THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Accountability | World-Class Math and Science Standards | Meaningful Diploma/CORE 24

November 11-13, 2009
Evergreen Public Schools
Vancouver, Washington

MINUTES

November 11, 2009 – Special Presentation
Ms. Sandi Jacobs, National Council for Teacher Quality (NCTQ)

Attending: Chair Mary Jean Ryan, Vice-Chair Warren Smith, Ms. Amy Bragdon, Ms. Connie Fletcher, Dr. Sheila Fox, Ms. Phyllis Bunker Frank, Mr. Bob Hughes, Ms. Anna Laura Kastama, Dr. Kris Mayer, Ms. Austianna Quick, Mr. Jack Schuster (11)

Staff Attending: Ms. Edie Harding, Dr. Kathe Taylor, Ms. Loy McColm (3)

The State Board of Education members and the Professional Educator Standards Board members met in an informal evening session to discuss potential state policies for Washington to strengthen its work around effective teaching as well as enable Washington to be more competitive for the Race to the Top grant. Sandi Jacobs from the National Council for Teacher Quality presented recommendations for Washington to consider for effective teaching. There is a new focus on teacher quality, recognizing it is the most important school-level variable in student achievement. The discussion included the following:

- Teacher preparation: ways to strengthen teacher preparation program accountability.
- Expanding the teachers' pool: ways to ensure alternate route selectivity and flexibility.
- Identification of effective teachers: ways to enhance teacher evaluation systems, make tenure decisions meaningful, and exit ineffective teachers.
- Incentives through the state salary schedule that would discourage paying teachers solely on years of experience and advanced degrees; support differential pay and performance pay; and explore pension reform.

November 12, 2009

Attending: Chair Mary Jean Ryan, Vice-Chair Warren Smith, Ms. Amy Bragdon, Mr. Bob Hughes, Dr. Sheila Fox, Ms. Anna Laura Kastama, Dr. Kris Mayer, Dr. Steve Dal Porto, Ms. Phyllis Bunker Frank, Mr. Jack Schuster, Ms. Austianna Quick, Ms. Connie Fletcher, Mr. Jeff Vincent (telephone), Dr. Bernal Baca (14)

Absent: Mr. Randy Dorn (excused), Mr. Eric Liu (excused) (2)

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

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:37 a.m. by Chair Ryan.

Superintendent John Deeder welcomed the Board to the Evergreen Public Schools.

Members introduced themselves to the audience.

Ms. Frank thanked Chair Ryan for her dedication and endless work on the Board to include past testimonies as well as sitting on the Quality Education Committee.

Approval of Minutes from the September 17-18, 2009 Meeting

Motion was made to approve the September 2009 minutes as presented.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Consent Agenda

Motion was made to approve the Consent Agenda.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

System Performance Accountability Update, Draft Report and Legislative Request on Required Action for the 2010 Legislation

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

Since 2006, the Board has been considering the components of a statewide performance accountability system, ensuring our students receive an excellent and equitable education. The Board created a System Performance Accountability (SPA) Work Group to review proposals for an accountability system. The work group consists of Board Lead Dr. Mayer, as well as stakeholders from a variety of educational groups.

As part of ESHB 2261, the 2009 Legislature asked the Board to present its report by December 1, 2009. The SBE staff, with consultant Jill Severn, have prepared a report that summarizes the detailed actions of the Board's System Performance Accountability Framework, with a special emphasis on a legislative proposal for required action.

Federal Draft Initiatives: Race to the Top and School Improvement will:

- Address the bottom five percent of persistently low achieving schools (Title I and Title I eligible schools).
- Change conditions dramatically: use turnaround models in schools and provide significant funds.
- Remove state barriers to allow the state to: 1) intervene in low achieving schools; 2) permit charters; and 3) improve efforts to recruit and retain effective staff.

ESHB 2261 acknowledged the work of the Board in its creation of a new accountability framework. The bill requested more detail on the following:

- An accountability index to identify schools for recognition and additional support.
- A proposal and timeline for a voluntary system of support for persistently low achieving schools.
- A proposal and timeline for a formalized, comprehensive system of improvement, targeted to more 'challenged' schools and districts.

The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) and the SBE will ensure that the state's Accountability Framework is seamless and will integrate the new draft Federal School Improvement Guidelines to ensure that Washington State is working with one system. OSPI and SBE support the work of the Quality Education Council to improve funding for all schools.

OSPI and SBE will continue to build on the work done by the System Performance Accountability Work Group, to include:

- A continuous system of improvement for schools and districts.
- A joint state/local collaboration for voluntary and required action.
- A focus on improvement and additional state criteria to determine which districts move into required action.

The SBE has completed groundwork needed as follows:

- Commissioned a study of policy barriers.
- Explored effective models for change.
- Learned lessons from other states' education reform efforts.
- Worked extensively with educators, parents, and community members in developing the comprehensive Accountability Framework.

In May 2009, the Board adopted a draft Accountability Index that focuses on multiple subjects, improvement, and closing the achievement gap. The SBE and OSPI will use the draft Index, with some additions, for the joint OSPI/SBE recognition school program by May 2010. The Board will consider the revisions for the final index during this meeting. SBE and OSPI will work with the United States Department of Education to ask for a waiver and future consideration as a part of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) reauthorization discussion in 2010.

Federal Criteria for Persistently Low Achieving Schools

OSPI will use the new draft Federal School Improvement Guidelines to identify the bottom five percent of persistently low achieving Title I schools in a step of NCLB improvement, plus others based on the three tiers shown below. SBE will look at non Title I school performance.

The schools are defined in the following three tiers:

Tier I: Lowest five percent of Title I schools in a step of improvement as defined by NCLB.
Tier II: Equally low-achieving secondary schools that are Title I eligible.
Tier III: Title I schools in a step of improvement as defined by NCLB.

The primary metric will be based on the following:

- "All students" category of performance in each school for reading and math in terms of absolute performance (the lowest performers).
- Whether schools have improved at the same rate as the state average gains, based on the "all students" category for reading and math (growth).

Examples of low performing schools were provided for grade four, grade seven, and grade eleven in the math and reading WASL.

Examples, shown below, of state defined criteria will also be considered, which must be legally defensible:

- Six years of performance data on state assessments for elementary, middle, and high schools.
- Feeder school patterns: elementary to middle to high school progression with continued low achievement.
- Number of students and numbers of schools in district with low achievement.

Further state criteria include examining details of low achievement by:

- Extended graduation rate for high school students.
- Subgroup performance on state assessments.
- ELL performance on Washington Language Proficiency Test (WLPT).
- Numbers of required credits ninth graders have failed.
- Perception data from local board, staff, students, and community.
- Local district data on student achievement.

Voluntary and Required Action Districts

A Voluntary Action District (VAD) contains Title I and Title I eligible schools that have extremely low overall student achievement and have not demonstrated growth in meeting or exceeding the state average performance gains in reading and math for all students in four years. Additional state criteria will also be considered in the selection.

OSPI will use external experts to conduct a district needs assessment, similar to the audit described under required action. The local school district, with local school board approval, will select one of four federal models and OSPI will focus on building district capacity to address individual schools.

Federal models of intervention include:

- Turnaround: replace the principal and fifty percent of the staff.
- Restart: Close school and reopen under a charter or new management.
- Closure: Move students to a high performing school.
- Transform: 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.

A Required Action District (RAD) contains Title I and non Title I schools that have extremely low overall student achievement and have not demonstrated growth in meeting or exceeding the state average performance gains in reading and math for all students in five to six years. The required action steps include:

1. OSPI will notify the local school district and superintendent that is recommending the district be placed in required action.
2. OSPI will notify the SBE of districts recommended as Required Action Districts.
3. The local school district may appeal to SBE/OSPI staff panel for review if it disagrees with OSPI, by providing information on why the district should not be in required action.
4. SBE will designate the district in the required action plan within three months of determination.
5. OSPI will conduct an academic performance audit with experts external to the Required Action District.
6. The local board will develop a required action plan with its staff and community. The plan must include budget, model, and metrics for desired outcomes.
7. SBE will approve a required action plan, which becomes a binding contract between the state and district.

8. The state will provide resources and authority for a district to act on the Required Action Implementation Plan.
9. The local school district must make significant progress, within three years, based on federal and state measures that qualified them for required action.
10. The local school board and district are required to provide regular reports to SBE/OSPI and the community on their progress.
11. After three years, OSPI notifies SBE and the Required Action District that the district is either ready to exit required action or that the district is not making sufficient progress.
12. SBE will approve the Required Action District's release or will approve the local school board to assess the use of a different model if progress is not made, and develop a new required action plan.

Legislative Component Timelines include:

Fall 2009	SBE will approve the legislative request.
Winter 2010	SBE will submit the request to the legislature.
Winter 2010	OSPI and SBE will identify eligible schools and their districts.
March 15, 2010	OSPI designation as Voluntary or Required Action District.
April 15, 2010	SBE designates as Required Action District.
July 15, 2010	Complete the academic performance audit.
December 15, 2010	Complete the academic plan.
January 15, 2011	SBE will approve the required action plan.

Voluntary Action Districts have three years to successfully implement their plans or they will be moved to required action. Required Action Districts have three years to successfully implement their plans or demonstrate sufficient progress as defined by the required action plan. The federal resources for voluntary and required action include $42.5 million in federal funding from school improvement available in 2010-2013, which would cover three to five districts with up to 50 schools total. Possible resources for required action include: 1) state funds from OSPI focused assistance for 2010-11; 2) Race to the Top funds for state model and non Title I schools in 2010; 3) state funding in 2011-13.

The legislature must approve the required action component, ensuring a state and local partnership, allowing required action and providing the resources and authority for the required action plan to commence.

Public Comment

Caroline King, Partnership for Learning
Partnership for Learning and the Washington Roundtable applaud the Board's efforts to create an accountability system, which supports high achievement for every student and the continuous improvement of every school and district. The Obama Administration, under the education leadership of Arne Duncan, has indicated that robust systems of accountability are crucial to ensuring all students graduate college and work ready. The federal Race to the Top and School Improvement grants requires that states have "authority to intervene directly in the states persistently lowest-performing schools and support its LEAs in turning around these schools." To quote Education Secretary Arne Duncan, "To turn around the lowest-performing schools, states and districts must be ready to institute far-reaching reforms, replace school staff, and change the school culture. All of these reforms are essential if we are going to start to close the achievement gap and make the dream of equal educational opportunity a reality." As a key component to the Board's discussion on accountability, and as OSPI deliberates on how best to improve our assessment system, the Partnership for Learning hopes that the Board will continue to be a strong advocate for college and work ready standards and graded assessments. These elements are essential to the work of the Board to ensure every student graduates with a meaningful high school diploma, critical for Washington to receive federal

stimulus dollars, and foundational to all other improvements in the state's education system. Ms. King thanked the Board for their leadership. Washington State has the historic opportunity to take the bold and courageous steps necessary to turn around persistently low performing schools. Partnership for Learning hopes that the state, with the State Board of Education at the helm, will take this opportunity.

Shannon Rasmussen, Federal Way School District
Ms. Rasmussen thanked the Board for the accountability conversation this morning. She expressed the importance of not closing the doors to any child and encouraged the Board to work together with stakeholders. She said that there is no research on punitive measures and that there is a better way to sustain schools in student achievement. Teachers care about students but they don't get asked about how they can be a partner in the work of student achievement. She encouraged the Board to partner with teachers when possible because they have firsthand knowledge of student achievement and what needs to occur. She is sure that if funding is allocated, schools will be competing to get into the programs being developed by the Board. She is concerned that students don't get many electives because innovation and creativity can't be tested so they're being taken away. The Federal Way School District is creating professional development that teachers are able to take back to their classroom. The District currently has three waiver days to review the data looking at the impact on students. She asked the Board to, most importantly, include people close to the students in the decision making process.

Wendy Rader-Konofalski, Washington Education Association (WEA)
The WEA shares a common goal with the Board and wants to partner with the SBE and other education stakeholders to close the achievement gap, improve student learning overall, turn around struggling schools, and improve the quality of education in Washington State. WEA members have the expertise, the experience, and the intrinsic motivation to provide research and experience-based input about what works. WEA is committed to educating the "whole child" and working productively to achieve common goals in a way that genuinely and effectively addresses the needs of students. Collective bargaining is the mechanism for sustained reform and the WEA has been, and will continue to bargain student achievement at the local level.

The WEA has agreed to move forward with supporting state intervention - not takeover--under the following conditions:

- Provide positive funded assistance - not penalties or punitive approach.
- Maintain the collective bargaining process and view the contract as a tool for sustained reform.
- Tailor a plan to the district or school through collaboration with staff.
- Keep Washington schools public (no charters or privatization).
- Maintain school board authority.

Ms. Rader-Konofalski gave an overview of the Association's proposal for collective bargaining in Required Action Districts, in the case that no mutual agreement is met.

Heather Pope, League of Education Voters (LEV)
LEV applauds the Board's work on building a new accountability system that will sustain and accelerate improvements for students, schools, and districts. It's time we gave our school and district leaders the resources, support, and authority to make needed changes. LEV is committed to building public support for this work. LEV supports the two system approach — voluntary and required. Requiring districts in voluntary action to choose between one of four federal models will be a whole new ball game. LEV enthusiastically supports legislation to give OSPI intervention authority. While LEV might hope for a more accelerated timeline, they know that this proposal builds on broad and deep work with stakeholders. LEV stands ready to help build public and legislative support for the good work on accountability.

Edri Geiger, Vancouver School Board
Ms. Geiger thanked the Board for looking at growth models. The Vancouver School District is involved in data dashboard and focusing on every child. When looking at models of growth, she asked the Board to look at the national level. She stressed the importance of making innovation zones available for all districts and students. She asked the Board to be careful of looking at federal alignment only. The funding is currently short term and it's important to look at long term. She encouraged the Board to be careful about jumping from one thing to another, which is frustrating to the districts. The districts hope that the Board will be consistent in their decision making. When decisions are based on what we know right now, that's what we get. Make sure to be open to many avenues and many viewpoints.

System Performance Accountability Continued

There was further discussion with clarifying questions being addressed. It was clarified that in order to get federal funds, one of the four models presented must be chosen.

The required action plan suggests that if there are issues between the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the district when developing the plan, funding will be held for six months from the onset of the plan. If a resolution cannot be agreed upon, the members were asked to give guidance on what needs to happen. The members agreed that there needs to be consequences for the district if a plan is not implemented within the timeframe allotted.

Public Comment

Tim Knue, Washington State Association of Career and Technical Education (WACTE)
Mr. Knue thanked the Board for the work done to improve education and options for students in the state. The WACTE asks for the Board's support on issues related to career and technical education in the state of Washington. Mr. Knue has worked with his board, as well as the Washington Association of Vocational Administrators board, to evaluate the current Core 24 language. Both boards, representing over 2,000 Washington CTE educators and administrators, are in agreement concerning their official position on Core 24 and Mr. Knue shared their concerns as follows:

- The current Core 24 language is disconcerting. Professionals in the field felt that the language is too weak and ambiguous in its 'career concentration' definition.
- The Board and Implementation Task Force should strengthen the 'career concentration' definition and specifically that the Core 24 language should require the 'career concentration' credits be from a state approved CTE course.
- Too much is left up to local interpretation that will ultimately limit and diminish student participation in genuine high quality CTE programs of study statewide. The language must clearly indicate the number of CTE credits that are required for graduation and the standards those credits must meet.

Mr. Knue referred to the letter sent to the Board members regarding the career concentrator and how it should be designed. The WACTE strongly encourages the Board or the Implementation Task Force Work Group to revisit and strengthen the 'career concentration' as presented above. The WACTE and the Washington Association of Career and Technical Education stand ready to participate and assist the Board and task force in the work of Core 24.

Will Rance, South Sound Career and Technical Advisory Council
On behalf of the South Sound Career and Technical Advisory Council in Thurston County, Mr. Rance shared concerns and recommendations regarding the Core 24 implementation. The Council feels strongly that career concentration needs to be defined specifically as three credits of CTE. Students already struggle to achieve the required credit for graduation. With the current thirty percent dropout rate, the Council fears these expectations will only drive down a student's motivation to succeed. With little room for failure, the Council hopes the suggestions presented today will help local districts with flexibility as well as providing realistic expectations.

Dennis Kampe, Clark County Skills Center
Mr. Kampe expressed his concerns regarding the removal of CTE courses from the graduation requirements, saying that it will impact the skills centers and will force many of them to close. He presented two examples of Core 24 schedules and discussed the barriers for students. Mr. Kampe recommended that the Board consider the following:

- Streamline the equivalency credit process.
- Provide academic credit for CTE classes.
- Waive art credit requirements for CTE pathway students.
- Provide career counseling that includes community college options.

Core 24 Implementation Task Force Interim Report on Phase-in Recommendations
Dr. Kathe Taylor, Policy Director
Dr. Steve Dal Porto, Board Co-lead
Mr. Jack Schuster, Board Co-lead
Dr. Jennifer Shaw, Co-chair, ITF
Dr. Mark Mansell, Co-chair, ITF

The SBE adopted the purpose of a diploma, Core 24 Graduation Requirements Framework, and chartered the Core 24 Implementation Task Force (ITF) before the 2009 Legislature's education reform bill (ESHB 2261) was passed. When Core 24 was approved, the Board expressed its intent to implement Core 24 graduation requirements fully for the graduating class of 2016, contingent on funding. ESHB 2261 expressed the legislative intent to phase in all education reforms by 2018, beginning no later than September 1, 2013.

Since Core 24 emerged, the Board has asserted that funding for six instructional hours would be needed for the implementation of Core 24. The Funding Formula Technical Work Group provided a different perspective when it informed the Quality Education Council (QEC), at its November 2009 meeting, that the state is already paying for six instructional periods plus a planning period. Currently the issue has not been definitively resolved. The Quality Education Council will consider phase in of the changes to the instructional program of basic education and the implementation of the funding formulas and allocations to support the new instructional program of basic education. The charge of the QEC is much broader than the implementation of Core 24 and the work of the QEC will be informed by working groups formally established by ESHB 2261 and key stakeholders. The Board's representation on the QEC assures that key Board initiatives will be voiced. The Core 24 ITF will advise the Board on graduation-related issues that may come before the QEC in the next six months.

May 2010	SBE begins to review ITF recommendations and consider policy changes.
Fall 2010	SBE reviews draft Core 24 graduation requirement rules.
Winter 2011	SBE forwards proposed Core 24 graduation requirement changes to the legislature with OSPI fiscal impact statements.
Summer 2011	SBE adopts Core 24 graduation requirement rules.

The SBE acknowledged, in the ITF charter, the challenge of maintaining momentum in an uncertain funding environment. Given the complexity and timeline of the state's education reform process, staff will work with the ITF to prioritize the funding elements that are essential for the implementation of Core 24. The ITF's advice will assist the Board with its advocacy for the implementation of the graduation requirement component of education reform and will help the Board consider what steps to take if only partial funding is attained initially.

The ultimate success of students' meeting the requirements of Core 24 depends on a systems approach across the K-12 spectrum. The ITF believes the framework, articulated in ESHB 2261, addresses many of the necessary supports needed to meet this essential work on behalf of the

students statewide. The following recommendations were presented to the members for consideration:

1. Stable funding in categories articulated in ESHB 2261 must be provided to support the implementation of Core 24 for at least grades eight through twelve. In particular, funding to meet class size standard, extra support for high poverty schools, guidance and counseling, and resources aimed at supporting struggling students are essential.
2. Once funding begins, the ITF believes districts will need one year for planning purposes and five years to make the relevant changes needed to graduate the first students meeting Core 24 expectations (beginning with students in grade eight of the first graduating class affected by the new requirements).

The ITF remains concerned about the facilities needs associated with the increase in graduation requirements. The ITF believes that many high schools will need to create and/or re-purpose space to provide appropriate learning environments to meet the increased course requirements. The Board's Core 24 2009-11 Work Plan and its work with the Implementation Task Force was presented to members.

Pilot Program for Waivers From the 180-School Day Requirement for the Purpose of Economy and Efficiency Flexible Calendar

Mr. Brad Burnham, Legislative and Policy Specialist

The 2009 Legislature created a pilot program where the Board was given authority to grant waivers from the requirement for a one hundred eighty day school year to school districts that propose to operate one or more schools on a flexible calendar for purposes of economy and efficiency. Five school districts are eligible for these waivers, two of which have student populations under 150 and three that have student populations between 150 and 500. The requirement that districts offer an annual average instructional hour offering of at least one thousand hours cannot be waived.

The SBE staff and Waiver Committee have reviewed the applications from Bickleton School District, Lyle School District, and Paterson School District and have determined that they meet the eligibility requirements and criteria outlined by the legislature and the Board. Details of the requests received were summarized for the members.

Joint Meeting with the Professional Educators Standards Board

Race to the Top Overview and Application

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director, SBE
Ms. Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB
Ms. Judy Hartmann, Executive Policy Advisor, Governor's Office

Ms. Hartmann gave an overview of the Race to the Top topics as follows:

1. What is Race to the Top and how does it work?
2. How is Washington State getting involved?
3. What is the timetable?

The four assurances are: standards and assessments; data to drive instruction, current teachers and leaders, and turning around struggling schools. The Race to the Top project structure was discussed and participants include: a steering committee, a coordinating committee, and project support. Ms. Harding gave a summary of Washington's current status of standards and assessments relative to the Race to the Top criteria. Ms. Wallace gave a summary of Washington's current status of data systems to support instruction as well as current teachers and leaders. Ms. Harding gave a summary on turning around struggling schools. Washington's criteria related to Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) capabilities were discussed.

Washington State is facing seven challenges as it develops its Race to the Top proposal to include:

- A comprehensive strategy.
- Policy Barriers.
- Struggling Schools.
- Standards, assessments, and curriculum.
- Teachers and leaders.
- Access and ability to use data.
- Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM).

The Points Overview chart was presented to show the maximum number of points that may be assigned to each criterion. The members broke into teams to discuss the criteria and returned to the full group to provide their feedback to the members. The summary PESB and SBE feedback on Race to the Top was presented as follows:

1. Improve principal and teacher effectiveness through evaluation and professional development which would: a) help low performing schools; b) tie to an array of data, and c) close the achievement gap.
2. Find ways to create an equitable distribution of teachers and principals in low performing schools, and to support teachers in those schools.Create a unifying theme: a) look at the mission statements of the education organizations, b) promote a concept to improve our education comprehensively, c) increase student achievement with great teachers.
3. Strengths: use of data and help with formative assessments.
4. Concerns: sustainability and limited dollars.

<u>Teacher Reduction In Force (RIF) Study</u>
Mr. Joe Koski, Policy and Research Analyst, PESB
Ms. Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

The PESB is ready to go with the teacher credentialing information apportionment data; however, there was a problem with the 2009-10 apportionment data. The data is information collected to determine district budgets, which is based on snapshots taken yearly on October 1. The problem that impacted the RIF study is that the submission dates were not universally understood within OSPI. The misunderstanding about deadlines led OSPI to initially promise the data would be available on November 1. OSPI reset the deadline for December 15. For this reason, the RIF Study will be available after January 1.

<u>Role of National Board Certification as a Policy Incentive: SBE Study and Other Considerations</u>
Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director, SBE
Ms. Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

The Legislature allotted Washington $65 million biennially to provide incentives for National Board Certification for teachers. The SBE is conducting a study with Ms. Jeanne Harmon from The Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession. The focus of the study is to examine the impact of the incentive program with a particular focus on the mobility and retention patterns of National Board Certified teachers compared to those without such certification. A draft report will be provided in January 2010 and a final report in June 2010.

November 13, 2009

Attending: Chair Mary Jean Ryan, Vice-Chair Warren Smith, Ms. Amy Bragdon, Mr. Bob Hughes, Dr. Sheila Fox, Ms. Anna Laura Kastama, Dr. Kris Mayer, Dr. Steve Dal Porto, Ms. Phyllis Bunker Frank, Mr. Jack Schuster, Ms. Austianna Quick, Ms. Connie Fletcher, Dr. Bernal Baca (13)

Absent: Mr. Randy Dorn (excused), Mr. Eric Liu (excused), Mr. Jeff Vincent (excused) (3)

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

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:20 a.m. by Chair Ryan.

Update on Revision to the 180 Day Waiver Process
Mr. Brad Burnham, Legislative and Policy Specialist
Ms. Phyllis Bunker Frank, Board Co-lead
Mr. Jack Schuster, Board Co-lead

The SBE and OSPI have the authority to grant school district waivers from the Basic Education Act requirements. Restructuring for SBE granted waivers has evolved primarily into granting days for district or school-wide professional development while reducing the number of current 180 days of instruction from students. Districts maintain that they do not have sufficient district-wide or school-wide days to focus on professional development and need the time. Many districts have provisions in their collective bargaining agreements that define how many professional days are available for individual teacher use versus district or school-wide use.

For the 2009-10 school year, there are 67 districts with waivers from the 180 day requirement. The average number of days is three and the average number of years is three. The revisions needed for the waiver procedures and rules include: 1) what kinds of waivers should the SBE promote; 2) who should make the waiver decisions; 3) number of days waived; and 4) the application process. Mr. Burnham discussed options under each of the revisions.

Members made suggestions for discussion at the January Board meeting for the waiver process as follows:

- What are the parameters for waivers?
- Additional time to discuss the number of days and why the designation is three days.

Intelligent Data Systems for Student Achievement from the Classroom to the Board Room
Ms. Chriss Burgess, Associate Superintendent, Vancouver School District
Ms. Lisa Greseth, Manager, Information and Instructional Technology, Vancouver School District
Mr. Joe Lapidus, Principal, Chinook Elementary

In partnership with home and community, Vancouver Public Schools provides an innovative learning environment that engages and empowers each student to develop the knowledge and essential skills to become a competent, responsible, and compassionate citizen. The personalized learning process was discussed.

The District has created a Collaborative Academic Support Team (CAST), whose purpose and key elements include:

- Formalizing a process to monitor individual student progress continually to inform instruction.
- Determining individual strengths and weaknesses via data collection and analysis.
- Promoting the use of a Response to Intervention (RTI) model.
- Utilizing the power of the team to ensure optimal service delivery to students.
- Providing a systemic process to know each child in the school by name, strengths, and needs.

The CAST Process occurs three times a year for 40-60 minutes per class and the process is completed within three to six days, depending on the size of the school. The data used in the CAST process, as well as the student Learner Profile forms used for the process, were discussed. The District's balanced scorecard was presented to the members. The District's dashboard data and milestone benchmarks were discussed and next steps were presented.

The presenters were given accolades for the work they're doing in the District and it was suggested that the Board send a letter to the District in recognition of the work being done.

Update on the Quality Education Council (QEC) and the 2010 Legislative Session
Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director
Ms. Mary Jean Ryan, Chair

Since the QEC began meeting later than expected, work is still being done on the legislative mandate. The prototype baseline values or prototype crosswalk is currently being worked on by the Council. Chair Ryan explained how the process works and encouraged the Board and other stakeholders to be helpful in offering education goals to help guide the strategic process in 2010.

Mr. Burnham and Ms. Harding are meeting with legislators and will continue to do so through the 2010 Legislative Session. Legislative Assembly Days are scheduled for December 1-4 and the SBE is slated to present in both the House and the Senate. The final regulations for Race to the Top are in and the McKinsey team is working with the Governor's office, OSPI, and SBE on the grant application.

Ms. Harding outlined some of the key issues for the 2010 legislation: a $2.6 billion budget deficit, SBE proposal on accountability, using a required action process for low achieving schools, and OSPI proposed to delay math and science graduation requirements

Chair Ryan talked about the issues around math and science. The January 2010 Board meeting agenda will include discussion on math and science and where the Board needs to go to accomplish the work.

System Performance Accountability Continued
Dr. Kris Mayer, Board Lead
Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director

SBE and OSPI Identification Process for Persistently Low Achieving Districts

The proposed process was reviewed as follows:

1. SBE will propose legislation for allowing a state and local partnership to intervene in persistently low achieving schools and their districts. The federal government requires no prohibition to state intervention for federal funds.
2. OSPI will identify persistently low achieving schools based on federal and state criteria.

3. Phase I will begin for the 2010-2011 school year to: a) identify Title I and Title I eligible schools; b) use federal models; c) provide federal money.
4. Phase II will begin for the 2012-2013 school year to: a) add non Title I schools; b) use state, local, and/or federal models; c) provide state, local, and/or federal money.
5. OSPI will notify district and SBE of status as Voluntary Action District (VAD) or Required Action District (RAD).
6. Local board with RAD may ask SBE to reconsider designation and become a VAD.
7. SBE/OSPI designates districts for required action.

The required action impasse options were discussed as follows:

1. Withhold Title I funds by state.
2. Redirect Title I funds by state.
3. Make performance audit findings not a part of the collective bargaining agreement and require the plans to be implemented.
4. Go to district-funded, binding arbitration (SBE, RAD, administration, union).
5. District management, SBE and/or OSPI (or any combination of the three) go to district-funded mediation.
6. District will have a co-signer for key policy and funding decisions related to student achievement.

There was considerable discussion regarding the withholding of Title I funds from schools. It was decided that all options would be explored. Members provided the following additions to the impasse options, which will also be explored.

1. Limited management authority.
2. District takeover rather than withholding funds.

The timeline for legislative components were noted as follows:

Winter 2010	Sort schools and seek legislation.
March 15, 2010	OSPI makes recommendations for VADs or RADS and RADS may ask SBE for VAD designation.
April 15, 2010	SBE designates RADs.
July 15, 2010	OSPI completes VAD needs assessment for Option I VADs and RAD performance academic audits.
September 1, 2010	VAD local board prepares its plan, model, budget, and metric.
December 15, 2010	RAD local board prepares its plan, model, budget, and metric.
January 15, 2011	SBE approves RAD plan.

Public Comment

Wendy Rader-Konafalski, Washington Education Association (WEA)

Ms. Rader-Konofalski talked about the information given that the Full Funding Work Group (FFWG) of the Quality Education Council (QEC) indicated that the state currently pays for the sixth period class. According to a member of the FFWG this was a “complete misinterpretation of what the FFWG has said about.” Her colleague reported that the work group discussed this misinterpretation at a meeting earlier in the week and was drafting a letter to the QEC to make the correction. The member said it was “unanimous among the work group members that the state currently pays for only five periods.” Ms. Rader-Konofalski quoted from an email from the FFWG member saying that “we are very concerned that others would think they can accommodate Core 24 simply by jamming more students into a classroom.” She hoped that with the information from the FFWG, the issue would be resolved. The WEA supports the comments made by the Washington Association of Career and Technical Education to strengthen the CTE credit requirements.

Business Items

Accountability Index Revisions and Accountability Draft Report and Legislation

Motion to approve the draft Accountability Report, consistent with the Board's direction as discussed at the meeting for the past two days for submission to the Washington State Legislature to meet the December 1, 2009 deadline.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Waivers for Efficiency and Effectiveness Calendar

Motion was made to approve Bickleton, Lyle, and Paterson School District's requests for a waiver from the 180 day school year requirement for the number of days requested to operate the schools identified on a flexible calendar for purposes of economy and efficiency as authorized in RCW 28A.305.141 for academic years 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012; and to revoke the waiver granted to Lyle School District under RCW 28A.305.140 in September 2009.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Planning for January Meeting

Topics presented for the January meeting were presented for discussion and additional topics were added. The strategic plan was discussed for 2010 and it was suggested that a "state strategic plan" be implemented to be consistent with goals for the future. The members were asked for their ideas on how to work with stakeholders and others to implement the new plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m. by Chair Ryan.