September 17-18, 2009
Puget Sound ESD
Renton, Washington

MINUTES

Attending: Chair Mary Jean Ryan, Vice-Chair Warren Smith, Mr. Jeff Vincent, Dr. Bernal Baca, Mr. Eric Liu, Mr. Jack Schuster, Dr. Sheila Fox, Dr. Steve Dal Porto, Ms. Phyllis Bunker Frank, Ms. Anna Laura Kastama, Ms. Austianna Quick, Mr. Randy Dorn, Ms. Amy Bragdon, Mr. Bob Hughes, Ms. Connie Fletcher, Dr. Kris Mayer (16)

Staff Attending: Ms. Edie Harding, Ms. Loy McColm, Ms. Ashley Harris, Dr. Kathe Taylor, Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Mr. Brad Burnham, Ms. Colleen Warren (7)

Thursday, September 17, 2009

Call To Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Chair Ryan.

Dr. Monte Bridges welcomed the Board to the PSESD and shared the Red Wheelbarrow poem by William Carlos Williams, from the book "*Teaching With Fire: Poetry That Sustains the Courage to Teach."* He talked about the programs that the ESD is responsible for and some accomplishments they have made, including a partnership with Seattle University on a math Endorsement Academy. He thanked the Board for their accomplishments with CORE 24, Accountability, etc. and looks forward to future work coming from the Board.

Introductions

Chair Ryan introduced Ms. Fletcher as the new Board member replacing Steve Floyd. The members introduced themselves and welcomed her to the Board. Ms. Fletcher thanked the Board for the opportunity to serve on the Board. She said her focus has been on 21st century skills and is pleased that the Board is working on that also.

Chair Ryan thanked Dr. Baca for participating, with OSPI, in the selection of the state level finalists for the Presidential Award for Excellence in Math and Science teaching. The award is the highest honor for any K-12 math or science teacher and awards are given to National Board Certified teachers in each state. The finalists for this award are: Meredith Clayton from Juanita High School, Nicholoa Wethall from Oak Harbor High School, and Kareen Border from Key Peninsula School District.

Agenda Overview

Chair Ryan talked briefly about the agenda items for the meeting and Ms. Harding gave an overview of the "FYI" folder materials as well as the "Additional Agenda Materials" to remind members where to find documents discussed throughout the meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Motion was made to approve minutes from the following meetings:

- July 15, 2009
- July 17, 2009
- August 25, 2009

- August 31, 2009

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Motion was made to approve the Consent Agenda as follows:
- Approve the Private School list as presented.
- Move the contract for National Board Certification Teacher Mobility and Retention Study to the Business Items for further discussion on Friday.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Update on Big Picture of Education Reform (Federal and State Initiatives) Potential SBE 2010 Legislative Agenda Items
Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director
Ms. Mary Jean Ryan, Chair
Dr. Alan Burke, Deputy Superintendent, OSPI

There is a direct correlation between the Board's work and the priorities of the new federal programs and HB 2261. The federal government has a number of major efforts to stimulate education reform in states. Three efforts that were discussed at today's meeting include: 1) the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA); 2) Race to the Top (RTTT); and 3) draft revised guidelines for school improvement. Funding, timelines, requirements, priorities, and criteria were discussed for each of the efforts. The education priorities of RTTT and ARRA include: standards and assessments; data systems to support instruction and measure student success; effective teachers and principals, equitable distribution of teachers; and remedies for turning around struggling schools.

The Governor, Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the Board Chair have formed a team to prepare and submit a request on behalf of the state. The Board will be working with many stakeholders in the districts to move forward with RTTT rounds one and two of the RTTT application.

Federal Stimulus Funding Phase Two
Two-thirds of the $1 billion has been received by the state, to date. Washington will need to apply for a second round of stabilization funding and must demonstrate its progress on the four assurances. The request must be submitted by October 2009.

Race to the Top
Funding is $4.35 billion total, and the state will allocate at least 50 percent of the funds to the districts. Phase One applications are due December 2009 and Phase Two applications are due in May 2010.

School Improvement Proposed Guidelines for Funding
Funding is $45 million with up to $500,000 for each school, per year, for three years allocated to districts with Title I eligible schools. Finalized guidelines are due November/December 2009, with funding available in the summer of 2010.

Mr. Dorn and Chair Ryan are members of the Quality Education Council (QEC), with Mr. Dorn acting as Chair of the Council for the work on Basic Education Reform, mandated by HB 2261. The Bill is the reflection of Washington's commitment to education reform, to include: 1) increased instructional hours for secondary education from 1000 to 1080; 2) opportunity to complete 24 high school credits; 3) all day kindergarten; 4) SBE accountability report due December 2009; and 5) full funding target by 2018.

The purpose of the QEC is to develop strategic recommendations for implementation of a new definition of Basic Education and the financing necessary to support it. Additional tasks of the QEC include:

- Develop strategic recommendations and update every four years.
- Identify measurable goals and priorities for a ten year period for the educational system, including ongoing strategies to eliminate the achievement gap and reduce dropout rates.
- Consider the OSPI system capacity report.

The Basic Education Funding Lawsuit (McCleary v. State) plaintiffs argue that the state has not met its constitutional duty of prioritizing education through sufficient funding. In many ways, the trial is an extension of the 1977 court case, *Seattle School District v. State,* litigation centering on the argument that the state was not meeting its constitutional duty to adequately fund basic education. The non-jury trial is scheduled to last six weeks.

Meaningful High School Diploma: CORE 24 Graduation Requirements Framework Policy "Refresher"
Mr. Eric Liu, Board Lead
Dr. Kathe Taylor, Policy Director

Since 2006, the Board has been considering the components of a Meaningful High School Diploma, including revising the process of a diploma and approving a Framework of CORE 24 graduation requirements. Mr. Liu gave an overview of the guiding principles as follows:

1. Equip everyone.
2. Expect more.
3. Provide flexibility.
4. Give focus.
5. Plan ahead.
6. Start early.

CORE 24 aims to prepare students for postsecondary and career success. There are several ways to meet the CORE 24 graduation requirements, a college- and career-ready path, a college emphasis, or a career emphasis. All students are automatically enrolled in a default set of college- and career-ready CORE 24 requirements that meet the Higher Education Coordinating Board minimums and complete career preparation requirements. Students can elect to pursue a more in-depth college or career emphasis, based on their High School and Beyond Plan. Flexibility is built into the different paths of CORE 24 so that students can personalize their course taking.

A policy of automatic enrollment will require some students to formally declare a college or career emphasis that enables them to make allowable substitutions to the CORE 24 default college and career ready program of study. The timing of this declaration and the process for students to make it may be an area of consideration for the CORE 24 Implementation Task Force.

Staff requests that the Board direct the CORE 24 ITF to recommend a process connected to the High School and Beyond Plan for students to elect and formally declare a college or career emphasis if they want to elect an alternative to pursuing the default college- and career-ready requirements.

Update on CORE 24 Implementation Task Force Initial Report

Dr. Steve Dal Porto, Co-Lead
Mr. Jack Schuster, Co-Lead
Dr. Jennifer Shaw, Co-Chair, ITF
Dr. Mark Mansell, Co-Chair, ITF

The Board approved a charter in November 2008 to establish the CORE 24 Implementation Task Force (ITF). The charter asks the ITF to advise the SBE on strategies to implement the proposed requirements.

At its August 14, 2009 meeting, the ITF identified preliminary considerations that they were ready to discuss with the Board. The considerations are still in process and will not become formal recommendations until the ITF has shared them with stakeholders and discussed them further. Each consideration is related to one of the questions posed to the ITF in its charter.

Mr. Schuster brought attention to the CORE 24 Charter, which was adopted in November 2008. The list below represents questions the Board posed to the ITF in the CORE 24 Charter:

1. What is the optimal strategy for phasing in the CORE 24 requirements, beginning with the graduating class of 2013 and becoming fully implemented with the graduating class of 2016?
2. What flexibility, if any, is needed to make CORE 24 requirements work for all students, e.g., ELL learners, International Baccalaureate (IB) diploma candidates, struggling students, etc.?
3. What conventional and out-of-the-box ideas should the Board consider to implement CORE 24?
4. What scheduling approaches assure sufficient opportunities for students to earn 24 credits and meet the definition for instructional hour credit, established in rule?
5. What should the career concentration requirement look like in practice?
6. What issues need to be addressed in order for the High School and Beyond Plan to begin in middle school?

Mr. Schuster thanked the ITF group for their work so far and introduced Dr. Mansell and Dr. Shaw, who explained the initial considerations emerging from the ITF deliberations as follows:

1. Consider a definition of career concentration that integrates both academic and CTE/occupational courses with sufficient flexibility to address students' interests in a variety of ways.
2. Consider implementing a two for one policy that would enable students taking classes formally identified as course equivalents to document the academic credit on the transcript and satisfy a career concentration requirement at the same time, thereby creating space for an additional elective.
3. Eliminate the time-based definition of a credit.
4. Permit students who meet proficiency on end-of-course state assessments to earn credit, even if they fail the course.

Advantages and disadvantages of each consideration were included in a table contained in the Board packet.

Deliverables for the Task Force include producing:

1. Recommendations with analyses of advantages and disadvantages related to the issues itemized in motion #2, passed in July 2008.
2. Recommendations with analyses of advantages and disadvantages related to other relevant issues the ITF identifies.
3. Regular feedback from the field on CORE 24 perceptions, concerns, and support.

An update on the Task Force's recommendations on phase-in will be presented to the Board at the November 2009 Board meeting in Vancouver.

La Center School District's New Graduation Requirements
Dr. Mark Mansell, Superintendent, La Center School District

In May 2009, the La Center School District Board of Directors approved new high school graduation requirements that align with the current expectations of CORE 24.

The new requirements create three pathways to the same La Center High School diploma; the pathway students select will be tailored to prepare them to meet the demands of their chosen postsecondary learning opportunities. This "multiple pathways to a single diploma" concept focuses on preparing students for their next point in learning – elementary to middle school, middle school to high school, and post-secondary learning opportunities. Each pathway requires 24 credits, including two credits in arts and three in science. Only students in the academic and honors pathways must earn two credits in world languages.

The District was part of the transcript study that the State Board of Education conducted in 2008. When La Center reviewed their transcript data, they learned the following about their graduates:

- Sixty percent of graduates earned 24 or more credits.
- Fifty-four percent met the new Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) minimum four-year public college admissions standards.
- Forty-five percent met the proposed CORE 24 standards.
- Seventy-three percent of graduates met HECB and CORE 24 standards in math.
- One hundred percent of graduates met HECB and CORE 24 standards in English and Social Studies.
- Fifty-three percent of graduates met HECB and CORE 24 standards in Science.

The transcript study showed that many of the District's students were already achieving the HECB and proposed CORE 24 standards. Those students who were not currently meeting the HECB and proposed CORE 24 standards were easily within reach for math and visual/performing arts.

Public Comment

Peggy Douglas, Superintendent, Patterson School District

One of the largest challenges the Patterson School District faces is to inspire and encourage students to look outside the box that has been developed for them and to help them answer the big question – "What do you want to do with your life?" The greatest challenge the District faces is providing students with the tools they need to walk into the future where education unlocks doors for them, where they can not only survive rigorous classes, but succeed.

During the past 18 months, the impact on student performance was carefully studied as we considered the potential effects of a Flexible Calendar waiver. The District strongly believes that the modified-flexible calendar plan the District has developed will allow them to implement an instructional model that would be creative and innovative in how direct instruction is delivered to students. Ms. Douglas asked the Board to take the District's plan into consideration during the waiver discussion.

Tim Knue, Executive Director of Washington Association of Career and Technical Educators

Mr. Knue represents the field in secondary and postsecondary education. He gave an analogy of a wheelbarrow with only one wheel and graduating students with one option – it doesn't work. He's advocating that a second wheel on the wheelbarrow is the career and technical education that will help achieve the goal. What do we value in our system of education? – speaks directly to CORE 24. He was pleased to see that there is communication outreach. Mr. Knue asked the question, "What's the clear definition of career readiness?" He indicated that the Board talks about career and college readiness and postsecondary opportunities and in the next sentence the Board talks about college in a four year university direction. There's a small group of people who head in that direction. He offered his and the association's help to move forward.

Additional Future Rule Changes on: a) State Board of Education Vacancy Appointment Options, and b) State Board of Community and Technical College High School Diploma Options
Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director
Mr. Brad Burnham, Policy and Legislative Specialist

The Board Vacancy Appointment Options

The Board looked at WAC 392-109-120 (1) which describes the action taken when a vacancy occurs among the elected members from the public school directors: the current elected members call for candidates to apply and select from a pool of qualified candidates. That person is then subject to WAC 392-109-120 (2), which require the Superintendent of Public Instruction to call for an election the following year. At that election a successor is elected to hold office for the unexpired term of the member whose position was vacated.

Currently, the new appointed member to the Board, Ms. Fletcher, will be required to run for election to fill out the remainder of Mr. Floyd's position, which expires in January 2012 if she chooses. Also, if Ms. Fletcher chooses to run for a new term, she will be required to run the following year in the fall of 2011.Two options were presented to the Board as follows:

Option A: WAC 392-109-120 – Current elected members make the final decision.
Option B: WAC 392-109-120 – Whole Board makes the final decision.
A third Option was presented for discussion as follows:

Option C: WAC 392-109-120 gives OSPI, in conjunction with WSSDA, the responsibility to hold an election for the purpose of filling an elected vacancy on the Board.

Members will vote during the business meeting on Friday for one of the above options.

Community College High School Diplomas

Board rule WAC 180-08-015 states that SBE will review all Board rules not less than every three years. SBE may update or clarify any of its rules and may fix incorrect references that have developed due to changes in other rules and laws.

Currently, community and technical colleges can issue a high school diploma to students if they meet the Board's graduation requirements. Last session, the legislature created two more options under SHB 1758. The changes require a revision to the Board's rule concerning community college high school diploma programs. The new options allow for community or technical colleges to issue a high school diploma to students without meeting the SBE graduation requirements if they complete an Associate's degree and are either enrolled in Running Start or are twenty-one years or older.

A public hearing will be set for the November 2009 Board meeting in Vancouver.

Waiver Pilot Criteria for Flexible Calendar Efficiency
Mr. Brad Burnham, Policy and Legislative Specialist
Mr. Jack Schuster, Co-Board Lead
Ms. Phyllis Bunker Frank, Co-Board Lead

The pilot program established by SHB 1292 gives the Board authority to provide waivers from the 180-day requirement for the purposes of economy and efficiency. This is an additional waiver authority to the Board's current waiver process under the Basic Education Act requirements for the purposes of restructuring to enhance the educational program for each student.

For the pilot program, the Board will adopt criteria to evaluate waiver requests, which will include criteria outlined in the legislation and can include other criteria determined by the Board. In addition, the Board will analyze evidence annually, to determine whether a waiver affects student learning. Up to five districts may participate in this pilot until 2014. SBE will conduct an evaluation of the pilot.

The following recommendations were prepared by the Waiver Committee:

A. Districts will meet the criteria for a first-time waiver by:
    1. Conducting one or more public hearings on the proposal.
    2. Providing a proposed calendar.
    3. Providing a resolution signed by the district board of directors with assurances that the district will:
        a. Meet the annual average 1,000 hours of instructional offerings.
        b. Discontinue the flexible calendar as soon as possible if the Board determines that student learning is adversely affected.
        c. Collect data on attendance rates of students and teachers, as well as satisfaction surveys of parents, students, and teachers with a target of sixty percent or greater participation rate for each group.
    4. Completing the application, which contains items required by legislation and the following items established by SBE:
        a. Explain the effect a waiver will have on the district's financial position.
        b. Show how content is being accommodated from the waived days to the remaining days for elementary and secondary grade levels.
        c. Identify assessments and observations the district will use to analyze student achievement.
        d. Provide a baseline of student achievement data.
B. If more than the allowable number of districts meets the criteria to receive a waiver at any given meeting, then a lottery will determine which districts will receive waivers.
C. Acceptable indicators for determining effects on student learning can include results of Washington State assessments, attendance rates, dropout rates, and graduation rates. The

Board will determine the suitability of other assessments used by school districts on a case-by-case basis.

D. Due to the difficulty of assessing an effect on student learning after only one year, the Board will make a determination at the end of the second and third years of a waiver, unless circumstances dictate otherwise.

System Performance Accountability Work Update: Accountability Framework: Voluntary Action and Required Action Policy Process

Dr. Kris Mayer, Board Lead
Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director
Dr. Janell Newman, Assistant Superintendent, District and School Improvement and Accountability, OSPI
Dr. Pete Bylsma, Contractor, SBE

Washington laws currently prohibit the state from intervening in persistently low achieving schools. School districts may choose whether or not to participate in the state-supported assistance. The Board created a System Performance Accountability work group to review staff work on developing proposals for an accountability system. The Board also conducted many outreach sessions statewide and has incorporated the feedback received. At its January 2009 meeting, the Board passed a resolution outlining the Accountability Framework with three components as follows:

1. An Accountability Index to recognize schools that are successful and those that need additional assistance.
2. Targeted state programs to assist districts.
3. Required action, if there are no improvements.

The Board intends to have one accountability system and it will work with OSPI and the federal government to adopt a new Index either through a U.S. Department of Education waiver or revisions to No Child Left Behind (NLCB).

The Board has received feedback from Washington stakeholders, as well as from Washington D.C. policy experts. Though the Board's proposed Index has some very desirable features, many education stakeholders feel that the Board should include student data by race, ethnicity, ELL, and special education.

Recent federal initiatives, including the state stimulus funds, the competitive grant for Race to the Top, and proposed School Improvement guidelines under Title I require states to change the way they will assist persistently low achieving schools. The Board must consider the proposed guidelines for Title I School Improvement as part of its work to ensure some uniformity in the accountability system. Washington State may receive $45 million in school improvement funding from the federal government to be used over the next three years for this work.

The purpose for school improvement grants' proposed regulations is to turn around the lowest five percent of schools, nationwide. The new achievement metrics include:

1. Absolute: data indicates overall student achievement in reading and math in all students is extremely low.
2. Growth: a school exceeds the average gains of the state in reading and math in the all students category.

In the selection process, OSPI will consider greatest need, strongest commitment, and a mix of Tier I, II, and III schools. Initial identification will be based on the following:

- Tier I: Lowest achieving five percent of Title I schools in a step of NCLB improvement.
- Tier II: Equally low achieving Title I eligible secondary schools.
- Tier III: Remaining Title I schools in a step of NCLB improvement.

Districts will be allocated up to $500,000 per school for three years, if they choose to participate and implement one of the models below:

1. Turnaround: Replace the principal and at least fifty percent of the staff. Adopt a new governance structure. Implement a new or revised instructional program.
2. Restart: Close the failing school and reopen as a charter or through an education management organization.
3. Closure: Close the school and transfer to higher performing schools in the districts.
4. Transformation: Implement a comprehensive transformation strategy that develops teacher school leader effectiveness, implements comprehensive instructional reform strategies, extends learning and teacher planning time, creates community oriented schools, and provides operating flexibility and intensive support.

At the August SPA work session, the Board staff acknowledged that permission to use its Provisional Accountability Index from the federal government might take several years. While the Board will continue to improve its Provisional Accountability Index, it is important to move ahead using the current NCLB accountability system for Voluntary Assistance and Required Action for persistently low achieving schools. Staff recommends working with OSPI to use the current Annual Yearly Progress System (AYP) and also recommends adding some factors to examine improvement and other criteria to develop a process for determining which Priority Districts are identified that might move into the Required Action process.

After OSPI identifies the lowest achieving schools, it will identify approximately ten to twelve Priority Districts for further examination to determine if they might be candidates for future Required Action. All schools in a district will be analyzed. The final small number of Priority Districts would have a set time to participate in state-assisted programs or use their own program to make student achievement gains. Priority Districts that do not demonstrate growth in meeting or exceeding the state average performance gains in reading and math for all students in two years, will be notified by OSPI that they are districts on Academic Watch. OSPI will then notify the Board and it is expected that a small number of Academic Watch districts would be selected for a cohort each year.
Academic Watch districts receive a grant, as well as OSPI assistance, to develop an Academic Watch Plan and estimated budget. The local school board works with its staff and community to prepare the Academic Watch Plan. Steps to recovery for Academic Watch districts include:

1. Local school boards can appeal this designation.

2. SBE directs OSPI to conduct an independent Academic Performance Audit.
3. OSPI will manage the Performance Audit.
4. Academic Watch districts will receive a grant and assistance to develop an Academic Watch plan and budget.
5. The plans will include one of the four school improvement models (turnaround, restart, closure, transformation).
6. Local school boards can appeal this designation.
7. SBE will direct OSPI to conduct an independent Academic Performance Audit.
8. OSPI will manage the Performance Audit. Performance Audit findings may include:
    - Improved instructional program.
    - Reorganization of instructional time.
    - Requirements to select new staff or revise personnel practices.
    - Requirement to change school structures to improve learning opportunities.
    - Requirement to strengthen family and community engagement.
9. SBE approves the local district Academic Watch Plan.
10. The district implements the plan and provides annual updates on progress.
11. OSPI provides assistance and determines when a district is qualified to leave Academic Watch.

The next System Performance Accountability meeting is scheduled for October 13, 2009 at the Puget Sound Skills Center in Burien. At the November Board meeting, in Vancouver, the Board will consider adoption of the report and legislation on the SPA Accountability Framework, which is due to the legislature by December 1, 2009.

Public Comment

Wendy Rader-Konofalski and Karen Davis, Washington Education Association (WEA)
As the WEA looks at the proposals that the Board is contemplating for new accountability action, the Association asks that the Board remember the obstacles that educators and students are facing and the optimism they feel about the future. The WEA and its members continue to be committed to high expectations for all students, closing the achievement gap, increasing student learning, and addressing the needs of all students. It will be harder to do that this year and harder next year, due to a probability of even more budget cuts ahead.

The WEA asks that the Board consider an “Academic Watch” model that reflects an earlier consensus from the SPA, that it: be supportive, not punitive or “heavy-handed;” collaborative, not top-down; allow locally tailored and collaboratively determined plans of action; respect collective bargaining process; respect and work with, not disband or replace schools boards; honor the will of the people of the state about charter schools and privatization of the state’s public schools; and identify schools as failing, based on multiple measures. The WEA asks that any school or district put into Academic Watch be provided with the tools to improve: sufficient funding; support; time for teachers to collaborate and time for individual attention to students; flexibility to be creative; and a commitment to collaboration between the union and the district, subject to the current laws of our state.

The WEA asks that at least one WEA representative be appointed to each Academic Audit team. If the Audit team is going to be looking at contract language, it would be helpful to have a bargaining expert there to assure fair and balanced interpretation of the provisions. The WEA recommends that if the Audit team identifies any provisions in the Collective Bargaining Act, which it deems an “impediment to student achievement,” such provisions be subject to bargaining – not to unilateral change by the Academic Watch district.

Martin Hutton, Lyle School District

Mr. Hutton addressed the pilot program on the 180 day school pilot program. He said that economy is going to be easier to monitor than efficiencies. The financial position is going to be money not spent with the current funding. Two teachers were laid off in the Lyle School District and since the District only has 25 teachers that is a lot. The District gave out two calendars to students, parents, and the community; however, they made them aware that it may be a flexible calendar and a thirty day notice would be plenty to let them know that the flexible calendar is in place. He is concerned about the selection using the lottery and encouraged the Board not to go that direction, which would minimize the program. The District believes that the flexible schedule will benefit students and staff by less absenteeism due to doctor appointments, etc. since it takes an entire day to travel to appointments from the District.

Ric Palmer, Bickleton School District
Mr. Palmer asked, "What's best for our kids?" The Bickleton School District believes that a flexible schedule is best for the District's kids, staff, community, and the school board. He reviewed the criteria for the 180 day school pilot and said that the District has been working on this for two years when they asked for a waiver due to the cost of utilities, transportation, wages and benefits. The District hopes that the Board will consider allowing the District to have a flexible calendar because of the funding. The District has a 100 percent graduation rate with 90+ percent of the students out of 104 going on to postsecondary education so he believes that the flexible calendar will not be a performance issue for the students.

Karen Madsen, Everett Public Schools and President Elect of WSSDA
Regarding Options A, B, and C in the election process: WSSDA members believe that WSSDA elected Board members should be elected by WSSDA members. Ms. Madsen advised the Board to follow the closest approximation of that. Even if there is only one candidate running for a vacancy, there should still be an election because if there is only one person, the only way WSSDA knows about that person is through information included in the election materials. If WSSDA doesn't have that information they wouldn't be aware of the candidates that are being considered for a Board position representing WSSDA. Ms. Madsen would be reluctant to see a rule put in place that would prohibit WSSDA from having the quickest possible election to most closely fit with the expectations of the legislature. If there's a vacancy – the remaining elected Board members should act as a proxy to appoint an short term interim in order to have time to hold an election. The whole Board should not need to weigh in on the decision made, since the elected members would be acting as a proxy. She encouraged the Board to offer a set of recommendations to OSPI that will align most closely to OSPI holding the election process through WSSDA.

Work Plan and Communications Plan
Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director
Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Communications Specialist

The 2009-10 Board priorities include the following:

- Complete work on CORE 24 implementation.
- Refine the SBE Accountability Framework.
- Institute a collaborative system, with OSPI, for recognizing high performing schools.
- Work with stakeholders to further implement HB 2261 Education Reform.
- Assist in Washington State's Race to the Top application.
- Understand OSPI's plan for assessment work and prepare for the Board's role in cut scores of new tests in math and science.
- Ensure that the achievement gap and dropout issues are part of the Accountability work.
- Create a new waiver process for the 180 day waivers.
- Begin examination of quality teaching issues.

The primary communication objectives will:

1. Support the Board's work, including the Accountability Framework and CORE 24, through clear and concise communication to a diverse audience.
2. Develop and maintain a timely and relevant SBE Web site.
3. Institute a collaborative system with OSPI for recognizing high performing schools.

Future outreach will include advisory and press releases, as well as communication roundtables with stakeholders. Berk and Associates has contracted with the Board to assist with graphics.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 p.m. by Vice-Chair Smith.

Friday, September 18, 2009

Attending: Chair Mary Jean Ryan, Vice-Chair Warren Smith, Mr. Jeff Vincent, Dr. Bernal Baca, Mr. Eric Liu, Mr. Jack Schuster, Dr. Sheila Fox, Dr. Steve Dal Porto, Ms. Phyllis Bunker Frank, Ms. Anna Laura Kastama, Ms. Austianna Quick, Mr. Randy Dorn, Ms. Amy Bragdon, Mr. Bob Hughes, Ms. Connie Fletcher, Dr. Kris Mayer (16)

Staff Attending: Ms. Edie Harding, Ms. Loy McColm, Ms. Ashley Harris, Dr. Kathe Taylor, Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Mr. Brad Burnham (6)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Chair Ryan.

Update on Online Learning
Mr. Brad Burnham, Policy and Legislative Specialist
Mr. Bob Hughes, Board Lead
Mr. Martin Mueller, Assistant Superintendent, Student Support, OSPI
Dr. Judy Margrath-Huge, Director, Digital Learning, OSPI

Online learning is a rapidly emerging educational delivery strategy in Washington's public schools. As an increasing number of districts enroll an increasing number of students in online courses, practitioners, policy makers and citizens are concerned about the impact of this trend on our public education system. Specific concerns address quality, accountability, equity, funding, and state oversight.

The legislature passed SSB 5410 to begin to address these concerns and to establish an organized approach to public K-12 online learning in Washington State. The OSPI, in collaboration with the SBE, will develop and implement approval criteria and a process for approving multidistrict online providers; approval for monitoring, and if necessary, rescinding the approval of courses or programs offered by an online course provider; as well as an appeals process by December 1, 2009.

The initial approval will be for four years. Multidistrict online providers, whether already approved by the Digital Learning Commons (DLC) or accredited by the Northwest Association of Accredited Schools (NAAS), are exempt from the approval process until August 31, 2012. OSPI will make the first round of approval decisions by April 1, 2010 and thereafter, decisions must be made by November 1 of each year. An Online Learning Advisory Committee will be established by OSPI and an Office of Online Learning will be created and staffed with former DLC staff, with an annual appropriation of $700,000.

The criteria for multidistrict online provider approval includes: legislative guidelines, sources, criteria categories, approval process, and timeline. Online learning is accredited by NAAS or

another national, regional, or state accreditation program listed by OSPI after consultation with WaCOL. Alignment with state academic standards is necessary and it's required that all teachers be certificated in accordance with Washington State law. High school courses must be eligible for high school credit and awarding of credit remains the responsibility of the school district. The Board was asked to think about the criteria and tools to determine if there is anything else that needs to be addressed for the reviewers.

Teams of reviewers will be selected for their expertise and experience and training is mandatory. The applications will be received online and will be reviewed online to expedite the process.

The timeline is as follows:

July – August	Research and initial iterations of the criteria.
August – November	Online Learning Advisory Committee feedback.
August – December	Adopt rule process.
September – January	Recruit and train application reviewers.
December – January	Criteria and process on website.
January	Providers submit applications.
February	Application packets reviewed.
March	Reviewer input compiled and recommendations made.
April 1	Decisions made on first round of approved multidistrict online providers.
April – May	Applicants notified and approved providers posted on the website for 2010 school year.
April – May	Appeals process.
November 1, 2010/Ongoing	Approval decisions announced.

Members will send questions to Mr. Hughes and Mr. Burnham, if needed, and Online Learning may be added to the November meeting, in Vancouver, for further discussion or as a strategy discussion for the Board next spring.

WASL Scores and AYP Data Release

Dr. Joe Willhoft, Assistant Superintendent, Assessment and Student Information, OSPI
Mr. Bob Harmon, Assistant Superintendent, Special Programs and Federal Accountability, OSPI

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Adequate Yearly Progress is one of the cornerstones of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) signed into law in January 2002, as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. In Washington, it is primarily a measure of year-to-year student achievement on the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) in reading and math. One of the requirements of NCLB is that states develop a baseline or starting point for students to achieve proficiency as measured by WASL math and reading scores (science will be added). Each year, the state must raise the bar in gradual increments so that by 2013-2014, all students will achieve proficiency in each subject area.

The four pillars of NCLB are:

Accountability	Ensures those students who are disadvantaged achieve academic proficiency.
Flexibility	Allows school districts flexibility in how they use federal education funds to improve student achievement.
Research-based education	Emphasizes educational programs and practices that have been proven effective through scientific research.

Parent option	Increases the choices available to the parents of students attending Title I schools.

Each school and district must meet the yearly AYP goals as a whole and by disaggregated student population groups. These groups are specified by the law to be race/ethnicity, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, and students who are economically disadvantaged. If a group does not meet the proficiency goal, it makes AYP if it has a ten percent reduction in those not meeting standard and meets the other indicator. The Uniform Bar was explained, as well as the AYP Matrix.

If a school in school improvement status does not make AYP for two consecutive years, the school is identified for school improvement. The following must be implemented for Title I schools:

- Develop or revise the school improvement plan.
- Public school choice.

If a Title I school moves into Steps two through five of school improvement, the school must:

1. Develop/review the School Improvement Plan.
2. Continue public school choice.
3. Implement supplemental educational services.

The AYP work group includes internal and external stakeholders and meets annually to review the AYP Accountability Workbook and to propose amendments. The work group makes recommendations to the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

<u>2009 Assessment Results</u>
Ms. Cinda Parton, Director, Assessment Development, OSPI
Dr. Joe Willhoft, Assistant Superintendent, Assessment and Student Information, OSPI
Dr. Thomas Hirsch, Co-founder for Assessment and Evaluation Services

Dr. Willhoft and Ms. Parton presented a series of PowerPoint slides explaining the results from the spring 2009 assessment. Estimated drop-out rates were discussed for the 2007-08 school year with a rate of 21.4 percent of all students dropping out. Of that percentage of all students, 18.7 percent were Caucasian and 32.5 percent were African American. A new student identification process is being developed that will allow for actual drop-out rates to be available starting this year.

In the class of 2009, students performed in reading, writing, math, and science, with 94.5 percent meeting standard in reading; 88.5 percent meeting standard by WASL and others by alternative options; and one percent meeting standard by a waiver opportunity. The data does not show status of those graduating.

As directed by the legislature under ESSB 5414, the OSPI, in consultation with the SBE, will begin the design and development of an overall assessment system. OSPI will revise the number of open-ended questions and extended responses in the statewide achievement assessment in grades three through eight and ten, to reduce cost and time of administering the assessment while retaining validity and reliability of the assessment and retaining assessment of critical thinking skills.

In the spring of 2010, the SBE will be asked to renew and approve the standard setting. A special meeting is scheduled for August 10, 2010, when the Board will set the standards for math in Grades three through eight.

Public Comment

Martha Rice, Washington State School Directors Association (WSSDA)

Ms. Rice is pleased with the progress the SPA Workgroup has made over these many months in listening to concerns from the stakeholder groups. She congratulated the Board on its intent to engage all stakeholder groups in the process.

Ms. Rice is very concerned with the changes that have occurred in the proposed Framework since the SPA meeting in mid-August.

Based on the changes in the Framework, it appears that as a state we may be willing to compromise the progress we have made toward the development of an accountability model through collaborative discussion and consensus for $45 million in federal funds. The following questions come to Ms. Rice's mind:

1. What happens to the federal money after two years and to our efforts to improve student learning using that funding?
2. If we commit ourselves to the proposed framework, where will the funding come from for its continuation? Most school districts will be facing extremely difficult budget decisions at that time.
3. Are we putting ourselves into a box where the need is there and the resources are not?
4. What are the unintended consequences of following this path?

There are problematic elements within each of the four models detailed in both voluntary and required action that range from the capacity of the district to compromising local bargaining agreements to restrictions within state law or voter decisions.

Ben Kodama, Chairman of the Equitable Opportunity Caucus

Regarding the assessment presentation given by Dr. Willhoft, he asked if there would be representation of diverse cultures on this committee to give input and if bias and fairness would also be included in the testimony. The projections are that the minorities are becoming the majority.

Executive Session for Purposes of Evaluation of Executive Director

Chair Ryan thanked Ms. Harding for her continued work with the Board and indicated that the Evaluation Committee Chair would be in contact with her on feedback from the Executive Session.

Next Steps on 180 Day Waiver Revision Process
Mr. Brad Burnham, Policy and Legislative Specialist
Mr. Jack Schuster, Co-Board Lead
Ms. Phyllis Bunker Frank, Co-Board Lead

In July, the Board began reviewing its procedures for schools and districts to request waivers from the requirements of the Basic Education Act. The Board Waivers Committee refined the SBE procedures and guidelines and recommended:

1. Further clarifying the purpose and use of waivers: Establish a set of Board approved best practice models for the use of waivers. Consider constructing a rubric for assessing waivers.
2. Strengthening the alignment of waiver requests with the school improvement plan and the priorities of the Board: Periodically update the guidelines to reflect the work of the Board.
3. Requiring districts to provide preliminary and final reports at the end of each year: Create a report template or form. Post the reports on the SBE Web site.
4. Revisiting the recommendation of an Accountability Loop: Consider repositioning the waiver process into the up and coming Accountability System. Districts identified to be in need of assistance could request waivers to address areas of deficiency. Districts showing increased achievement could request waivers to further develop successful strategies.

The SBE will consider adopting revised procedures at its March 2010 Board meeting.

Business Items

Approval of Criteria for Efficiency/Economy Calendar Waivers

Motion was made to approve the revised recommendations of the Waivers Committee for the economy and efficiency waiver pilot program established by House Bill 1292, as presented in today's handout. The recommendations include the criteria, an application, examples of student learning indicators, a timeline to access student learning, and the procedure to be used when more than the allowable number of districts apply.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

180 Day Waiver Requests

Motion was made to approve Lyle School District's request for a four day waiver from the 180 day requirement but for the 2009-2010 school year only; subject to the qualification that if the Board grants the Lyle School District a flexible calendar waiver under SHB 1292, this waiver will become null and void.

Motion seconded

Motion carried with one no vote by Dr. Mayer

CORE 24 Implementation Task Force New Task

Motion was made to direct the CORE 24 Implementation Task Force to recommend a process connected to the High School and Beyond Plan for students to elect and formally declare a college or career emphasis if they want to elect an alternative to pursuing the default college and career-ready requirements.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Work Plan and Communications Plan

Motion was made to approve the Board's 2009-2010 Work Plan and Communications Plan

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Adoption of Legislative Request to Revise Election of Board Members

Motion was made to approve the draft language amending RCW 28A.305.021, dispensing with the requirement for an election by OSPI in the case where a Board member is unopposed, as the State Board of Education requests legislation to the Washington State Legislature.

Motion seconded

Motion failed

Approval of Recommended Changes to the State Board of Education Vacancy Process Rule

Motion was made to approve Option C as the Board's proposed recommended language to OSPI for amendments to WAC 392-109-120 regarding the filling of a vacancy for an elected member's position on the Board.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Approval of Proposed 2010-2011 Meeting Dates

Motion was made to approve the State Board of Education's meeting dates for 2010-2011.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

National Board Certified Teachers Contract

Motion was made to approve the contract with the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession.

Motion seconded

Motion carried
The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m. by Chair Ryan.