

The Washington State Board of Education

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

January 11-12, 2012
Educational Service District 113
Tumwater, Washington

MINUTES

Wednesday, January 11, 2012

Members Attending: Chair Jeff Vincent, Dr. Bernal Baca, Ms. Amy Bragdon, Mr. Jared Costanzo, Mr. Randy Dorn, Mr. Kevin Lavery, Dr. Sheila Fox, Ms. Phyllis (Bunker) Frank, Mr. Bob Hughes, Dr. Kris Mayer, Ms. Mary Jean Ryan (video conference), Mr. Tre' Maxie, Mr. Matthew Spencer, Mr. Jack Schuster, Ms. Cindy McMullen (15)

Staff Attending: Mr. Ben Rarick, Ms. Sarah Rich, Dr. Kathe Taylor, Ms. Loy McColm, Ms. Ashley Harris, Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Ms. Colleen Warren, Mr. Jack Archer (8)

The meeting was called to order by Chair Vincent at 8:00 a.m.

Dr. Bill Keim, Superintendent of the Educational Service District 113, welcomed the Board to the new facility.

Ms. Cynthia McMullen and Mr. Kevin Lavery were sworn in as new members to the Board in Positions One and Three, respectively.

Chair Vincent read a letter received from former Vice-chair, Steve Dal Porto thanking the Board Members for the work of the past six years. He talked about the many accomplishments the Board worked together on to do what was best for the education system. He thanked the staff for their continued excellent work in support of the Board.

Chair Vincent asked the Members to send nominations for the Vice-chair position to replace Dr. Dal Porto to Loy McColm by the end of February. The successful candidate for this position will need to run again for the main election in September. The regular election for all Executive Committee members will occur at the September planning meeting. Nominations for officers should be submitted to Loy McColm beginning in July and nominations will be accepted through August for the September election.

Consent Agenda

Motion was made to approve the November 9-10, 2011 Board meeting minutes

Motion seconded

Motion carried

NCLB Waiver – Discussion of Options/Timelines

Ms. Sarah Rich, Research Director

Mr. Bob Harmon, Assistant Superintendent, OSPI

The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) is moving forward with writing an application for an Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) waiver that will be ready for submission on February 21, 2012. The SBE is participating in this effort and the Achievement Index is being seen as the unifying accountability tool. The waiver is an opportunity to create a state accountability system as described in HB 2261 and HB 6696. The Board was assigned responsibility to create and oversee an accountability framework, with or without a waiver. The waiver provides additional incentive and momentum to create and implement such a system with our education partners, specifically OSPI and school districts. The four principles needed to receive a waiver are:

1. College and career ready standards and assessments for all students.
2. State developed, differentiated systems of recognition, accountability, and support.
3. Supporting effective instruction and leadership through educator evaluation.
4. States must reduce unnecessary burden of reporting and ensure that what is required impacts student achievement and is not duplicative.

The timeline for applying is:

Early January 2012	Internal OSPI and SBE vetting of draft application.
January 11	SBE Board meeting.
Late January/Early February	Posting of draft application for public comment and stakeholder meetings for input.
January 23	Council of Chief State School Officers peer review.
February 21	Final application due.

For the past three years, districts and schools have been able to assess their progress with the Washington Achievement Index. The Index was developed using a set of guiding principles as follows:

The Index should:

- Be transparent and easy to understand.
- Use existing data.
- Rely on multiple measures.
- Include assessment results from grades 3-8 and 10 and subjects tested statewide in reading, writing, mathematics, and science.
- Use concepts of the federal NCLB Act and its Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) system when appropriate.
- Be fair, reasonable, and consistent.
- Be valid and produce accurate results.
- Focus at both the school and district levels.
- Apply to as many schools and districts as possible.
- Use familiar concepts when possible.
- Rely mainly on criterion-referenced measures instead of norm-referenced measures.
- Provide multiple ways to reward success.
- Be flexible enough to accommodate future changes.

Updates to the structure of the Index should include the following along with the above principles:

- Inclusion of disaggregated subgroup data.
- Once available, inclusion of student growth data.
- An updated look at achievement gaps.

As a part of the accountability system, Washington needs to choose one of the following new Annual Measureable Objectives (AMOs):

1. One hundred percent proficiency for all students by 2020.
2. New goal of reducing, by half, the percent of students in each subgroup not meeting standard within six years.
3. Another goal that is educationally sound, ambitious, and achievable.

In addition to the existing recognition system, the Index will be used to produce data to identify the 5 percent lowest-performing Title I schools (Priority Schools) and the 10 percent of Title I schools with the largest achievement gaps (Focus Schools). The waiver application needs to provide a phased-in timeline for a system of differentiated support to help all schools; most urgently those that find themselves in the Priority or Focus school categories.

The process for flexibility to improve student achievement and increase the quality of instruction includes:

1. The 2013-2014 timeline for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP):
 - Flexibility to develop new ambitious, but achievable, Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) in reading/language arts and mathematics.
 - Eliminates AYP.
2. Implementation of School Improvement requirements:
 - Flexibility from requirement for school districts to identify or take improvement actions in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
 - Eliminates Public School Choice (PSC) as a mandate.
 - Eliminates Supplemental Education Services (SES) as a mandate.
 - Eliminates the 20 percent district Title I set aside to fund PSC and SES.
 - Eliminates the 10 percent set aside for professional development for schools.
3. Implementation of district improvement requirements:
 - Flexibility from requirement for states to identify or take improvement action for districts identified for improvement or corrective action.
 - Eliminates the 10 percent set aside for professional development for districts.
4. Rural districts:
 - Flexibility to use rural and low-income school program funds or small rural school achievement programs for any authorized purpose regardless of AYP status.
5. School-wide programs:
 - Flexibility to operate a school-wide program in a Title I school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty threshold if the state has identified the school as a priority school or a focus school.
6. Support school improvement:
 - Flexibility to allocate ESEA section 1003(a) funds to an LEA in order to serve any focus or priority schools.
7. Reward schools:
 - Flexibility to use funds reserved under ESEA section 1117(C)(2)(A) to provide financial rewards to any reward school.
8. Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) improvement plans.
 - Flexibility from the requirements regarding HQT improvement plans.
9. Transfer of certain funds:

- Flexibility to transfer up to 100 percent of the funds received under the authorized programs designated in ESEA section 6123 among those programs and into Title I, Part A.
10. Use of the School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds to support priority schools:
- Flexibility to award SIG funds available under ESEA section 1003(g) to an LEA to implement one of the four SIG models in any priority school.

The USED Secretary intends to grant waivers included through the end of the 2013-2014 school year. An SEA may request an extension for the initial period of this flexibility prior to the start of the 2014-2015 school year unless it is superseded by reauthorization of the ESEA.

In order to provide flexibility to states by the end of the 2011-2012 school year, there are two submission windows:

1. Submit request by November 14, 2011 for December 2011 peer review, which has passed at the time of this writing.
2. Submit request by February 21, 2012 for a spring 2012 peer review.

Ms. Rich, Mr. Harmon, and other OSPI staff are attending a pre-review meeting sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers on January 23, 2012.

The pros and challenges were discussed as follows:

Pros

- Elimination of costly set asides.
- Elimination of AYP and 100 percent proficiency in 2014.
- Washington's accountability system, not the feds.

Challenges

- Prescriptive teacher and principal evaluation.
- Funding (state/federal).
- Timing of ESEA Reauthorization.
- Possible legal challenges.

BEA Waivers

Ms. Sarah Rich, Research Director

The Board continued its deliberations on waivers and their statutory responsibility to establish criteria in W.A.C. for evaluating school district waiver applications. At the conclusion of the discussion, the Board opted to table the issue until May.

At the November 2011 meeting, the Board directed staff to outline what specific criteria should be applied to waiver requests in order to move forward with establishing criteria to apply to waiver requests. Waiver principles and recommendations in response to that direction are as follows:

1. The Legislature has defined basic education as 1,000 instructional hours and 180 school days.
 - There are legal definitions for each. SBE's role is ensuring compliance with these minimums and granting exceptions when warranted. While a conversation about what is the best way to structure basic education is valuable and important, SBE's role is not to define basic education minimums. The Legislature has that role and responsibility and the SBE role is to grant waivers from those basic minimums.
2. Waivers should not be granted to back-fill legislative cuts to Learning Improvement Days (LIDs) or other budget constraints.

- Opportunities for districts to provide professional development and parent teacher conferences are critically important and are also universal. All districts conduct parent teacher conferences. These are legitimate and important activities but should not be part of a waiver process. SBE should not grant waivers for a basic, routine part of an educational program. Universal components of the system should be supported and funded by the Legislature as part of basic education.
3. Waivers should only be granted to districts in response to local characteristics or circumstances.
 - Waivers should not be granted for activities that all districts need to conduct. To grant waivers for these universal purposes is to re-define basic education. Some districts have circumstances that warrant a waiver and it is up to SBE to define these criteria.
 4. Innovation should be encouraged through the New Innovative Schools application process established in HB 1546.
 - SBE supports and encourages innovation. Clearly the Legislature does as well, which is why HB 1546 was created last year. Rather than having the concept of innovation vaguely permeating all waiver options, staff proposes steering innovative proposals through this option in order to provide them with the most rigorous review and the highest public attention. SBE is exploring possible revisions to the Bill to make this an annual application process and to ensure it is open to existing innovative schools.
 5. Waivers can only be renewed if the district can make a compelling argument that they have made significant progress that is clearly demonstrated through data, but additional time is needed to achieve their goals. New local characteristics/circumstances could also warrant a new waiver.
 - The recommendation for requiring districts to provide a summary report is directly tied to this issue. The Board may ask districts requesting a waiver to come before the Board, review their progress toward achieving their goals, explain why their initial waiver period was not adequate to achieve goals, and why an extension on their waiver will directly result in achievement of their goals.

The following is the review of Board Input since July 2011:

	July	September	November
Summary	Keep all options.	Keep all options.	Staff is directed to develop criteria and return for further discussion.
Proposed RCW/WAC changes	Revise rules to cap Option One at five days.	Do not cap Option One. Any number of days may be granted as long as the 1,000 instructional hours are protected.	First, establish criteria then make decisions about capping days. Add language to Option Three rules that reduce the number of waiver days granted if the Legislature reduces days below 180 days.

If the above-mentioned principles are acceptable to the Board, recommendations are to:

1. Eliminate Option One.
2. Revise Option Three.
3. Keep Option Two.

4. Advocate to the Legislature for the following changes:
 - Clarify whether a school day is inclusive of full-day parent teacher conferences.
 - Fund professional development time for teachers.
 - Revise the Innovative Schools application process to be conducted annually and to include existing schools.
5. Consider a phase-in plan to implement these recommendations by July 2013.

Other alternatives include:

- Alternative A: Review Option One and cap this Option at a specific number of days below 180, which reflects Board member direction to staff from the July 2011 meeting.
- Alternative B: Continue to issue waivers to districts according to the established process, which reflects Board direction to staff at the September 2011 meeting.
- Alternative C: Review Option One but do not cap the number of days, which reflects Board direction to staff at the November 2011 meeting.

Rule Revision

In November, the Board directed staff to move forward with the rules revision process, which would enact changes to WAC 180-18-040 as follows:

- Change one would put into rule the waiver motion the Board has in place for waivers issued in March 2011 and beyond. The proposed amendment to WAC-18-040 would make it explicit that if state law authorizes a school district to operate on less than the current statutory requirement of 180 school days and a school district reduces the number of school days in response to that change in law, then the total number of days for which a waiver is granted in any year shall automatically be reduced.
- Change two constitutes a new direction for the Board. This change would extend the reach of the proportional reduction in waiver days to Option Three waivers. The motion language has only so far applied to Option One waivers. Putting this language into WAC 180-18-040 would extend the proportional reduction of waiver days to Option Three waivers, which so far have been unaffected by motion language.
- Change three deletes section three due to a change in legislation, which renders the language obsolete.

School Levy Proposal

Representative Ross Hunter, Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee

Rep. Hunter introduced legislation to change the way schools are funded in Washington. The new approach would expand statewide property tax rate collections for support of the common schools and enact corresponding reductions in local excess levy collections. Although the purpose of the proposal is to maintain some degree of "revenue neutrality," the proposal does have meaningful impacts on the tax rates paid in each school district, and the total amount that could potentially be raised locally by the districts themselves.

The Levy Proposal:

1. Increases the state property tax by \$1.17 per \$1,000 of value starting in 2013 and makes the new rate permanent.
2. Distributes the new state property tax revenue to school districts in proportion to the previous year's general apportionment allocations.
3. Offsets previously approved local excess levies by the amount of the school district's distribution of new state property tax revenue.

4. Creates new school district excess levy caps for maintenance and operation levies at \$2,500 per student.

Representative Hunter gave examples of school impact (for Yakima, Goldendale, Seattle, and Bellevue) before and after the Levy Proposal. The distribution of a new state tax based on basic education allotments was discussed.

Recognition of Award Winners

The Board honored the recent teacher awardees as follows:

Ms. Barbara Franz

North Elementary, Moses Lake, 2010 Presidential Awardee for Excellence in Mathematics

Ms. Dawn Sparks

Thorp Elementary, Thorp, 2010 Presidential Awardee for Excellence in Science

The Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching (PAEMST) was established in 1983. Administered nationally by the National Science Foundation, the PAEMST is the highest honor in the country for a K-12 math or science teacher and alternates between elementary and secondary teachers. Award winners receive a \$10,000 cash prize, a trip to the nation's capital, and a signed commendation from President Obama.

Dan Alderson

Lake Stevens High School, Lake Stevens, 2011 Milken Educator

The Milken Educator award is the largest recognition program in the country. The award winner receives a \$25,000 cash prize and professional and leadership development from the Milken Family Foundation.

The teachers addressed the Board and talked about their experiences as teachers and parents of children in the Washington State school system.

Education System Governance

Dr. Aims C. McGuinness, Jr., National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS)

Dr. McGuinness presented and led a discussion on the Higher Education Steering Committee proposals and possible legislative priorities in the area of governance and ways that the Board is uniquely positioned to lead reform in Washington State.

The "*State Coordination of Higher Education: Washington State in a Comparative Perspective*," was presented at the September 19, 2011 meeting of the Higher Education Steering Committee. The Principles to guide deliberations about governance were discussed as follows:

- Focus first on ends, not means.
- Be explicit about specific problems that are catalysts for reorganization proposals.
- Ask if reorganization is the only, or the most, effective means for addressing the identified problems.
- Weigh the costs of reorganization against the short- and long-term benefits.
- Distinguish between state coordination and system/institutional governance.
- Examine the total policy structure and process, including the roles of the Governor, executive branch agencies and the Legislature, rather than only the Formal Post-secondary Education Structure.

The December 2011 Higher Education Steering Committee final report was provided for the members.

Board Discussion

What are some things we need to change in Washington? What are the gaps and why do we need to focus on them?

- Persistence.
- Funding for students' seat time.
- Prepare students to be competitive once they get there. Remediation data indicates this need.
- Linkage between P-20, as well as Pre-Kindergarten.
- Agreeing and meeting goals that aren't broad.
- Communication issues with the public and the severity of the issues.
- Denying Washington students enrollment into universities and accepting out of state students due to tuition revenue.
- Leaders having relationships and parameters.
- States need to coordinate with bordering states on enrollment into college.
- Expectations from higher education aren't clear, nor are they the same from one institution to another – they have different cut scores and assessments.
- When transferring, which courses actually count towards a degree?
- GPA requirements are broad across colleges.
- Lack of communication between K-12 and college faculty. Faculty need to iron out the issues and facilitation is needed.
- We need to do a better job at preparing our high school students to have “life thinking” skills to help them when they get to college.
- Are transfer policies in place or not?
- A lot of decisions are being made based on finances.
- What are the meaningful differences between P-13 and P-20? What is seamlessness?
- The system seems focused on those kids who know what they want to do after high school and not so much on those that don't. We aren't looking at ALL the students. There isn't a linear progression amongst all students.
- Good systems are out there but they aren't statewide and they aren't being replicated.
- A group of seven or eight top-notch educational leaders in K-12 and higher education are needed to create goals and a matrix to measure the system. But the resources aren't there right now.
- No uniform allowance for full-day kindergarten.
- No across the board assessments until third grade.
- More urgency on the importance of rigor and what's going on in the world.
- How would authority be used in the operational context?
- Who has authority to make financial allocations to this group and that group?
- Lack of data.
- Thought leadership is needed in finding a solution.
- Postsecondary attainment. We have data that people seem to brush aside.
- Fragmented at the state level. Diffused and can't take advantage to move ahead.

Key characteristics of a successful structure were discussed:

- What are the Board's goals and how are they measured? What are our resources? Are we holding the system accountable for achievement? Who is setting the goals and who is being held accountable? Who decides on the measure and is there consensus on it?
- Someone has to step up and provide that role. The Board could do this and be visible on their progress or lack of. We have done this with the graduation requirements. Should we work on getting stakeholders invested with the possibility of elimination on the table? This may be the right time to do this. The Quality Education Council (QEC) has reached out to the Board on this; do we accept the invitation and are we ready to move forward?
- Put a plan on the table. It's hard to start with structure; start with clarity on what we want to do. It will take major leadership to move the agenda forward. The Board is as good a group as any to take this on.
- Compartmentalize the goals on the table.
- Identify three or four major gaps that need to be identified. Two or three parties must be involved to get a solution. On the action agenda: what will the State Board do to be involved in those issues and get them moving forward? Define roles that are unique to the Board and be the one to campaign for those goals. Be clear about the "what" first. Use the public communication as a means of accountability.
- The accountability index shows that it can be done. The Board is successful when it gets the thought leadership and engages others in it.
- Focus group and financing.
- Don't go backwards; move forward.
- The Board is connected, but not beholden to, which is an advantage when it comes to goal setting.
- Collaborate with early learning and higher education. Honor the other agencies in their responsibility and role and start bringing people together to identify the problems. Listen to the issues from other agencies and let them discuss ways to solve the issues; work as a facilitator and make goals from there.

Public Comment

Jonelle Adams, Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA)

Ms. Adams presented a letter from the Paramount Duty Coalition that expressed deep concern over the breach of trust that resulted from the November 11, 2011 action of the Board to increase graduation requirements without appropriate funding. The letter was signed by the following Coalition members:

- Gary Kipp, Executive Director, Association of Washington School Principles
- George Dockins, Executive Director, Public School Employees of Washington
- Paul Rosier, Executive Director, Washington Association of School Administrators
- John Okamoto, Executive Director, Washington Education Association
- Jonelle Adams, Executive Director, Washington State School Directors' Association

The letter was filed with the Official Copy Agenda for this meeting.

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Vincent at 4:30 p.m.

Thursday, January 12, 2012

Members Attending: Chair Jeff Vincent, Dr. Bernal Baca, Ms. Amy Bragdon, Mr. Jared Costanzo, Mr. Randy Dorn, Mr. Kevin Laverty, Dr. Sheila Fox, Ms. Phyllis (Bunker) Frank, Mr. Bob Hughes, Dr. Kris Mayer, Ms. Mary Jean Ryan (video conference), Mr. Tre' Maxie, Mr. Matthew Spencer, Mr. Jack Schuster, Ms. Cindy McMullen (15)

Staff Attending: Mr. Ben Rarick, Ms. Sarah Rich, Dr. Kathe Taylor, Ms. Loy McColm, Ms. Ashley Harris, Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Mr. Jack Archer, Ms. Colleen Warren (8)

The meeting was called to order by Chair Vincent at 8:00 a.m.

Mr. Jack Archer was introduced as the new Policy Associate for the Board. He is assisting with the ESEA waiver application and governance proposals.

Lessons of Impact

Mr. Jared Costanzo, Student Board Member

In his presentation to the Board, student Board Member, Jared Costanzo, presented on lessons of impact from his experiences as a public school student. Lessons learned include:

1. Never be too proud to ask for help.
2. Model the best. Mentor others to be the best.
3. Don't let others hold you back. Everything is possible.
4. Don't let failures influence your dreams. They're only speed bumps.

SBE Strategic Plan Work Session

Mr. Ben Rarick, Executive Director

At the request of the Board, staff prepared a revision and update of the Board's Strategic Plan. Results of the staff-level review were discussed for potential key areas of focus for the next six months. The major issues that surfaced during the staff review include:

1. Vision for education system governance:
 - K-12 versus P-13 versus P-20.
 - How do we view the parameters of effective governance?
2. Governance versus Government:
 - July 2011 retreat – focus shifted from structure of the system towards effective attributes of the system.
 - Proposals from the Higher Education Steering Committee may force the issue of 'government' in near term.
3. State Education Plan versus establishment of performance improvement goals:
 - State Education Plan never got off the ground.
 - Performance Improvement Goals is language in the Board statute.
 - Possible collaboration with the Quality Education Council (QEC).
4. System transition and seamlessness:
 - Broaden the focus on transition points beyond just secondary/post-secondary.
 - SBE statute specifies that it will work with early learning and higher education to ensure articulation throughout the system.

5. Nationally and internationally competitive in math and science:
 - Fidelity of goals to objectives – if our goal is international competitiveness, we need a way to measure that.
 - We currently participate only on a small scale in Trend in International Math and Science (TIMSS) and the Programme for International Student Assessment.

The seven potential priorities were provided for the Board as noted below. Discussion followed.

1. Setting performance improvement goals/success metrics for system.
2. Effective P-13 governance.
3. K-12 Accountability System Framework.
4. Basic education waivers.
5. Graduation requirements.
6. Legislative advocacy for basic education and HB 2261 implementation.
7. Common core standards implementation.

The summary of suggested changes are as follows:

1. Structural changes:
 - Recommend eliminating the strategic roles framework and dashboard found at the end of the Plan. Staff prefers a shorter version.
2. Clean Up:
 - Eliminate or modify strategies or deliverables that have since past.
 - Reconcile existing language to updated conversations of the Board.
3. Seek congruity of goals to objectives:
 - Avoid setting goals that cannot be measured.
 - Use language that is reflective of our roles, duties, and powers.

Suggestions for possible six month priorities were discussed.

Legislative Update/SBE Legislative Agenda Discussion

Mr. Ben Rarick, Executive Director

Dr. Kathe Taylor, Policy Director

Mr. Jack Archer, Policy Associate

The Governor's proposed budget makes major reductions, which could have significant impacts on instructional quality in school districts:

1. The proposed cut and deferment of levy equalization payments (\$152 million):
 - \$82 million in actual cuts.
 - Remaining \$70 million is deferred into the next fiscal year (payment delay).
2. The elimination of four school days (\$99.2 million).
3. Apportionment delay (\$340 million).
4. Bus depreciation delay (\$49 million) permanent not temporary.
5. Over \$450 million in payment delays.

The Governor included two new STEM related initiatives in the budget totaling \$700,000. They include:

1. Promote aerospace competitiveness through the Launch Year (\$450,000).
2. Promote aerospace competitiveness through Project Lead the Way (\$250,000).

The following legislation impacting SBE and its strategic priorities includes:

1. HB 5475 – would assign the SBE responsibility for making phase-in recommendations for the new program of basic education outlined in HB 2776. However, the bill also strips

out many of the phase-in timelines for some of the major funding enhancements established in the underlying bill.

2. HB 2111 – did not pass last year, but is re-introduced for the 2012 Legislative Session. The bill implements various recommendations of the Quality Education Council. Those that pertain to the SBE are:
 - Requires each school district to adopt a policy on defining a high school credit and charges SBE and WSSDA with developing a model policy for districts.
 - Encourages the SBE to adopt rules repealing the seat-time requirement for high school credit.
3. Higher Education Steering Committee Legislation (not yet filed) – The report includes two recommended options. Both options would create an Office of Student Achievement in the Office of the Governor, which would also staff an Advisory Board to the Office of Student Achievement. In Option A, the Office and Board would take on a P-13 focus, and would essentially replace the State Board of Education. In option B, the Office and Board would focus on secondary-to-post-secondary transitions and the State Board of Education would be preserved. The proposal includes:
 - House Bill 2215 – makes two significant changes to economy and efficiency waivers: eliminates current restrictions on renewals of economy and efficiency waivers, and removes the limit of five districts.
 - Senate Bill 6020 – requires SBE to extend economy and efficiency waivers to 2014 unless student achievement suffers as a result of the initial waiver.
 - House Bill 2170 – programs in CTE are added to the state’s basic education program. The SBE, and others, must add strategy of increasing secondary and post-secondary graduates to strategic plan and/or goals. All materials and communication materials related to graduation requirements must illustrate multiple pathways, (including a non-baccalaureate pathway). The Workforce Training Board shall now make recommendations to SBE on what it considers to be core competencies in K-12 education. SBE cannot require waivers, permissions, or something similar for students who wish to be removed from a four-year college prep pathway.
 - House Bill 2205 – allows eligible youth at least 16 years of age to register to vote; they would not be able to vote until 18.
 - House Bill 3170 – establishes high school graduation requirements for the Class of 2016 and sets those directly in statute. The bill requires a total of 18 credits for graduation rather than the current 20. It strikes reference to 24 credit requirements in the basic education statutes. The bill is silent on the culminating project but keeps the high school and beyond plan.

Other Board related legislation includes:

- House Bill 2165 – facilitates implementation of a revised teacher and principal evaluation system and requires statewide training during the 2012-2014 school years.
- House Bill 2209 – adds a new definition of “Contract Learning,” essentially mandating at least five hours of face to face time per week for students in grades 9-12. It also makes clear that students in ALE are not exempt from state assessments. It stipulates that contract learning programs would not be affected by the 15 percent ALE cut.
- House Bill 2199 – changes compulsory school attendance requirements for children six and seven years of age. Moves that children six years of age or older are required to be enrolled in school, but maintains that districts must only act on the truancy of students eight years of age or older.

- Senate Bill 5142 – requires districts to communicate distinctions between home-schooling and ALE programs.
- Senate Bill 6029 – requires high schools to inform students of three-year baccalaureate degree programs, and requires state colleges to make information about accelerated degree programs and other materials available on their websites.
- House Bill 2231 – removes various state testing requirements to save money. Includes Washington KIDS, End-of-Course tests, and others.

Graduation Requirements Phase-in: Next Steps and Associated Funding Requirements

The Legislature redefined basic education and created a new funding model with ESHB 2261 and SHB 2776. The Bills:

- Established legislative intent that implementation of the new funding structure and a new instructional program should occur together.
- Defined the program of basic education as that which is necessary to provide the opportunity to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the state-established high school graduation requirements that are intended to allow students to have the opportunity to graduate with a meaningful diploma that prepares them for postsecondary education, gainful employment, and citizenship.
- Required instruction that provides students the opportunity to complete 24 credits for high school graduation.

The Supreme Court ruling affirms the need for basic education funding reforms. The Legislature recently enacted a promising reform package under ESHB 2261, which, if fully funded, will remedy deficiencies in the K-12 funding system. Several state officials testified that full implementation of the funding for ESHB 2261 will remedy the deficiencies in the prior funding system. At that time, the SBE Chair expressed her opinion that full implementation of ESHB 2261 would go a long way toward giving students an opportunity to meet the state's academic learning goals.

A chart showing the fiscal analysis of costs provided by OSPI was provided for the Board's review. In the fiscal analysis, changes that have fiscal impact shall take effect only if formally authorized and funded by the Legislature through the omnibus appropriations act or other authorized legislation.

The Board was presented with two potential ways to think about the phase-in approach:

1. Begin phase-in of graduation requirements when the Legislature funds materials, supplies, operating costs (MSOC) enhancements to a pre-determined level.
2. Phase-in credit requirements only when the Legislature provides new funding for increased 9-12 staff allocations consistent with the QEC recommendations.

Public Comment

Jonelle Adams, Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA)

Ms. Adams asked the Board to think about all the waivers and processes and encouraged the Board to slow down and make sure it gets public comment and feedback on the waiver process before moving forward. She asked the Board not to move forward with the CR101s, CR102s, and CR103s. She said that waivers are very serious for school districts and to jerk the rug out from underneath them right now would not be a good idea. She asked the Board to think about the impact to schools. She encouraged the Board to make sure school districts are protected. She hopes that if the Board does this it will gain some trust back from education stakeholders.

Marie Sullivan, Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA)

Ms. Sullivan gave a briefing on three bills being introduced that will affect the SBE as follows: 1) currently, when the Board adopts a rule it is not required to do a fiscal analysis. This bill would ask for a fiscal analysis of rule making and would be part of the CR102 process; 2) due to the November 2011 action of the Board regarding graduation requirements, there is a bill for graduation requirements to become voluntary. The bill would make credit changes voluntary unless they're funded by the Legislature or authorized by the Legislature. When there are fiscal impacts and if a school district believes there is a fiscal impact, they need to present that to the Board; 3) This bill would reconfigure the Board and would be more modeled after the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) with a broader representation of people who are even more close to the ground than the SBE members might be currently. It also includes financial analysis. These bills are being worked by education stakeholders.

Tim Brittell, Northshore Education Association

Mr. Brittell talked about the waiver process, saying collaborative time is crucial in working with teachers to continue the process in their development as educators. Mentoring time has been used in the District since 2000 and the Northshore School District is diligent in the effort to mentor both veteran and new teachers. It's vital as a district to meet the success of students. Mr. Brittell was a dropout who was guided by three teachers who looked at him as a student needing help in the system. Because of collaborative time with his teachers he has moved forward in his education and has become a success story. Mr. Brittell encouraged the Board to do their homework and talk to teachers about the need of waivers and collaborative time. He invited members to meet with him anytime. As state budgets continue to be cut, waivers are the only avenue to take.

Art Jarvis, Tacoma School District

Mr. Jarvis thanked the Board for their work through the years. He asked the Board to think about when action is taken, is the Board helping people to tackle the problems and be different and innovative? Or is the Board applying rules with little flexibility and holding people accountable? Tacoma has beautiful and innovative ideas and programs and has lots of struggles and issues that are being tackled. He asked the Board to use a filter that will open the door and ask how the SBE can help and not dictate. This isn't a criticism to the SBE. He encouraged the Board to visit public schools in Tacoma to see a good system.

Business Items

The **motion** to file the CR102 with the proposed amendments to WAC 180-18-040 was tabled until the May 2012 Board meeting in Yakima.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m. by Chair Vincent to allow Board members time to meet with legislators regarding the 2012 Legislative Session.