

# The Washington State Board of Education

Governance | Achievement | High School and College Preparation | Math & Science | Effective Workforce

Old Capitol Building, Room 253  
P.O. Box 47206  
600 Washington St. SE  
Olympia, Washington 98504

January 12-13, 2011  
New Market Skills Center  
Tumwater, Washington

## MINUTES

### January 12, 2011

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

**Staff Attending:** Ms. Edie Harding, Ms. Loy McColm, Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Dr. Kathe Taylor, Mr. Brad Burnham, Ms. Sarah Rich, Ms. Ashley Harris, Ms. Colleen Warren (8)

### Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m. by Vice Chair Dal Porto.

Mr. Joe Kinerk welcomed the Board to the New Market Skills Center.

### Consent Agenda

**Motion** was made to approve the November 9-10, 2010 meeting minutes with a friendly amendment to the language on the Strategic Planning original motion on page 39 of the Board packet.

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

### SBE Data Dashboard on Strategic Plan

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director

Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Communications Manager

Mr. Wyatt reviewed the strategic goals snapshot with the members and explained the representation of the products/results. Ms. Harding reviewed each goal and explained the progress made by SBE staff on each goal.

**SBE Strategic Plan Goal Two: Provide Leadership for Closing the Academic Achievement Gap Objective A: Joint Strategies to Close the Achievement Gap**

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director  
Ms. Sarah Rich, Research Director

**Overview of Goal Two Topics**

The SBE Goal Two: Provide Policy Leadership for Closing the Academic Achievement Gap, has the following objectives:

1. Focus on joint strategies to close the achievement gap for students of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds, students in poverty, and English language learners.
2. Advocate for high quality early learning experiences for all K-3 educational continuum.

The SBE received the latest state assessment information in September 2010 that showed a continued substantial achievement gap for students of color, students in poverty, and English language learners. Tables were presented to the members, describing race/ethnicity, poverty, and English language learner gaps over time for math, science, reading, and writing.

At the November 2010 Board meeting, SBE adopted the schedule for identification, designation, approval of the plan, and contingencies for an impasse through mediation and the courts if the plan is not agreed upon. In November 2010, OSPI adopted rules that address the criteria for how persistently lowest achieving schools would be identified and which school districts would be recommended for required action to the SBE for designation, as well as the exit criteria. OSPI intends to provide up to half of the federal school improvement grant funds for Required Action Districts. The timeline for SBE and OSPI action is as follows:

December 2010	OSPI identifies the list of the bottom five percent of persistently lowest achieving schools and notifies districts that they will be recommended to SBE for required action.
January 2011	SBE designates Required Action Districts and provides a model letter for districts to use to communicate with parents.
January-February 2011	OSPI conducts Performance Audits and RADs; develops plans and budgets.
March 2011	OSPI reviews RAD applications. SBE approves RAD plans at a special meeting on March 31 and funding is awarded.

The 2010 awards will include 24 schools to be recognized with closing the achievement gap in an awards ceremony scheduled for April 24, 2011.

**Board Reflections on Reading Materials for Goal Two**

The members broke into work groups, facilitated by the award winning teachers, for a work session and came back to the large group to report out on their discussion as follows:

Strategic Plan Goal Two: Closing Achievement Gaps - Small Group Discussions

Board Roles: Advocacy—Policy Leadership—Communication—System Oversight—Convening — Facilitating

**Group One:** Jay Maebori, Washington Teacher of the Year (facilitator), Mary Jean Ryan, Bernal Baca, Connie Fletcher, Edie Harding

### Three main themes:

Collaboration is important:

- It is not just up to the schools to help kids.
- Students must take responsibility as well as parents/guardians.
- Work with higher education.
- Important for teachers not to give up on kids.
- Listening to what different groups of students want, such as young African American males important.
- We need ways to be more proactive, not reactive to situations.

ELL triple segregation article, thought provoking:

- What is the best way to teach ELL students?
- Politically hard to shift resources.
- ELL students don't learn the same way.
- Teachers need to decide what model works best.
- Teachers newly minted from Teacher Prep programs unprepared to teach ELL students.
- Need to tighten up licensure requirements for ELL endorsement.

Innovation:

- Look at new high school models.
- Look at different staffing, such as high needs teacher/counselor in each building.
- Look at new models for underperforming schools.

**Group 2:** Kelly Aramaki, Milken Educator Award (facilitator), Sheila Fox, Jared Costanzo, Bob Hughes, Randy Dorn, Sarah Rich

### Major themes

- We already know what works, but we don't always put it into practice (e.g. using varied examples, having students think aloud, distributed practice).
- Teacher preparation: there have been major improvements in teacher preparation. The pro-cert standards include student voice, relevance of student background, and differentiation. Student motivation according to their own interest is critically important but is not the only thing – teachers also need to teach standards. We can embed the things students need to know in areas where they have interest. Professional development for existing teachers is critical.
- Relationships: Be relentlessly respectful, respectfully relentless.
- Technology and student engagement must be deliberately built.

**Group 3:** Nicola Wethall, Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching (facilitator), Steve Dal Porto, Phyllis Frank, Jack Schuster, Anna Laura Kastama, Kris Mayer, Kathe Taylor

### Major themes

- Advocate for differentiated instruction.
- Improve alignment within system of feeder schools (elementary, middle, high) to assure systematic interventions with struggling learners.
- Advocate that race, ethnicity, and gender-responsive approaches to school improvement are considered.
- Advocate for systemic cultural change and the political will to make the changes that are needed, including addressing promotion and tenure policies based on effectiveness rather than longevity.
- Home-school connection between family/mentor (significant adults/guardians/parents) and students is essential.

- State is populated with immigrant communities that may not know how to engage with schools, or may not feel safe engaging with schools.
- Better communication system.
- We need a different model—less a management model than one of leadership and education to intervene strategically as a student progresses through the grades. Recognize good, comprehensive professional learning communities, recognize what good instruction is, what an authentic, measurable partnership supportive of students' learning is?
- Importance of heterogeneous groups.

### Overview of Programs for School and District Improvement

Ms. Sarah Rich, Research Director

Ms. Tonya Middling, Acting Assistant Superintendent, OSPI

Cece Mahre, Yakima School District

Sandra Yager, Longview School District

The purpose of the School Improvement Grants is to turn around the lowest five percent of schools nationwide. Approximately \$7.3 million will be available for the 2011-12 school year for districts selected for cohort II, which includes districts designated for required action. Hopefully, this same amount will be available for the following two years for Cohort II.

The schools eligible to receive School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds are:

Tier I Schools – Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that:

- Is among the lowest achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the state for the five lowest achieving such schools.
- Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. 200.19(b) that is below 60 percent over a number of years.

Tier II Schools – Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive Title I, Part A funds that:

- Is among the lowest achieving five percent of secondary schools or the five lowest achieving secondary schools in the state that are eligible for, but do not receive Title I funds.
- Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. 200.19(b) that is below 60 percent over a number of years.

Tier III Schools – Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is not a Tier I school.

Ms. Middling gave an overview of School Improvement Grants (SIG), including all four federal intervention models: Turnaround, Restart, Transformation, and School Closure. The Cohort I (MERIT schools) that applied and received \$17.3 million in SIG funds in 2010 will receive funds for two more years. These schools are under the voluntary process. She also shared the improvement timeline effective 2011-12.

There are no major changes for the 2011 SIG competition. There are a few changes to the 2011 non-regulatory guidance addressing: flexibility to generate new lists; pre-implementation; and parent and community engagement. The three year program evaluation will be conducted by a national research firm – Human Resources Research Organization, and includes:

- Providing comprehensive evaluations of state improvement initiatives: Summit Districts (2008-12); MERIT Network and Required Action Districts (2010-13); WIIN (2010-13).
- Delivering data based reports that:

- ✓ Support leaders in making timely revisions and adjusting resources and support based on analysis of actionable data.
- ✓ Assist state and local level parties to determine outcomes and overall effectiveness of improvement initiatives.
- ✓ Identify improvement processes, tools, and products that can be scaled district-wide, regional, and statewide to improve learning, teaching, and leadership.

### MERIT Schools Briefings

Ms. Mahre gave an overview of Adams Elementary, Stanton Academy, and Washington Middle School, as schools receiving the SIG funds.

Ms. Yager gave an overview of Monticello Middle School as a school receiving the SIG funds.

Board discussion followed with Ms. Mahre and Ms. Yager answering clarifying questions.

### **OSPI Required Action District Recommendations**

Ms. Tonya Middling, Acting Assistant Superintendent, OSPI

The methodology used for the required action recommendations includes:

- Following guidance of added ranks method.
- Final ordering: schools in lowest five percent in both reading and math; total “added ranks”; and lack of progress relative to state.

Schools are ranked in priority order based on:

- The lowest levels of achievement in the all students group in reading and math combined for the past three consecutive years.
- The schools with the lowest rate of improvement in reading and math combined for the past three years.

OSPI will prioritize district applications based on:

- Districts that have been designated for Required Action.
- Districts with Tier I or Tier II schools on the Persistently Lowest Achieving list for consecutive years.

Additional consideration for final selection may include:

- Geographic distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools through the state.
- Number of schools within each tier.
- Size of schools within each tier.

According to E2SSB 6696/RCW 28A.675, Required Action Districts:

- Will be designated by the SBE and will not compete for the federal funds, but they must follow the requirements for the Federal School Improvement Grants and SB 6696.
- Must allow for the opening of any collective bargaining approved after June 10, 2010 if necessary to meet requirements of the federal intervention models and findings from the academic performance audit.

In the case of impasse, agreement will be reached either through mediation or superior court. If no plan is submitted or the plan is not approved, SBE shall direct the Superintendent of Public Instruction to require the local school district to redirect its Title I funds, based on the academic performance audit findings.

A district may be recommended for removal from Required Action after three years of implementation if the district has no school, or schools, on the list of persistently lowest achieving schools. The school, or schools, on the list of persistently lowest achieving schools must have a positive improvement trend in reading and math on the state’s assessment in the “all students” category, based on a three year average.

Timelines were presented as follows:

December 2010-January 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>December 1 – LEA’s notified of OSPI’s RAD recommendation.</li> <li>December 15 – Reconsideration requests due.</li> </ul>
January – March 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>January 12 – SBE designates RADs.</li> <li>OSPI conducts school and district level academic performance audits.</li> <li>LEA reopens CBA in areas needed.</li> <li>March 4 – LEA application/Required Action Plan development and submission due.</li> <li>RAP approved by SBE.</li> </ul>
April – July 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SBE awards grants to LEAs.</li> <li>LEAs begin pre-implementation including recruiting, selection, and placement of school administrators and instructional staff.</li> </ul>
August – October 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MERIT districts and schools create and implement the first 90-day plan.</li> </ul>

The Required Action Districts being recommended to the Board for approval during this meeting are:

- Morton Junior/Senior High School, Morton School District.
- Onalaska Middle School, Onalaska School District.
- Lakeridge Elementary School, Renton School District.
- Soap Lake Middle/High School, Soap Lake School District.

**Public Comment**

Ramona Hattendorf, Washington State Parent Teacher Association (WSPTA)

The WSPTA’s vision is for every child to reach his or her potential. They don’t expect to achieve this vision alone and believe that family, community, and government should partner to support and reinforce each other’s efforts. Increasingly, though, students are not getting the core education they need and private efforts to supplement raise concerns of inequities. The WSPTA commends the Board for their efforts to ensure all children get the opportunities they need to transition to college or careers. The WSPTA is also concerned about the achievement gap. There is success in classrooms where educators can provide differentiated instruction and promote critical thinking, but our recession has left local districts struggling to fund these enhancements and state funds that gave schools flexibility in this area have been cut. Ms. Hattendorf gave an overview of the WSPTA’s priorities for the 2011 Legislative Session including: 1) stay the course on basic education; 2) help our children reach math and science standards; and 3) reach 100 percent literacy. The WSPTA supports statewide adoption of early phonological awareness screening and the statewide implementation of research-based, direct, explicit and systematic literacy instruction in every classroom. The WSPTA supports funding education first in any budget process undertaken by the Legislature. The cumulative effects of cuts will leave our learners vulnerable and have long term economic consequences. Going forward, we need to make deliberate and strategic investments. We need to follow through on steps we’ve already identified, which are: 1) pay for the basics kids really need; and 2) follow the research and make sure all kids are on a path to reach their potential.

Heather Cope, League of Education Voters (LEV)

Ms. Cope commented on the legislative positions that are being discussed later in the meeting. The LEV urges the Board to maintain their momentum on aligning high school exit requirements with post-secondary expectations. We cannot go backwards on math and science. The LEV agrees with staff recommendations to maintain assessments as graduation requirements. For math, the LEV is open to ideas around specific assessments. The LEV is concerned about the absence of the Career and College Ready high school graduation requirements from the SBE legislative priorities.

**Teacher Recognition**

The Board welcomed the following teachers and recognized them for their excellence in serving the children of Washington State:

- Teacher of the Year, Jay Maebori, Kentwood High School
- Milken Award, Kelly Aramaki, John Stanford International School
- Presidential Award in Math, Nicola Wethall, Oak Harbor High School
- Presidential Award in Science, Karen Borders, Key Peninsula Middle School was unable to attend the recognition.

The teachers were recognized and asked to give an overview of the work they do to make a difference in student’s lives.

**State Fiscal Situation and Implications for K-12**

Mr. Shawn Lewis, Assistant Superintendent, OSPI

In September, the Governor implemented an across the board cut to all state general fund programs, excluding basic education, pensions, and debt payments of 6.287% or \$520 million. In November, the deficit increased and the state now must prepare for a supplemental budget to address at least \$1,115 million shortfall in the current fiscal year, ending June 30, 2011. Work is being done to prepare for a 2011-13 biennial budget that addresses a \$5.7 billion shortfall.

Mr. Lewis indicated that the cuts only apply to a small portion of the education budget and gave an overview of the impact from the Governor’s proposed supplemental budget cuts, as follows:

<b>Programs</b>	<b>Amount in Millions</b>	
Education Reform (assessment savings)	\$8.7	Reduction
OSPI Administration and Program Funding	\$3.4	Reduction
School-based Medicaid Services	\$3.3	Eliminate
Levy Equalization	\$18.0	Reduction of 6.3 percent retroactive
K-4 Enhancement	\$81.5	Eliminate, full year retroactive
Highly Capable Student Funding	\$7.0	Eliminate, full fiscal year 2011
Education Job Funds	\$208.4	Use for basic education costs

The 2011-13 biennium outlook shows a state projected biennial shortfall of \$5.7 billion. As part of the shortfall, the state will:

- Restore cuts to I-728 and I-732 over four years, beginning in the 2011-12 school year.
- Increase employer pension contributions (pension savings proposed by the Governor will still result in an increase in the pension contribution paid by school districts).

State funding for K-12 will be impacted by all above hurdles.

Mr. Lewis reviewed the six-year outlook with members and answered clarifying questions.

## **Quality Education Council Report and Governor's Recommended Budget and Education Policy Issues**

Mr. Shawn Lewis, Assistant Superintendent, OSPI

The January 2010 QEC recommendations were:

1. Do not decrease funding in 2009-10.
2. Adopt crosswalk/baseline.
3. Three year phase-in of transportation, beginning 2011-12.
4. Three year phase-in of non-related employee costs, beginning 2011-12.
5. Seven year phase-in of full day kindergarten.
6. Five year phase-in of K-3 class size to 1:15, beginning 2011-12.
7. Three year phase-in of early learning for at-risk three and four year olds, beginning 2011-12.

The QEC work plan for 2010 included:

- Identifying measurable goals and priorities for the educational system, utilizing the state Reform Plan and current performance data as a baseline.
- Implementing a schedule for revised graduation requirements and increased hours of instruction.
- Making necessary reports to the Legislature regarding classified staff adequacy and capacity of school districts, to implement new funding including class size reductions.
- Recommending programs and funding to close the achievement gap, increasing graduation rates, and decreasing the dropout rate to include:
  - ✓ Recommending an improved learning assistance program, including funding methodology.
  - ✓ Recommending an improved transitional bilingual program, including funding methodology.
  - ✓ Reviewing recommendations made by the Achievement Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee.
  - ✓ Reviewing recommendations made by the Building Bridges Workgroup.

The draft January 2011 QEC recommendations include:

1. Continue implementation of SHB 2776 and preserve funding necessary to deliver basic education including Levy Equalization, highly capable, and K-3 reduced class size funding.
2. Support opportunities to graduate prepared for postsecondary education employment and citizenship.
3. Close the opportunity gap for disadvantaged students and students of color.
4. Support programs that strengthen education professionals.
5. Support improvements in math and science.
6. Invest in early learning.

The QEC will release their report soon. The Local Levy Technical Working Group recommendations are due on June 30, 2011 and the Compensation Technical Working Group begins on July 1, 2011.

## **OSPI Legislative Initiatives - Math and Science Graduation Requirements**

Mr. Bob Butts, Assistant Superintendent, OSPI

Ms. Ellen Ebert, Science Director, OSPI

To graduate from high school, current law requires the students in the Classes of 2013 and 2014 to meet standards on two end-of-course high school math assessments and either the comprehensive science HSPE or a newly developed biology end-of-course assessment. These assessments are in



addition to the requirements that students meet standards on the reading and writing assessments. For the Class of 2015 and beyond, the comprehensive assessment option is eliminated.

Mr. Butts proposed three questions for the members to consider:

1. Are our current plans for math and science end-of-course assessment graduation requirements fair to our students?
2. Will these plans, once implemented, actually improve math and science achievement?
3. If not, what changes and actions are needed?

The current science assessment graduation requirements include:

1. RCW 28A.655.061
  - Beginning with the Class of 2013, students must meet state standards in science or an alternative/alternate assessment in order to graduate.
2. Senate Bill 6444 (operating budget – 2009 session)
  - OSPI, in consultation with SBE, will develop a high school end-of-course assessment measuring the science standards in biology. This will be implemented in the 2011-12 school year.
3. In December 2010, OSPI recommended whether additional end-of-course assessments in science should be developed.

OSPI will recommend two agency-request bills to the Legislature as follows:

1. **Mathematics:** The first bill will amend current law to require students in the Classes of 2013 and 2014 to meet the standard on only one high school mathematics end-of-course assessment instead of two. Since most students in grades ten and eleven are taking geometry this school year, they will be able to take the geometry end-of-course assessment as a graduation required exam this spring. Phasing in the implementation of the requirement will also give teachers and students more time to understand what is being assessed, to modify instruction, to provide appropriate assistance to students who do not meet the standards and result in a more orderly implementation.
2. **Science:** The four components of the science legislation includes:
  - Continue with the development of the biology end-of-course exam with initial implementation in spring 2011.
  - Phase in two additional science end-of-course exams, the first in physical science in 2015 and the second in integrated science in 2016. If possible, these assessments will be developed in cooperation with other states using the common core science standards that are being developed.
  - Delay the science graduation requirement until the Class of 2017. Require students in the Class of 2017 to pass the biology end-of-course exam or a biology alternative assessment to graduate.
  - Require students in the Class of 2018 and beyond to meet standards in science by passing the biology end-of-course exam or one of the additional science end-of-course exams, or appropriate alternative, to graduate.

### **SBE Legislative Strategy**

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director

Mr. Brad Burnham, Policy and Legislative Specialist

The 62<sup>nd</sup> Legislative Session began on January 10 and will end on April 24. The Democrats have retained a majority in the Senate: 27-22 and in the House: 56-42. The biggest challenge facing the

Legislature, this session, is how to address the significant budget deficits for the remaining part of the 2009-11 budget that ends June 30, 2011, and the biennial budget for 2011-13.

The SBE 2011 legislative positions are as follows:

1. Washington State graduation requirements.  
Staff recommendation: The Board opposes legislation that would reduce the rigor or the number of credits required for the Graduating Class of 2013.
  - Members suggested changing language to the recommendation.
2. Removing the Culminating Project as a graduation requirement for the 2011-13 school years.  
Staff recommendation: The Board supports the temporary suspension of the Culminating Project graduation requirement as proposed by the Governor for the 2011-13 school years.
  - Members were not in favor of supporting the Governor's proposal to suspend the Culminating Project.
3. Mathematics assessment graduation requirement.  
Staff recommendation: The Board supports the Governor's proposal to require students in the Graduating Class of 2014, and beyond, to pass two math end-of-course assessments, providing for the continuation of the collection of evidence as an alternative assessment.
  - No comments, recommendation stands as presented.
4. Science assessment graduation requirement.  
Staff recommendation: The Board supports keeping the science assessment graduation requirement to pass one science end-of-course assessment beginning with the Graduating Class of 2013.
  - No comments, recommendation stands as presented.
5. Temporary reduction in the basic education requirement of 180 school days.  
Staff recommendation: The Board supports maintaining the 180 school day school year requirement and opposes any reductions to the length of the school year. The Board also supports that any granted waivers from the 180 school day school year requirement not be considered applicable to any school year where a change in state law mandates that a school district provide less than the current minimum requirement of 180 school days per school year, or 180 half-days of instruction or the equivalent for kindergarten.
  - No comments, recommendation stands as presented.
6. PESB/SBE joint policy issues.  
Staff recommendation: The Board joins with the PESB in supporting legislation addressing the following policy issues:
  - a. Meaningful evaluation system for teachers and principals.
  - b. Completion of the work to develop an enhanced, collaboratively designed salary allocation model by the QEC Compensation Work Group.
  - c. Strategies to close the achievement gap.
  - d. Funding of focused professional development.
  - e. E-certification and other data bases.
  - No comments, recommendation stands as presented.
7. OSPI/Department of Early Learning.  
Staff recommendation: The Board supports legislation implementing the kindergarten readiness assessment to be used in state funded all-day kindergarten.
  - Staff and members will discuss language offline.
8. Quality Education Council recommendations.  
Staff recommendation: The Board will continue to advocate for funding to phase in new graduation requirements as the state fiscal situation improves.
  - No comment, recommendation stands as presented.
9. Financial literacy as the third math credit for high school graduation.

Staff recommendation: The Board supports incorporating high school level financial literacy standards into existing social studies courses.

- Staff and members will discuss language offline.

10. Joint Higher Education Coordinating Board, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, and SBE.

Staff recommendation: The Board will support:

- a. Maintaining the rigor and number of credits required for the Graduating Class of 2013.
- b. Ensuring that capacity in our two year and four year institutions is provided to increase college access for students currently underrepresented in postsecondary education.
- c. Continued state support for State Need Grants (including College Bound Scholarship program).

- Language for a. above will be changed according to the language in number one above.

11. Governor's education governance proposal.

Staff recommendation: The Board will examine the Governor's proposal in the context of its own strategic plan goal to review education governance.

Staff will work on language changes and bring recommendations back to the members on Thursday.

### **180 Day Waiver Requests and Basic Education Program Compliance by School Districts**

Mr. Brad Burnham, Policy and Legislative Specialist

School districts are required to show compliance with the Basic Education entitlement requirements and the minimum high school graduation requirements. Districts demonstrate compliance by submitting SPI Form 1497 to the SBE by the first Monday in November of each school year. All 295 Washington State school districts have provided their compliance with the Basic Education entitlement requirements for the 2010-11 school year.

Applications were received by Edmonds School District and Shoreline School District for a renewal of five waiver days for 2011-14. Approval of applications will occur during business items on Thursday.

### **Public Comment**

#### Nancy Hiteshue, Washington Roundtable

Regardless of the path they choose, the power it gives students to solve problems and design innovative solutions is critical, not only to student success, but to preserving our state's competitiveness and prosperity. Students, parents, taxpayers, and employers across the state can no longer tolerate our near annual debate over whether or not to delay math requirements. Washington students need the Board to hold firm to its commitments. Statute states that students in the class of 2013 have the option to meet the math graduation requirement through either an end-of-course assessment or through the current comprehensive assessment. Based on this statute, why wouldn't we allow students the opportunity to take the comprehensive high school assessment? Right now, the state has recommended that we switch from the comprehensive assessment and end-of-course exams to the common core assessments all in a matter of five or six years. Is this really fair to districts, teachers, and students when we could simply stick with a comprehensive test and minimize disruption to the state's assessment system? Ms. Hiteshue urged the Board to not make this transition to common core standards and assessments harder than it needs to be for districts, teachers, and students.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m. by Vice Chair Dal Porto

## **January 13, 2011**

**Members Attending:** Chair Jeff Vincent (phone), Vice-Chair Steve Dal Porto, Ms. Connie Fletcher, Mr. Randy Dorn, Mr. Jack Schuster, Ms. Phyllis Bunker Frank, Dr. Sheila Fox, Dr. Bernal Baca, Ms. Mary Jean Ryan, Mr. Jared Costanzo, Ms. Anna Laura Kastama, Mr. Bob Hughes, Mr. Warren Smith, Dr. Kris Mayer, Ms. Amy Bragdon (15)

**Members Absent:** Mr. Eric Liu (excused) (1)

**Staff Attending:** Ms. Edie Harding, Ms. Loy McColm, Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Dr. Kathe Taylor, Mr. Brad Burnham, Ms. Sarah Rich, Ms. Ashley Harris, Ms. Colleen Warren (8)

## **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m. by Vice Chair Dal Porto.

## **Lessons of Impact**

Ms. Anna Laura Kastama, Student Board Member

Ms. Kastama gave an overview of her classes and experiences at the Tacoma School of the Arts. Ms. Kastama is a For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology (FIRST) team member and she talked about the FIRST Robotics Competition and the process students took to perform at the competition. She explained how the Mentor Project Group (MPG) works at the school. Every student is assigned to a MPG with each group having a different task or project involving the community in some way. The students have the same MPG for all three years of their education. Graduation requirements are monitored through the MPG and students are kept up to date by a mentor in their group to ensure that graduation requirements are met on time to graduate. The Tacoma School of the Arts has a 97 percent graduation rate.

## **SBE Middle School Initiative**

Dr. Kathe Taylor, Policy Director

One of the SBE strategic plan goals is to provide policy leadership to increase Washington's student enrollment and success in secondary and postsecondary education. An objective under this goal is to provide policy leadership to examine the role of middle school preparation as it relates to high school success. A strategy for meeting the objective is to convene an advisory group to study and make policy recommendations for ways to increase the number of middle school students who are prepared for high school.

Currently, there is no centralized pool of information about middle level education in the state. Although OSPI assigns an assistant superintendent to secondary education, there is no single department or person at the state level with responsibility solely for middle level education. Dr. Taylor referred to page 114 of the Board packet, asking members to review the potential areas of study. The potential areas are organized around the questions that will guide the inquiry. In all areas, SBE staff will look nationally and within the state for exemplary policies or practices to consider and showcase. Data will be disaggregated wherever possible to assess impacts on student groups. The members reviewed the potential areas of study and discussion followed.

## **State Education Reform Plan Draft Recommendations**

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director

Ms. Sarah Rich, Research Director

1,309 responses were received from the survey and focus group feedback. The responses came from SBE and Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) members, as well as: 667 parents, 631 teachers, administrators, education advocates, and teacher union members. The following decisions were made after reviewing the feedback received:

### **Plan Content**

- Change goals to priorities and reorganize – all Washington students graduate able to succeed in college, training, and careers should be first.
- Add one additional priority – Washington educators should demonstrate the highest levels of expertise, excellence, and professionalism.
- Create Theory of Action – why, how, and toward what end – for Washington’s approach to education reform.
- Reduce number of strategies under the priorities.
- Add parent education and engagement strategy and expected results under kindergarten readiness.

### **Plan Communication, Implementation, and Coordination**

- Create public Education Reform Plan document.
- Establish action plan and accountability targets.
- Assign responsibilities for implementation planning and prioritization, including establishing targets for expected results.
- Continue cross department, agency, board, executive office, commission, and legislative collaboration on education reform.
  - ✓ Expand to include pre-school through post-secondary education departments, boards, and/or offices.
  - ✓ Expand to include one representative external leadership seat on the Coordinating Committee/Working Team and the Steering Committee/Leadership Group.

The five priorities were included as attachments for this discussion:

1. All Washington students graduate able to succeed in college, training, and careers.
2. All Washington students attain high academic standards regardless of race, ethnicity, income, or gender.
3. All Washington students will enter kindergarten prepared for success in school and life.
4. All Washington students compete in mathematics and science nationally and internationally.
5. All Washington educators demonstrate the highest levels of expertise, excellence, and professionalism.

## **SBE Strategic Plan Goal Two: Provide Leadership for Closing the Academic Achievement Gap Objective B: Advocate for High Quality Early Learning Experiences Department of Early Learning**

Dr. Elizabeth Hyde, Director, Department of Early Learning (DEL)

Ms. Bonnie Beukema, Assistant Director of Outcomes and Accountability, Department of Early Learning

The early learning plan is a ten year roadmap that:

- Provides all children a solid foundation for success in school and life.
- Coordinates the multiple systems that impact children in their earliest years.

- Measures results over time for children and families to ensure we invest in what works.
- Supports early care and education professionals in offering quality learning environments.

To implement the plan, an early learning partnership joint resolution was signed by DEL, Thrive by Five, and OSPI. The group has met consistently since the signing of the resolution and has worked on school readiness by addressing: ready and successful children; parents, families, and caregivers; early learning professionals; schools; and systems and communities.

The first year priorities for DEL in 2011 include:

- Implement the kindergarten readiness assessment (WaKIDS) as co-lead with OSPI.
- Expand and enhance the Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP).
- Revise and promote use of Early Learning and Development Benchmarks.
- Build statewide infrastructure for partnerships and mobilization.
- Expand P-20 longitudinal data system.
- Implement quality rating and improvement system.

The first year priorities for OSPI in 2011 include:

- Implement the kindergarten readiness assessment (WaKIDS) as co-lead with DEL.
- Implement phase-in of full-day kindergarten.
- Increase early literacy as co-lead with Thrive.

The first priorities for Thrive in 2011 include:

- Make home visiting available to at-risk families.
- Ensure social-emotional learning for parents, caregivers, and early learning professionals.
- Implement a quality rating and improvement system as co-lead with DEL.
- Increase early literacy as co-lead with OSPI.

Most priorities are supported with existing state funds, existing federal funds, and a combination of federal and private funds.

WaKIDS supports a smooth transition into kindergarten for children; informs teacher instruction; builds partnerships among parents, providers, and teachers; and focuses on whole child development.

In the fall of 2010, DEL and OSPI piloted the WaKIDS Kindergarten Readiness Assessment in classrooms in 51 districts statewide. Three assessment tools were piloted and each assessment measured four domains of child development as follows:

1. Social/emotional.
2. Literacy.
3. Cognitive.
4. Physical.

The WaKIDS pilot was implemented because there is no consistent data on child progress until the third grade and there is a need to address the preparation gap before it becomes an achievement gap. The pilot partners include: OSPI, DEL, Thrive by Five, voluntary school districts, the University of Washington, and the WaKIDS Advisory Team. The participants in the pilot include 115 classrooms in 51 school districts statewide and almost 3,000 incoming kindergartners. The three parts of the pilot are: family connection, whole child inventory, and early learning collaboration. Ms. Buekema gave an overview of the purpose of each part of the pilot.

A report due to the Legislature on January 15, 2011, will inform future funding and policy decisions about kindergarten assessment processes in Washington State.

Next steps include:

- Ensure teachers have one day of WaKIDS training before school starts, with follow-up communications and training to support teachers during the implementation of WaKIDS.
- Strengthen the Early Learning Collaboration component.
- Strengthen the pre-k through third grade alignment.

### **Public Comment**

#### **Lynn Gilliland, Washington State Parent Teacher Association (WSPTA)**

Ms. Gilliland is the founder of Read-On, which is an organization that is a voice for students who struggle to read. Ms. Gilliland referenced Dr. Reid Lyon who is the former chief of the child development and behavior branch of the National Institute of Health and Human Development. Mr. Lyon estimates that five percent of children learn to read effortlessly, while another 20-30 percent learns to read with relative ease when exposed to any kind of instruction. For about 60 percent of students, learning to read is more challenging and their success is tied directly to the efficacy of instruction. Studies show that the common trait of children with reading disorders, such as dyslexia or those who find reading remarkably difficult, is a primary weakness in phonological and phonemic awareness. Ms. Gilliland urged the Board to support the statewide adoption of early phonological awareness screening and the statewide adoption of research-based, direct, explicit and systematic literacy instruction in every classroom so that children can learn to read. Washington State has some powerful tools. The Dyslexic Program was very successful and the Kennewick model is one to look at as well. Also, the reading model from OSPI is great but it is not followed in her district and many others as well. She encouraged the Board to set a model that will help struggling students.

#### **Ramona Hattendorf, Washington State Parent Teacher Association (WSPTA)**

Ms. Hattendorf was impressed by the good conversations about early learning and the achievement gap. She encouraged stakeholders to be smart about what we are doing and how we are doing it. From the get go, we should be responding to students' needs. We know what we should do but we are not following through. Legislators are talking about using a simple proven research-based curriculum in the classroom for dyslexic children. The WSPTA is in support of the work of the Board and is looking forward to working with the members to do the work that needs to be done.

### **Business Items**

#### **SBE Required Action District (RAD) Designation**

**Motion** was made to designate, as Required Action Districts, the following four school districts recommended for designation by the Superintendent of Public Instruction:

1. Soap Lake School District.
2. Renton School District.
3. Morton School District.
4. Onalaska School District

**Motion** seconded

Board discussion

**Motion** carried

### Basic Education Compliance

**Motion** was made to certify that all 295 state public school districts are in compliance with the Basic Education approval requirements.

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

### 180 Day Waiver Requests

**Motion** was made to grant the requests of Edmonds School District and Shoreline School District for waivers from the 180 day school year requirement for the number of days and school years requested. Provided, however, that the waiver granted by the Board is not to be considered applicable to any school year where a change in state law mandates that a school district provide less than the current minimum requirement of 180 school days per school year, or 180 half-days of instruction, or the equivalent, for kindergarten.

Board discussion

**Amended Motion** was made to table the original motion until the March 2011 Board meeting.

**Amended Motion** seconded

**Amended Motion** carried with two nays

### Nominations Chair for SBE Executive Committee Elections

**Motion** was made to nominate Dr. Kris Mayer and Ms. Amy Bragdon as Co-Chairs of the SBE Executive Committee elections.

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

### SBE 2011 Legislative Positions

**Motion** was made to approve each of the legislative positions for the 2011 Legislative Session as follows:

1. High School Graduation Requirements

**Motion** was made to approve the position statement:

“Strongly advocate for the policy direction reflected in SBE’s Career and College-Ready High School Graduation Framework and oppose legislation that would undermine this policy direction.”

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

2. Removing the Culminating Project as a Graduation Requirement for the 2011-13 School Years



**Motion was** made to remove item #2 as a legislative position at this time.

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

### 3. Mathematics Assessment Graduation Requirement

**Motion** was made to approve the position statement:

“The Board supports the Governor’s proposal to require students in the graduating class of 2013 to pass one math end-of-course assessment, and students in the graduating class of 2014 and beyond to pass two math end-of-course assessments, providing for the continuation of the collection of evidence as an alternative assessment.”

**Amended Motion** was made to remove “the Governor’s proposal to require” and replace with “The Board supports requiring students in the graduating class of 2013 to pass one math end-of-course assessment, and students in the graduating class of 2014 and beyond to pass two math end-of-course assessments, providing for the continuation of the collection of evidence as an alternative assessment.”

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

### 4. Science Assessment Graduation Requirement

**Motion** was made to approve the position statement:

“The Board supports keeping the science assessment graduation requirement to pass one science end-of-course assessment beginning with the graduating class of 2013.

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

### 5. Temporary Reduction in the Basic Education Requirement of 180 School Days

**Motion** was made to approve the position statement:

“The Board supports maintaining the 180 day school year requirement and opposes any reductions to the length of the school year. The Board also supports that any granted waivers from the 180 school day school year requirement not be considered applicable to any school year where a change in state law mandates that a school district provide less than the current minimum requirement of 180 school days per school year, or 180 half-days of instruction or the equivalent for kindergarten.”

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

## 6. SBE/PESB Joint Policy Issues

**Motion** was made to approve the position statement:

“The Board joins with the PESB in supporting legislation addressing the following policy issues:

- Meaningful evaluation system for teachers and principals.
- Completion of the work to develop an enhanced, collaboratively designed salary allocation model by the Quality Education Council’s Compensation Working Group.
- Strategies to close the achievement gap.
- Funding of focused professional development.
- E-certification and other data bases.”

**Motion** seconded

Board discussion

**Original motion** withdrawn

**Amended Motion** was made to approve the position statement:

“The Board joins with the PESB in supporting legislation addressing the following policy issues:

- Completion of the work to develop an enhanced, collaboratively designed salary allocation model by the Quality Education Council’s Compensation Working Group.
- Strategies to close the achievement gap.
- Funding of focused professional development.
- E-certification and other data bases.”

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

## 7. OSPI/Department of Early Learning

**Motion** was made to approve the position statement:

“The Board supports legislation maintaining the all-day kindergarten implementation schedule. The Board also supports implementing the kindergarten readiness assessment in state funded all-day kindergarten.”

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

## 8. Quality Education Council Recommendations

**Motion** was made to approve the position statement:

“The Board will continue to advocate for funding to phase in new graduation requirements as the state fiscal situation improves.”

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

## 9. Financial Literacy

**Motion** was made to approve the statement:

“The Board supports incorporating high school level financial literacy standards into existing social studies courses.”

**Motion** seconded

Board discussion

**Motion** carried with six ayes and five nays

## 10. Joint Higher Education Coordinating Board, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, and SBE Policy Issues

**Motion** was made to approve the position statement:

“The Board will support:

- Maintaining the rigor and number of credits required for the graduating class of 2013.
- Ensuring that capacity in our two year and four year institutions is provided to increase college access for students currently underrepresented in postsecondary education.
- Continued state support for the State Need Grants (including College Bound Scholarship program).”

Board Discussion

**Amended Motion** was made to approve the position statement:

“The Board will support:

- Strongly advocating for the policy direction reflected in SBE’s Career and College-Ready High School Graduation Framework and oppose legislation that would undermine this policy direction.”
- Ensuring that capacity in our two year and four year institutions is provided to increase college access for students currently underrepresented in postsecondary education.
- Continued state support for the State Need Grants (including College Bound Scholarship program).”

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

## 11. Governor’s Education Governance Proposal

**Motion** was made to approve the position statement:

“The Board sees the need to develop a comprehensive state education governance structure. The Board will examine Governor Gregoire’s proposal in the context of its own strategic plan goal to review education governance.”

**Motion** seconded

Board discussion

**Amended Motion** was made to approve the position statement:

“The Board’s strategic plan reflects the need to develop a comprehensive state education governance structure. We will examine Governor Gregoire’s proposal in the context of the Board’s strategic plan.”

**Amended Motion** seconded

**Amended Motion** carried

#### 12. Teacher and Principal Evaluations

**Motion** was made to approve the position statement:

“The Board wants to ensure an improved and strong teacher and principal evaluation system that uses student growth data is developed and fully implemented.”

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

#### 13. Basic Education Funding

**Motion** was made to approve the position statement:

“The Board urges the Legislature to uphold the state’s Constitutional obligations to amply fund the K-12 system and to make progress on HB 2261 and HB 2776.

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

#### Education Proposal

Ms. Harding gave a summary of the Governor’s Education Proposal. The recommendations will go to the Steering Committee and a meeting will be scheduled later in January.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m. and members met with legislators for the remainder of the day.