

Washington State Board of Education
Regular Meeting
Brouillet Conference Room, Old Capital Building
Olympia, Washington

MINUTES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 9:25 a.m. by Warren Smith. Mr. Smith welcomed all of the members to the meeting. Executive Director Larry Davis gave a general overview of the agenda for the day. Staff introduced themselves.

Members Present: Bernal Baca, Amy Bragdon, Steve Dal Porto, Steve Floyd, Sheila Fox, Phyllis Bunker Frank, Linda W. Lamb, Eric Liu, Kristina Mayer, Mary Jean Ryan, John C. Schuster, Warren T. Smith Sr., Jeff Vincent, Deputy Superintendent Marty Daybell for Superintendent Terry Bergeson, and Student Representatives Gustavo Ramos and Tiffany Thompson

Staff Present: Larry Davis, Pat Eirish, Laura Moore, Sarah Bland, Dave Stolier

REMARKS BY GOVERNOR GREGOIRE

Mr. Smith introduced the Honorable Christine Gregoire, governor of the state of Washington. She swore in the elected members of the State Board of Education—Steve Dal Porto, Steve Floyd, Phyllis Bunker Frank, Linda W. Lamb, Warren T. Smith Sr., and John C. “Jack” Schuster.

Governor Gregoire thanked Gayatri Eassey, Boards and Commissions Office, and Judy Hartmann, education policy liaison, for the work they have done. She reviewed the appointment process and she shared her perspective. She serves as vice chair of the Education and Training Committee of the National Governor’s Conference.

- ✓ Organizational vision—one seamless education system in the state from Pre-Kindergarten to postsecondary education. We need to give our students the best shot available to get the best jobs in Washington State. The Governor is a fan of the book, “The World Is Flat”, although she does not subscribe to all the principles in the book. We need to be looking at the rest of the world as our competition. The Department of Early Learning was passed out of the House and Senate—the consolidation of early child learning programs into one state agency with a centralized point of contact in state government with focus, measurement and outcome coupled with public/private partnerships. We need to maintain a seamless system so that all students can achieve the best they can.
- ✓ Role of Government—create a world class education system. I728 funding was restored. The winds of politicizing the standards are ebbing and flowing in the Legislature. Hopefully we will come out of the session without a lowering of the standards. The Governor is a fan of Navigation 101—students taking control of their lives. Some students will need help or an alternative route to achieve their diploma. Working with the students will help achieve the goals of a high graduation rate and a high rate of attending some sort of postsecondary training. We need to ask students what they need to be successful—summer school doesn’t work for everyone.

The Governor feels that this is a much stronger Board with a much stronger voice. Expectations are very high; she is looking forward to working with the Board.

Linda Lamb noted that in India and Asia not all the children are being educated and it is creating a disparity. The Governor has been meeting with Bill Gates on how to create the engineers, the astronauts, etc., while raising the bar for all of the students. Not all jobs can be outsourced—left brain jobs can be outsourced; right brain jobs, such as firefighter, cannot be outsourced.

In response to a question on the role of the Board from Mr. Schuster, the Governor stated that she has met with Hispanic students and knows that they are non-traditional learners. The schools have to become more open to the needs of all students. We need to think non-traditional to help students—a computer for every student personalized to his/her learning style is an example. We need to open up opportunities for **all** students. Mr. Smith stated that he has been working with his granddaughter's kindergarten class and is frustrated because of the lack of support he sees with some students and families.

No student in Washington State should be left out in the system. All should be able to succeed.

Questions/comments for the Governor were noted for later response.

ETHICS PRESENTATION

Assistant Attorney General David Stolier provided an overview of his role and certain statutes relevant to the role of the Board.

Role—Attorney General's Office serves all the agencies and elected officials in the state. Mr. Stolier is part of the education division.

Responsibilities—for Board members:

- ✓ **Members cannot make statements on behalf of the entire Board.**
- ✓ *Ethics*—office cannot be used for personal gain. No activity in conflict with proper discharge of official duties; may not use official position or resources to secure special privileges; may not receive gift if it could be reasonably expected to influence performance of official duties; may not use state resources for political campaigns. The AG's Office will not defend members on ethics violations.
- ✓ *Open Public Meetings Act*—intent that the actions of all public boards and commissions be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted in public meeting. Subcommittees can be subject to the Act. (All prior subcommittees were considered open public meetings.) A meeting is a gathering where "action" is taken. Any such meeting must be open. "Action" means the "transaction of the official business of a public agency by a governing body including but not limited to public testimony, all deliberations, discussions, reviews, evaluations, final action. Depending on the size of the group, a quorum could be one-half plus one of the voting members; special meetings are limited to a specific topic(s) and limited notice.
- ✓ *Emails*—**an exchange of emails among board members can constitute a "meeting" subject to the Open Public Meetings Act.** Compose under the assumption that it will be made publicly available; don't hit "Reply-all" to a message sent to multiple board members; keep Board business in a separate file.
- ✓ *Public Records*—any writing containing information relating to (a) the conduct of government, or (b) the performance of any governmental or proprietary function. Agency should have copies of the records. Exemptions—preliminary drafts in which policies are formulated; communications protected by the attorney-client privilege; personal information in any files maintained for students in public schools; test questions, scoring keys, and other examination data used to administer an

academic exam; trade secrets. Compose anything, including an email, in the light that it will be a public record.

Executive Director Larry Davis introduced Judy Ness, who will be the facilitator for the rest of the meeting. Ms. Ness is a former educator. She began working in staff development after teaching for several years. Two part theme—tasks we are charged with; trust between members.

INTRODUCTIONS

Board members introduced themselves and told a little of their backgrounds.

Drives people crazy in meetings

- ✓ Not staying on task on time; chair fails to keep on task
- ✓ Lack of an open mind; personal agenda
- ✓ Being clickish
- ✓ Sound of your own voice
- ✓ Objectives not being clear
- ✓ Doing everything to avoid conflict
- ✓ No clear group process—group structure
- ✓ Not working as a team
- ✓ Loss of focus
- ✓ Failure to consider effect of policy on all constituents in the field.

Meeting Norms

- ✓ Leadership and board members take responsibility to maintain focused meetings toward achieving the agenda's purpose and the board's goals.
- ✓ Develop a clear group process—clear agenda with target goals outlined; clear decision process; constructive conflict management process; hard beginning and end.
- ✓ Group process acknowledges that respectful conflict is a natural part of policy development and management.
- ✓ Be inclusive and have self restraint; people who don't speak out either tell the group or are asked for an opinion (honoring all voices equitably; consistently use clarity checks)
- ✓ Well structured agenda that is managed well to keep on task and on time.
- ✓ **Authentic listening and respectful speaking.**

How does the board want to be held accountable when one of the norms is broken? Confront the problem, maybe after checking a perception with someone else, and then go to the source of the conflict. Members need to be able to give and receive criticism.

Decision Making Process

Executive Director Larry Davis provided background information on the process the Board used in the past to make a decision. It was suggested by Mr. Vincent to move the election of officers to the next meeting. Dr. Mayer asked for some preliminary work on officers.

Ms. Ness stated that decision making process has been decided. The decision was made to table the election of officers. Questions were raised on who would be the interim and since we don't know what the duties are, why do it? What are we empowering the group to do? The decision was made to hold this until tomorrow.

If the executive director moves on, the decision on who should replace Mr. Davis should be the Board's.

Duties and History

Mr. Davis reviewed the governance structure of the state and the history of the Board. HB 3098 has passed the Senate with a technical amendment; the House must concur or it goes to the conference committee. He presented the total duties now with those color coded that would remain once HB 3098 is passed. He reviewed the A+ Commission duties inherited by the State Board.

Judy Hartmann provided the broader perspective by presenting the legislative adopted purpose from the 2005 and the purpose statement being proposed in the 2006 legislation. She reviewed the work of the Washington Learns and its various tasks. In the preliminary report there is a suggestion to the State Board with regard to the accountability system.

Mr. Davis reviewed the decisions that have to be made before December of this year which include the cut score setting process. The decision on the process has to be made tomorrow so that the cut scores can be adopted by July 28. Ms Hartmann reviewed the ombudsman office.

Discussion was held on various topics related to the duties now and in the future. Communications with school directors and the general public were discussed.

Ms. Ness summarized the discussion—old board vs. new board; looking at the big picture; the immediate calendar items. She suggested planning backward to take care of the items that must be done. This is a brand new board.

Meeting recessed at 6:20 p.m.

Thursday, March 2, 2006

Warren Smith opened the meeting at 8:04 a.m. thanking the members for their work yesterday.

Members Present: Bernal Baca, Amy Bragdon, Steve Dal Porto, Steve Floyd, Sheila Fox, Phyllis Bunker Frank, Linda W. Lamb, Kristina Mayer, Mary Jean Ryan, John C. Schuster, Warren T. Smith Sr., Jeff Vincent, Assistant Superintendent Marcia Riggers for Superintendent Terry Bergeson, and Student Representatives Gustavo Ramos and Tiffany Thompson

Member Excused: Eric Liu

Staff Present: Larry Davis, Pat Eirish, Laura Moore, Sarah Bland, Dave Stolier

Change is inevitable; growth is optional. A good meeting is like a good lesson—a good meeting has a lot of preparation.

Judy Ness outlined the agenda for today.

GROUP DISCUSSION—GOVERNOR'S REMARKS

- ✓ Advocate for this board to make great changes.
- ✓ Seamless education—what does it mean; what is the overlap between Pre-K, K-12, and higher education
- ✓ Seeing results

- ✓ How to apply the concept of seamless to the Pre-K system. Silos; protected territories.
- ✓ All professionals have to take a test.
- ✓ Silos, seamless, graduation rate
- ✓ Support of early childhood education

Ms. Ness cautioned the Board members to not to try and do everything at once. Results of the group discussions on the focus of the Board.

Group 1

- ✓ Technical—work on the bylaws, technical aspects (Bernal)
- ✓ Identify liaisons for the board
- ✓ Accountability—who in the group would like to work on the task
- ✓ Seamless—who in the group would like to work on the task

Identify the expertise on the Board.

Group 2

- ✓ Division of labor—need some people to do the daily work; some to work on strategic planning.

Group 3

- ✓ Seamless system—need to study to come up with a definition
- ✓ Accountability system—left brain/right brain
- ✓ Subcommittees for the reactive items; committee of the whole for the proactive items

Group 4

- ✓ Need to have a clear idea of where we need to go—what we need to do to make sure students are successful in school to be successful in work and college.

Need to clearly and accurately define the definition. Where are we—gap analysis. Want to develop a seamless P-16 system. Operationalizing and capitalizing this group with Washington Learns. Early learning—building the strong connection between the Department of Early Learning (DEL) and the Board. Addressing accountability—as a board and revising the structuring in the system.

ASSESSMENT (WASHINGTON ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING [WASL]) PRESENTATION

Dr. Joe Willhoft, Interim Asst. Superintendent of Assessment for OSPI, and Dr. Tom Hirsch, Assessment Evaluation Services (AES), introduced themselves and provided an overview of the presentation.

Dr. Willhoft provided the background information on the various WASL assessments currently in place. Previous standards setting was done by the Commission on Student Learning followed by the Academic Achievement and Accountability (A+) Commission. The WASL is an assessment of the system as well as the individual assessment at the high school level. The WASL was designed to be a measurement of student performance against the Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs) in a standards based system.

Validity check steps:

- ✓ National Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviews and critiques the WASL
- ✓ Professional Standards: designed to follow professional standards established by AERA/APA/NCME
- ✓ Independent Evaluation: legislative requirements that WASLs be developed by external researchers
- ✓ Federal Peer Review: No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirement that assessments in all states be subjected to a peer review

The development of a test question takes two years before it goes live on a test. Teachers are involved in all aspects of the development. Validity is an ongoing discourse.

Under NCLB, states are required to have assessments in reading and mathematics in grades 3 through 8 and high school.

Once the standards recommendations are made by the panel, Dr. Willhoft will have to meet with the Board to have them set the standards.

Goal:

- ✓ Find levels of test performance indicating knowledge and skills that are advanced, proficient, basic, and below basic.
- ✓ Assure that the standards, when taken as a whole, represent a coherent system of expectations across grade levels.
- ✓ Standards are only set once; afterwards, tests are equated year-to-year.

Who does the standard setting?

- ✓ State Board sets standards, based on recommendations from Standard Setting panels.
- ✓ Four panels will be convened—3 & 5 Reading, 6 & 8 Reading, 3 & 5 Math, 6 & 8 Math; 24 members in each panel; panels fit demographic goals; panel members are nominated, then selected on basis of applications, letter(s) of recommendation, demographic fit.

How is it done?

- ✓ “Modified Bookmark” method—same approach used for Reading, Math & Science; commonly used by many state assessment programs; practical for assessments containing open-ended items with different points awarded for partial/complete work.
- ✓ Description of the process.
- ✓ Review of draft standard setting agenda.

How do we know it isn't arbitrary?

- ✓ Composition of the panels
- ✓ Use of a professionally-accepted process
- ✓ Contribution of “performance level descriptors” to the process
- ✓ Multiple rounds and discussion
- ✓ Consideration of “impact data”

Motion: Moved by Mrs. Frank and seconded by Mrs. Lamb to approve the next steps for the standards setting process. Motion carried.

The Board will have further discussions at subsequent meetings.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Bill Panos, director of Facilities and Organization with OSPI, provided background information on the school construction and funding. (copy of presentation on file with these minutes.)

Motion: Moved by Dr. Dal Porto and seconded by Mr. Vincent to approve construction tabs 1, 2, and 3. Motion carried.

Miscellaneous

Calendar—members listed dates for possible meetings

Next steps

- ✓ Parking Lot questions/issues need to be addressed
- ✓ Creative ideas for public outreach
- ✓ Conflict process
- ✓ Decision making process has been established.
- ✓ Officer elections; executive committee decision
- ✓ More detail in the cross communication between the governance connection
- ✓ Big picture strategic planning
- ✓ Backfill planning so items don't fall through the cracks
- ✓ Need to clarify what is meant by leadership, advocacy, and communication
- ✓ Developing, getting tight with Washington Learns
- ✓ Being clear about the liaisons with other groups
- ✓ Ask for additional funding from the legislature
- ✓ Redo and wordsmith the norms
- ✓ Structure and design of operations

We can't do everything up to bite size pieces—an agenda committee.

- ✓ Regional meetings of WSSDA
- ✓ Decisions in the interim
- ✓ Legislation

Interim Executive Group

Dr. Steve Dal Porto

Linda W. Lamb

Mary Jean Ryan

Dr. Kristina Mayer

Regional meetings—should be up to the individual member.

LEGISLATION

Mrs. Lamb suggested contacting the conference committee on E2SHB 3098 to leave facilities and accreditation with the State Board.

Motion: Moved by Mrs. Lamb and seconded by Mrs. Frank to keep school construction/facilities with the State Board. Motion failed.

Motion: Moved by Mrs. Lamb and seconded by Mrs. Frank to keep accreditation with the State Board, Motion carried.

Subsequent to the meeting a letter was sent to the conference committee members with a copy to the Governor.

Ms. Ness wrapped up the meeting asking the group to rate their satisfaction of the meeting on the scale of 1 to 6 with 6 very satisfied and the reason for the satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Meeting adjourned at 1:18 p.m.

Adopted by the Board: April 28, 2006