

Washington State Board of Education
Regular Meeting
North Thurston School District Boardroom, Lacey
January 25-26, 2007

MINUTES

Thursday, January 25, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m. by Chair Mary Jean Ryan. She introduced Superintendent Jim Koval of the North Thurston Public Schools.

Superintendent Koval welcomed members to the district and thanked the Board for the work it does, especially in these critical times.

Present: Bernal Baca, Terry Bergeson, Amy Bragdon, Steve Dal Porto, Steve Floyd, Sheila Fox, Phyllis Bunker Frank, Linda W. Lamb, Eric Liu, Kristina Mayer, Mary Jean Ryan, John Schuster, Warren T. Smith Sr., Tiffany Thompson and Jeff Vincent.

Excused: Zac Kinman

Staff: Edie Harding, Pat Eirish, Evelyn Hawkins, Sarah Bland, Laura Moore and Colleen Warren.

Chair Ryan provided information on the agenda for the next two days, noting that this is the foundation meeting for the two large projects—Meaningful High School Diploma and Performance System (Accountability). Mathematics will also be a topic of discussion for the meeting; data systems will also be an important part of the discussion.

New staff members—Kathe Taylor, policy director, and Evelyn Hawkins, research associate—were introduced to Board members.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: Moved by Mrs. Lamb and seconded by Mr. Schuster to approve the minutes of the November 2006 meeting as presented. Motion carried.

Motion: Moved by Mrs. Frank and seconded by Mrs. Lamb to approve the minutes of the January 9 K-20 meeting as amended. Motion carried.

PANEL FOR THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF K-12 MATHEMATICS STANDARDS

Chair Ryan asked to go over the Charge and Process for an independent review of K-12 mathematics standards with a vote to follow during Friday's meeting. She read the opening paragraph on the Charge. Chair Ryan also outlined the process for selecting the panel and what it will be doing.

Dr. Bergeson stated that she was happy the Board agreed to institute the panel review. This will insure the independence of the review. She described what needs to happen in conjunction with the review. The effect on districts needs to be kept in mind.

Several questions were raised on what will be studied by the panel regarding the entire system. Dr. Mayer stated that the Charge should be very clear on what will be reviewed and what will not be reviewed. Mr. Vincent stated the leadership will be critical as well as buy-in from the field in the end product. Dr. Baca noted that the concept paper is still confusing and needs to be clear with several sections needing more definition. Mrs. Lamb stated that there needs to be representation from all groups so that no one is left out of the discussion. Mr. Smith advised the Board to stay focused on the standards review and system readiness. Dr. Bergeson stated that once the panel and expert are selected, the Charge to the panel will be much more detailed. There will need to be a balance. Mr. Lui asked to have concrete information on what the panel will be working on, what it will be reviewing. It really helped to be able to see the Mathematics WASL when that was being talked about.

Chair Ryan stated that the Charge is general; a more detailed document will be produced before the panel begins; there needs to be people from all perspectives. The person leading will need to have experience with this type of review and will have to be strong. The Executive Committee and Steve Floyd will interview the consultants and develop the work plan for the panel. She stated that Board members can nominate members to the panel with an explanation of why that person should be considered. There will be reports at each meeting. In response to a question from Mr. Schuster, the consultant will not be asked to work the dynamic of the panel; a facilitator will be hired to work with the consultant and panel. Dr. Bergeson stated that the consultant will have to be able to look at the content, standards, strategies, and processes as well as the methods of teaching the subject area. The Board will have to make sure that the person is as unbiased as possible.

MEANINGFUL HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA

Committee Chair Eric Liu provided information on the process in setting up the committee and an overview of the charge to the committee for its study. Board members on the committee are Steve Dal Porto, Tiffany Thompson, Warren Smith, Amy Bragdon, Linda W. Lamb, and Bernal Baca.

Mr. Liu reviewed the outline of the morning's session. Executive Director Edie Harding presented a PowerPoint on the work of the committee. She reviewed the rule governing the graduation requirements (WAC 180-51-003). The minimum number of credits required for graduation by the state has not changed in the state for 20 years. There is a push between mathematics and science and the other requirements from the Governor and business community. The Board will be adopting changes that will clarify the

current graduation requirements. Recommendations on further changes will be made to the Legislature in December 2007. Mr. Liu pointed out the chart on graduation requirements from other states as compared to Washington—this should be the floor to strive to, not the ceiling. Push-Pull areas: college readiness versus a variety of options for students; attention on English, mathematics and science versus other areas; college preparation versus career preparation; preparation of students prior to high school as well as preparation for college.

Mr. Vincent asked how the graduation requirements are linked to the basic education goals. At present, there is no link to the goals. Mr. Schuster requested that the committee look at moving away from seat time for students and move to a more performance-based system. He also asked about the states that have no state requirements and wanted more information. Mrs. Frank asked the committee to look at the definition of a credit. Funding is another issue to study and how it is tied to the current 19 credits required. She also asked that the committee look at time and intervention in the students' journey to graduation. Mrs. Lamb asked that the committee keep in mind what other entities such as the Workforce Training Board are doing for the career and technical needs of students. She stated that middle schools will be crucial. The dropout question will need to be addressed in a cooperative way. Mrs. Lamb also asked that the committee look at various ways students can earn credits.

Dr. Bergeson stated that the Board has language that allows students to earn competency-based credits. Districts don't know how to implement such credits; funding is an issue. She also outlined what is happening in the Legislature and some of the discussion that took place when HB 1209 was passed. Mr. Smith also pointed out that among groups of students who may not get the full diploma are a group of Caucasian students from middle and upper income families. System readiness and how it affects students, and staffing and capacity are crucial items. Dr. Fox stated that we should look both ways—at higher education and early learning; and at different types of diplomas for different paths students would be taking.

Ms. Thompson asked if there was systems data information on the various time configurations (6 or 7 period day, 4 period block, zero hour, etc.) in the high schools in the state. The information is not available. Chair Ryan noted that there is a false choice trap that needs to be avoided. She expressed concern that if student do not get the right courses, they do not get to go to college. All students should be ready for college even if they don't choose to go. Not only postsecondary concerns need to be addressed but middle schools need to be linked to the process. The American Diploma Project could be a technical resource for the committee. We at least need to have them talk to the group, if the Board does not join the project. Dr. Fox wanted the committee to look at what keeps students in school (fine arts, etc.) as well as postsecondary education; 40 percent go to university; and the dropout rate of 25 to 30 percent. Mr. Smith stated that there are hundreds of thousands of students coming into the system at the kindergarten level who are behind and stay behind unless there is extra help in the kindergarten classroom. The total system needs to be prepared. Mrs. Frank suggested that the Board needs to drop the term "college ready" and use "postsecondary education." Mrs. Bragdon suggested using the 4th grade WASL to help determine programs at the middle

school; same for high school, building on the 7th grade WASL profiles. She asked how dropout rates are determined.

Mr. Liu summarized the concerns raised by other Board members such as defining basic education time for learning around credits, unfunded mandates, system readiness, dangers of tracking, differentiation, and avoiding false choices. The system needs to be learner centered.

PANEL DISCUSSION

Principal panelists: Kathy Everidge, Hudson's Bay High School [1600 students] (Vancouver); Sharon Collins, Interlake High School [900 students] (Bellevue); and Jennifer Shaw, Rainier High School [320 students] (Rainier). Ms. Collins presented a PowerPoint on her school—demographics, bell schedule, seven-period day, early release for teacher professional development, college readiness, graduation requirements. Their mission is to graduate students from college, rather than simply admitted. The district is looking at increasing the mathematics credits to 4 years; science to 3 years; and two years of foreign language that can be earned at the middle level. Bellevue uses an integrated mathematics program in middle school as preparation for high school work. Their district has a K-12 aligned curriculum, teacher support and professional development so that teachers are invested. Interlake offers student support classes for students who having problems with mathematics. English Language Learners (ELL) are now passing mainstream classes.

Ms. Everidge provided information on the demographics of Hudson's Bay High School. They would like to have students come into the middle schools with grade-level readiness in mathematics. Hudson's Bay also provides support classes at the ninth grade level; tenth grade level will start next year. Currently only two years of mathematics are required for graduation. They have difficulty bringing staff together for planning, K-12 articulation and professional development.

Ms. Shaw noted that the population of Rainier High School is about 300 with 40 percent free and reduced lunch. There are no English Language Learners at the present time and only a small special education population. The students are now required to have three years of mathematics and science along with four years of English. They also have a strong career and technical integrated program. The school uses Navigation 101 for the Culminating Project curriculum. The problems surround professional development and curriculum alignment. Small schools need assistance from the state or the ability to work with other districts. A good start would be a common curriculum for mathematics. She believes that credits do not make a meaningful diploma—meaningful instruction is more important than meaningful credits. Professional development is critical for teachers to help prepare them to be able to teach students.

In response to questions, Ms. Everidge stated that Hudson's Bay requires geometry and algebra to graduate. Ms. Shaw stated that the students have to be at grade level to count towards graduation. Ms. Everidge and Ms. Collins stated that grades are available online for students and parents to check. Rainier will be starting the same process this semester. Interlake is using summer school and bridge classes to help students. Students who didn't do well in middle school are required to attend. Hudson's Bay

students are not taking advantage of the summer school courses. They are looking within the day to help struggling students. Rainier is having the same problems with struggling students. Rainier's WASL remediation was successful in reading and writing, but not in mathematics. Ms. Everidge stated that meaningful diploma means meaningful instruction that helps students. All three principals were encouraged to submit information to the committee.

Mr. Smith asked several questions of the panel to be replied to later. Mrs. Bragdon asked for input on the charge of the subcommittee. Ms. Collins stated that technology is an important factor and needs to be considered. (Interlake videotapes missed classes and students can access Algebra 1 chat rooms. We need to utilize the many ways students learn.)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Ryan introduced Representative Dave Quall, chair of the House Education Committee.

Representative Quall stated that schools are doing good things. In talking to an admissions officer at a college, the person was troubled with having one test determine graduation of students. He is troubled by the following:

- ✓ Classroom teachers do not have confidence in the system to make it work—more diagnostic tools are needed in the classroom as well as more information on students provided to the teachers;
- ✓ WASL results need to be in the classroom sooner;
- ✓ Will professional development, a new mathematics curriculum, etc. (big ticket items) fix the problems?
- ✓ Need to build an assessment system that will help classroom teachers and students.

The House Education Committee will be looking at several pieces of legislation next week including the Governor's omnibus bill from Washington Learns.

Chair Ryan stated having diagnostics for the classroom is part of the Mathematics Action Plan.

Chris Carlson, parent, is concerned about mathematics and science. He is a fan of checks and balances. He complimented the Board on the mathematics review panel. He feels OSPI having authority over standards, assessment, AND curriculum is a problem. He sees the need for the review panel to be a long term item. The structural coordinator will be the key as the consultant will come with one foot in one camp or the other. The panel should be a six-month pilot for a system change to other curricular areas. He noted he is having problems finding someone from the state to do statistics for his lab.

Deanna Winterrose, parent from Eastern Washington, participating by telephone, echoed Rep. Quall's statements for other diagnostic assessments, but thinks the current WASL system should be replaced. She raised questions on the Mathematics Action

Plan requirements. She is concerned about the remediation requirements being proposed. She is concerned about students losing the electives.

Rainer Houser, Superintendent of Ocean Beach School District, noted there is a systems problem in mathematics. He is hearing the same conversations that he heard at the beginning of HB 1209, which is positive. We have disrupted people in the field, but going back is not an option. He needs the standards to use as leverage to help his students so they don't end up in service jobs on the peninsula as their only option. The system needs some tweaking, but don't change it. There needs to be a modular system for the Level 1 student.

Julie Wright, parent, noted that she is involved with "Where's the Math?". She complimented the Board on taking the lead on the independent review. She is glad that there will be mathematicians but they should be involved in all aspects of the system changes. The standards need to be aligned with international standards. The same needs to happen for science. The system needs to be fixed before additional requirements are introduced. We have no assessment system that will compare students nationally since removal of state-supported ITBS testing.

Shalmar Backman, co-founder of "Where's the Math?" reviewed the development of the mathematics program in the Bellevue School District. Bill Schmidt of Michigan did a study of the Bellevue mathematics program. He also provided Bellevue with the Michigan TIMSS standards. Bellevue took the standards and fit them to the curriculum. Dr. Schmidt, who is being considered for the review panel, is a paid consultant who will tell you what you want to hear. There needs to be a study of the money influencing state decisions.

GOVERNOR'S BUDGET

Julie Salvi, fiscal analyst with the Governor's Office, presented written materials on the Governor's budget for 2007-09. She reviewed the funding for the various sections of K-12 education.

- ✓ Class size: \$90M
 - ✓ Professional development: \$39M
 - ✓ Professional development (regional): \$5.4M
 - ✓ Mathematics/science coaches: \$5.4M
 - ✓ Increase number of teachers: \$6.6M
 - ✓ Increase in the PAS program at 12th grade: \$12M
- Total: \$177.2M for mathematics and science

Total for all areas of K-12 education: \$926.9M

The Governor is looking at doing a salary study that would restructure teachers' pay with incentives. There is also money for a statewide professional certificate system. There is money for special education, simple majority, a student transportation formula, and salary equity. If simple majority does not pass, the monies in the budget for simple majority will not be used.

In response to questions, preschool programs are not necessarily considered to be in a school. The demonstration projects for K-3 and all-day kindergarten are to give guidance to those districts that choose to participate. This budget is truly enhancement money, not a change to the basic education formula. The enhancement for professional development is not an increase in professional development days and is for mathematics and science improvement only. The National Board Certificate bonus is in the Washington Learns omnibus bill. Dr. Mayer is concerned that the mathematics readiness stops at the fourth grade—why was the decision made? It should go all the way down to kindergarten. This is a systemic problem and not just a demonstration project problem.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

- ✓ Executive Director Harding reviewed the calendar for the Legislature—bills not moved out of the house of origin die on February 28.
- ✓ The Governor fully funded the Board's request.
- ✓ Letters have been sent to key legislators.
- ✓ Ms. Harding is meeting with legislators and will be joined on February 12 by Chair Ryan.
- ✓ Ms. Harding reviewed the following bills as they relate to the State Board: Washington Learns Omnibus Bill; review of all Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs) by September 2007; diagnostic feedback immediately to the classroom; state report card for education with a report each year by the State Board.

Pat Eirish, SBE staff, reviewed the status list she is maintaining. She is meeting with the Executive Committee to review legislation. She is sending out highlights each Friday evening. Dr. Bergeson stated that there is a different feeling on the hill this session. The Board is being perceived as independent but able to work with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) and the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB). There is the perception on the hill that the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) can be used for diagnostic purposes (for which it is not designed).

The Board has to make a decision on what it will support or oppose on the hill during session. There is a move to delay reading and writing requirements also. Science is another concern—delay or allow to begin as scheduled. Mrs. Lamb asked what the level of activity should be for Board members with legislators. Dr. Bergeson suggested that the Board should give Chair Ryan, Director Harding, and the Executive Committee authority to take stands as needed.

UPDATE ON PROPOSED CHANGE TO RULES

Director Harding provided background information on the proposed changes. It has been noted that Benchmark 3 is no longer used but the Grade Level Expectations (GLEs) are the standard. Pat Eirish reviewed the construction of the language (making the rules easier to read). These are just clarifying changes to the rules other than Chapter 180-51 WAC are necessitated by HB 3098. Mrs. Lamb suggested a change

regarding classes taken at the 7th and 8th grades. Chair Ryan reiterated that the rule clarification is based on the Math Action Plan.

Chair Ryan asked staff to prepare some options that will show that this will actually be done. Will courses be aligned with the GLEs within a year? How can we get the data to show the alignment? Dr. Bergeson said OSPI can provide the course list, but it is difficult to say what is in the courses because there is no common course description. SBE staff will be working with OSPI staff on accountability from the districts for the alignment.

PUBLIC HEARING

In response to a question from Deanna Winterrose, parent from the Tri-Cities area, Chair Ryan stated that the rule will be clarified to reflect alignment with the 9th and 10th grade GLEs. It is not in conjunction with the recommendations for additional mathematics credits and passage of the WASL.

DATA SYSTEMS

Executive Director Harding introduced Evelyn Hawkins, research associate for the Board. Dr. Mayer provided background information on the need for data systems for accountability and other portions of the Board's work.

Dr. Hawkins presented a PowerPoint on the national Data Quality Campaign. Data systems should include:

- ✓ A unique student identifier
- ✓ Enrollment, demographic, and program participation information
- ✓ Matching test records from year to year
- ✓ Information on untested students
- ✓ Teacher identifier system
- ✓ Student-level transcript information
- ✓ College readiness test scores
- ✓ Graduation and dropout rates
- ✓ Ability to match student records between systems
- ✓ State data audit system

Washington has eight of the ten minimum elements. The minimums listed above are just that—the bare minimum.

Director Harding introduced Nina Oman and John Bowden, Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC). Ms. Oman and Mr. Bowden presented the preliminary report of the K-12 Data Study through PowerPoint (on file with the minutes).

Recommendations: Expenditure Data

OSPI should:

- ✓ Collect missing salary/benefit data, and use school code that can be linked to outcomes
- ✓ Collect teaching related non-salary expenditures by school using standard codes and definitions (and report back to JLARC by July 2007)

- ✓ Develop a statewide standardized methodology for allocating all other expenditures to schools (and report back to JLARC by July 2007)

Recommendations: Teacher/Staff Data

- ✓ OSPI should develop a plan for creating a unified staff data system that includes all descriptive data currently collected, plus the missing data identified by JLARC. (Report plan, including timeline and costs, to JLARC by September 2007)

Recommendations: Student Data

OSPI should:

- ✓ Conduct regular audits of student data
- ✓ Identify an appropriate college readiness test
- ✓ Collect better information about courses, including:
 - ❖ Course minutes
 - ❖ Core coursework completed by students
 - ❖ A common course catalogue with standardized naming conventions for courses

Priorities for Data Collection

- ✓ Focus first on collecting school-level expenditures
- ✓ Next, collect additional descriptive data about teachers and staff
- ✓ Then turn to collecting additional student data
- ✓ Lastly, address collection of additional school & community descriptive data (no recommendation)

After data are improved, then what?—connect the four categories of data to answer detailed questions about the relationship between expenditures and outcomes. The final report is due in February 2007.

In response to a question, most of the information is public and can be obtained from districts or OSPI. Dr. Bergeson noted that the postsecondary institutions are developing a college readiness exam to help students know where they are.

Dr. Bergeson noted that this is a joint effort between the study committee, districts and OSPI; she thanked them for their professionalism.

Joe Eagan, Chief Information Officer for OSPI, presented information on a longitudinal data system. He explained the Core Student Record System (CSRS), the first data system. The Secure Student Identifier was introduced in 2003. CSRS 2 was also introduced in 2003. The identifier is connected to WASL testing but not to the school lunch program. The system is not able to connect student to teacher, student to course, or student to program at this time. They have just completed a pilot with three districts with different collection programs. Some districts are creating data extracts for the state to grab onto; some are allowing the state into their data bases.

Marge Plecki, College of Education at the University of Washington, talked about teacher data systems. Several items looked at included characteristics of teachers, retention and mobility patterns, small and rural district information, and career

pathways. Seventy eight percent of the novice teachers were still in the state five years later. The main source of information for the study was the state report, SR275, which is supplemented by other reports from districts. Questions raised:

- ✓ Who are the teachers?
- ✓ What are they teaching?
- ✓ What supports are available?

Lin Douglas, interim director of the Professional Educator Standards Board, noted that the Standards Board is a user of data not a producer of data. The state does not collect information on teachers of mathematics—endorsement and credential. At the present time, districts are required to report out-of-endorsement assignments—there are no penalties and no incentives for reporting. Data is needed to know the numbers of teachers available now and in the future, quality, access, etc. Companies are going to the alternative routes programs and recruiting the participants into business. HB 1541 could provide the ability to collect the data on teachers and teaching assignments (sponsored by Rep. Hunter). PESB, OSPI, and SBE need to work together on the teacher data system.

LEGISLATION

Chair Ryan noted that the Executive Committee is receiving a legislative update each Friday from Director Harding and Ms. Eirish. The Executive Committee is providing direction for support of legislation that comes up for hearing. Mrs. Lamb suggested a method by email for each Board member to express an opinion on upcoming legislation as needed. Mrs. Frank suggested having information from the Executive Committee discussions sent to the other members for possible reaction. Mrs. Lamb suggested having the chair of the committees involved with the legislative topic be included in conference calls.

Dr. Bergeson stated that the suggestions from Mrs. Lamb seemed doable. She suggested having some direction on the core themes that can be expressed to legislators, i.e., graduation requirements, accountability system, etc. stay with the State Board; data system for education stay with OSPI, etc. Dr. Bergeson would like help from the Board in staying the course with the mathematics, reading, and writing. This is going to be the core bill coming out of this session.

Director Harding listed the following plan:

- ✓ Executive Committee will meet every Friday
- ✓ If the bills involve one of the committee chairs, that person will be on the call
- ✓ If time, there will be an email outlining what the topic is
- ✓ If something comes up at the last minute, the office will notify the members
- ✓ If contact with legislators is needed, staff will call the appropriate member

Chair Ryan will work on a platform for presentation during the work session tomorrow (January 26).

Dr. Bergeson would like to have support from the Board for trying to keep the standards intact.

Staff asked for direction with the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) item on the agenda. The Board will discuss the topic at 2:30 p.m. on Friday. There is a joint memorial in the Legislature that the State Board of Education was asked to sign on as a sponsor.

Recessed at 5:11 p.m.

Friday, January 26, 2007

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m. by Chair Ryan, who outlined the agenda for the remainder of the meeting.

Present: Bernal Baca, Terry Bergeson, Amy Bragdon, Steve Dal Porto, Steve Floyd, Sheila Fox, Phyllis Bunker Frank, Linda W. Lamb, Kristina Mayer, Mary Jean Ryan, John Schuster, Warren T. Smith Sr., Tiffany Thompson and Jeff Vincent.

Excused: Zac Kinman, Eric Liu.

Staff: Edie Harding, Pat Eirish, Evelyn Hawkins, Sarah Bland, Laura Moore and Colleen Warren.

LEAGUE OF EDUCATION VOTERS

Roger Erskine, League member and member of the Professional Educator Standards Board, presented the report card from the League of Education Voters.

SYSTEM PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY

Kris Mayer, chair of the System Performance/Accountability Committee, provided information on the work of the committee. Board members on the committee are Steve Dal Porto, Steve Floyd, Sheila Fox, and Phyllis Frank. Executive Director Edie Harding reviewed a PowerPoint which outlined the work of the committee and what the committee will be looking at in depth. She also outlined what is happening currently and the need for quality data.

Committee work

- ✓ Examine data needed to improve student achievement
- ✓ Create annual SBE report (including multiple measures of performance) to identify schools that are performing well and those that are not
- ✓ Create mandate for any school that does not meet its performance goals within 2 years to engage in improvement efforts
- ✓ Proposed recommendations for this first phase of work by December 2007
- ✓ Complexity of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) as it affects the state system

The committee will be looking at system capacity as well as building-based capacity. Dr. Bergeson asked to keep the NCLB requirements on the list as they affect the work that will be done at the state and local levels.

Sheila Fox presented the attributes being looked at by the committee. Dr. Fox reviewed each of the attributes (complete description on file with these minutes).

- ✓ Attribute #1 Transparent Development
- ✓ Attribute #2 Clear Relationship Between Performance and System Response
- ✓ Attribute #3 Evidence Based
- ✓ Attribute #4 Timely
- ✓ Attribute #5 Multiple Communication Channels
- ✓ Attribute #6 Statewide
- ✓ Attribute #7 Adaptable
- ✓ Attribute #8 Snapshot Data and Longitudinal Data
- ✓ Attribute #9 Multiple Measures
- ✓ Attribute #10 Understandable to the Public

Chair Ryan suggested adding an attribute that says that the management is results-oriented not process-oriented. Also that a performance system has more role clarity—need to shift from local control language to local responsibilities language. Do we believe that the state has a role in making sure all students get the education they deserve? If we do, then the state has a role to consider along with the districts. Mrs. Frank supported the additions. Mr. Smith cautioned the Board in removing the “local language”—small districts especially would be resistant; adding responsibilities is a conversation he would like to engage in. Dr. Bergeson thanked Dr. Fox for her work and stated the responsibility has to be shared between the state and local districts. She stated that, without the authority to intervene, you have to influence, inform, build capacity, and provide an opportunity to receive help under the premise that if you provide the help they will come. Mr. Vincent stated that he is in favor of local control; but at what point do you step in when a district is not improving and students are being hurt? It is going to be a tough issue to deal with in looking at interventions. Mr. Smith stated that the system needs to provide resources to a failing district, and then have interventions available.

Dr. Mayer stated that she had the opportunity to attend a conference where she learned about several new programs. This is an equity issue, an opportunity to learn, and civil rights issue especially for minority students. One of the speakers spoke on the political aspect of accountability. Dr. Mayer stated that the committee is not starting with intervention strategies. Building system capacity and defining aspects of a performance system take precedent over the intervention issues.

PRESENTATION ON SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

Janell Newman, assistant superintendent for School and District Improvement and Accountability at the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), introduced panel members JoLynn Berge, federal finance coordinator, OSPI; Greg Lobdell, research director, Center for Educational Effectiveness (CEE); Duane Baker, president, Baker Evaluation, Research and Consulting, Inc. (BERC). She also introduced Bill Mason, director of Operations, School Improvement Assistance, OSPI.

Ms. Newman stated that along with NCLB came an unprecedented focus on students who are not meeting standards for one reason or another. She asked two questions: What students and schools have access to state technical assistance? Which schools volunteer for this assistance and which schools do not?

Which students leave high school prepared for college and the workplace?

Ms. Newman noted that students who enter the system in kindergarten behind because of family situations, they drop further behind throughout the system. The Opportunity Gap results in Achievement Gap; and has to be addressed before anything else will make a difference.

JoLynn Berge discussed the federal regulations that drive work at the state level. There is a work group that provides input on the workbook that has to be submitted to the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) under NCLB regulations. The workbook requests changes in the rules that the USDOE establishes to implement NCLB. She described the changes that have been and are being proposed. There is no credit for growth—if a district improves one group during Step 1 of Improvement and a new group the next year struggles, the district is not given credit for the improvement, but moves to Step 2. The assessments at grades 3, 5, 6, and 8 will now be calculated into adequate yearly progress (AYP). Only the elementary and middle level schools will be affected by the change.

Greg Lobdell reviewed the work of the Center for Educational Effectiveness (CEE). As of last September, 1711 schools met AYP and 321 did not make it. Also, 32 schools met AYP in 2006, but because they had not before, were in federal assistance requirement. One in four students is represented by the schools who have not met AYP (353 schools). The struggling schools have higher diversity and poverty, and more English language learners. The Title 1 schools—145; non Title 1—208. Some of the non-Title 1 schools are eligible for Title 1 monies. The assistance is only for Title 1 schools because federal funding is used. State money and grant money does help the non-Title 1 funded schools. Missing the mathematics portion of the assessment affects most schools. District resources are not available for all of the struggling schools. Dr. Fox (on behalf of Mr. Smith) asked if, in the 53 percent of Caucasian students, there were other factors than poverty that have been disaggregated. Mrs. Frank asked if the struggling schools have a high percentage of alternative students and if they came from struggling middle schools. The information will be provided to the Committee. Assistance is making a difference as reported by the schools. In the struggling schools, grades 4 & 7, the gap is closing. There is no longitudinal data for grades 3, 5, 6, and 8 at this time. Will the closure of the gap be sustained as these students move to the middle level? Unknown at this time.

Duane Baker stated that he started his career as a high school teacher before becoming a vice principal and assistant superintendent. He now runs Baker Evaluation Research and Consulting (BERC). To change the high school you need to know the purpose of the high school. Schools need to make students ready for college, career and citizenship. Most jobs will require some sort of college level preparation. Structural

changes do not make that much of a difference; what is taught makes the biggest change. BERC can track the students, by name, throughout their college careers. Students and teachers have to be college aware. Students need to graduate college eligible and college prepared. College aware + college eligible + college prepared = college ready. Schools are trying to eliminate lower level English and mathematics courses. Mathematics and foreign language are gatekeepers for students trying to get into college. Mr. Baker provided information on the numbers of students attending college within the first year after high school graduation. He noted that on a state level, 32 percent take remedial mathematics; 16 percent take remedial English. Students in two-year institutions do not matriculate will to four-year institutions. Dr. Mayer suggested Board members look at the Illinois and Ohio information as well as the Washington State high poverty and high minority teaching information. In response to questions, Mr. Baker stated that there is no consistency among universities on the remedial tests given to students entering school. The rate of error is not known in the Achieve data. Chair Ryan asked if, when visiting schools, they could check the level of the mathematics being taught.

Dr. Bergeson thanked Ms. Harding for the organization of the meeting and providing the information on the system and what needs to be done. If legislators had been here, the bills floating on the hill would drop from their own weight.

Dr. Mayer asked that Board members get information/questions for the committee within the next week.

BASIC EDUCATION COMPLIANCE

Pat Eirish, SBE staff, presented the Basic Education Compliance report and background information.

Motion: Moved by Mrs. Lamb and seconded by Dr. Fox to accept the report that all 296 school districts are in compliance. Motion carried.

Chair Ryan expressed concerns about the form as it is now and the need for improvement. If they are in compliance, then they should be offering courses that are aligned with the grade level expectations (GLEs). In response, Ms. Eirish stated that the form is broad to reflect the requirements of the Basic Education Act. Dr. Bergeson stated that this is a tool. If there is going to be a change, the Board needs to make a decision on what the system should look like before making changes in the form.

ADOPTION OF THE CHARGE AND PROCESS FOR AN INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF THE K-12 MATHEMATICS STANDARDS

Motion: Moved by Dr. Baca and seconded by Mr. Floyd to accept the Charge and Process for an Independent Review of the K-12 Mathematics Standards. Motion carried.

Mrs. Lamb asked that the workforce and career and technical mathematics requirements be included.

The Board recessed for an Executive Session to discuss performance goals for the executive director.

Upon reconvening, the Board started a work session to discuss the Board evaluation that was completed in December 2006.

Following the work session:

Chair Ryan's group looked at the way items are framed, posing questions at the beginning and coming back to them at the end; using small groups for discussion. Executive Committee—need to communicate with the whole Board to provide input; Executive Committee sharing what is being done. Several of the items should be saved for July.

Vice Chair Smith noted that his group felt that the Board should review all six items—study time for Board members to work on items; creating a consent agenda; not everything is due by December 2007, save other items for later; lack of clarity with the Executive Committee—look at the Bylaws for the role of the Committee; if it is not an urgent item, bring it to the Board for discussion; share the agenda with the entire Board; follow the list of members wishing to speak and adhere to it.

Dr. Bergeson suggested that the committee chairs provide a recap of what was learned at the beginning of the next meeting or the end of the current meeting.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Chair Ryan listed a proposed platform:

- ✓ Unusual moment that threatens the standards based system and what has been worked on for the last 12 years. There are bills that would remove the WASL as a graduation requirement
- ✓ Board is in a unique position to express that we should not get rid of the standards-based education or remove the WASL as a graduation requirement
- ✓ What are we defending—the strong standards based system with a strong realization that there needs to be system improvement
- ✓ Retain the graduation requirements, with the exception of mathematics—heighten focus on mathematics and system changes
- ✓ The big ticket items—Governor's budget, Washington Learns, Math Action Plan, data systems, system help for various populations, system capacity
- ✓ Avoid—impossible tasks, unfunded mandates, K-12 fragmentation (governance)
- ✓ Next steps—work with other groups

Dr. Bergeson stated that there are several first or second term legislators dropping bills that will fragment the K-12 system; the Board needs to make its presence known and what it is working on. Mrs. Lamb thanked the staff for the brochure; be positive in

statements to get the Legislature to back off and let the Board do its work. If something is important to the Legislature, bring it to the Board to work on the topic.

Mrs. Bragdon stated that when communication is mentioned, she is thinking of the people in the trenches, parents, and community members. The Board needs to generate positive information for the Legislators to hear from constituents.

Mr. Smith introduced Ann Varkados, assistant superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, Bethel School District. She will be getting information on teachers to the Board. Mr. Dal Porto asked a rhetorical question—should we pass a resolution in support of standards based education and staying the course for education? Dr. Baca stated that the op ed piece should have the option of adding a personal statement. Some newspapers will not accept op ed pieces if not written by the person submitting the piece.

This resolution needs to be the Board's statement in support of the system. What is most urgent is getting the word to the Legislature not to postpone, there have been and will be improvements. Mr. Vincent suggested laying out the accomplishments and not to punt now—we have more changes to make, but don't stop now. Dr. Bergeson stated that not all items have been measured, but we can't stop now.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND (NCLB)

Director Harding provided background on the information provided to the Board. NCLB is up for reauthorization this year. Problems: flexibility for special populations; school choice and tutoring services; inadequate federal funding; highly qualified teachers; adequate yearly progress proscriptive. The next steps are to support the proposed memorial and/or draft a letter to the state Congressional delegation.

Shirley McCune, federal liaison at OSPI, provided background information on the work that has taken place with NCLB. She presented the administration's proposed changes to the law. Rep. George Miller and Senator Ted Kennedy are going to try to bring the reauthorization up this year. The administration is promoting "vouchers" in the guise of scholarships. Money will also go to sectarian schools. Intrusive in state law: if a state caps the number of charter schools, the legislation would override; the legislation would also override collective bargaining agreements.

Good items: more money for mathematics at all three levels. The positive items proposed because of budget concerns. Because of the war efforts and the pay-go law, there will be little money to fund the changes. Ms. McCune outlined recent studies on competitiveness (mathematics and science) and workforce readiness. There is also a trend for national standards and national assessment (comparing the states' assessments with the National Assessment of Education Progress [NAEP]). States are not taking this seriously enough. These changes will shape education for the next five years. England, Canada, and Australia have gone towards centralization of education and have run into many problems.

Dr. Bergeson spoke in favor of the Board supporting the joint memorial to Congress. The Governor will probably not sign on, but wants the Legislature to pass to use in working with Congress.

Chair Ryan stated that the memorial is aimed at getting money rather than making substantive changes to the law. She would like to have the Board begin working with the state's Congressional delegation. Mrs. Lamb listed several problems she found in the reauthorization.

Chair Ryan would like to be in communication with the Congressional Delegation that we are the State Board of Education and much of what happens affects the work the Board is doing. Several Board members spoke for and against the memorial. Mr. Floyd stated that the language should be worked on and brought to the next meeting.

DRAFT RESOLUTION

Member worked on wording for a draft resolution to legislators.

180-DAY WAIVER STUDY

Jack Schuster, Pat Eirish, and Evelyn Hawkins presented information on the study that has been conducted so far. The next meeting will be on February 16. Teachers and many of the principals are hired by the day. Some school people are on a full-year contract. The Legislature has granted Learning Improvement Days (LID), but now only offers districts two, due to the high cost of each LID day. In the past, grants were provided to be used for innovation in schools under the 21st Century Program. The Board has granted waivers from the 180-day student contact requirement, allowing for restructuring and program improvement.

Pat Eirish, SBE staff, provided background information on the committee and previous waiver requirements. Short term improvement—TRI days (negotiated time with local bargaining units, not state-funded), for performance on the WASL and school improvement planning.

Evelyn Hawkins, SBE staff, presented long-term improvement—further analysis on WASL scores and AYP; go out and talk to a sample of the districts.

Mrs. Frank raised a question on how the 1000 hours is calculated. It is a district-wide annual average. The calculation considers all levels. Dr. Fox asked what the waiver is for from the Board's perspective. The TRI day should not be considered as it is a local district option, not a statewide mandate. In response to a question, it was noted that the early release days are paid for with state funds.

GED STUDY REPORT

Pat Eirish, SBE staff, reviewed the study and the fact that it has been submitted to the Legislature. The study was mandated during the reorganization because the rules are in three separate agencies (SBE, OSPI, and the State Board for Community & Technical Colleges). The recommendation was to leave the rules alone.

BOARD RESOLUTION

The SBE reconfirms its strong support for a robust standards-based assessment system and high quality graduation requirements. Systems issues are being addressed in:

- ✓ Joint Mathematics Action Plan
- ✓ Focus on systems performance and accountability
- ✓ Meaningful high school diploma planning

Progress is being made on these issues.

We solicit your support as we strive to meet our common mission to improve student learning.

Motion: Moved by Dr. Bergeson and seconded by Dr. Dal Porto to adopt the resolution as revised. Motion carried.

COLLECTION OF EVIDENCE

Chair Ryan asked for a short consensus on how the Collection is going. Dr. Lesley Klenk, Assessment and Research at OSPI, provided an update on the Collection of Evidence process. They have started receiving registrations for the Collection. She also presented examples of the work samples for mathematics, reading and writing.

Anton Jackson, Assessment and Research at OSPI, provided information on the changes to the Collection on mathematics. The targets have been met with acceptance in the field. The Collection has been made clearer in the language of what has to be done. They have created frequently asked questions.

Mrs. Bragdon asked for information on where the registrations are coming from.

Meeting adjourned at 3:36 p.m.