

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

March 9-10, 2011
New Market Skills Center
Tumwater, Washington

MINUTES

March 9, 2011

Members Attending: Chair Jeff Vincent, 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. Warren Smith, Dr. Kris Mayer, Ms. Amy Bragdon (14)

Members Absent: Vice-Chair Steve Dal Porto (excused); Mr. Eric Liu (excused) (2)

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

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:33 a.m. by Chair Vincent.

Mr. Rhen Niles, student, welcomed the Board to the New Market Skills Center. Mr. Niles answered questions posed by the members.

Announcements

The members congratulated Mr. Jared Costanzo for being accepted into the summer program at Georgetown University.

Consent Agenda

Motion was made to approve the January 12-13, 2011 meeting minutes

Motion seconded

Motion carried

SBE Data Dashboard on Strategic Plan

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director
Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Legislative and Communications Director

Ms. Harding provided an overview of each of the dashboard goals. The bulk of staff work has been on governance and the achievement awards over the last few months. Chair Vincent asked the Members for feedback on the Dashboard and how the process works for them. Discussion followed and the Members asked for more outcome reporting on the Dashboard. This will be a topic to examine at the Board's July retreat.

SBE Strategic Plan Goal One: Governance

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director
Mr. Jesse Burns, Contractor, SBE

The goal of SBE is to advocate for an effective, accountable governance structure in Washington State. The governance review included:

1. What is Washington trying to achieve?
2. Governance: a definition, literature review, and analytical framework.
3. Education Governance in Washington and other states.
4. Washington's history of education reform efforts in K-12.
5. Washington case studies on governance.
6. International education systems governance and how they compare to the U.S.
7. Lessons learned.
8. Governor's proposal for new department of education and other education governance bills in the 2011 Legislative Session.
9. Next steps.

Effective governance provides for clear relationships, authorities, and responsibilities among a set of institutions to guide strategic decisions through a set of cohesive policies and processes. The Members' discussion followed on the governance characteristics and the framework needed to move forward. The characteristics for effective governance include: stability, systems planning, accountability, flexibility, transparency, and efficiency.

Lessons learned from the literature review include:

- There is limited research on ability of governance to affect student achievement. The limited body of research does not identify causal linkages between governance arrangements and student achievement.
- Governance is an important determinant of the effectiveness of an educational system meeting its goals.
- There is no single best way to organize education agencies.
- Across the nation, education governance systems are moving toward systems that centralize decision-making authority.
- Funding is an important lever for affecting educational governance.
- There are analytical tools to assist with identifying the comparative advantage of which levels of government should make particular decisions to support logical decision-making when empirical evidence is lacking.
- Educational governance reforms typically focus upon governmental agencies; however, attention should be paid to a broader network of organizations that are increasingly influencing the educational system.
- Governance across governmental and nonprofit organizations is starting to shift decision-making control from within specific governmental entities at the state or national level to networks at multiple scales and locations.

Case study results indicated that:

- Adequate staff support, leadership, and a strong public outreach process are important when developing system-wide planning efforts.
- Currently, there is a lack of clarity about the roles and authority for education decision-making in the state.
- Statewide plans have not provided specific deliverables and outcomes.
- The primary incentives for collaboration rest upon the good will of the partners.

- Washington's current governance system is effective in terms of checks, balances, and providing citizen participation.
- Washington's current governance system is less effective for promoting higher levels of student achievement and strategic level planning.
- Governance is not the only tool for improving student outcomes. Issues of lack of funding and resources also constrain outcomes.

Mr. Burns will have a final report on the case studies for the members later in the spring.

Ms. Harding gave an overview of governance in other states. Wisconsin and Minnesota do not have a state board of education. There is a growing trend toward fewer elected chief state school officers and more governor or SBE-appointed chief state school officers. Almost half of the chief state school officers are appointed by SBEs. Only two states have full P-20 consolidated agencies. States with a central office of education are not recognized for strong postsecondary education based on a Higher Education Coordinating Board review.

Ms. Harding also shared information on international governance. Departments of education at state, country, or province level have the authority and responsibility to manage the education system, including aligning standards and exams with a high level of cognitive demand. Schools decide allocation of resources, materials used, and courses offered. They do not have district-level organization.

Public Comment

Mark Wenzel, Methow Valley School District

Mr. Wenzel's District needs to have the ability to offer effective professional development for staff in schools. Building relationships with kids is important but he feels that the system doesn't always do that. Professional development time will help staff learn how to do that. Kids in trauma have different triggers and have difficulty learning because of the traumas occurring in their personal lives. It's intentional, reflective work but critical for relating to these students. The waiver days are absolutely vital for the work teachers need to do to make a difference with kids. He encouraged the Board to approve the six waiver days for the Methow Valley School District.

Nominations for Executive Committee at Large Members

Dr. Kris Mayer, Board Member

Ms. Amy Bragdon, Board Member

The three candidates nominated for the At Large Members positions on the Executive Committee are Ms. Fletcher, Ms. Frank, and Ms. Ryan. Ms. Bragdon asked for any additional nominations to be considered. No additional nominations were provided.

Motion was made to close nominations

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Common Core Update

Ms. Jessica Vavrus, Assistant Superintendent, OSPI

OSPI provisionally adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in 2010 with the understanding that the 2011 Legislature would have the opportunity to review the decision. There is currently no legislation that would impact the Superintendent of Public Instruction's intent to finalize adoption of the CCSS. Since July 2010, the following activities have taken place to advance progress on the Common Core State Standards:

- One hundred people participated on the Washington CCSS workgroup.
- The statewide outreach included nine regional meetings, five public forums, and two statewide webinars.
- Standards comparisons were completed.
- The legislative report was completed.
- There were emerging national, regional, and state collaborations.

Ms. Vavrus gave an overview of the move toward career- and college-readiness in English Language Arts and mathematics as follows:

English Language Arts	Mathematics
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• CCSS adds grades 11 and 12.• Great focus on increasing text, complexity, argumentative writing, and research skills from early grades.• Washington strength at K-3 student goal setting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Standards for mathematical practice ("Habits of Mind") denoted at each grade level.• CCSS includes more advanced standards denoted by (+) symbols starting in grade six.• High school course pathways.

Per 2010 E2SSB 6696, the Superintendent of Public Instruction will adopt the Common Core State Standards, unless the Legislature otherwise takes action during the 2011 Legislative Session.

Next steps for spring 2011:

Close of 2011 Legislative Session:	Formal adoption
May/June 2011:	Washington Bias and Sensitivity review
Summer 2011:	Begin to implement

Washington's anticipated implementation timeline includes the following:

Phase One: Awareness and understanding, alignment, and adoption.
Phase Two: Build statewide capacity. Collaboratively develop and align resources and materials.
Phase Three: Professional development and classroom transition.
Phase Four: Statewide implementation through the assessment system.

Key considerations for implementation include:

1. What are our core values and vision for supporting statewide transition to the CCSS?
2. How can we tap into existing state structures and expertise to most efficiently approach developing necessary materials and building statewide capacity?
3. What are common challenges and concerns for school districts in this transition?
4. What are common needs among school districts for assistance and resources?
5. Prioritize content training support and resources.

Estimated state- and district-level costs for implementation:

State-level	District-level
1. Allocation of additional new funds to the state for the 2011-13 biennium is not necessary.	1. All districts currently have systems to address curriculum and instructional support for teachers.
2. Maintaining coordinated state and regional support is critical for our implementation infrastructure.	2. Instructional materials alignment and purchase considerations.
3. Cost-saving opportunities through emerging state and national expertise and collaborations.	3. Fund sources to consider.

Legislative Update

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director

Mr. Brad Burnham, Former Legislative and Policy Specialist

The deadline for bills to make it out of the house of origin has passed and many bills and their issues have died. For the last half of the session, the House and Senate will work on an agreement for the 2011-13 biennium budget and the surviving policy issues.

The SBE 2011 legislative positions, approved at the January 2011 Board meeting, were presented for review as follows:

- High school graduation requirements
- Mathematics assessment graduation requirement
- Science assessment graduation requirement
- Temporary reduction in the basic education requirement of 180 school days
- SBE/PESB joint policy issues
- OSPI/Department of Learning
- Quality Education Council recommendations
- Financial literacy
- Joint Higher Education Coordinating Board, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, and SBE policy issues
- Governor’s education governance proposal
- Teacher and principal evaluations
- Basic education funding

The following bills were discussed:

HB 1412 – Allowing students to graduate with the successful completion of one math end-of-course assessment for the graduating classes of 2013-14:

- After discussion it was agreed that the Board will remain neutral on this bill.

2SHB 1546 – Authorizing creation of innovation schools and innovation zones in school districts:

- The Board is in support of this bill.

HB 1521 – Reorganizing Washington’s Innovation Schools:

- The Board is in support of this bill.

HB 1891 – Would delay the adoption of the common core standards for two years:

- The Board is not in support of this bill.

E2SHB 1808 – Creating opportunities for students to earn college credit in high school:

- The Board is in support of this bill.

The Revenue Forecast will come out on March 17. Potential budget issues for the Board include:

- Protection of basic education funding.
- Protection of the state mandated 180-day school year, with no exceptions.
- Continuing to phase-in all-day kindergarten for lowest income students.
- Teacher and principal evaluations.
- WaKids Assessments funding.

Board members decided it was most important to focus on protecting basic education funding and the 180-day school year.

The Board Student Members expressed their concerns about what's happening with their schools and the elimination of classes, teachers, and class time due to the budget.

Crosswalk on Washington Education Governance Bills

	Governor's Original Bill SB 5639	Senate Substitution SSB 5639	House Substitution ESHB 1849
Creation of new Department of Education	P-20 Department with Secretary of Education appointed by Governor.	P-12 Department with Secretary of Education appointed by Governor.	Creates temporary council to create a two-year study on how to improve state education governance.

Ms. Harding discussed the responsibilities, goals and strategic plan for the Governor's proposed education department. The Members discussed pros and cons for each bill.

Required Action District Update

Ms. Sarah Rich, Research Director

At the January 2011 Board meeting, the following districts were designated as Required Action Districts:

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

The Required Action Plan approval timeline is as follows:

By February 10	Academic Performance Audits were completed by OSPI.
March 4	Districts submitted Required Action Plan to OSPI.
March 8 (9 and 10 for regular SIG applications)	Required Action plans were read and scored by OSPI to ensure they are compliant with federal guidelines.
March 16-18	OSPI interviews Required Action Districts.
March 18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required Action Districts submit plans to OSPI with revisions based on OSPI feedback. • OSPI provides copies of Required Actions plans and summaries of scoring to SBE.
March 18-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBE reads Required Action plans. • Work group recommends approval or changes.
March 25	SBE small work group recommends approval or non-approval of each Required Action Plan.
March 31	SBE Special meeting to approve Required Action plans.

Waiver Applications and Discussion of Innovation Waivers

Mr. Brad Burnham, Legislative and Policy Specialist

Ms. Sarah Rich, Research Director

The following nine applications were submitted for approval during the Business Items on March 10:

1. Edmonds – (tabled from the January meeting) is requesting a renewal of five days for school years 2011-14.
2. Shoreline – (tabled from the January meeting) is requesting a renewal for five days for school years 2011-14.
3. Bethel – is requesting a renewal of two days for school years 2011-14.
4. Methow Valley – is requesting a renewal of six days for school years 2011-2014.
5. Monroe – is requesting a renewal of four days for school years 2011-14.
6. Newport – is requesting a renewal of five days for school years 2011-14.
7. Northshore – is requesting a renewal of five days for school years 2011-14.
8. Seattle – is requesting a renewal of three days for K-6 and K-8 and one day for middle and high school for years 2011-13. The District is also requesting a renewal of three days for years 2011-13 for parent-teacher conferences.
9. Sedro-Woolley – is a new request of three days for school years 2011-14.

All of the above submittals include enhanced responses about Collective Bargaining Agreements.

Innovation Waivers

The three options for school districts were presented to the Members for discussion:

Option One: The regular option that has been available since 1995 to enhance the educational program and improve student achievement and is outlined in WAC 180-18-040(1) and WAC 180-18-050(1) and (2). There are 67 districts that currently have Option One waivers.

Option Two: A pilot for purposes of economy and efficiency outlined in RCW 28A.305.141 for eligible districts to operate one or more schools on a flexible calendar. This option expires on August 31, 2014. There are three districts that currently have Option Two waivers.

Option Three: A pilot outlined in WAC 180-18-050(3) to allows districts meeting eligibility and other requirements to use up to three waived days for specific innovative strategies. This option expires August 31, 2018. There are seven districts that currently have Option Three waivers.

Basic Education Act Compliance Rule Revision

Mr. Brad Burnham, Legislative and Policy Specialist

SBE has the responsibility of ensuring school district compliance with the Basic Education program requirements and other related supplemental program requirements. SBE's rules outline the procedure that districts must follow to report compliance each year. Due to legislation, SBE must revise certain sections of its rules and may want to consider additional revisions that would modernize and streamline the reporting process.

Although there is a moratorium on amending rules, there are exceptions in place. The new rule would be to modernize and streamline the process used by districts to report compliance. The process will utilize the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's web-based data reporting system and would greatly reduce the time and effort spent by both district and SBE staff in fulfilling this task.

The following SBE rules were presented for changes due to new laws:

1. WAC 180-16-210: Kindergarten through grade three students to classroom/teacher ratio requirement will no longer be needed since the underlying statute will be repealed as of September 1, 2011. The proposed rule revision repeals this entire section of rule, which is referenced in Appendix A of the meeting agenda packet.
2. WAC 180-16-215: Minimum one hundred eighty school day year contains a subsection that quotes the current definition of a school day and will be incorrect as of September 2011. The definition of a school day will change on September 1, as follows: "School day means each day of the school year on which pupils enrolled in the common schools of a school district are engaged in ~~education activity~~ academic and career and technical instruction planned by and under the direction of the school ~~district staff, as directed by the administration and board of directors of the district~~. The proposed rule revision repeals this entire section of rule referenced in Appendix B of the meeting agenda packet because it is stated in law.

Public Comment

Kathy Ehman, Sedro-Woolley School District

The District's waiver application is based on input and strong support from the community, parents, staff, and the school board of directors. The request will not have an impact on the District's current total of instructional minutes. It would convert six existing student early release days into three full waiver days for staff professional development. The three full days will provide for more concentrated and intense professional development and reduce time lost to travel. By making this conversion from the six early release days to three full waiver days for professional development, we would actually increase the number of full days for instruction from 168 to 171 per year at both the elementary and secondary level. This is a value-added benefit of the waiver request. The District respectfully requests the Board's serious consideration of this request. Ms. Ehman thanked the Board for their time.

Anthony Byrd, Edmonds School District

Mr. Byrd expressed why the District waiver days are so critical for their staff, parents, and students. It is his understanding that there were questions about the days the District provides through local bargaining. The District is among the largest in the state, serving 20,000 students and covering five municipalities. The District asks themselves five basic questions when considering waiver days: 1) What do we want students to learn? 2) How will we know if they learned it? 3) What will we do if they did not learn it? 4) What will we do if they already get it? 5) What are the best teaching practices we need to employ? The District routinely brings principals and teachers together to learn about the standards, assessments, and practices necessary to do the work. The District has also seen distinct benefits, both anecdotally and quantitatively. With respect to its local contract, the District has six supplemental days; three before school and three during the year. The Districts had these days prior to its waivers and has not added any since the institutionalization of the waivers. The supplemental days are part of the District's local time, responsibility, and incentive pay. The District uses this time for: welcoming and training new teachers, preparing for the opening of school, parent contact, planning, and organizing decision-making rules. The District had several problems with the use of early release days. First, they were very difficult for the parent community. Parents and principals were concerned about the quality of service during these shortened days. The District also found it to be very challenging to provide quality professional development in such a short time frame. Without common start and stop times, the District found it impossible to collaborate across schools. A loss of waiver days, coupled with loss of two Local Improvement Days (LID) days, would be devastating to the learning in the District's system. The staff and parents have told administrators

that they want these days and would respectfully request that they be granted so that the District can effectively address the achievement gaps.

Susan Porter, Shoreline School District

Ms. Porter expressed the importance of improving the academic achievement of the students in the Shoreline School District. For the past 39 years, Ms. Porter has been an educator in the Shoreline School District and can state, with certainty, that the only way we are going to improve student achievement is to continue to implement a system that supports educators to focus on the instructional practices that will make a difference. This professional development must be ongoing, imbedded in daily instructional practice, and be focused on individual student's needs in the classrooms. Time is needed to:

1. Understand, align, and implement new, and ever changing, standards.
2. Prepare for new, and ever changing, state assessments.
3. Create and utilize common assessments to test expected standards.
4. Analyze assessment data to determine which students need remediation, as well as which students need acceleration.
5. Determine what interventions should be used and evaluate their effectiveness over time (Response to Intervention).
6. Replicate practices that are successful. The District has one school that has closed the achievement gap and was just named a Washington State School of Distinction. The District is excited to share their strategies with other schools.
7. Implement additional graduation requirements, working toward Core 24.
8. Engage parents, particularly those of our English Language Learners.

As a result of the above activities, we can close the achievement gap and improve academic learning for all of our students. There is no time to implement this system in a district, or in a school, during the student school day. Shoreline does not have late start or early release time. Ms. Porter encouraged the Board to consider the necessity of these days and approve Shoreline School District's waiver request.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m. by Chair Vincent

March 10, 2011

Members Attending: Chair Jeff Vincent, 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. Warren Smith, Dr. Kris Mayer, Ms. Amy Bragdon (14)

Members Absent: Vice-Chair Steve Dal Porto (excused); Mr. Eric Liu (excused) (2)

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

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:05 a.m. by Chair Vincent

Student Presentation

Mr. Jared Costanzo, Student Board Member

Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Legislative and Communications Director

Mr. Costanzo talked about what makes a quality teacher. In his presentation, he quoted both students and teachers. Students appreciate teachers who are reasonable, trustworthy, respectful, and have a great attitude. Mr. Costanzo's quote for the day is, "Nobody will care about how much you know until they know how much you care." The Members asked clarifying questions and congratulated Mr. Costanzo on a good presentation.

Student presentations allow Board members to work with staff on topics assigned as follows:

1. My experiences as a student; good, bad, or otherwise.
2. One to two good ideas to improve K-12 education.
3. How the Board's work on (the choice of the student) has impacted or will impact K-12.
4. Five lessons, from school or elsewhere that have had an impact.
5. Before and After: Where I started, Where I am, and Where I'm going.

Mr. Wyatt explained the process for the student presentations and answered clarifying questions.

Student Video Contest on CTE, Math, or Science

Mr. Jared Costanzo, Student Board Member

Ms. Anna Laura Kastama, Student Board Member

This year's student video contest will ask students to create films based on the importance of math, science, engineering, technology, and/or Career and Technical Education coursework. The contest opened on February 14 and submissions are due on May 2. Student members, Ms. Kastama and Mr. Costanzo will lead the evaluation of the videos, with the assistance of Mr. Wyatt and other education leaders. The student videos will be broadcast on the SBE YouTube channel and the top vote getters will be highlighted through the SBE's Web site, e-newsletter, and social network outlets.

Governance (Continued)

The Members prepared a draft for next steps on governance. Discussion followed and the letter will be edited to reflect the feedback received by the Members during the discussion. Members will provide guidance for the staff to continue the work on what role the Board has in governance.

Connections: High School to College

Dr. Kathe Taylor, Policy Director

Mr. Randy Spaulding, Director, Academic Affairs, Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB)

Ms. Beth Ahlstrom, Program Associate, Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB)

Ms. Jan Yoshiwara, Deputy Executive Director, Education, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC)

The Board's third strategic planning goal is to provide policy leadership to increase Washington's student enrollment and success in secondary and postsecondary education. To accomplish this goal, the Board will partner with stakeholders to assess current and potential new state strategies to improve student's participation and success in postsecondary education through coordinated college- and career-readiness strategies.

The intended outcomes of this work will include:

- A road map of state strategies for improving Washington students' chance for participation and success in postsecondary education, with annual documentation.
- Annual dashboard summary of student performance on college- and career-readiness measures.
- Transcript study of course-taking patterns of students enrolled in college incentive programs.

In 2008-09, 63,386 students graduated; 40,708 enrolled in postsecondary education; and 16,415 high school students dropped out. The question is: How can higher education and K-12 work collaboratively to learn from existing initiatives, and publicize and promote effective practices to encourage postsecondary attainment?

The seven principles of college- and career-readiness include:

1. College-going culture in the school.
2. Core academic program aligned with, and leading to college-readiness.
3. Teach key self-management skills and academic behaviors and expect students to use them.
4. Make college and careers real by helping students manage the complexity of preparing for and applying for postsecondary education.
5. Create assignments and grading policies that more closely approximate college expectations each successive year of high school.
6. Make the senior year meaningful and appropriately challenging.
7. Build partnerships with, and connections to, postsecondary programs and institutions.

State initiatives that illustrate the seven principles were reviewed in-depth with the Members.

College Readiness in Washington

Mr. Spaulding gave an overview of the 2008 Master Plan for P-20 strategies as follows:

- Create higher expectations for all K-12 students.
- Scale up successful student advising and mentoring programs.
- Engage families and communities.
- Create multiple pathways from high school to college or workforce training.
- Prepare educators for the 21st century.

Part of creating higher expectations is providing direct, comprehensive, extensive, and frequent early intervention services and college campus experiences to low income students. Washington's GEAR UP program does this and more. Washington is the only state to explicitly supplement the federal GEAR UP grant with state funds.

The promise of financial support, through federal programs like the College Access Challenge Grant and state need grants like the College Bound Scholarship (CBS), also helps create higher expectations. The CBS was passed by the Legislature in 2007 and is an early commitment of an enhanced State Need Grant award that offers the promise of tuition and books to qualifying seventh and eighth grade students in Washington State. The scholarship covers the amount of tuition not covered by other state financial aid, plus \$500 for books per year. It can be used at two- or four-year public and private colleges and universities.

The HECB is one of nine organizations in a public/private partnership that created theWashBoard.org, a free online clearinghouse for Washington students seeking college scholarships.

Washington's dual credit options help to create multiple pathways for high school students, and include: Running Start, Tech Prep, College in the High School, Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), Early College High School, Gateway to College, Technical College Direct Funded Enrollment Programs, The Cambridge Program.

The HECB is directing professional development "educators for the 21st century" funds to build college and career readiness in the schools. Six Title II math and science projects, and seven GEAR UP projects are helping to provide teachers with the tools they need to close the achievement gap and provide a clear picture for teachers, students, and parents of the learning that needs to occur in grades eleven and twelve to prepare students for postsecondary education and training, as well as to develop the capacity to deliver that curriculum effectively.

Key Intervention Strategies – Community and Technical Colleges

In 2005, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) published the System Direction, which established an overall goal of raising educational attainment for all Washingtonians. In order to accomplish this, each sector of education and higher education must serve more state residents and bring more of the students that we serve towards completion of diplomas, certificates, and degrees.

More than half of recent high school graduates enroll at a community or technical college within three years of leaving high school. Many are not college ready and do not stay long enough to earn degrees or transfer. Community and technical colleges serve the most low-income, first-generation college students, immigrants and students of color among higher education sectors.

The college system focuses on statewide strategies for young adult students that include:

1. Improved planning for and transition to college (for example, through checkoutacollege.com)
2. Incentives for accelerated learning through dual credit opportunities.
3. Increasing degree completion through performance funding incentives for colleges.

The Student Achievement Initiative is a new performance funding system for community and technical colleges. Its purposes are to improve public accountability by more accurately describing what students achieve from enrolling in colleges each year and to provide incentives through financial rewards to colleges for increasing the levels of achievement attained by their students. It represents a shift from funding entirely for enrollment inputs to also funding meaningful outcomes.

Re-thinking pre-college math and reforming precollege education continues to be a focus of the SBCTC through its Gates grant-funded initiatives and through its participation in Achieving the Dream, a national community college project to improve retention and completion.

Public Comment

Grazyna Prouty, Tahoma School District

Ms. Prouty expressed concern about the process for teacher evaluations. She asked the Board to review materials she provided from a recent evaluation and asked for feedback from Members.

Wes Pruitt, Workforce Training Board

The Workforce Training Board has a couple of programs on connections in high school. The Board prepared a career guide for students in Washington that is very helpful. The Board received a national award for their guide that is on their website called Career Bridge, which has all the information students need to go online and learn about programs they could get into and what jobs

are available in those programs when completed. Mr. Pruitt encouraged the Board to look at the Career Bridge.

Standard Setting Plans for High School Math EOC Exams and Science Measurement of Student Progress

Ms. Cinda Parton, Director of Assessment Development, OSPI
Dr. Thomas Hirsch, Co-founder, Assessment and Evaluation Services

In May 2011, the 2009 Science Learning Standards will be assessed for the first time on the Measurements of Student Progress in grades five and eight. The 2008 Mathematics Learning Standards will be assessed on the 2011 End-of-Course exams in Algebra 1/Integrated Mathematics 1 and Geometry/Integrated Mathematics 2. Standard setting panels will convene to recommend cut scores on these tests.

Four standard-setting panels with 30 committee members each will convene in early August to provide recommendations on the cut scores for these new assessments. The Superintendent of Public Instruction also provides recommendations from a policy panel.

Standard setting is a formalized process to determine how well students need to perform on an assessment to be classified into performance levels. Once standards have been set, scores for tests given in later years are adjusted through statistical equating, assuring that the difficulty for the performance levels stays the same. A pre-established percent correct would make the performance levels easier or more difficult due to how hard the questions are on a given year's test.

Members asked for further discussion at a later meeting about the format of the standard setting process; specifically, they raised questions about what point in the process the standard-setting panels will receive information about the impact that a potential cut score will have on the percentage of students likely to meet standard. Action on the standard setting process was deferred until a future Board meeting.

The SBE sets standards in a special meeting on August 9, 2011 at the Puget Sound Education Services District (PSESD) in Renton.

Washington Achievement Awards and Index

Ms. Sarah Rich, Research Director
Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Legislative and Communications Director

SBE and OSPI will recognize 186 schools through the 2010 Washington State Achievement Awards.

For the 2010 Awards, SBE decided to:

- Add special recognition for improvement, using the same criteria as other awards.
- Not provide Overall Excellence awards for schools that have large socio-economic or racial/ethnic gaps.
- Highlight schools that receive awards for multiple years.
- Add special recognition for Closing Achievement Gaps.

Award winners will be recognized at the Washington Achievement Award ceremony on April 27, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at Lincoln High School in Tacoma, Washington. The Achievement Index Look Up Tool was presented to the Members.

Data Systems

Ms. Sarah Rich, Research Director

Dr. Carol Jenner, Senior Forecast Analyst, ERDC

Mr. Bill Huennekens, Data Governance Coordinator, OSPI

The Members were provided with an overview of current development in statewide longitudinal data systems; how early learning, K-12, and postsecondary education systems are working together; and what developments are coming in the next year.

ESHB 2261, passed in May 2009, established several critical objectives for educational data. The bill established the expectation for a K-12 education data improvement system, a data governance group at OSPI, and the Education Research and Data Center.

The latest state assessment information shows substantial achievement gaps for students of color, students in poverty, and English Language Learners. The matrix, presented to the Board, displayed student performance on the 2010 High School Proficiency Exam (HSPE) and for 2009 and earlier, the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL). Results from the matrix are as follows:

- The grade ten mathematics race, ethnicity, and income achievement gaps have remained largely unchanged for African American, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaska Native, and low-income students. English Language Learners' gaps have increased.
- The grade ten science race and ethnic achievement gaps are persistent for African American and low-income students and have increased for American Indian/Alaska Native, Hispanic, and English Language Learner students.
- The grade ten reading race, ethnicity, and income achievement gaps have decreased by about one-third in ten years. The English Language Learners' gap has increased.
- The grade ten writing race, ethnicity, and income achievement gaps have decreased most dramatically in ten years, for all groups except English Language Learners, where the gaps have increased.

Washington's class of 2010 ranks 17th in the nation on the Advanced Placement Exam, with 17.1 percent of students scoring a three or higher on at least one Advanced Placement exam. This is slightly above the national average of 16.9 percent. Washington ranks tenth in the nation for five-year increases in the percent of students scoring at a three or higher. Washington has seen a 4.2 percent increase over five years.

Mr. Bill Huennekens, Data Governance Coordinator, OSPI

The essential notion behind establishing a K-12 data governance system is that decisions are only as good as the data on which they are based. As OSPI transforms data into information to facilitate wise decision-making, users, and managers of K-12 data need to establish data definitions, data and process ownership and authority, accountability, security, and reporting needs and requirements. Mr. Huennekens gave an overview of what has changed since 2008 because of data governance.

The Statewide Longitudinal Data System federal grant was awarded in summer 2009 for \$5.9 million. Goals to accomplish this with the grant funding include:

- Develop a governance model and enhance data quality and stewardship from data entry through reporting.
- Implement an infrastructure encompassing all K-12 business areas, which will facilitate communication and technical efficiency within the agency and with primary stakeholders.
- Develop tools, which will enhance data driven decision-making at all system levels.

- Incorporate external education partner organization membership into the proposed K-12 governance system.
- Extend the statewide longitudinal data system to external systems with infrastructure components that meet technical requirements and standards while protecting individual student privacy.

Choice Solutions was the successful vendor selected in fall 2010. The timeline for fully implementing the system is winter 2012.

Dr. Carol Jenner, Senior Forecast Analyst, ERDC

E2SSB 5843 was passed during the 2007 Legislative session, creating the Education Research and Data Center (ERDC), within the Office of Financial Management. ESHB 2261 was passed during the 2009 Legislative Session, which directed ERDC to identify the critical research and policy questions and added the P-20 data governance role. It also directed ERDC and OSPI to take all actions necessary to secure federal funds to implement sections 201 through 203 of this act. In December 2009, ERDC and OSPI submitted a grant proposal for P-20/Workforce data system funding through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). The grant was awarded for \$17.3 million in May 2010.

Dr. Jenner gave an overview of the critical questions for data management as follows:

- Student profile: who are the students and what are their characteristics?
- Quality/Achievement: what are students doing, how well are they doing?
- Transition/Advancement Outcomes: do students continue on the education path?
- Program effectiveness and costs: evaluation and comparisons of programs, schools, and districts.
- Teachers: supply, distribution, retention, and training.

RCW 28B.10.685 required each public higher education institution in the state to report annually to OSPI and SBE the following:

1. The number of students who, within three years of graduating from a Washington high school, enrolled in a state-supported precollege-level class at the institution.
2. The types of precollege classes in which each student was enrolled.
3. The name of the Washington high school from which each student graduated.

Business Items

180-Day Waiver Requests

Motion was made to approve Edmonds, Shoreline, Bethel, Methow Valley, Monroe, Newport, Northshore, Seattle, and Sedro-Woolley School District's requests for waivers from the 180 school day requirement for the number of days and school years requested in their applications to the Board subject to the following condition:

If a state law is enacted authorizing or mandating that a school district operate on less than the current statutory requirement of school days, and a school district reduces the number of school days in a year in response to the change in law, then the total number of days for which a waiver is granted in any year shall be automatically reduced by a number equal to the total number of school days a district reduces its schedule for that year below the current statutory requirement.

Motion seconded

Amended Motion was made to remove Bethel from the approval and review separately.

Amended Motion seconded

Amended Motion failed

Original Motion carried

Legislative Positions

Motion was made to approve the short term recommendations on governance bills, as presented:

Short Term Recommendation on Governance Bills:

The SBE applauds the Governor and Legislature for being willing to tackle the difficult issue of education system governance. We support doing serious work on this issue because we believe a better structure can help the state deliver better results for Washington students. Addressing the state's fractured governance system is one of SBE's five strategic priorities during the next few years. The SBE understands this governance review may lead to its elimination, which we would support if it leads to better governance. We understand that a change in governance is not the solution to all of the state's education, but it is one of the elements that will help propel education forward.

We offer the following as a definition of "effective governance:"

An effective governance structure should provide for clear roles and responsibilities among a set of institutions and support their ability to make and sustain strategic policy, program delivery, and resource allocation decisions. Most importantly, an effective governance structure should enhance the education system's ability to deliver great student achievement and taxpayer value.

Some of the guiding principles of this system should be as follows:

- **Stability:** A governance system that eliminates bureaucracy and unnecessary costs, attracts great people, is resistant to political change and is built to last for a sustained period of time.
- **Accountable:** A person and or organization is accountable for student achievement for all children and for the effective use of taxpayer dollars
- **Transparent:** Clear measures of success are tracked in a transparent manner
- **Innovation:** Schools have the ability to innovate, and the State is great at leveraging innovation results across the system
- **Simple:** Timeframes are significantly reduced to drive systemic change throughout the state and achieve results within five years
- **Capacity:** The responsible parties have sufficient resources to do their job

At the state level, we do not have an effective system of education governance (add diagram) despite representing a little less than half of the state's budget. Our present system of governance is long overdue for a redesign aimed at organizing to deliver much higher performance of student achievement from early learning post-secondary attainment. Our present system at the state level is extremely fragmented. It makes it virtually impossible for the state to coherently and sustainably set a strategic direction and then execute to get the desired result (list current challenges and goals).

We would suggest beginning the work within the P-12 system to improve and streamline governance and also work on strengthening the transition points between K-12, early learning, and higher

education. Clearly, from the student point of view, all of education must be considered one system and our governance work should move us to a stronger "whole system" approach.

We think it would be valuable to appoint an education governance commission to make its initial recommendations by January 1, 2012 to the Legislature and Governor. Final recommendations would be made by June 1, 2012. The Legislature may vote up or down on the recommendations, but may not change them.

The education governance commission group needs to be independent of any existing institutions and include persons not currently employed in government or work in the P-20 system. The members should be diverse and have strong skills and backgrounds to examine the governance issues. We would suggest a commission of no more than nine members. These members would have two appointed by the Senate (one from the Majority Leader and one from Minority Leader) and two appointed by the House (one from the Speaker and one from the Minority Leader), one appointed by the SPI, one by the Secretary of DEL and three appointed by the Governor no later than June 1, 2011. They would elect their own chair.

This effort needs a staff that is independent of the current P-12 entities to prevent a conflict of interest. We would suggest two professional staff and a half time support person at the cost of \$300,000, which would include travel expenses for the commissioners.

The Legislature should make it clear that it wants all the recommendations driven by the goal of improving student achievement for all children and utilizing taxpayer dollars more effectively. The Legislature should also request phase-in options, which would allow needed restructuring to begin so we can begin to move progress immediately.

SBE Next Steps:

For the next session on governance:

- Complete the case studies, potentially including the reorganization of Washington's DOT.
- Examine barriers to governance (I need help with this beyond what we did in case studies and our lessons learned).
- Examine Michael Barber work with US Education Delivery Institute.
- Develop some straw proposals to improve system and engage stakeholders for work.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m. by Chair Vincent

education. Clearly, from the student point of view, all of education must be considered one system and our governance work should move us to a stronger "whole system" approach.

We think it would be valuable to appoint an educational governance commission to make its initial recommendations by January 1, 2012 to the Legislature and Governor. Final recommendations would be made by June 1, 2012. The Legislature may vote up or down on the recommendations but may not change them.

The education governance commission group needs to be independent of any existing institutions and include persons not currently employed in government or work in the P-20 system. The members should be diverse and have strong skills and backgrounds to examine the governance issues. We would suggest a commission of no more than nine members. These members would have two appointed by the Senate (one from the Minority Leader and one from the Minority Leader) and two appointed by the House (one from the Speaker and one from the Minority Leader), one appointed by the SFR, one by the Secretary of Education, and three appointed by the Governor no later than June 1, 2011. They would elect their own chair.

This effort needs a staff that is independent of the current P-12 entities to prevent a conflict of interest. We would suggest two professional staff and a full-time support person at the cost of \$200,000, which would include travel expenses for the commissioners.

The Legislature should make it clear that it wants the recommendations driven by the goal of improving student achievement for all children and utilizing taxpayer dollars more effectively. The Legislature should also request those in opinion who would allow needed restructuring to begin so we can begin to move progress immediately.

222 Next Steps

For the next session on governance:

- Complete the case studies, potentially finishing the reorganization of Washington's DOT
- Examine barriers to governance (lead work with the payers what we did in case studies and our scores learned)
- Examine Mutual Partner work with US Education Delivery Institute
- Develop some slow proposals to involve system and engage stakeholders for work.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m. by Chair Minton