke announced that there was a last minute request to change the agenda. The K-5 ELA Adoption Update was left off the agenda. Michael Tolley explained the K-5 ELA Adoption update was provided in the June 10th Friday Update to the School Board. Director Burke called for a motion to approve the agenda and Director Geary seconded. The agenda was approved unanimously.

c. Approval of Minutes:

Director Burke called for a motion to approve the minutes and Director Pinkham seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously as amended.

2. **Agenda Items:**

a. BAR for Policy 2255, Alternative Learning Experience (ALE) for Nova and Middle College:

1. Shauna Heath, Executive Director of Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction, is bringing Policy 2255 forward to request adding two schools to the ALE option (Nova and Middle College High Schools). Both schools have in the past been ALE schools. However, four years ago was removed. The schools were not fully funded at the state level as comprehensive schools. The ruling has changed. All schools are now funded at the same rate. It is an appropriate shift for Nova and Middle College High Schools. Both schools are required to prepare an annual plan to be approved to be placed on ALE status. Mark Perry, Principal at Nova High School and Cindy Nash, Principal at Middle College High School joined the conversation.

Director Burke asked the Directors for questions at this time.

Director Harris stated ALE status requires more paperwork. Paperwork is not our strongest suit. How are we going to address that? Mark Perry explained they have a

good tracking history. The school sets up their own data base and continue to do paperwork to track students monthly. The challenge with ALE is that each school is different. What is done at Nova High School may not work for every school.

Director Harris mentioned with the ALE status in the past, there has been concerns with teachers with missing credentials. Does ALE move that around where it is more flexible? Michael Tolley explained all that teachers need to meet the same qualifications. ALE is a funding model with students having individual written student plans. Teachers who are monitoring plans need to be certificated in a particular subject area.

Director Burke asked what are the lines of responsibility for the schools' oversight under the ALE framework? Michael Tolley explained that each school has an Executive Director of Schools as well as the Chief of Schools. In terms of the ALE model, school funding model, reporting mechanisms, it is reported to technology and they are entering the data.

Director Burke asked how many schools are working with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)? Is this done in conjunction with the Executive Director of Schools? Shauna explained that schools are required to complete the OSPI piece. It is the policy. Susan Watters, Fiscal Specialist at Nova High School, explained that all schools and students are enrolled in PowerSchools. Reporting is automated like other traditional schools. Nova does not work with OSPI, however, they are required to provide an annual ALE report to OSPI. This is the only item they work on with OSPI. Michael Tolley explained there is an annual approval for the ALE schools. Schools are required to respond to six questions. There is an assurance document to verify if there is alignment that all items are in place on an annual basis. It is reviewed by the school. It is not an OSPI document, it is an internal mechanism to make sure we are aligned with state law.

2. DECISION of the Committee:

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

b. BAR for Birth-Three:

1. Director Burke explained that he would like to start the discussion by grouping the contracts together and then turn it over to Wyeth Jessee to provide a quick overview and then open it up for questions.

Wyeth introduced Beth Carter, Special Education Supervisor. Wyeth presented the contracts during the Audit & Finance Committee meeting on Thursday, June 9th. These are contracts that rolls over each year with certain providers broken out in private placement contracts, done through the Individualized Education Program (IEP), proportional share for students attending private schools and not enrolled in SPS. This is a mandate from the federal government. It changes year to year around service providers.

Director Burke mentioned that there are eight BARs that are being considered.

Director Geary asked about the Birth-Three increase of 11.25% across the board. How did we come up with that? Beth explained that based on the increase in the BEA rate, it is the difference. BEA = Basic Education Allocation.

Director Geary asked if this covers our entire Birth-Three? Wyeth replied yes.

Director Burke asked that based on an average number of students, do you have a total for that? Beth explained that they still have one more month. This will be done at the end of the school year. When the information moves forward to the School Board, the sheet will be included.

Director Geary asked in terms of the private placement contracts, what is the basis for the projections of students for next year? Wyeth explained that students that continue to have this on their IEP, there is no change in place. Sometimes students come back. This is an IEP team decision. This is not a stable population. The student move so much that staff needs to track/monitor the students.

Director Geary asked are there students to create an internal program? Wyeth replied correct, starting at the middle school level and perhaps intermediate.

Director Geary asked what is the success rate of the providers? Wyeth explained currently, we are not the only district researching and planning for bringing services back to the district. Any time you have contracted services, SPS have accountability for students to that service. With proper staffing/services, we will be able to provide better services. It is an opportunity to keep students connected to their home schools. Wyeth has heard from parents that they want to keep their students connected to their home schools.

Director Harris explained this is time that we negotiate contracts and ask the Legal Department to add language to shift the responsibility on accountability. Wyeth explained there is a waitlist from other districts for those seats. We want to bring services back to SPS, so that we do not have these issues. Paying for services and not notified within a desired period of time. Other districts are looking at these options.

Director Geary appreciates tightening up internal compliance and the work. We have a duty to oversee the progress of students and monitor placement. It makes sense that we need to track them closely and make sure we have people that are assuring the compliance on IEPs. Get a good system that looks at IEP compliance. Wyeth explained that we are working with OSPI on some of this as well to make sure we can monitor services.

Director Burke asked how does this impact student services if we need more services? Do we reserve spots or ask for them as they come up? Wyeth explained that

we have to look at services and where they are provided. There are only so many providers. This comes down to funding, quality of services, how to deal with students who need therapeutic services, etc. We increase the ability to have a better oversight of services by having personal contact with services – Go out to visit sites. Bringing services back to SPS is great for oversight, better monitoring and best practices.

Director Geary asked about the language provided in the Edmonds Contract. The contract states Edmonds/Skagit contract. Wyeth will look at the language.

Director Pinkham asked if we have anything else out of district or out of the county (paying funds outside of the state)? Wyeth explained the cost is less than \$250,000. We do have some out of state contracts which involves a single student. This is a very unique need for that particular student.

Director Harris asked Wyeth to identify placement and total number of students placed out of state/county. Wyeth explained there was a total of three students – One in Utah and one in Idaho. The cost depends on each case. We do bring the students back to SPS.

1. **DECISION of the Committee:**

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

c. BAR for RFQ Private School Equitable Services:

1. Director Geary called for a motion to move this item forward to the full School Board and Director Pinkham seconded.

2. **DECISION of the Committee:**

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

d. BAR for Inter-District Agreement with Edmonds School District:

1. Director Geary called for a motion to move this item forward to the full School Board and Director Pinkham seconded.

2. **DECISION of the Committee:**

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

e. BAR for Flow-Through Seattle Children’s Hospital:

1. Director Geary called for a motion to move this item forward to the full School Board and Director Pinkham seconded.

2. **DECISION of the Committee:**

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

f. BAR for Overlake Hospital Contract:

1. Director Geary called for a motion to move this item forward to the full School Board and Director Pinkham seconded.

2. **DECISION of the Committee:**

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

g. BAR for Northwest SOIL Contract (Fairfax):

1. Director Geary called for a motion to move this item forward to the full School Board and Director Pinkham seconded.

2. **DECISION of the Committee:**

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

h. BAR for Children’s Institute (CHILD):

1. Director Geary called for a motion to move this item forward to the full School Board and Director Pinkham seconded.

2. **DECISION of the Committee:**

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

i. BAR for Yellow Wood Academy:

1. Director Geary called for a motion to move this item forward to the full School Board and Director Pinkham seconded.

2. **DECISION of the Committee:**

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

j. SMART Goal #1, MTSS-A:

1. Shauna Heath provided an update on the formative practice work. Shauna’s department finished with the board of teachers for year one. Most of them will move on to year two where they will work on developing formative common assessments. The career ladder teachers will start year two in August – Assessment training to learn formative practices and dig deeper into the standards. The team is in the process of recruiting 30 more schools. Title II dollars are currently dedicated for the work.

Director Burke asked how many people per school are participating? Shauna responded 3-4 people per school depending on the schools. It is up to the principal if they use their career ladder teacher or teacher leader. We have consultants that work with the teams to help ensure it is reliable and valid.

Director Burke asked if the building chose a particular assessment tool or strategy, can we support them strategically and ensure that we are building capacity (Amplify vs Formative Assessments)? Shauna explained that it depends on the team and what they chose to use. Eric Anderson, Director of Research & Evaluation, explained there are two vendor formative tools that we are looking at closely. Fluent and Pulse K-2 Formative Assessment. Fluent was very well received. Pulse K-2 Formative Assessment is observations, inexpensive and very well received.

Director Harris asked if this means we will have 99 separate assessments per school? Shauna explained that we are trying to get teams of teachers on the same level by delivering professional development around conversation and how they use tools to determine what students need.

Director Harris is frustrated around the fact that we are trying to close the opportunity gap, we know we have outlier schools that are doing a good job. Why not take a good job school to help the other schools?

Director Harris asked where is the replication that says this is working at Denny International and Aki Kurose Middle Schools and says this is what I want you to use? Michael Tolley explained that the district is moving in the right direction. Unfortunately, we have not invested in this work as much as we would like. MTSS-A and MTSS-B has no baseline funding that has been identified. We have to pull funding from various locations to make this work. There is a proposal to invest in this work. The School Board made the decision not to invest.

Director Harris asked if there is a time when we say this is working and this is what you will do? Michael Tolley explained that we are moving in the right direction. We are working on initiating a review of systems and schools, and bringing individuals together to review this. Wyeth explained that we are partnering with a consultant. Common practices of using different types of assessments now we are at a place where it has been site based. We are at a place where principals and central office are saying it is time to give up some things and start doing non-negotiables to make it happen.

Director Buke mentioned there is a meeting on Thursday, June 16th at 1:00 p.m. at the John Stanford Center for individuals that have more interest.

Director Burke asked about the first cohort. Do we have measures of efficacy? Shauna explained that we have some data and staff is in the process of finalizing the evaluation documents. Kathleen Vasquez, Literacy Program Manager, explained that we have the teacher evaluation responses for tools used to align assessment to standards, tools to monitor progress and the tools used to redesign instruction when it was not meeting the needs of students. Director Burke asked staff to include this information in the Friday Memo when it is gathered.

Director Harris asked if we are going to get student data or tools? Director Burke explained there is no student data. The feedback is on teacher data. Shauna explained that we can provide data on the Smarter Balanced Assessment scores. Michael Tolley explained there is a desire to move in that direction which will require additional funding.

k. Special Education Update:

1. Wyeth spoke about the MOU with OSPI. Four out of Five regions met certification. Wyeth had a conference call with OSPI on Friday, June 10th. One of the indicator needs a file review. The OSPI will conduct their central office visit on Thursday, June 16th and

Friday June 17th to go over the MOU, compliance data, reporting structures along with interviewing some staff.

Wyeth spoke about all of the Special Education positions being filled. There are still candidates coming in. Wyeth will be meeting with principals at the coffee chats to educate them.

There will be a summer academy on June 24, 25 and 26 at Ballard High School. Approximately 400 special education staff will be there as well as school leaders.

Director Harris asked about the coffee chats. Where are the Executive Director of Schools? Wyeth explained that the Executive Director of Schools attends one of the coffee chats for content. They do not need to attend each one.

i. TERP Sign Language Services PSC Modifications:

1. Wyeth explained that through the Accounting Department one particular service provider around interpretation for the American Sign Language (ASL) is TERP Sign Language Services. This organization is the primary provider of interpretation services in the Puget Sound area. There are multiple district contracts with them which includes Special Education, Human Resources and Legal Departments. The Human Resources Department hires TERP for employees who needs the services. These separate contracts combined totals over \$250,000. TERP has been very responsive around immediate needs on short notice. They come to community and School Board meetings. Wyeth is here to represent and inform the School Board Directors about TERP. Wyeth wanted to make sure the School Board Directors are aware that we are moving forward as a district.

Director Harris asked how much did the district pay them last year? Wyeth explained the district paid \$350,000 this year. The district receives a lot of modifications based on new students, etc. that exceeds \$250,000 which was not planned.

Director Burke asked if we are seeing an increase this year? Wyeth explained that he does not have the answer. This is a question for the Accounting Department. Wyeth tracks his contracts/modifications with TERP.

m. K-5 ELA Adoption Update:

1. Kathleen Vasquez spoke about the finalists for the K-5 ELA Adoption. In the June 9th Friday Update to the Schools Board, Kathleen provided information on the ELA Adoption finalists. The PowerPoint presentation was sent to principals, so they are apprised of the finalists. The committee moved forward with 3 of the 6 remaining vendors. The adoption survey data was considered and the criteria developed by committee members was applied to reach a decision about the 3 finalists moving forward. Prior to the decision, the committee met for an additional meeting on June 4th due to expressed concerns about calibration. Some members felt the committee was not calibrated in the way they were applying the criteria. Coordinators reshuffled the groups to enable varying perspectives to surface and allowed newly formed groups to evaluate

the texts again. What resulted from another round of evaluation of the texts was a clear indication, the committee was, in fact, calibrated. The top three remained the top three. What shifted was the finalist rank order results from one to two (one became two and two became one). The three vendor finalists are American Reading, Collaborative Classroom and Reach: National Geographic.

Kathleen explained that price quotes are not provided in Round 1. In Round 2, it shows that one of three finalists are well over the budget. Michael Tolley noted that 6 out of 10 vendors were within budget. The funds that were set aside was in the right ballpark. There are outliers. Shauna explained there is still the negotiation process. The price/amount will fluctuate.

Kathleen explained that the next step is to go to field testing. There is a lot of interest. There will be six field testers in each region. All three finalists will be covered in all regions. We will be able to get a sense of how materials are planned out in the buildings. Other school districts field test during adoption, but this is new to the SPS process. Kathleen strongly recommend that we do this.

Director Burke is uncomfortable with the process with purchasing - How the adoption committee is budgeted. It hampers our process. Is there a way to move forward? How do we get there? Shauna has communicated with Stephen Nielsen, Deputy Superintendent, the need for a review of the procedures. Michael Tolley will meet with the new Assistant Superintendent for Business & Finance to go over the process.

Director Harris asked if there is a way to do a FAQ sheet do that the public/community understands what is going on? We need to be able to explain the process.

Director Burke explained that we have a budget that is public and any of the providers can see. He would like to be respectful and sensitive to the messaging.

n. Policy 2200, Equitable Access (Quarterly) Report:

1. Sherri Kokx, Manager of School Operations, is presenting the July report in June due to the summer Curriculum and Instruction Policy Committee schedule. Sherri is not aware of any new program changes, however, there is a potential service change. In planning for the changes, the district is possibly considering an addition of 1-2 classrooms for therapeutic services for middle school. There are changes the School Board has already approved around the Seattle Preschool sites.

Director Geary provided suggested edits. On the HCC Pathways for high schools. It says “guaranteed”. It is her understanding it is no longer “guaranteed”. We will need to change this language. And, on Special Education under Whitman, Laurelhurst is a feeder. This seems contrary to what the task force has recommended as far as keeping middle schools in their feeder area. Wyeth will have to review this and research why they are out of region.

Director Harris asked if we have figured out where to fund Interagency at Schmitz Park. Michael Tolley replied we have not. The estimate is \$104,000 investment for Interagency at a new location.

Director Harris asked if the program will be for young parents and students. Michael Tolley explained that we will have this as a model like South Lake – For students who are parents.

Director Harris asked about the Old Van Asselt building. By putting the Special Education program there are we being sensitive to concerns? Wyeth explained these are students being away from other students. It is not just special education.

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

1. Director Burke mentioned that we have two policies that are being discussed jointly. Eric Anderson explained that we have potentially suggested new language. Michael Tolley explained that the intent was to separate the assessment conversation away from Policy 2090. The thought of the two did not go together. We are putting assessment into Policy 2163 since it was already referenced. Policy 2090 will be around the review process.

Director Geary provided suggested edits. Challenge common assessment – Using the language dual times becomes confusing. Change to “using an assessment framework” to be consistent.

Eric spoke about Policy 2090. Goal 9 of the Superintendent’s SMART Goals portfolio, program review comes with a price tag. Eric can structure an internal review process. To go beyond the initial programs review will require additional staff. The Research & Evaluation Department can support program review/internal review. However, will need to contract out for other requests.

Director Geary provided suggested edits. In the final sentence that was added, we need to add language that grabs research that was done. There may be general studies that we are considering. However, it will need to be in the checklist or it will be overlooked.

Director Pinkham asked about the Work Session on the Superintendent Evaluation Check-In/Superintendent SMART Goals taking place in June tying in with this. Michael Tolley explained that for this policy, we anticipate bringing this back in August with a BAR. The language will be informed by the School Board’s budget decisions in the next few weeks.

Director Pinkham asked about Policy 2090 being an annual report. Eric Anderson explained that Policy 2090 is a January annual report.

Director Harris asked about benchmarking. If we are going to use outside benchmarking, can we develop language that addresses the funding or philosophy being

studies that come out? If we are using this as where we want to focus the money, we want to do this prior to spring. Spring is too late. Eric explained that it goes back to implementing the program review cycle. We have programs that we look at each year and should take place in the fall at the latest. This policy will have guidance to make program level decisions.

Director Geary asked if the amount of money that goes into SMART Goal 9, with that money, do you get closer to giving us a working report by January? Eric explained his department can provide a report each year. Are we looking closely at a certain set of programs? With that money that was allocated, can we make it work? Then yes.

Director Burke recommends having some community footprint. Have a tool that we evaluate as well as race and equity.

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

1. Eric Anderson added language to be more concrete. There are two versions. Director Burke restated that he would like to make sure we are evaluating our programs for internal research before we consider having services for outside agencies. He is looking at the needs of students and infrastructure to build this capacity.

q. Policy 2030, Service Animals in Schools:

1. Kelli Schmidt, Student Civil Rights Compliance Officer, provided background on why changes are being made. Currently, the policy based on the WSSDA model found compliance concerns around policy/procedures. Kelli is working with Andrea Schiers in the Legal Department. She would like have the principals and the Safety & Security Department review the policy and give them an opportunity to provide feedback. Kelli will bring the policy back to the C&I Policy Committee after she engages/collect feedback from the appropriate groups.

Director Geary asked why the policy includes the sentence “generally, the district will modify its policies, practices, or procedures to permit the use of a service animal by an individual with a disability” if we state that we will permit persons with disabilities to be accompanied by service animals -- are we stating the same sentence twice? Kelli explained that the Americans with Disability Act requires modification of other policy and procedures to allow a service animal, such as modification of a district policy prohibiting pets; prohibitions against animals in certain building, facilities or programs; or an employment rule about offices, etc. The term “generally” is used because there are exceptions. For example, if an animal poses a threat, or the animal is out of control, or the animal is not house broken, etc. then you do not have to allow the service animal. Kelli asked the Directors to forward their comments and feedback to her.

Director Harris asked about whether Kelli intended to engage community members about the policy and procedure revision. Kelli explained she had not intended to because it relates to compliance and federal laws. Kelli does intend to engage with internal stakeholders, such as the Human Resource Department, principals, Security, and others who would be directly affected by a change. Director Harris mentioned that the School

Board had met over the prior weekend and discussed increasing community engagement and heard the more that we reach out and engage, we have to rebuild trust. Kelli explained that she will talk to Carri Campbell, Chief Engagement Officer, about the community organizations she might engage with and the recent School Board meeting to learn more. Erinn Bennett, Executive Director of Government Relations & Strategic Initiatives, will link up Kelli with Carri. There are some community organizations that are more involved than others.

Director Geary explained that it is important to engage the community, so that we have a consistent application that we can define.

Kelli will return to the Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee in a month or two after she has engaged in stakeholder engagement and received feedback.

r. Superintendent Procedure 2190SP, Highly Capable Services & Advanced Learning Programs:

1. Stephen Martin, Supervisor of Highly Capable Services & Advanced Learning, explained that he introduced an updated version of Superintendent Procedure 2190SP. The tracked version that was released on Friday caused some confusion. He will provide a clean tracked version as soon as possible. Stephen spoke about the five changes which includes high school eligibility requirement for a writing sample, K-7 eligibility requirements, appeals language, Elementary Highly Capable Social Studies option and Ingraham High School being a space available site.

Director Harris asked about the writing prompt vs. sample. Stephen explained that we are promoting students to write an essay.

Director Geary spoke about the need to go through the community and Race & Equity tool first. Stephen will talk to Carri Campbell about this to make sure we have the appropriate engagement around this.

Director Burke spoke about his concerns. We are looking at amending a procedure to follow practice that could put it out of language with the policy. It is creating polarization – It is a polarized issue. We are not serving our advanced learners where they are working to their potential and we are not closing the gap. We are taking two separate issues and putting them together. There are a lot of people who are not satisfied. He would like to articulate the Advanced Learning program in a way that engages with the community and have the opportunity that bring students along. Director Burke is worried that the conversation could be perceived as a risk to long term viability of the Advanced Learning program. We need to be deliberate about how we address and identify what benefits we are looking for and how we are demonstrating to families that we are delivering the policy work.

Director Burke spoke about the implementation concerns. If procedure drives implementation, we need to look at procedure. Comments include Advanced Learning structure has room to grow. Michael Tolley explained that staff will take the

information and work on the changes based on feedback. This will go to the Superintendent for review. Community engagement on proposed changes will be offered during July. The intent is to bring the procedure back to the Curriculum & Instruction Committee in August.

Director Burke thanked staff for taking on the work.

l. Policy D121.00, Student Activities General Standards & Regulations:

1. Mike Starosky, Chief of Schools, is here to receive input/feedback on the policy which he feels is redundant and outdated. The policy is set up for guidelines for a manual that we are not sure what the manual is for principal and advisory. This is an active/alive policy. There are other policies that address these issues as well. Mike spoke to several high school principals who feels the policy is redundant from their perspectives. The principals asked about the purpose of the policy. The high school principals do this anyway. The recommendation is that we lose most or all of the policy. It references a manual they are not sure of and it is not controversial.

Director Geary would like to know which do not make sense and where is it covered in other policies. Would it be helpful to have an umbrella policy that references other policies? There may be information from Kelli Schmidt that she does not see in the umbrella policy. We do not know what umbrella we have to guide.

Director Burke explained that the policy, as it is, is not actionable and is outdated. It is either obsolete and referenced in other policies. Looking to guide procedures and actions. If this is captured somewhere else, he does not see the need to keep it. Mike explained that he will play around with it to address some of the issues.

Director Burke mentioned the need of reducing risk and providing guidance – Need to be conscious of both.

m. Policy 2415, High School Graduation Requirements/Policy 2420, High School Grade & Credit Marking/24 Credits Discussion:

1. Michael Tolley explained the feedback received was a clear desire to have a work session on the policies to provide more deep learning - What are the implications, etc. We have to schedule this in late/early fall to inform these decisions. The next step will be to schedule a work session.

For the work session, Director Burke asked if staff can reach out to stakeholders and invite them to present their point of view. People who are against and in favor of the policies, and receive more feedback from people who are affected by it.

Michael Tolley spoke about the need for a feasibility study for the 3x5 which is not covered by policies.

Erinn Bennett will ask Theresa Hale, School Board Office Manager, to find time for a work session.

Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Decision/Follow Up Items
<p>1. Decision: <u>BAR for 2255, Alternative Learning Experience (ALE) for Nova and Middle College</u> - The Committee moved this item forward with a recommendation for approval by the full School Board.</p> <p>2. Decision: <u>BAR for Birth-Three</u> - The Committee moved this item forward with a recommendation for approval by the full School Board.</p> <p>3. Decision: <u>BAR for RFQ Private School Equitable Services</u> - The Committee moved this item forward with a recommendation for approval by the full School Board.</p> <p>4. Decision: <u>BAR for Inter-District Agreement with Edmonds School District</u> - The Committee moved this item forward with a recommendation for approval by the full School Board.</p> <p>5. Decision: <u>BAR for Flow-Through Seattle Children's Hospital</u> - The Committee moved this item forward with a recommendation for approval by the full School Board.</p> <p>6. Decision: <u>BAR for Overlake Hospital Contract</u> - The Committee moved this item forward with a recommendation for approval by the full School Board.</p> <p>7. Decision: <u>BAR for Northwest SOIL Contract</u> - The Committee moved this item forward with a recommendation for approval by the full School Board.</p> <p>8. Decision: <u>BAR for Children's Institute (CHILD)</u> - The Committee moved this item forward with a recommendation for approval by the full School Board.</p> <p>9. Decision: <u>BAR for Yellow Wood Academy</u> - The Committee moved this item forward with a recommendation for approval by the full School Board.</p>