

THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Accountability | Graduation Requirements | Math | Science

July 13-14, 2010
Northwest Educational Services District #189
Anacortes, Washington

MINUTES

July 13, 2010

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

Members Absent: Mr. Warren Smith (excused) (1)

Staff Attending: Ms. Edie Harding, Ms. Loy McColm, Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Dr. Kathe Taylor (4)

Staff Absent: Mr. Brad Burnham (excused), Ms. Sarah Rich (excused), Ms. Ashley Harris (excused), Ms. Colleen Warren (excused) (4)

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m. by Chair Vincent

Dr. Jerry Jenkins, Superintendent of ESD 189 welcomed the Board to Anacortes and thanked them for their continued partnership with the ESD's.

Consent Agenda

Motion was made to approve the following consent agenda as presented:

- Private Schools
- May 13-14, 2010 Board Meeting Minutes
- June 15, 2010 Special Board Meeting Minutes

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Required Action District Draft Rules for Implementation

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director

Ms. Tonya Middling, Director, School and District Improvement Project Development, OSPI

The 2010 legislature passed E2SSB 6696 creating Required Action Districts that contain persistently lowest achieving Title I or Title I eligible schools in the bottom five percent of performance on state assessments for all students in math and reading. Following are the steps taken to determine which districts could become Required Action Districts:

- By December 2010, and annually thereafter the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) shall develop a list of the five percent persistently lowest achieving Title I or Title I eligible schools.
- By January 2011, and annually thereafter, OSPI shall recommend to the State Board of Education Required Action Districts based on the availability of federal funds for school improvement and OSPI criteria as defined in rule.

- In January 2011, and annually thereafter, provided federal funds are available, the SBE will designate the Required Action District(s) based on OSPI's recommendations.

Once the SBE designates Required Action Districts, the district(s) must follow a schedule set in rule to complete a Required Action Plan. The SBE approved the Required Action District's plan and OSPI must ensure the Required Action District will meet the requirements of the Federal School Improvement guidelines to receive funding.

The SBE and OSPI are drafting rules to implement the Required Action provision. SBE's rules address the schedule for the Required Action process. OSPI's rules address the criteria for selection and de-selection into and out of required action. The SBE Accountability Rules (E2SSB 6696) draft was provided to the members for review and decision at its business meeting on July 14.

The SBE asked for more clarification from OSPI staff on the criteria used to determine what school districts would be recommended for required action and what federal/state funds were available for school turnaround efforts.

Recognition Awards for 2010

Dr. Pete Bylsma, Consultant, SBE

Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Communications Manager

Using the SBE's Accountability Index, the OSPI and the SBE recognized 174 schools through their new joint SBE/OSPI recognition program – "Washington Achievement Awards," on May 5, 2010. There were six possible awards. While we planned to recognize schools that closed the socioeconomic achievement gap, the criteria established to receive this award were too stringent, so no schools met the criteria and no recognition was given.

SBE/OSPI want to give recognition for closing the achievement gap next year, with the following two forms of recognition being recommended:

1. Gap in Socioeconomic Status (SES):

- Give recognition to any school that has a difference between the row averages of less than one in two consecutive years by using the following criteria:
 - ✓ Two-year average for each row must be at least 4.00.
 - ✓ Accountability Index must be at least 4.00 each year.
 - ✓ At least two of five cells in the row must be rated each year.
 - ✓ Must be fewer than ten percent of students designated as gifted each year.

Using this system, 30 schools would have been recognized in 2009.

2. Gap between race and ethnic groups:

- Report disaggregated results of lower performing groups (American Indian, African American, Hispanic, and Pacific Islander) and higher performing groups (Asian and Caucasian).
- Use the combined results of the two groups and give recognition to any school that has less than a .50 difference between the row averages in two consecutive years:
- Use the following eligibility criteria:
 - Two-year average for each row must be at least 3.50.
 - At least four of nine cells in the row must be rated each year.
 - Must be fewer than ten percent of students designated as gifted each year.
- No results computed yet, so estimated number of schools to be recognized is unknown. Criteria may need to be adjusted after reviewing results in the fall.

Other recommendations are as follows:

1. Add special recognition for improvement, using the same criteria as other awards, i.e. two year average of at least 6.00.
2. Do not provide the overall excellence recognition award for schools that have a significant socio-economic or racial/ethnic gap.
3. Highlight schools that receive multiple year awards.
4. Add special recognition awards for achievement gap (SES and race/ethnicity), using a criterion based system.

SBE staff debriefed with OSPI, SBE members, and the System Performance Accountability work group on the Washington Achievement Awards for 2009 and received the following feedback:

- They like the new Accountability Index and its measures.
- Many found the award ceremony and recognition very meaningful.
- There were concerns about the timing for recognition at the ESD's while the main ceremony was going on.
- Suggestions were made to develop a better way to access school's scores on the SBE and OSPI websites.

Per the requirements set forth in E2SSB 6696, the SBE continues to collaborate with the Achievement Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee on measures used to compute the achievement gap and recognition for schools that close their achievement gaps. The SBE staff and its consultant met with the Committee in May to discuss ways to recognize closing the achievement gap by income, race/ethnicity, and some of the proposed changes the Board reviewed at its May meeting. The Achievement Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee supported the SBE recommendations as follows:

- Add special recognition for improvement using the same criteria as other awards (two year average of at least 6.00).
- Do not provide the overall excellence recognition award for schools that have a significant socio-economic or racial/ethnic gap.
- Highlight schools that receive multiple year awards.
- Add special recognition awards for achievement gap, using a criterion based system.

Mr. Wyatt explained the program timeline as follows:

September 30, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raw assessment data and cut scores available for index calculation and delivered to the SBE
October 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review data for anomalies • Criteria for achievement gap selection established
December 10, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete 2008-09 and 2009-10 indexes and two-year averages delivered to the SBE • Complete list of award winning schools • Review data for quality check
January 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share overall data with schools to review and ensure data is correct
February 1, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete formatted and searchable index
February 15, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ceremony date and location set • Recognition at ESD meetings set
March 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of award winning schools present to the SBE • Award winning schools notified by SBE and OSPI • Invitations mailed
March 25, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ceremony details set
March or April 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awards ceremony

Math Rule Revision

Dr. Kathe Taylor, Policy Director

In 2007, the legislature directed the Board to increase the high school math graduation requirements from two to three credits and to determine the content of the three credits. The Board adopted a new math rule (WAC 180-51-066) in July 2008, which went into effect for students graduating in 2013. The rule was amended in 2009.

Three implementation issues have emerged that can only be addressed through a second amendment to WAC 180-51-066. The three implementation issues that the proposed rule amendment will clarify include:

1. Provisions for taking classes simultaneously:

The current rule language stipulates that math courses must be taken in a progressive sequence, implying that courses must be taken one after another. The proposed rule change adds flexibility for students to take courses concurrently, as well.

2. What constitutes an appropriate sequence?

The current rule requires math courses to be taken in a progressive sequence and contains a provision that any combination of the three math courses can be taken. The intention was to:

- Allow flexibility for students to mix and match algebra/geometry courses with integrated courses, in the event that they moved between schools or districts that took different approaches.
- Stipulate that the courses needed to be taken in a progressive sequence, meaning a student who completed algebra I in District A would take integrated math II in District B.

The rule change clarifies what is an appropriate sequence of courses.

3. Provisions for placing out of required courses.

Some schools/districts allow students to place out of lower level courses through formal or informal assessment procedures. Students are not awarded credit; rather, the assessment is used to assure they take the level of math most suited to their abilities. The rule change outlines the sequence of courses students must take if they place out of a course required for graduation.

Staff asked the Board to consider the changes to the math rule, as presented in Attachment A of the Memo, at its business meeting on July 14. A public hearing will be conducted at the September 2010 meeting.

180 Day Waiver Requests

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director

The following eight applications were presented to the Board for waivers from the 180 school day calendar requirement of the Basic Education Act for all schools in each district:

- Auburn School District
- Battle Ground School District
- Columbia (Hunters) School District
- Nespelem School District
- Orondo School District
- Pomeroy School District
- Tacoma School District
- Thorp School District

The purpose of each proposal is to improve student achievement by enhancing the educational program for all students. In addition, each district has stated in their resolution that they will meet the minimum instructional hour offering.

Core 24/Graduation Requirement Revision

Dr. Kathe Taylor, Policy Director

The SBE adopted a proposed Core 24 graduation requirements framework in July 2008. Since that time, the SBE has received extensive stakeholder input and the recommendations of the Core 24 Implementation Task Force. The Board looked at the framework once again to determine changes that may be needed and a timetable for moving forward.

The Board engaged in a discussion to consider revisions to the Core 24 framework, using the following questions as a guide:

1. What changes to the proposed Core 24 graduation requirements framework are needed to show that the Board has responded to the concerns of stakeholders?
2. How can the Board reconcile its advocacy for the state to fund the opportunity to complete 24 credits with its responsibility to ensure students have access to needed graduation improvements now?
3. Given the Board's commitment to no unfunded mandates, what no cost policy changes will start the process of moving forward to improved graduation requirements?
4. How will the Board know that funding has started and rules may be put in place? What type of funding will signal that the rule process may begin for changes with fiscal impact?

The staff's recommendation of a revised framework called the "Quality Core" served as a catalyst for the Board discussion.

Public Comment

Chris Borgen and Pam Estvold, Anacortes School District

Six years ago, Anacortes School District and many districts across our state, took a good hard look at our efforts and results toward increasing student achievement. The District asked the questions: 1) how well are we preparing our students to thrive in their futures? And 2) how do we compare to the world's best performing school districts? In asking these questions, the District did not like what they saw. The standards and expectations for what students could achieve were not up to World Class Learning standards and were not preparing all of Washington's students for the future work force they were entering. They also found that students were not ensured the prerequisite educational experiences, knowledge, and skills to be college/career ready. As a result of the research, the District developed a new strategic plan titled "*Charting a Course to Excellence.*" Washington State already has one of the lowest numbers of credits required to graduate of any state. Having low high school graduation requirements means the state is systemically limiting access to higher education and career pathways for underrepresented students. This is not a time to retreat from the strong graduation requirements put in motion during the 2009 Legislative Session. The Board is on the right track. Students must be given a chance to complete and thrive in their futures. Expect more, support more, and we will get more from our students. They are capable and we must provide the system to get them there.

Kevin Laverty, Washington State School Districts Association (WSSDA)

The Board is aware of the reality check. Core 24 is highly doable and WSSDA appreciates the Board setting high expectations. Mr. Laverty says "20 today and 24 when we get the money."

Annette Woolsey, Northwest Art Education Committee

Ms. Woolsey thanked the Board for their discussion on Core 24. She appreciates that the arts are still included in the credits. Science and arts are important in all aspects of education. She appreciated the clarification about the six-period day and encouraged the Board to make sure that when talking about waivers for requirements that it really is a hardship condition.

Mike Stark, Substitute Teacher

Mr. Stark started his education involvement 48 years ago in the Los Angeles School District and has continued as a substitute at the high school level since his retirement. He has spent a great deal of time in the arts. He expressed the importance of the arts being a vocational choice and gave examples such as: musicians, web designers, writers, and many others. Students seriously believe that it's something they have made part of their lives and it's our job to give them the opportunity to pursue the arts.

Lisa McFarlane, League of Education Voters

Ms. McFarlane supports equality of opportunity for students to obtain post secondary success. The United States used to lead the world in postsecondary success. Between 1970 and 2008, the estimated baccalaureate degree attainment by age 24 was presented by Ms. McFarlane as follows:

- Top income quartile – 40.2% to 76.6%
- Third income quartile – 14.9% to 34.3%
- Second income quartile – 10.9% to 15.8%
- Bottom income quartile – 6.2% to 9.5%

Twenty plus four graduation requirements is a good option and is consistent with HB 2261. Ms. McFarlane encouraged the Board to continue on with twenty plus four to raise the rigor for students for a well rounded education. She is concerned that if the Board stops at 20, it will send the wrong message to the legislature. It's the right thing to do for kids. The sooner the Board writes the rule for 24 credits; the sooner it will benefit the kids in Washington State. Low income kids can get college paid for in this state and it's our job to lead them to the right decision.

Martin Huffman, Lyle School District

Mr. Huffman gave an update on the District's school calendar that was approved last year. There were different opinions expressed in the District about the pilot program this year; however, he looks forward to the program running smoothly next year. Mr. Huffman gave examples of some successes from the program. He thanked the Board for allowing the Lyle School District to conduct the pilot and said he will send a packet for members to review. He invited the Board to visit the District anytime.

Gary Kipp, Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP)

Mr. Kipp congratulated the Implementation Task Force for bringing forward a proposal that might be considered a transition step to the ultimate goal of implementing Core 24 in Washington State. It is clear from the Quality Core proposal that creative thinking was necessary to pare down Core 24 into a more modest proposal. It is also clear that the spirit of doing more with no added resources is still alive and well in the hearts of the educators in our state, in this case borne out by those who served on the Task Force. As the AWSP analyzes the Quality Core proposal, they wonder about the implications of some sections of the proposal and encouraged the Board to consider the observations and questions that the AWSP has, prior to taking action on the proposal. Mr. Kipp provided observations and questions to the Board in writing for their review and consideration.

Una McAlinden, ArtsEd Washington

Ms. McAlinden thanked the Board for its thoughtful and considered process with Core 24, which has been enriched by leadership and unwavering focus for the needs of students. She appreciates the way the Board has absorbed and integrated the many opinions and perspectives throughout the process. Ms. McAlinden expressed her appreciation in the continued commitment to the two arts credits in the Quality Core, which recognizes the importance of arts learning to all students and the benefits and competencies the arts nurture and foster. She understands the flexibility and individualization for students and is concerned that it will become an automatic or default waiver. The fact that the waiver is tied to the High School and Beyond Plan and a student's educational career goals concerns Ms. McAlinden.

Very few 15 or 16 year olds really have a strong sense of their futures. Much work is needed for students and those advising them to recognize and understand the benefits of arts learning, regardless of what career they are heading toward. She encouraged the Board to be united, with others, in the efforts for funding of basic education – to include the arts – to ensure that the resources are available to meet the needs of students.

The meeting was recessed at 5:25 p.m. by Chair Vincent

July 14, 2010

The meeting was called to order at 8:34 a.m. by Chair Vincent

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

Members Absent: Mr. Warren Smith (excused) (1)

Staff Attending: Ms. Edie Harding, Ms. Loy McColm, Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Dr. Kathe Taylor, Ms. Colleen Warren (3)

Staff Absent: Mr. Brad Burnham (excused), Ms. Sarah Rich (excused), Ms. Ashley Harris (excused) (3)

Executive Director Evaluation Instrument

Prior to the meeting, Dr. Dal Porto consulted members and the Executive Director to prepare an evaluation instrument for the Executive Director. Dr. Dal Porto, Ms. Bragdon, and Dr. Fox briefed the Board on the process for the new evaluation instrument and explained that once the instrument is approved it cannot change without the formal approval of the Board.

The members provided feedback on the instrument and changes will be made as noted. The instrument will be used in September as a draft to determine what worked well and what did not. Using the findings of the draft in September, Dr. Dal Porto, Dr. Fox, and Ms. Bragdon will prepare the final evaluation instrument to be used in the future.

Briefing on World Language Competencies

Dr. Kathe Taylor, Policy Director

Dr. Michele Aoki, Program Supervisor, World Languages, OSPI

Ms. Marilee Scarbrough, Director, Policy and Legal Services, WSSDA

SBE, OSPI, and WSSDA staff briefed the Board on the development of a sample WSSDA policy and procedure for awarding competency-based credit in world languages. The Board, in collaboration with OSPI and WSSDA, convened a world language advisory group in 2009 to:

- Discuss the pros and cons of establishing world language proficiency for credit. Can it be done and how would it work?
- Review the policies of New Jersey, Connecticut, and Utah for guidance.
- Review the results of standardized world language assessments of college and high school students.

The SBE has endorsed competency-based learning since the inception of education reform in Washington State. Washington State is one of 35 states with a state competency-based credit rule. The Board's competency-based credit rule allows high school credit to be awarded upon:

“Satisfactory demonstration by a student of clearly identified competencies established pursuant to a process defined in written district policy. Districts are strongly advised to confirm with the higher education coordinating board that the award of competency based high school credit meets the minimum college core admissions standards set by the higher education coordinating board for admission into a public, baccalaureate institution.” (WAC 180-51-050)

Competency-based credit can only be awarded if there are clear standards, designated performance tasks and assessments, and a specified level of expected performance. Few districts award competency-based credit, in part because state funding policies have not rewarded districts whose students might use competency-based credit to accelerate their studies.

Competency-based credit in world languages will matter to:

- English Language Learners who will have their skills in their mother language recognized and validated.
- Families who will get the message that multi-lingualism is an advantage, not a deficit.
- Students who might not otherwise be on a path to college and will get a head start.
- Students who can take better advantage of resources, such as community language schools.

The sample competency-based world languages credit policy and procedure will help districts and schools by providing:

- Clear policy and procedures for districts to award world language credits to students with demonstrated proficiency.
- Consistent way to award credits for middle school language experiences, based on proficiency, not on seat time.
- Supporting “out of the box” learning opportunities where seat time is not relevant.

Next steps were discussed as follows:

1. WSSDA will disseminate the sample policy and procedures to its members on their website. OSPI and SBE will post the policy and procedures on their websites as well.
2. OSPI will publicize the policy and procedures in world languages presentations.
3. The Board will work with the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to identify and negotiate any barriers to the acceptance of world languages competency-based credit toward meeting the College Academic Distribution Requirements (CADRs). The conversation has already begun and staff will work with OSPI staff on the manner in which competency-based credit would be acknowledged on the standardized transcript.
4. With the first model in place, staff plans to pursue other subject areas to develop sample policies and procedures. The next subject has not yet been identified.
5. SBE will work with the Washington State School Directors Association (WSSDA) on a presentation at the WSSDA annual meeting.

Core 24/Graduation Requirement Revisions Continued

Dr. Kathe Taylor, Policy Director

The following are the current credit requirements for the Class of 2011:

Subject	Credits
English	3
Math	2
Science (1 lab)	2
Social Studies	2.5
Health and Fitness	2
Occupational Education	1
Arts	1
Electives	5.5
High School and Beyond Plan	
Culminating Project	
Total	19

The following three options were provided for discussion:

Option One (staff recommendation posed originally for discussion)

Subject	Credits
English	4
Math	3
Science (2 labs)	3
Social Studies	3
Health	.5
Career Preparation	1
High School and Beyond Plan	
Career and Technical Education/World Languages	2
Arts*	2
Fitness*	1.5
Culminating Project	
Total	20
Locally-Determined Electives	4
*Appropriate substitutions can be made based on a student's high school and beyond plan. Only one credit may be substituted in the Arts.	

Option Two

Subject	Credits	
English	4	Common pathway. Parents must sign off to allow CTE to be substituted for world languages.
Math	3	
Science (2 labs)	3	
Social Studies	3	
Health	.5	
Career Preparation	1	
World Language*	2	
High School and Beyond Plan		
Arts*	2	
Fitness*	1.5	
Culminating Project		
Total	20	
Locally Determined Electives	4	
*Appropriate substitutions can be made based on a student's high school and beyond plan. Only one credit may be substituted in the Arts.		

Option Three

Subject	Credits	
English	4	Common pathway. Parents must sign off to allow CTE to be substituted for world language.
Math	3	
Science (2 labs)	3	
Social Studies	3	
Health	.5	
Career Preparation	1	
World Language*	2	
High School and Beyond Plan		
Arts*	2	
Fitness*	1.5	
Career Concentration	2	
Culminating Project		
Total	22	

*Appropriate substitutions can be made based on a student's high school and beyond plan. Only one credit may be substituted in the Arts.

The Board decided that further discussion was needed about the options and about the Implementation Task Force (ITF) recommendations; however, the consensus is that the members are split between options one and two above. Board members wanted to be clear that any revision of the graduation requirements supported the “opportunity to complete 24 credits” language of the Basic Education Act. The Executive Committee discussed how to proceed with the ITF recommendations discussion and a special Board meeting may be scheduled.

Public Comment

Karen Davis, Washington Education Association (WEA)

The WEA has been an active participant in implementing accountability and in the process of making accountability a hybrid, there were problems. In SHB 6696 there was an involvement in being aware and participating in the plan, which is a significant piece. There is limited funding for the state so WEA has looked at federal funding for the Required Action Districts (RADs). Some districts did not receive funding after they had the expectation of moving forward, and the WEA suggests that the districts that have adequate funding for the RADs need to be identified before moving forward with required action. There's an expectation by the legislature that we need to intervene and thus should be sure to analyze the criteria closely so that happens.

Jim Kowalkowski, Rural Education Center and Davenport School District

Mr. Kowalkowski thanked the Board for listening to the field and initiating and sustaining a healthy debate. Schools are only funded for a five period day. If a school district has a six period day they're using local dollars. When mandating six periods the Board needs to be careful about the funding and what it will take to add the sixth period. The districts want additional requirements but they are getting less money from the state and are in a critical spot right now. Pilots are important. Mr. Kowalkowski suggested that the Board find some districts that are struggling and work with them on a pilot. He encouraged the Board to keep world language in and require the arts as an option. Realistically, there is not enough room in college for every high school graduate. Are there enough teachers for world language? He encouraged getting students involved more in their decision making for their education.

Tim Knue, Washington Association for Career and Technical Education (WACTE)

Mr. Knue thanked the Board for the movement to improve Core 24 while listening to input from a variety of perspectives. A great deal of deep thought on the Board's part is visible in the latest Quality Core version. Improving the flexibility of the credits that must be connected to their high school and beyond plan is critical to having the new graduation requirements meet the needs of

all students in Washington State. The Quality Core 20 creates a frame where students can be provided the chance to create the kind of personal education that truly moves them toward their dreams. The WACTE is pleased that the Board's discussion expanded the Quality Core 20 to a 20 plus four for a total of 24. The additional four credits, when directly tied to the student's high school and beyond plan, increase the opportunity for students to attend skills centers. In the Quality Core 20 proposal WACTE is concerned that students may not be able to attend skills centers. The WACTE looks forward to working with the Board in creating the best final Core proposal for all students that is not constrained by adult perceptions or the current systems limits.

Mack Armstrong, Washington Association of School Administrators (WASA)

Mr. Armstrong suggested a systems approach to the graduation requirements and expressed interest in the implications for individuals. Whatever the Board decides, it should consider fully funding upfront. What the Board does with graduation requirements becomes basic education. If you say 20 then that's what the funding becomes. There is currently not funding for all the credits for local districts. The state carries the burden for how it will fund the districts. Mr. Armstrong encouraged the Board to set a high standard, but allow the flexibility to phase-in over time. He expressed the importance of communicating with stakeholders and the community when the Board decides on an option for requirements. WASA is supportive of the Board and the work that's being done.

Anne Luce, Partnership For Learning (PFL)

The PFL urges the Board to move forward, adopt, and implement the 24 credit package approved by the Board in 2008. Right now, Washington State has one of the lowest numbers of credits required to graduate in the nation. As a result, more than half of our students who go straight into a two year college after high school need remedial courses before they are allowed to take credit bearing classes. These students are more prone to drop out of college and fail to complete the training necessary to compete in our global economy. Student skills in science, technology, engineering, and math are critical for our state's economic competitiveness and prosperity given that Washington is home to agriculture, technology, global health, aerospace, and other science and technology driven industries. This is not the time to retreat on the strong graduation requirements that this Board and the 2009 legislature put in motion. It's important that we set our kids up for success in whatever education or training they choose to pursue after high school. A low bar for high school graduation hurts the kids who most need the skills to participate in our economy and democracy. We have an obligation to ensure all students are ready to succeed in college and careers, not shut out of opportunities due to our failure to coordinate state policies. Students shouldn't have to "opt-in" to a college and career ready education. Preparing our kids doesn't just make sense for their futures; it makes sense for our state.

Randy Spaulding, Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB)

Washington State wants as many students as possible to graduate from high school. In order to do that, the state needs to prepare them for secondary education. The proposals that were outlined today would be appropriate for the alignment – most especially option two. World language is not included because it's required for college, it is about preparing students to work and live in the global society. Students should be allowed to take CTE courses as well. The HECB works toward getting kids ready for college and the Board is on the path to make that happen. The HECB and the SBE working together is a very positive move for the state and will be positive for students in the future.

Ricardo Sanchez, Latino Educational Achievement

Mr. Sanchez commended the Board on Core 24 and graduation requirements work. He's concerned about how students will do with 24 credits? He feels the world languages approach is backwards. Children have a high ability to learn when they're young and he wonders why world languages isn't being required in elementary school or at a minimum - in middle school. Isn't proficiency what we're after? He gave the Board an option of 15 credits with additional credits. He expressed the importance of providing counselors as part of the education system. Students

that struggle need counselors to help them through. It's a source of hope for students. Some kids think they don't have hope to go to a university because they lack funds or because of their legal status.

Business Items

Decision on State Board of Education FY 2011 Budget

Motion was made to approve the Board's FY 2011 budget

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Decision on Competency based Policy Resolution for World Languages

Motion was made to approve the Competency Based Policy Resolution for World Languages.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Decision on Draft Required Action District Rule

Motion was made to approve the draft language implementing the accountability legislation for required action districts for filing with the Code Reviser for proposed rule making under RCW 34.05.320.

Motion seconded

Discussion followed. Roll call vote results: 6 nay; 6 aye; 2 absent

Motion failed

Decision on Draft Revision of Math Credit Rule

Motion was made to approve the draft amendments to WAC 180-51-066 for filing with the Code Reviser for proposed rule making under RCW 34.05.320.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Decision on 180 Day Waiver Requests

Motion was made to approve the 180 day waiver requests for Auburn, Battle Ground, Columbia (Hunters) Nespalem, Orondo, Pomeroy, Tacoma, and Thorp school districts for the number of days and years requested in their applications to the Board.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Recommendations for Changes to SBE Accountability Index for Achievement Gap Recognition

Motion was made to approve the five key revisions to the SBE Accountability Index recommended by Pete Bylsma set forth in the Board documents; and, for key revision #4, approve the use of the third recommendation in the Bylsma paper set forth on the last page of Bylsma memo.

Motion seconded

Discussion followed.

Motion carried

Decision on Executive Director Evaluation Instrument

Motion was made to approve the Executive Director Evaluation Instrument

As per discussion earlier in the day, the draft instrument will be used as a pilot at the September meeting and members will then determine if there are any changes needed to finalize for approval at the November meeting.

Motion withdrawn

Common Core Standards Update

Dr. Alan Burke, Deputy Superintendent, OSPI

Ms. Jessica Vavrus, Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning, OSPI

Beginning in the spring of 2009, governors and state commissioners of education from 48 states, two territories, and the District of Columbia committed to developing a common core of state K-12 English Language arts (ELA) and math standards. The Common Core Standards Initiative (CCSSI) is a state-led effort coordinated by the National Governors Association and the Council for Chief State School Officers. As of July 9, 2010, 23 states have formally adopted the Common Core Standards.

The national feedback and review included external and state feedback teams that consisted of: K-12 teachers; postsecondary faculty; state curriculum and assessments experts; researchers; and various national organizations.

The CCSSI builds on the strengths of current state standard and are designed to be:

- Focused, coherent, clear, and rigorous.
- Internationally benchmarked.
- Anchored in college and career readiness.
- Evidence and research based.

The K-8 Mathematics Standards include:

- The K-5 standards provide students with a solid foundation in whole numbers, addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, fractions, and decimals.
- The 6-8 standards describe robust learning in geometry, algebra, and probability and statistics.
- Modeled after the focus of standards from high performing nations, the standards for grades seven and eight include significant algebra and geometry content.
- Students who have completed seventh grade and mastered the content and skills will be prepared for algebra in eighth grade or after.

High school mathematics standards include:

- High school standards are organized around five conceptual categories.
- Call on students to practice applying mathematical ways of thinking to real world issues and challenges.
- Require students to develop a depth of understanding and ability to apply mathematics to novel situations, as college students and employees regularly are called to do.
- Emphasize mathematical modeling, the use of mathematics and statistics to analyze empirical situations understand them better and improve decisions
- Identify the mathematics that all students should study in order to be college and career ready.

Next steps for 2010 include:

July and August	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provisional adoption• Convene external workgroup
September and October	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Statewide information sessions in collaboration with statewide stakeholder groups• Solicit input on the 15% and other implementation considerations
October-December	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Complete legislative report, which is due January 2011

Race to the Top and Education Reform Plan Status

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director

At the May meeting, the Board passed a motion to authorize the State Board of Education to sign the Race to the Top Education Reform Grant application. The final application met the Board's requirements set forth in the motion with the exception of the September 15, 2010 date for completion of the Education Reform Plan. The RTTT Steering and Coordinating Committees agreed that the feedback and development of the education plan should continue this fall and then be presented to the legislature in 2011 before the Education Reform Plan is finalized.

Under the state/local partnership agreement, 265 local districts representing 97 percent of the school districts signed onto the grant application. The RTTT Steering Committee signed off on the grant application and it was delivered to the U.S. Department of Education on June 1. The Steering Committee met July 6 to discuss: the application, preparation for potential interviews, and the education reform plan.

Public Comment

Bill Williams, WSPTA

WSPTA is supportive of the Common Core Standards. They hope to be involved in the issues as follows: initial review in comparison with current standards and how we communicate the expectation; the assessment ends up driving change delivered in the classroom. What's counted is what gets done. Mr. Williams encouraged the Board to be aware of that. The WSPTA is supportive of Core 24 subject to funding and encourages the members to keep the funding tied to the classroom. Parents need to be included in the decision for opting in or out. He expressed the importance of adequate counseling for students and also that communication should include whole communities.

Ann Varkados, Bethel School District

The District is supportive of Core 24 and Ms. Varkados expressed the importance of parents being involved. Kids need all of the options: foreign language, arts, fitness, etc. She encouraged the Board not to be too strict with the options for kids. Funding is huge for the District and all the districts are trying to do a lot with very little. We need choices and funding.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:27 p.m. by Chair Vincent

July 15, 2010

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chair Vincent

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

Members Absent: Mr. Warren Smith (excused) MR. Randy Dorn (excused) (2)

Staff Attending: Ms. Edie Harding, Dr. Kathe Taylor (2)

Staff Absent: Mr. Brad Burnham (excused), Ms. Sarah Rich (excused), Ms. Ashley Harris (excused), Ms. Colleen Warren (excused), Ms. Loy McColm (excused), Mr. Aaron Wyatt (excused) (6)

Ms. Bonnie Berk and Ms. Natasha Fedo, from Berk and Associates, joined the Board for the strategic planning work. The draft strategic plan for 2011-2014 was revised during the full day process. The draft vision, mission and goals are as follows:

Vision, Mission, and Summary of Goals

VISION

The State Board of Education envisions a learner-focused state education system that is accountable for the individual growth of each student, so that *0.students can thrive in a competitive global economy and in life.

MISSION

The mission of the State Board of Education is to lead the development of state policy, provide system oversight and advocate for student success.

SUMMARY OF GOALS

- Goal 1: Advocate for an Effective, Accountable Governance Structure for Public Education in Washington
- Goal 2: Provide Policy Leadership for Closing the Academic Achievement Gap for Underperforming Students
- Goal 3: Provide Policy Leadership to Increase Washington's Student Enrollment and Success in Secondary and Post-Secondary Education
- Goal 4: Promote Effective Strategies to Make Washington's Students Nationally and Internationally Competitive in Math and Science
- Goal 5: Advocate for Policies to Develop the Most Highly Effective Pre K-12 Teacher Workforce in the Nation

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m. by Chair Vincent