

July 11-12, 2012  
Western Washington University  
Bellingham, Washington

## MINUTES

### Wednesday, July 11, 2012

Members Attending: Chair Jeff Vincent, Vice-chair Amy Bragdon, Mr. Randy Dorn, Ms. Connie Fletcher, Ms. Phyllis (Bunker) Frank, Dr. Sheila Fox, Mr. Bob Hughes, Dr. Kris Mayer, Ms. Mary Jean Ryan, Mr. Tre' Maxie, Mr. Matthew Spencer, Ms. Cindy McMullen, Mr. Kevin Laverty, Dr. Bernal Baca, Mr. Eli Ulmer, Ms. Judy Jennings (16)

Staff Attending: Mr. Ben Rarick, Ms. Sarah Rich, Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Mr. Jack Archer, Ms. Linda Drake, Ms. Emily Persky, Ms. Loy McColm, Ms. Janet Culik, Ms. Colleen Warren (9)

The meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m. by Vice-chair Bragdon.

David Bover, Ph.D., the Associate Dean of the College of Sciences and Technology at Western Washington University, welcomed the Board to the University and Bellingham. He talked about activities at Western Washington University and issues in post-secondary education. Dr. Bover noted the contributions of Dr. Sheila Fox and Dr. George "Pinky" Nelson, both of whom are retiring from Western Washington University this year.

### Consent Agenda

Approval of Private Schools was moved to the Business Items portion of the meeting.

**Motion** was made to approve the Consent Agenda as presented:

- Approval of Minutes from the May 8-9, 2012 Board meeting as corrected.

**Motion** seconded.

**Motion** carried.

### Strategic Plan Dashboard

Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Director of Communications and Partnerships

Mr. Wyatt discussed the division of labor to allocate resources for SBE staff. He explained the new format for the Dashboard, which will be presented at each Board meeting in the future. Work completed in March and April was presented for the Members' information.

The current work on the 2012-2014 Strategic Plan goals was reviewed. Board discussion followed.

## **SBE Statutory Authority for Accountability**

Mr. Jack Archer, Senior Policy Analyst

Mr. Archer described SBE's statutory authority for development of a revised Achievement Index and a framework for school accountability that includes assistance and intervention strategies.

SBE's statutory authority for a framework for school accountability is established by:

- 2005 legislation (ESSB 5732) reconstituting SBE's powers and duties, codified as RCW 28A.305.130.
- 2009 legislation (ESHB 2261) redefining basic education, in findings on shared accountability for school and district improvement.
- 2010 legislation (E2SSB 6696), codified as RCW 28A.657 (Academic Achievement and Accountability).
  - RCW 28A.657.005 establishes closely connected roles for SBE and OSPI in the development and implementation of an accountability system.
  - RCW 28A.657.110 recognizes the need for continued refinement of the accountability index.

RCW 28A.657.120 grants broad rule-making authority to SBE and OSPI to implement the powers and duties granted by Chapter 28A.657.

Board discussion ensued.

## **Achievement Index Communications Plan and Work Group Work Plan**

Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Director of Communications and Partnerships

Ms. Sarah Rich, Policy Director

The SBE and OSPI, through collaboration with state and local policy makers, educators, parents, and citizens, will develop:

1. A revised Achievement Index to enable a unified system of support for challenged schools that aligns with basic education, increases the level of support based upon the magnitude of need, and uses data for decisions. The Index will identify high-performing schools for recognition and low-performing schools for support and intervention.
2. A statewide accountability framework designed to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement/opportunity gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for all students, including students with disabilities, English language learners, and students from historically underserved subgroups.

The rationale for this work is outlined in the Achievement and Accountability Resolution.

Ms. Rich explained that to better inform the work and encourage broad-based stakeholder feedback, SBE and OSPI will convene an Achievement and Accountability Workgroup (AAW). The role of the AAW is outlined in the AAW Charter. Comprised of up to 17 appointed members, the workgroup will play an instrumental role in supporting SBE and OSPI in the Achievement Index and accountability framework's design. Several AAW members have been tentatively identified and Mr. Wyatt noted that all members should be identified by the end of July 2012.

Mr. Wyatt discussed the AAW communications plan, which identifies key publics, targeted objectives for those publics, and strategies/tactics necessary to successfully meet those objectives. He said that communications will be essential in successful direction to and

facilitation of AAW, coordination with OSPI and the steering committee, outreach to key publics through direct and indirect channels, and feedback to SBE.

Ms. Rich reviewed a draft accountability system resolution and an achievement and accountability charter with the Board members. Board discussion followed. Mr. Rarick reminded the Board that the subject will be revisited at later times during the meeting as part of Richard Wenning's presentations.

### **ESEA Flexibility Overview**

Ms. Sarah Rich, Policy Director

Mr. Alan Burke, Deputy Superintendent of K-12 Education, OSPI

Ms. Rich reported that on July 6, the United States Department of Education (ED) conditionally approved Washington State's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) flexibility request for the 2012-13 school year. Washington has proposed an accountability system that meets all of ED's requirements, and the state proposed moving to a more sophisticated system that includes measures of student achievement, student progress, and graduation rates in the 2013-14 school year. The state is still working on the details. Once Washington gets its new system in place, it will need to be approved by ED.

Districts were notified earlier of the approval's imminence due to requirements that districts publish a draft budget by July 10. Having this information now will help districts because the Title I set-asides for transportation and supplemental educational services will need to be incorporated back into district budgets.

OSPI will hold a series of webinars primarily focused for districts with Priority, Focus, and Emerging (formerly referred to as Persistently Low Achieving) schools. These districts will need to dedicate up to 20 percent of their Title I funds to improving outcomes at these schools.

Mr. Burke gave detail and perspective on the conditional approval of the flexibility request and the limited time frame that districts had to make adjustments to meet the conditions of the waiver. Ms. Rich reiterated that the approval is conditional; if Washington meets the requirements, it will be a two-year waiver. If the state does not meet the requirements, it will be a one-year waiver and the state would then have to return to the old rules of No Child Left Behind.

### **State Accountability System – Underlying Principles and Concepts**

Mr. Richard J. Wenning, RJW Advisors, Inc.

Mr. Wenning guided the Board through a discussion of key elements of accountability systems and recommended principles. The Board also discussed student growth percentiles in depth.

Beginning in July 2012 and culminating with an approved revised Index in September 2013, SBE, in partnership with OSPI, will consider necessary elements of a revised Achievement Index to fulfill the responsibility of SBE as defined in Senate Bill 6696, which included expectations for two phases of development of an accountability system. Phase I of the work includes the development of the following:

1. Principles to guide the development and implementation of the accountability system.
2. Goals, which includes the purposes, uses, and theory of action of the system.
3. Performance Indicators to measure performance and improvement.
4. Design decisions, including relative weight of performance indicators, additional data to include such as ELL data and tier labels.

5. Consequences including rewards, sanctions, and interventions.

Phase II includes:

1. Communication designed to provide data to stakeholders and the public.
2. Support for schools and districts that increases based upon the magnitude of need.
3. System evaluation, monitoring, and improvement to continually ensure goals are being met.

Mr. Wenning discussed recommended accountability system principles that are most relevant to a revised Index, including:

- Alignment of performance indicators to rigorous standards.
- Meaningful differentiation of school performance.
- Inclusion of multiple student outcomes (proficiency and growth).
- Subgroup disaggregation.
- Engagement with stakeholders.

Board discussion followed.

### **Recognition of Steven Lawrence**

The Board recognized Steven Lawrence as Washington State's 2012 History Teacher of the Year. Mr. Lawrence and the principal of Meridian High School, James Everett, were welcomed by Chair Vincent. Chair Vincent presented Mr. Lawrence with a certificate of appreciation from the State Board of Education.

Mr. Lawrence began teaching at Meridian High School in 1994. He teaches U.S. History and Government, AP U.S. Government, Current Issues, Law and Society and Comparative Religion. He serves as the chair of the Social Studies Department and is on the District's Social Studies Curriculum team. He also coaches the school's Mock Trial and girls' golf teams, is the advisor for the Teen Court club and is the president of the Meridian Education Association.

Mr. Lawrence delivered a presentation to the Board entitled, "Attracting and Retaining High Quality Teachers." He shared his perspective, noting that money doesn't necessarily attract this talent, but what does include purpose, autonomy, professional growth, time, and administration.

The Board briefly continued discussion on the draft Accountability System Resolution language.

### **State Accountability System – Key Design Choices**

Mr. Richard J. Wenning, RJW Advisors, Inc.

Mr. Wenning guided the Board through an in-depth discussion of key design choices for an accountability index and student growth percentiles. He then spoke about the key components of differentiated accountability and support:

1. Key Performance Indicators.
2. Multi-Measure Framework.
3. Incentives for Change and Innovation.
4. Unified Planning Process.
5. Service Mix and Delivery.
6. Evaluation and Validation.
7. Rollout Strategy – Communications, Stakeholder Engagement, Training.

Mr. Wenning discussed four example performance indicators in a sample district performance framework report, and a sample rubric that explained scoring. The indicators were rated (does not meet/approaching/meets/exceeds) and measured by points earned out of points eligible:

1. Academic Achievement
2. Academic Growth
3. Academic Growth Gaps
4. Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

Board discussion followed regarding multi-measure frameworks, implementation benchmarks, reviews and feedback, and validation of measures. The Board also discussed how efforts must be made to inform educators and students what they need to know, and to create an index that is understandable, clear, and user-friendly to all stakeholders.

### **Option One Waiver Requests**

Mr. Jack Archer, Sr. Policy Analyst

Option One is the regular 180-day waiver request that has been available to districts since 1995. The State Board of Education is authorized by RCW 28A.305.140 to grant waivers to school districts from the minimum 180-day school year requirement in RCW 28.150.220 to implement a local plan that is designed to enhance the educational program for each student. Districts may propose the number of days to be waived and the types of activities deemed necessary to enhance the educational program and improve student achievement. SBE may grant waiver requests for up to three years.

Complete applications for the following thirteen districts were provided in the member packets. A summary follows:

**Auburn** requests three waiver days for the 2012-13 school year to continue restructuring initiatives and implement revised school improvement plans in alignment with its 2009-12 Strategic Improvement Plan. Auburn currently has a waiver of three days to implement its school improvement plan and requests it be extended one year.

**Battle Ground** requests five waiver days for the 2012-13 school year for implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation program directed by ESSB 5895, 2012 Session, in the 2013-14 school year and to begin using a specific research-based instructional framework.

**Cascade** requests four waiver days for school years 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15 for parent-teacher conferences in order to reduce from 12 to four the number of early release days.

**Columbia** (Walla Walla County) requests three waiver days for school years 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15, for elementary and middle schools only, for the purpose of holding two full-day parent-teacher conferences in the fall and one full-day parent-teacher conference in the spring.

**Cusick** requests two waiver days for school years 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15 for staff professional development.

**Kelso** requests one waiver day for the 2012-13 school year for its high school and two middle schools only.

**North Franklin** requests four waiver days for the 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years to provide four full days of parent-teacher conferences.

**Prosser** requests four waiver days for the 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years for full-day parent-teacher conferences.

**Republic** requests two waiver days for the 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years for staff professional development, to be conducted in collaboration with eight other districts.

**Stevenson-Carson** requests one waiver day for the 2012-13 school year to provide training for staff for the restructuring and move of the seventh and eighth grade students from a traditional middle school setting, in a separate building, to a junior-senior high school.

**Tacoma** requests two waiver days for the 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years for staff professional development.

**Thorp** requests two waiver days for 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15 for professional development.

**West Valley** requests four waiver days for the 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years for parent-teacher conferences in elementary and middle schools.

Mr. Archer, at the request of Mr. Rarick, gave further detail regarding Kelso School District's waiver request. The request is not for a parent-teacher conference. The waiver days would be used to familiarize sixth and ninth graders with their new schools. A day would be set aside for only sixth graders to attend, and one for only ninth graders to attend. The remaining grades would have a day waived. Board discussion followed.

The Board reviewed Option One waiver requests for districts implementing the legislatively mandated program called the Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS). In the landmark school finance legislation of 2009 and 2010, the Legislature extended the definition of basic education to full-day Kindergarten. WaKIDS was optional for districts receiving state support for full-day Kindergarten in 2011-12. It becomes mandatory in 2012-13. A required component of WaKIDS is the family-teacher conference called Family Connections. WaKIDS waivers will be granted for one year only. SBE will work with the Legislature for a permanent solution so that districts will not continue to need basic education waivers to implement WaKIDS.

Copies of the applications for waivers were provided for Members before taking action on Wednesday during the business meeting.

### **Proposed Waiver Rule Revisions and Communications Plan**

Mr. Jack Archer, Senior Policy Analyst

Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Director of Communications and Partnerships

Mr. Archer discussed how the SBE is required by law to adopt rules for evaluation of requests for waivers of the basic education requirement of a minimum 180-day school year. At its May 2012 meeting the Board approved the filing of a CR 101 to initiate rule-making and set direction for draft rules to be presented at the July 2012 Board meeting.

Mr Wyatt described the communications plan for receiving public input on the development of rules for evaluation of 180-day waiver requests.

The draft rules presented to the Board for review include:

- Setting criteria for evaluation of Option One waiver requests under RCW 28A.305.140 and WAC 180-18-040.
- Creating a procedure through which a district may obtain a 180-day waiver solely for the purpose of parent-teacher conferences without formal action by SBE.
- Integrating Option Three waivers into Option One by striking WAC 180-18-050(3).
- Setting criteria for evaluation of Option Two “economy and efficiency” waivers under RCW 28A.305.141.
- Changing from 50 days to 40 days the required length of time before a Board meeting that applications for Option One waivers must be submitted under WAC 180-80-050(2).
- Eliminating WAC 180-18-040, concerning waivers from the student-teacher ratio requirement, as the statute it references has been repealed.
- Providing for other technical, clean-up changes to WAC 180-18-040 and WAC 180-18-050.

Mr. Archer shared a potential timeline for the review and approval of a CR 102, with the potential goal of filing a CR 103 by November 2012. He also discussed results of a survey that was sent to superintendents regarding waiver requests. Board discussion followed.

### **Public Comment**

#### **Bob McMullen, Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP)**

Mr. McMullen expressed his association’s appreciation for working on a new accountability index and said, “This is a gateway moment in terms of policy, and I urge the Board to think about kids, their own children, or grandchildren, in terms of what we’re trying to do. We need to push school systems to create graduates that are college and career-ready, and classroom environments which incentivize learning more than test passing. I am concerned about Richard Wenning’s comments about learning rates. Is the learning rate a driver or the byproduct of learning systems? To what extent should you focus on the effectiveness of school system operations and to what extent the actual learning of our children? Who is the learning rate audience and to what end? Is “learning rate” merely the re-imposing of the “Taylor Model on K-12 education? Speed up the assembly lines! Who is the beneficiary of that? Some current research suggests crucial growth aspects for student learning go beyond content focus, which can be found in a 2012 University of Chicago study called *Teaching Adolescents to Become Learners: The Role of Non-cognitive Factors in Shaping School Performance*.

“As policy makers, your deliberation is about what to hold tight and what to hold loose in policy making. Bear down on the few crucial learning markers, like Kindergarten readiness, 3rd grade reading, 8<sup>th</sup> grade numeracy, and high school completion. Look and listen deeply to schools and districts for widely diverse populations, like organizations, which successfully drive themselves to be both instructionally and culturally intentional, and teachers who continually grow through relentless emphasis on improving individual and collective instructional effectiveness. Engage school boards, superintendents, principals, and teachers whose schools/districts are outliers of amazing learning outcomes with challenging populations. Find out what are they doing more effectively and need to sustain this educational effectiveness growth.”

#### **Marie Sullivan, Washington State School Directors’ Association (WSSDA)**

Ms. Sullivan said, “I have two things for your consideration on the draft rules for waivers: 1) It is unclear how professional development might be “scored” under the proposed criteria in WAC 180-18-040. I might suggest that some examples be included, and that it might be hard to make the case for the Teacher Principal Evaluation Pilot; 2) Several references in the summary document that a waiver request in excess of five days would trigger additional scrutiny. I suggest that if this is going to be practice, that it be put in the WAC as formal language. Hearing

it out makes the process less clear. I'm not sure what "enhanced review" would mean in practice, and think this needs clarity.

"I appreciate the clarification of parent/teacher conferences and expedited review. If the Board is looking at doing something about parent/teacher legislation, WSSDA would be a willing partner."

JR Johnson, Burlington-Edison School District

Mr. Johnson spoke about waiver requirements. He said, "The consideration to loosen requirements on waivers encourages the status quo, which we know needs to continue to evolve. If we want to invoke this change it must begin with disallowing avenues that permit a kind of creative financing, e.g., reducing classroom time to make room for other needs of a functioning education system, such as in-district professional development and parent-teacher conferences.

"By keeping requisites specific and focused to innovative teacher collaboration, we can begin to pressure lawmakers to provide the necessary resources to fulfill their court-ordered mandate of abiding to Article X in our state's constitution.

"Please do not make classroom reduction waivers easier for the sake of improving the quality of our state's education system. Make these waiver requests thorough, limited in days and renewals, and directly connected to improving student learning quality in the classroom."

Jami Lund, Freedom Foundation

Mr. Lund said, "I appreciate the work that you do. The State Board of Education's emphasis on accountability and improved education is a unique responsibility, which the citizens of the state count on the Board to fulfill. The recent effort of the Board to smooth the way for shortening the student school year represents a troubling departure from the Board's usual efforts to look after the interest of students. We know it intuitively, but research also confirms that the length of the school year affects student learning. Nothing in the Board materials or applications suggests that students are better served by shortening the number of days they spend with their teachers.

"Why do adults need to perform duties on days that formerly were student learning days? It is a real solution for districts to treat the annual salary received by professionals as exactly that – an annual salary. Certificated employees in districts do not punch a clock like factory workers and other professionals have seasonal exceptional expectations, which are considered part of the profession. The state-funded wages are sufficient to expect that students are served for 180 days and that professional responsibilities are executed.

"It is not a suitable defense to suggest that adding two minutes to the end of each day is equivalent to a day of school. If minutes can be traded for days in this way, then would it be equally impact-neutral for the school days to be shortened by twenty minutes and employees asked to work for an additional two weeks?

"The action items currently before the Board do not safeguard the interests of students and do not improve the quality of the education system. The regulations offer no cap on the waivers or other indication that the Board disapproves of reducing the services to students. The regulations make waivers for conferences without Board review. This is establishing a formal state policy that all districts may now serve students fewer days.

"Instead the State Board of Education should require that no waiver will be granted unless there is a significant net increase in service levels to students. For example, a shorter school year for students who have reached achievement goals could enable a district to significantly extend the

day or year for students who are at risk of falling behind. Or perhaps if a district offers 1080 hours the district could shorten the number of days.

“Place a cap on waivers. The meeting materials suggest that even of the skewed sample of survey respondents, only 9 percent thought no cap should be imposed. The majority thought three or less days was a sufficient cap. Direct staff to prepare model legislation to clean up the statutes.

“At a time when education attainment is more important than ever, please consider the obligation the Board has to push for the interests of students.”

John Kirk, Citizen

Mr. Kirk said that he is making his comment, and brought his daughters along, as part of a public policy project. “I represent public perception. I have three concerns. Waivers should not be a pressure valve to deal with budget/bargaining pressures that accommodate teachers at the expense of students who cannot bargain for themselves, or to deal with data collection pressures which should be dealt with in other assessment arenas.

“Waivers should be tied to student success as school districts use them creatively to balance needs of advanced or failing students. Why create a WAC workaround when an RCW fix is needed? Do the thorough job.”

Ann Varkados, Bethel School District

Ms. Varkados said, “We currently have two waiver days for professional development. It was my understanding if you have schools in the lowest 5 percent, you could not request more waiver time. Now with the US Department of Education waiver and the proposed change in policy, Bethel School District goes on the record supporting this change. We did not consider additional waiver requests due to this understanding.

“For the record, the Teacher Principal Evaluation Pilot is costing our District over \$100,000 to launch and initiate. Planning implementation of this initiative in a district of our size requires and consumes a great deal of time and energy.”

Beth Hensley, Teacher

Ms. Hensley said that she believes 180 days of funding should be for 180 days of education. Taxpayers paid for this, not waivers. She said that 20-30 percent of parents show up for parent-teacher conferences, and she wonders if the state is getting “the bang for its buck” for waivers that are issued. She recommends additional funding, beyond 180 days, for all waiver requests and to set a cap of waiver days to three maximum.

Michael Vendiola, Swinomish Tribe and Matt Remle, Indian Education

Mr. Vendiola and Mr. Remle said, ““We respectfully ask that the Washington State Board of Education adopt an administrative rule that prohibits public schools in Washington State from using names, symbols, or images that depict or refer to an American Indian tribe, custom, or tradition as a mascot, nickname, logo, or team name.

“In Washington State, we have roughly twenty high schools with Native American mascots, ranging from the Renton and Reardon Indians to the Moses Lake Chiefs and the Port Townsend Redskins.

“For decades, American Indians from around the country have protested the use of Native American mascots and imagery, citing the discriminatory and derogatory nature of such images.

Research supports these claims. In 2005, the American Psychological Association (APA) called for the immediate retirement of all American Indian mascots, based on a growing body of social science literature that shows the harmful effects of racial stereotypes in American Indian sports mascots on the social identity development and self-esteem of American Indian youth.

“In 2010, the Washington State Legislature and Governor Gregoire passed HB 3026, which banned discrimination in public schools. Under HB 3026, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) shall monitor and enforce school districts’ compliance with this law. HB 3026 parallels the Washington Law Against Discrimination (RCW 49.60), which also prohibits discrimination, based on these protected classes in public accommodations, including schools.

“The continued use of Native American mascots violates both HB 3026 and RCW 49.60 in the promotion of discrimination against Native Americans. The State Board of Education and OSPI have been given the responsibility by the Washington State Legislature to ensure that persons are not subjected to unlawful discrimination. Native American students are entitled to educational environments that are free of discrimination.”

Mr. Vendiola and Mr. Remle presented a list of people who added their names to a petition regarding the prohibition of using Native American mascots in public schools.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:13 p.m. by Chair Vincent.

#### **Thursday, July 12, 2012**

Members Attending: Chair Jeff Vincent, Vice-chair Amy Bragdon, Ms. Connie Fletcher, Ms. Phyllis (Bunker) Frank, Dr. Sheila Fox, Mr. Bob Hughes, Dr. Kris Mayer, Ms. Mary Jean Ryan, Mr. Tre’ Maxie, Mr. Matthew Spencer, Ms. Cindy McMullen, Mr. Kevin Laverty, Dr. Bernal Baca, Mr. Elias Ulmer, Ms. Judy Jennings (15)

Members Excused: Mr. Randy Dorn (1)

Staff Attending: Mr. Ben Rarick, Ms. Sarah Rich, Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Mr. Jack Archer, Ms. Linda Drake, Ms. Emily Persky, Ms. Loy McColm, Ms. Janet Culik, Ms. Colleen Warren (9)

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chair Vincent.

#### **Student Presentation**

Mr. Matthew Spencer, Student Board Member

Student Board Member Matthew Spencer spoke on how the Board’s work has impacted or will impact K-12, with an emphasis on accountability and achievement. He responded to questions asked by the members.

#### **Achievement Index Communications Plan and Work Group Work Plan**

Mr. Ben Rarick, Executive Director  
Ms. Sarah Rich, Policy Director

Ms. Rich reviewed the current Achievement Index that is used in Washington. She discussed the current tiers of rating, along with benchmarks and ratings for outcomes and indicators.

Board discussion ensued regarding performance indicators, and a suggestion was made to hold a webinar for Board members to review how to interpret and use the Achievement Index information.

### **State Accountability System – Board Discussion and Next Steps**

Mr. Richard J. Wenning, RJW Advisors, Inc.

Mr. Ben Rarick, Executive Director

Ms. Sarah Rich, Policy Director

Mr. Wenning spoke about determining key performance indicators, and distinguishing the indicator from the measurement of the indicator. At the request of the members, he also explained the identification and measurement of gaps. The members discussed what indicators it wished the Achievement and Accountability Work Group to consider in the creation of the next Achievement Index.

The members wish for the careful consideration of proficiency, growth, and readiness in the context of poverty, subgroups, and English Language Learners (ELLs), when considering the indicators below:

1. Proficiency indicators (percent of students meeting proficiency in reading, writing, mathematics, and science.
  - a. Progress toward, or attainment of, AMOs. Possible separate indicator.
2. Growth indicators (student growth rates (median student growth percentile), percent of students making a year's growth, percent of students making adequate growth to be on track in reading and math.)
3. Workforce and postsecondary readiness indicators (percent of students demonstrating readiness on one of multiple indicators of workforce or college preparedness.)
4. Achievement gaps.
5. English Language Learner (ELL) students and the use of language proficiency assessments.
6. Leading indicators, lagging indicators.
7. Improvement over time.
8. 95 percent participation.
9. Graduation rates.

The Board discussed the distinction between “targets” and “strategies.”

A possible future indicator discussed was the whole child measure, with careful consideration of indicator's bias and fairness. The availability and validity of data is not yet clear.

A strategy in the measure of workforce and postsecondary readiness might be the possible inclusion of body of work from students that demonstrates student progress, a portfolio, or High School and Beyond plan performance/completion.

The Board asked for a revision of the Theory of Action. Mr. Wenning reviewed the indicators that were discussed and noted they were satisfactory.

Mr. Rarick reviewed the timeline for the creation of the revised Achievement Index with the Achievement and Accountability Work Group. He said that by the November 2012 meeting, the Board should be in a position to vote on and settle the key performance indicators of the Index.

### **Impact of Learning Assistance Program on Student Outcomes: Preliminary Report and Study Update**

Ms. Annie Pennucci, Associate Director, Washington State Institute for Public Policy

Ms. Pennucci spoke about the Learning Assistance Program (LAP), which is the state's major program of remediation in public schools, funded at \$255 million in state funds and \$748 million in total funds in the current biennium. Allocations for this program are made to school districts based on a measure of family poverty. LAP allocations may be used to provide extended learning opportunities for students in grades K-12 who score below standard for grade level on assessments of basic skills, which include reading, writing, and mathematics.

The Quality Education Council (QEC) created a Learning Assistance Technical Working Group. The report of this group in 2010 included a recommendation for a research study to assess the overall effectiveness of LAP. The QEC contracted with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy, a legislative research agency, for this study.

Board discussion followed, and Mr. Bob Harmon, Assistant Superintendent of Special Programs and Federal Accountability, OSPI answered questions regarding LAP funding. Chair Vincent asked Board staff to collect further information for discussion at the August special Board meeting.

### **Public Comment**

Wendy Rader-Konofalski, Washington Education Association (WEA) on behalf of Holly Koon, Science Teacher, Mt. Baker School District

Ms. Koon was unable to be in attendance to address her comments to the Board. She asked Ms. Rader-Konofalski to address the Board in her absence. Ms. Koon spoke a few years ago at a Board meeting held in Bellingham and told of the great work her school was doing. At that time cuts were just beginning to be made in their counseling program and she told of how that was going to negatively affect the success they were achieving with their students. Her message to the Board this time outlined how that same high poverty school that was awarded as a high performing school as little as three years ago has now begun to go backwards.

"The change," she says "is not because of the union, and it isn't because we aren't a charter school, and it isn't because we have a few awful teachers. It is because the margin has finally been cut too thin. After years of expert juggling and balancing resources and biting our nails every spring during the budget process as we slice, dice, and adapt, we finally have come to the point where resources are just too few and mandates too great (if narrow) to overcome. We are seeing the systematic dismantling of every exemplary thing we've worked years to build. Watching the effects on kids is heart wrenching." "What changed," she said, "are the resources we have to support the kids who need support. What changed are our class sizes and the number of class sections we can offer kids who need remediation and extra support. What changed is the loss of our curriculum director, a principal, part of a math teacher, part of a science teacher, a reading support teacher, money for the new curriculum and materials required every time the state changes standards and assessment, funding for professional development, and the loss of our entire alternative program for very at risk students (putting

those students back into the regular classrooms with 30-36 other kids while simultaneously decimating the surround-support services we've provided in the past)."

Wendy Rader-Konofalski, Washington Education Association (WEA)

"These comments are relevant to the Board's work of revising the accountability system and it is important to remember what the Board agreed to when we started the first accountability effort: accountability is a shared proposition with many responsible parties. A big piece of the partnership comes from the state's commitment to provide at least the basic funding and support and that must be a feature of the accountability system or we are not going to truly be helping our kids or our educators. Additionally, for any changes to the accountability system to be embraced and accepted by those most affected by it, it will have to do more than make Arne Duncan and the Department of Education happy. It will have to be based on a deep respect for those educators at our schools all across the state who are dedicated and working hard to manage everything thrown their way under more and more difficult circumstances and foster support and assistance rather than consequences, penalties, sticks, or any form of shaming and blaming just as your current Accountability Index has done up to now. As we have seen in the past several years with RADs and SIGs, our schools don't need to be forced to accept assistance and where they have received financial assistance, their plans have resulted in great improvements.

"With regard to the upcoming work of the Accountability Workgroup, we are glad to see sensitivity about not pre-determining outcomes. We think that it should be very clear that this workgroup can have the leeway to help create a system most meaningful for students, educators, and the state as a whole. We also encourage the Board to honor and heed the recommendations of this workgroup."

**Recognition of Dr. Sheila Fox**

Dr. Francisco Rios, Education Dean of Western Washington University, welcomed the Board to the University and Bellingham. He spoke about preparing education students to become teachers that work with families and communities, and how education students at Western Washington University are involved with service learning. He also described the University's efforts to encourage and increase diversity in the teaching profession.

Dr. Rios also recognized the work of Dr. Sheila Fox and noted that the Woodring School of Education and Western Washington University will miss her when she retires later this summer. Dr. Fox will also retire from the State Board of Education after this meeting.

Chair Vincent addressed Dr. Fox and complimented her on her work and participation on the State Board of Education. He noted that she has been a very valuable member of the Board and will be missed.

Dr. Fox thanked the Board and staff for their hard work and dedication to public education.

**September Board Retreat Planning**

Mr. Ben Rarick, Executive Director

Mr. Rarick presented a draft structure describing the types of issues, formats, site visitations, and guest speakers under consideration for the September Board retreat to be held in conjunction with the September Board meeting.

**The Opportunity Gap**

Mr. Bob Hughes, Board Member

Mr. Hughes handed out a *New York Times* article by David Brooks, entitled "The Opportunity Gap," from the July 9, 2012 issue. Mr. Hughes presented data regarding the relationship between students that qualify for free and reduced lunch, and mathematics End of Course assessment scores.

Mr. Hughes shared concepts from the book, *Finnish Lessons: What Can the World Learn from Educational Change in Finland?* by Pasi Sahlbergh, and suggested that the concepts from this book and the topic of student poverty be discussed at the September Board retreat.

Board discussion followed. Chair Vincent and Mr. Rarick will work together on the September Board Retreat agenda and send it to Board members by July 20.

### **Compensation Technical Working Group Recommendations**

Ms. Kelci Karl-Robinson, Director of Financial Policy and Research, OSPI

Ms. Maria Flores, Associate Director for Innovation, OSPI

Ms. Sheryl Moore, Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources, Renton School District

SHB 2261, from the 2009 Legislative Session, directed the Office of Financial Management to convene a technical working group to recommend an enhanced salary allocation model that aligns educator certification with the compensation system. (This was changed in 2010 to provide that the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction convenes the working group.) The legislation gave the working group specific charges for this analysis, including examining salaries and other compensation for teachers and other staff, comparing salaries and other compensation to appropriate labor markets for beginning teachers and certain other kinds of certificated staff. It directed the working group to make recommendations on:

1. How to reduce the number of tiers in the existing salary schedule.
2. How to account for different geographic regions where there may be difficulty recruiting and retaining teachers.
3. How to account for labor market adjustments.
4. What kinds of salary bonuses should be available.
5. How equalization in state salary allocations can be accomplished.
6. What the estimated costs would be of implementing the group's recommendations on salaries and other compensation.

The final report of the working group was due June 30, 2012.

An overview of the recommendations of the working group's final report were presented as follows:

1. Increase beginning teacher salary to \$48,687.
2. Provide fair market-based salary allocations for all K-12 staff.
3. Maintain comparable wages through COLA and periodic updates.
4. Align the salary allocation model to the career continuum for educators.
5. Invest in ten days of professional development time.
6. Allocate mentors and instructional coaches in the basic education funding formula.
7. Provide appropriate staffing levels and increased program support.
8. Ample fund basic education salaries and limit locally funded salary enhancements.
9. Ensure school districts receive the same or higher state salary allocations.

The fiscal estimate of additional costs tied to the recommended salary allocations total \$2,064,170,000; this amount is already spent by the local districts, and the Working Group is recommending that the cost be shifted from the local districts back to the state.

## **Business Items**

### **Waivers**

#### a. **Option One Waivers**

**Motion** was made to approve Auburn, Battle Ground, Cascade, Columbia (Walla Walla County), Cusick, Kelso, North Franklin, Prosser, Republic, Stevenson-Carson, Tacoma, Thorp, and West Valley School Districts waiver requests from the 180 day school year requirement in RCW 28A.150.220 for the number of days and school years requested in their applications to the Board.

Board discussion

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** failed

**Amended Motion** was made to eliminate approval to Columbia (Walla Walla County).

Board discussion

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried; six aye, five nay, one abstained.

#### b. **WaKIDS Waiver Requests**

**Motion** was made to approve Bremerton, Centralia, Mabton, Renton, Mary Walker, and East Valley School Districts WaKIDS waiver requests from the 180 day school year requirement in RCW 28A.150.220 for the number of days and schools requested for the 2012-2013 school year.

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried with one nay.

### **CR102 for Waivers**

**Motion** was made to approve the proposed amendments to WAC's 180-18-040 and 180-18-050, and the proposed rule for economy and efficiency waivers, for inclusion in the CR 102 notice of proposed rule-making filed with the Code Reviser.

**Motion** seconded

Board discussion

**Motion** was made to amend the proposed amendments to WAC 180-18-050(3) as highlighted in bold, and underlined below with no other changes to the proposed rule language:

(3) Under this section, a district seeking to obtain a waiver **of no more than five days** from the provisions of the minimum one hundred eighty-day school year requirement pursuant to RCW 28A.305.140 solely for the purpose of conducting parent-teacher conferences shall provide notification of the district request to the State Board of Education at least thirty days prior to implementation of the plan. **A request for more than five days must be presented to the Board under section (1) for approval.**

Board discussion

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

#### Accountability Resolution

**Motion** was made to approve the *Accountability System Resolution* on pages 60-61 of the Board's meeting materials as amended.

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

#### Work Group Charter

**Motion** was made to approve the *Achievement and Accountability Charter* on pages 60-61 of the Board's meeting materials as amended.

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

#### Election Committee for September Board Elections

Hearing no objections from the Board, Chair Vincent approved Amy Bragdon as the Nomination Committee lead.

#### Approval of Private Schools for the 2012-13 School Year

**Motion** was made to approve the private school list for the 2012-13 school year as presented.

**Motion** seconded

**Motion** carried

The meeting was adjourned at 3:43 p.m. by Chair Vincent.