

Washington State Board of Education  
Regular Meeting  
Evergreen School District  
Vancouver, Washington

MINUTES

**Wednesday July 23, 2008**

Members Present: Chair Mary Jean Ryan, Co-Chair Warren Smith, Mr. Steve Floyd, Ms. Phyllis Frank, Mr. Eric Liu, Dr. Steve Dal Porto, Ms. Lorilyn Roller, Dr. Kris Mayer, Dr. Terry Bergeson, Mr. Jeff Vincent, Ms. Amy Bragdon, Ms. Linda W. Lamb, Dr. Sheila Fox, Dr. Bernal Baca (telephone) (14)

Members Absent: Ms. Austianna Quick (excused), Mr. Jack Schuster (excused) (2)

Staff Present: Ms. Edie Harding, Dr. Kathe Taylor, Ms. Loy McColm, Ms. Ashley Harris, Ms. Colleen Warren, Ms. Jessica Ganet, Mr. Brad Burnham (7)

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

Chair Ryan introduced Mr. John Deeder, Superintendent of the Evergreen School District. Mr. Deeder welcomed the Board the School District and introduced members of local school boards to include: Holly Williams, Todd Yuzerha, Joan Skelton, Edry Geiger, Mary Greaves, and Ed Rankin.

Board members introduced themselves to the audience.

Chair Ryan talked about the Seattle PI article and the importance of this meeting. She gave an overview of the agenda.

**MOTION** was made to approve the May 2008 Board Minutes

**MOTION** seconded

**MOTION** carried

**Competency-based Credits**

Mr. John Deeder, Superintendent, Evergreen School District

Washington, along with 33 other states, has established a competency-based credit policy. Competencies are generally perceived to be a cluster of knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes that can be measured against well-accepted standards. The concept of awarding credit for competencies helps students demonstrate expertise they have already gained, gives them free time in their schedule to pursue other interests, and applies learning.

Few Washington State school districts have pursued the opportunity for competency-based credits because the credits:

1. Are resource intensive.
2. Require reliable and valid assessments, aligned with standards.
3. May be costly to districts.
4. Are complex to define, communicate, and transcript.

Evergreen School District established a graduation requirements policy in September 2006 that included developing assessments to grant credit, based on competencies.

**Meaningful High School Diploma: Public Outreach, Proposed Framework for High School Graduation Requirement Options: CORE 24, Culminating Project, High School and Beyond Plan**

Mr. Eric Liu, Board Lead

Dr. Kathe Taylor, Policy Director

One of the Board's three goals is to *"improve student preparation for post-secondary education and the 21<sup>st</sup> century world of work and citizenship."* To that end, the Board reviewed the purpose of a diploma and the graduation requirements for which it has authority, as follows: minimum credit requirements, Culminating Project, and High School and Beyond Plan. In January 2008, the Board approved a revised purpose of a diploma and is now prepared to take a positive step toward a stronger, more coherent set of graduation requirements through the CORE 24 Graduation Requirements Policy Framework.

The Framework consists of a set of defined subject-area requirements, a Culminating Project and a High School and Beyond Plan. Implicit in all the requirements are competencies defined by the state's essential academic learning requirements, graduation level expectations, basic education goals, program standards, and district-determined policies.

CORE 24 is meant to equip all students with a strong foundation of core subjects and the opportunity to personalize their course choices to pursue their individual post-secondary and career goals. Implementation of the CORE 24 Graduation Requirements Policy Framework is contingent on funding. No rules will be written until after the 2009 legislative session. A phase-in timeline will be worked out in consultation with implementation advisors, with phase-in beginning in 2013 and full implementation by 2016, contingent upon state funding.

**Public Comment**

**Judy Hartmann, Governor's Policy Office**

Ms. Hartmann expressed her support for the policy on CORE 24. The Board knows that in the last several years Governor Gregoire studied, extensively, early learning through higher education, as a framework for what our state needs to be successful in the future and what our students need to be successful as well. The CORE 24 fulfills many of the directions and ideas that Washington Learns suggested. The Board has discussed the meaning and purpose of rigorous high school study. The Board has also begun to explore what it means to provide this in a world-class learner-focused and seamless way. The Board has done the work to open doors for CORE 24, by preparing a vision, but has also put in the perspiration to work with many in the field to explore what a meaningful high school diploma is and what it takes to produce the funding and address the implementation issues. Washington Learns says, specifically, that a world class education system sets high expectations for all students and commits the human and financial resources necessary. This is the basis for looking at what these commitments need to be for our human and financial resources. Your timing is great and will provide a firm foundation for a piece of the important work ahead.

**Martin Huffman, Lyle School District**

Mr. Huffman supports the CORE 24 Framework. As a school superintendent and elementary principal, he reminded the Board that early funding of the math and science curriculum is critical. Lyle School District is seeking a waiver for a scheduling alternative, due to the elevated cost of fuel, utilities, and food. The request for a four-day school week stems from a financial motivation to avoid cutting funds for music, art, etc. Mr. Huffman talked with other schools in Colorado, New Mexico, and South Dakota, as well as with administrators, secretaries, coaches, and parents who found some benefits of going to a four-day school week. The seat time would

be extended approximately 75 minutes a day. Mr. Huffman met with the community in two public meetings, as well as the Washington Education Association, and staff and superintendents in ESD 112 receiving positive support from most.

#### Diane Dick, Kelso School District

Ms. Dick thanked the Board for advocating for adequate funding. She is from a district that is in a budget crunch that may be forced to cut the all-day kindergarten program, due to funding. Under the current graduation requirements, all students have all post-secondary courses available to them. The idea the students are unaware of their options is ludicrous. Students have been required to signoff on learning plans and have been informed about their career paths for years. To say that parents and students are unaware is incorrect. Schools have to bend over backwards to make sure students have the information they need. No amount of mandating courses is going to keep certain kids in school taking the courses they need to graduate. We have huge obstacles to surmount with our current graduation requirements and now the Board is asking us to add more. If the Board makes an assessment for competency-based credit more difficult than sitting in a classroom, you will have few takers. The Board is setting students up for unrealistic expectations. You're calling this a compact and perhaps it should be called a "contract." What do we tell the graduates when they have fulfilled their compact with the district and they still can't get into a college or university?

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

The AWSP thanks the Board for involving the principals in the work on CORE 24. Mr. McMullen suggested that more time be taken for reflection on CORE 24 and that the Board continue to focus on the following areas:

- What do we need to do to make the system work?
- Does it have flexibility?
- Is it equitable for all students?
- Is it impactful?
- What about the funding?

The AWSP thinks that moving in to the middle schools is something that needs to be looked at very closely. We're talking about all middle and high school kids and the date of 2016 is a close date to implement this. The timeline isn't realistic. The principals suggested getting out of the credit box dilemma, which allows for more student success. The Association is pleased with the kind of direction that the Board has taken with CORE 24. It creates flexibility and the opportunity to be inclusive. If we get out of the credit box dilemma, it can become even more flexible. Most of the principals are saying that they believe all students are going to have four credits of math, period, and that science will be the same, but it's too early to tell. Principals say that art is important, but what are we trying to accomplish with two years of art that's so important that we say it's fundamental to what's going on in the process of education? The AWSP would like to continue to work with the Board to talk about funding these issues.

#### Dennis Schatz, Pacific Science Center

Mr. Schatz attended the Board meeting in Wenatchee where there was discussion about the importance of science and mathematics. One key issue that was discussed then, was the comparison to what other states required and it was determined that most of them require three years of math and science. He appreciates the flexibility in CORE 24, saying that it's important to separate the quality graduation requirements from the process of implementation. The question is: "Are there teachers in math and science available, and do we have the right people in those classes?" Schools don't always need the full blown chemistry labs to learn science. It's better to teach science than wait for the full blown lab to do so. Two years of science vs. three years should be looked at to determine what the minimum science requirement is to get into a college or university.

Amina Jones Fields, Seattle Urban League

On behalf of the K-12 students we serve, their families, and communities, we appreciate the Board's continued work to support enhanced learning goals. CORE 24 is the articulation of a vision that the Urban League supports zealously. As the Board joins with the legislature to move the CORE 24 proposal forward, the Seattle Urban League urges the Board to remain intentional about buffering the trajectories of high school students, to ensure that any plan for credit accumulation is based on deep and diverse learning experiences that offer an aggregate credential, which is consistently transferable and equitably prepares students for next steps. As we continue discussion about setting credit minimums and share our aspirations for all students to own their education, it is critical that we are thoughtful about the translation of this framework, in particular the way that "Navigation 101" may need to be augmented to meet the needs of the less resourced school contexts.

Donna Steward, Association of Washington Business (AWB)

The Association's interest is significant and the overall development is of concern to the members. Students often come out of K-12 schools saying they don't know what they want to do. With enhanced requirements, it might help students know more about what their goals are when they graduate. The AWB appreciates the increase of science requirements and world language, as well as CTE courses. We are concerned about increasing class size because it won't get us where we need to go. The AWB encourages the Board to consider other elements, such as course requirements in particular areas, so we can ensure that rigor is available. Ms. Steward also asked the Board to consider a gap analysis to identify strengths and weaknesses.

Dennis Kampe, Clark County Skills Center

Mr. Kampe is supportive of the CORE 24 model and structure being put forward. He is concerned that there is confusion between college and university. The Board needs to be cautious about implying that all students will be attending a university. Five years ago, the concern was resources for technology, now it's the ability of students to get to our schools. We can't forget about the students who are not designed for college or university, but are technical. We need to look at the way students learn rather than the way it's been done for a number of years. Over the years, CTE and arts have been trying to keep their place. With the schedule the way it is for students there should be flexibility. Mr. Kampe recommends that students be allowed to waive arts or CTE for world language. He supports Navigation 101 because if we don't have that it's not going to work.

Holly Williams, Evergreen Public Schools

The Evergreen School Board supports CORE 24, but is concerned about the funding for implementation. All districts have budget challenges and Ms. Williams asked the Board to stay focused on the funding challenges, saying that we can't fit a ten pound bag of learning into a five pound bag of time.

Ben Matley, Vancouver Resident

As a new Washington State resident and home owner, Mr. Matley sought to serve as a substitute algebra teacher. He is a retired algebra teacher from a California community college and holds a doctorate degree in education, with a major in curriculum development. He published a textbook on elementary algebra. Mr. Matley stated that he cannot receive a credential in Washington State because he has not done student practice teaching in Washington.

James Kelly, Seattle Urban League

The Urban League is in full support of the CORE 24 credit requirements for high school graduation. CORE 24 will require that students be given a strong academic foundation, but have the flexibility to prepare them for whatever path they choose. The true definition of CORE 24 is to prepare every student to become productive and contributing members of society, and that's not the way it is today – not in Seattle, not in Washington as a whole. The Board has a

unique opportunity to shape the future of education in our state from what it is today, to what it ought to be. He encouraged the Board not to be afraid for the change that they seek, saying that “if you raise expectations, they will come.” Mr. Kelly thanked the Board for recognizing that a high expectation of our students needs ongoing commitment from the legislature. Mr. Kelly asked the Board to respect collective bargaining so that we don’t split our energies and efforts as we face the most challenging year of education history ever. The Board is about to do something that has never been done in Washington. Mr. Kelly reminded the Board that they are not alone and if the Board provides the backbone, the Urban League will supply the foot power.

Tom Archer, Washington Science Teachers Association

The Washington Science Teachers Association supports the work on CORE 24. There is a need to look at science through K-12 and look at the discrepancy of the K-8 program in relation to the number of quality hours of instruction; it’s an issue that must be discussed across the state.

Holly Ferguson, Seattle Public Schools

The Seattle Public Schools support the CORE 24 proposal. The ultimate goal of our strategic plan is to ensure that each of our students graduate from Seattle schools and are given the skills necessary for the student to take his/her pathway after high school, whether it be a technical school, college, or world of work. CORE 24 will provide students with the tools to allow them to reach this goal, by allowing more rigor and relevancy. Our support is predicated on full funding. We look forward to working with the Board to make sure that students’ needs are met through this flexible program.

Wes Pruitt, Workforce Training Coordinating Board

The Workforce Board supports CORE 24 and looks forward to working with the Board on implementation. There has been discussion about the career concentration area and students who are not taking CTE options having to take a one-credit requirement for occupational credit. The Workforce Board is suggesting that the requirement not be lost. The number one skill that is missing, when talking to the communities, is that occupational skill is needed. The Workforce Board is working on the drop-out issue and knows there is a challenge for kids with credit attainment. Mr. Pruitt suggested that waivers of electives for students who have to retake courses to help eliminate the drop-out problem should be looked at.

Debra Wilds, College Success Foundation

The current high school graduation requirements do not position our students to access the post-secondary options that are available to them, nor to succeed in the 21<sup>st</sup> century workplace. All young people deserve the same opportunities to succeed in life and should graduate from any high school in our state, well prepared to take advantage of any post-secondary educational opportunity available. Currently, there is a lack of rigor and inconsistent requirements among high schools and school districts in the state. Too many students are denied opportunity because the adults in their lives do not know, or are not paying attention, to the courses the student is taking. Students say they want rigor, they want to be prepared, and they want to trust when they meet the expectations to graduate from high school that it will mean something. Ms. Wilds quoted data that 80% of students believe they will go to college; 50% of their parents believe their student will go to college; and, only 30% of the adults in school systems believe the students will go to college. CORE 24 is a good solution that will give our students increased rigor and a common foundation so that they are all well prepared upon graduation to enter the workplace, or go on to any post-secondary option of their choosing, whether it is a technical two-year or four-year college. The College Success Foundation is committed to finding the dollars for students to achieve their dreams of a college education; however, they cannot make this happen unless students are adequately prepared. We now have the opportunity to link the CORE 24 program with our new College Bound Scholarship program. The Foundation urges the Board to pass CORE 24 and to work as partners with our legislators to ensure that the appropriate funding is provided for proper implementation.

Tiffany Jones, League of Education Voters

Ms. Jones urged the Board to support the CORE 24. She shared her personal story and explained how CORE 24 would have provided a better foundation for her high school career. As one of seven children, Ms. Jones spent most of her childhood in foster care and attended 15 schools. She attended a different high school each year and each school had different sets of graduation requirements. In order for her to graduate, she had to “scramble” to take night classes and classes on contract, to meet the graduation and college entrance requirements for the school she attended as a senior. CORE 24 would have ensured that she was on track by providing the framework she needed to be successful, regardless of what school she attended or the lack of adult support received. Every child has the right to be prepared for life after high school and CORE 24 will level the playing field for all students. We don’t have time to wait; our students’ futures cannot be put on hold. She encouraged the Board to support this initiative and send the message to our kids that we care.

Pat Thompson, Highline School District and YES Foundation

The YES Foundation is a faith-based organization with a strong desire and vested interest in students becoming more respectful citizens, who are able to contribute to their economic well being, to their families, and to their communities. Thanks for taking this seriously. Education is the greatest opportunity for students to move out of poverty. The time is now to do the right thing. The Foundation will stand with the Board to do the right thing. The Foundation urges the Board to count on those in the community who can come to the table to help get this done.

Roxana Garcia, League of Education Voters

Ms. Garcia didn’t discover the importance of education until her junior year in high school, saying that some students realize this either too late or not at all. She believes that it is important for the education system to implement CORE 24. There are students who are not being pushed to their full potential. They are taking only the classes they need to graduate and think that taking extra classes is a burden rather than a reward. CORE 24 is imperative to the future of an effective education system and the students who benefit from it. She encouraged the Board to implement changes, which will not only motivate students to continue their education, but prepare them for their future and the future of our country. Ms. Garcia supports CORE 24 because every student should leave high school with the confidence that they are ready to succeed in today’s competitive society.

Simran Manhas, League of Education Voters

As a third year student at Western Washington University, Ms. Manhas is fortunate to have parents and a brother who were familiar with high school four-year plans and knew how to prepare for success in enrollment for college. By taking Advanced Placement courses and being highly involved in high school, she gained enough experience to ensure her position at a four-year university. Students in Washington’s public school system are struggling with many of the requirements needed to graduate and prepare for the world after high school. There are too many complications and too much variation in school districts’ high school requirements. CORE 24 would simplify expectations for students and give them more flexibility to pursue their interests. CORE 24 will let students focus on their futures, whether they go to college, an apprenticeship in the trades, or the workforce. This is for the betterment of all students and will give them an opportunity to excel. Students are the future of society and she believes that the Board has all students’ best interests in mind. Ms. Manhas thanked the Board for continuing to do what they do for all students.

Liv Finne, Washington Policy Center

Current law requires only 19 credits to graduate, which does not prepare students to apply for college or to follow a vocational career. Education officials say that our system is not ready for a change because we already face shortages of teachers in math and science. The system is

hampered by laws, which sabotage efforts at reform. Antiquated teacher credential laws prevent schools from hiring individuals working in the private sector who have a high degree of knowledge and expertise in math and science. In 2001, the legislature reacted to the shortage of math and science teachers by attempting to create an alternate route to the classroom; however, the shortage of math teachers persists. School officials are forced to lower standards for teachers of math. Updating the curriculum through CORE 24 is clearly necessary to prepare our students for the global marketplace. Our students desperately need to benefit from individuals currently working in the private sector who might be attracted to our classrooms. School officials need freedom to hire any skilled professional with a bachelor's degree in math or closely related subject and to create on-the-job training programs supported by mentor teachers.

#### Georgi Krom, Seattle Public Schools

Ms. Krom's two sons graduated from Seattle high schools; however, the present math curriculum failed them. She encouraged the Board to increase the math requirements and noted that the curriculum needs to change to achieve success. She urged the Board to review the National Math Panel Report and the Hook Studies in California to see which countries are leading the world in math. If the math requirements are strengthened in Washington State, the curriculum must also be improved or the children without help will continue to fail.

#### Bobbi Arnold, Washington Association for Career and Technical Education (ACTE)

The Washington Association for Career and Technical Education supports the Board's proposal for CORE 24. Ms. Arnold presented a set of recommendations to the Board for review. ACTE believes that a comprehensive career guidance system, beginning in middle school, will be necessary to prepare and help students and their parents/guardians make appropriate choices about their coursework under the plan outlined by the Board. The Board can reinforce sound career guidance through criteria it establishes for the High School and Beyond Plan. Career and Technical Education is 21<sup>st</sup> century education. It will increase the number of youth who live meaningful lives, and will rescue and strengthen our economy. Our responsibility is to do more than deliver on the career-related skills and standards found in our curriculum. We must also ensure that graduates of our programs are finding adult success. That is the only real accountability measure that matters. State exams pale in comparison to the truly high stakes of our commitment to prepare students for an adult life well-lived and prosperous, with not a single life wasted.

#### Don Nielsen, Former Seattle School Board

Mr. Nielsen encouraged the Board to pass CORE 24. The State Board is a policy making Board and its job is to determine what our children know and what they are able to do to be successful in the future. The Board should look at the whole notion of a credit. Is it important for students to spend time in 24 different classes in high school or is it important for them to prove they know the subject? Our goal should be student competence, not seat time. Mr. Nielsen believes that if a child proves competency in class, if they are in the class or not, they should be receiving a credit for that class, such as world language and knowing both English and Spanish – should they get credit for that second language? He thinks so. He suggested that foreign language be taught in elementary school. Be careful about setting goals too low – you might achieve them. To not pass this proposal would be a dereliction of duty. Please pass CORE 24.

#### Larry Ehl, Partnership for Learning

The Partnership for Learning sent a letter recently to the Board, saying they are aware of the challenges in implementing CORE 24. They pledge to be partners with the Board to go to the legislature and advocate for resources to implement the proposal.

#### Von Paul Patu, League of Education Voters

Mr. Patu thanked the Board for the work done on CORE 24 and for allowing the League of Education Voters to participate in the work. He would like to see students learn more languages

so they can learn to associate with the world wherever they go. After school programs and tutoring are done in the South Pacific and are very helpful for students there. Make sure the funding is in place before implementing.

Sebastian Hill, League of Education Voters

Mr. Hill thanked the Board for allowing the students to join the meeting today. In his own words: "I can't wait to go to school and I am excited about all the challenges that await me at Aviation High School. If you think that watering down the requirements to graduate from high school is the right thing, you're doing a great disservice to me and my fellow students." Mr. Hill explained a program that he has completed at Aviation High School, saying that he learned much from those who gave him the opportunity to be part of the program. He was chosen for the program because of his hard work at school. "The kids are the future and it depends on a hard working and motivated citizenry."

Dangela Owens, League of Education Voters

Ms. Owens is a junior at Cleveland High School and also a Higher Education Readiness Opportunity (HERO) student. She encouraged the Board to vote for CORE 24, because it has an impact on students preparing for their post high school plans. Ms. Owens found opportunities to succeed through the HERO program, which helped her "realize that it's never too late to make a change to better your life." She believes that everyone deserves a pathway to success and that CORE 24 will help every student graduate with a post high school plan to succeed in society.

Valentano Fanmuina, League of Education Voters

Mr. Fanmuina went to school in American Samoa and said that education there was very different than education here. He said that there are lots of opportunities here that he didn't have in Samoa. He supports CORE 24 to prepare students for entering technical schools, colleges, or the work world when they leave high school. "I see lots of kids dropping out of school and I encourage them to stay in school and be successful."

**Math Standards Recommendations for Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II:  
Strategic Teaching Report**

Mr. Steve Floyd, Board Lead

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director

Ms. Linda Plattner, Strategic Teaching

The Board is considering the final approval of Strategic Teaching's report on finalization of the high school mathematics standards for the three credits of high school math. The standards include: Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II. The Board is also considering introductory language to the K-12 mathematics standards, which addresses among other things, the organization of the standards and the use of technology. If the Strategic Teaching Report is approved during tomorrow's business meeting, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction will draft the new Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II Standards, which the Board will review at a special teleconference meeting on July 30. OSPI will use the mathematics standards adopted to create standards for an integrated mathematics series, as a number of school districts use an integrated sequence for high school mathematics, which combine Algebra and Geometry.

These high school math standards will serve as the basis for the three credits of math required by the Board, for high school graduation, as well as the assessment of students' knowledge and skills in Algebra I and Geometry through end-of-course assessments, to replace the current Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) by 2013.

The new standards are based on the March 5, 2008 draft from OSPI. The changes since March 5, came from the National Math Advisory Panel, Foundations for Success, Washington College Readiness Standards, Achieve's ADP work, feedback from the State Board of Education Math Panel and OSPI's Standards Revision Team (SRT), and other Washington State citizens. Ms. Plattner explained the Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry overviews, which include: core content, additional key content, and core processes. The SRT will rearrange the identical performance expectations into Integrated I, II, and III. Results will be shared with teachers during professional development on July 28, 29, and 30.

### **Adoption of the Rule for Three High School Mathematics Credits**

Mr. Steve Floyd, Board Lead

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director

Mr. Brad Burnham, Legislative and Policy Specialist

The Board is considering the adoption of a math rule to add a third credit of Algebra II or its equivalent, or an elected alternative math based on the student's career path for high school math. The Board also plans to add back the rule language on the High School and Beyond Plan from the previous rule. The third credit of math would be required to begin with the Class of 2013.

The three credits of mathematics are related to the Board's goals of improving achievement for all students and improving student preparation for success in post-secondary education, the 21<sup>st</sup> century world of work and citizenship.

The Board directed staff to develop a draft rule for a third math credit, based on its definition of a meaningful high school diploma and on guidance received at the January meeting. The Board took public comment at its March and May meetings, to address the issue of when a student's parent or guardian could participate in the meeting and sign off for the election of a third math credit other than Algebra II or the Career and Technical Education credit. The Board worked with the Washington State School Directors Association (WSSDA) and the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) on a survey to address implementation and teacher supply issues at the district level.

The organizations supporting Algebra II, or its equivalent, as a third math credit include:

- Washington Roundtable
- College and Work Ready Agenda
- Washington State Parent Teacher Association
- Association of Washington Business
- Washington Work Force Coordinating and Training Board

A binder of letters and postcards were provided at the meeting regarding this topic.

### **Public Hearing**

The Board will consider a rule to add a third math credit and to add back the High School and Beyond Plan, under current WAC 180-51-060 and 180-51-061, as well as a new rule, WAC 180-51-066, as set forth in the CR102, filed with the Code Reviser on June 11, 2008. The Board will direct staff to file the CR103 to make the existing rules and the new rule permanent.

### **Todd Parsons, Evergreen School District**

Education needs to help kids to succeed in the 21<sup>st</sup> century by teaching them to be creative problem solvers and have the ability to learn. We can't have math education where teachers give a set of rules and expect to get creative problem solvers. Teachers need the skills to ask the kids guiding questions to get them to think at a higher level, which will help them problem solve. The new standards are good because they add fluency and focus on linear functions

with a big concept idea. The standards won't solve all the problems. We can't give up on any of the kids. Some kids need remediation.

#### Elliott Paul, Where's the Math

While Where's the Math supports the need for three credits of math as a graduation requirement, the current proposal on Algebra (or Integrated Math III), as the only third math credit (except for CTE students), while well intended is:

- Poor policy.
- Too burdensome.
- A regulation that is too complex.
- Does not consider current reality of math education in this state.
- Not required, as per the National Math Advisory Panel recommendation.
- Does not support alternate courses that build on Algebra I and Geometry.
- Has a high chance of having the reverse consequences – poorer math students and lower achievement for those who need it the most.

Mr. Paul submitted a simpler proposal for the Board's consideration.

#### Diane Dick, Kelso School Board

Ms. Dick does not support the proposed rule to increase minimum graduation requirements, to include Algebra II for the majority of students. Requiring high school students to pass Algebra II to graduate with a diploma, would put public high schools and students on a path similar to the one they are already struggling with – passing the WASL and attaining a Certificate of Academic Achievement. The support our teachers and students need to achieve more rigorous math proficiency demands more questions, deliberative planning, and ordering of resources - not simplistic mandates. This rule will affect students already struggling in their academic studies. Is it too much to ask that we have an accurate projection of the numbers of students an additional graduation requirement will harm, and verification of possible benefits? Ms. Dick encouraged the Board to provide guidance, incentives, financial resources, and time for teaching and learning to the new math standards. If the new 10<sup>th</sup> grade math WASL is properly constructed to reflect what students have mastered in Algebra I and some Geometry, the test scores should indicate, at a future point in time, when the system and the students are adequately prepared to tackle a more rigorous Algebra II graduation requirement.

#### Heidi Rhodes, Evergreen School District

Ms. Rhodes applauds the continued work on the standards. While she was in China, she learned that China is one of the top five countries in technology. However, the graduate students there couldn't think. "I want my high school students to be able to think. I don't want them to be guessing. I will be sure to continue practicing on problem solving."

#### Ruth Wilmuth, Washington Coalition for Gifted Education

The Coalition supports the Board's work to improve graduation requirements so all students are prepared for their future. The proposed CORE 24 credit framework is a strong start. Many highly capable students may already reach these standards; however, there are those who may not, due to inadequate resources for gifted programs. The Coalition is working with the Basic Education Finance Task Force to address this issue. Many highly capable math students quickly accelerate through the math curricula by the time they start high school, many may have already taken Algebra I and/or Geometry or Algebra II. At some schools they may exhaust the math offerings before they reach their senior year. While the Coalition understands that the Board is currently considering only math credits, there is information that students face similar challenges in other subject areas also. It is the position of the Coalition that high school level courses should receive both high school and graduation credit, no matter the grade in which the course was taken, nor the setting for the course, provided that the course meets the equivalency requirements. The Coalition asked the Board to recommend statutory amendments to the legislature, to ensure that granting of credit for high school and graduation is uniform throughout the state.

### Edry Geiger, Vancouver School Board

As adults, we're seeing rules made for what school was rather than what it should be. The Board indicates, through the rules, that there is only one pathway and if students don't choose that pathway they are not successful. There are many different avenues for students to decide on. We not only need doctors, teachers, and lawyers – we need horse trainers, massage therapists, and others in the world of work. She wants rigorous education where each child comes in every day and knows that they are worthwhile, that their skills are appreciated, and we, as adults, will help them get there. She asked the Board to look at the whole rather than just part. How are we going to get there and how are we going to teach students to learn where they are? How are we going to get the money? How do we make sure that students, who are living in cars and changing schools due to their home life, get the education they need? She asked the Board to be aware and think clearly what we really value for education.

Public hearing closed at 3:45 p.m.

### **Washington Assessment of Student Learning: Class of 2008 Results and ACT High School Writing Cut Scores as Alternative to the Washington Assessment of Student Learning**

Dr. Joe Willhoft, Assistant Superintendent, OSPI

At the November 2007 meeting, the Board approved cut scores on the SAT-Reading, ACT-Reading, and SAT-Writing tests. A cut score for the ACT-Writing test could not be set at that time because a "Concordance Table," jointly published by the College Board and ACT, aligning the SAT-Writing test to the ACT-Writing test, was not available.

On June 30, 2008, the College Board and ACT released a Concordance Table matching SAT-Writing scores and ACT-Writing scores. The table is based on the comparative performance of a large national sample of students who have taken both exams. Tables of this type are used by college admissions officers to judge the relative performance of students who may not all have taken the same test.

OSPI recommends that the Board adopt an ACT-Writing score of "15" as adequate to demonstrate a student has met the state's writing standard, assuming eligibility criteria required to use this alternative option, have also been met. The ACT-Writing score of 15 aligns to an SAT-Writing score of 380, which is the cut score approved by the Board for SAT-Writing in November 2007.

### **Overview of K-12 Funding: Current Picture of State/Local Funding for K-12 and Review of Comprehensive Proposals to the Basic Education Finance Task Force**

Ms. Jennifer Priddy, Assistant Superintendent, OSPI

Mr. Brad Burnham, Legislative and Policy Specialist, SBE

The 2007 legislature created a Joint Task Force on Basic Education Finance (JTFBEF) to review the definition of basic education funding and formulas. The Task Force will develop options for a new funding structure and necessary formulas, and will propose a new definition of basic education by December 1, 2008. Mr. Burnham presented a spreadsheet summarizing the three most comprehensive proposals presented during the Task Force meetings on June 9 and 10, which can be viewed on the Task Force Web site at <http://www.leg.wa.gov/Joint/Committees/BEF/>.

Mr. Burnham presented a summary of some funding proposals presented to the Basic Education Finance Joint Task Force as follows:

- Basic Education Definition
- Educator Compensation
- Educator Support
- Student Support
- Class Sizes
- Classified Staff
- School Operations Support
- Accountability
- Administrative Oversight
- Revenue Sources
- Formula Components
- Implementation

Further explanation of the above list can be found on the Board Web site at [www.sbe.wa.gov/meetingcalendar/July23-24](http://www.sbe.wa.gov/meetingcalendar/July23-24).

Ms. Priddy presented a PowerPoint on the current K-12 funding situation and then presented OSPI's proposal recommendations to the Basic Education Finance Task Force. It is estimated that adding a sixth period will cost approximately \$110 million. Districts must subsidize state salary allocations significantly. District allocations vary, so the first step is to equalize salaries. After equalization, the state must identify an appropriate method to address the disconnect between state allocations and true costs districts experience. To equalize salary allocations for instructional, classified, and administrative staff in the districts would cost \$40 million per year.

The current Learning Assistance Program (LAP) funding is inadequate. It allocates 3.46 staff units per 1,000 poverty students, which equates to one staff per 289 poverty students. With this equation, teachers would spend 30 minutes per day with groups of 28 struggling students. Funding is inadequate to cover student need at a service level, with any hope of improving learning. OSPI's recommendation: reconstitute the LAP formula with six components, based on successful programs, and increase funding to \$325 million over current funding.

Districts must choose between mandatory costs and improving achievement with the following problems and possible solutions:

	<b>Problem</b>	<b>Possible Solution</b>
Instructional Staffing Ratios	Districts must choose between class size and instructional hours	Explicit state decision on both assumptions that is funded
Salary Allocations	Out-dated and low	Equalize, re-base to logical drivers
Non-Employee Related Costs	Out-dated and low	Re-base to logical drivers; fund assumptions regarding curriculum.
LAP and ELL	Funding not connected to a model of service	Design a model of service, based on research and fund

State under-funding pushes costs onto local funds, which are maxed out. Local funds are typically levy and local effort assistance funds and are commonly thought to employ enhancement staff and programs.

Ms. Priddy discussed how the districts balanced their budgets in the last few years and explained a three-year projection of local funds capacity. Districts' budgets face significant pressure to cover the staffing cost increases that must be paid out of local funds. Trends that were favorable in the prior eight years have slowed or turned around, new federal and I-728 funds will not provide significant relief, and unless state resources increase to offset the cost increases, districts have only bad choices.

If cuts are necessary the district must re-visit the following options:

- Close schools
- Programmatic cuts (libraries, etc.)
- Delay curriculum adoption
- Reduce staff (increase class size, reduced maintenance staff)
- Add additional students (e.g., internet academies)
- Cut administration
- Create additional fees for students and families
- Eliminate sports and extracurricular activities or pay to play
- Cut arts, music, social studies, physical education
- Eliminate 6<sup>th</sup> and/or 7<sup>th</sup> period in high school
- Reduce elective course offerings
- Reduce bussing options

#### Lisa MacFarlane, League of Education Voters (LEV)

The League of Education Voter's vision is:

- Every child can read by 3<sup>rd</sup> grade.
- There is a great teacher in every classroom.
- Every student is motivated by a personal education goal and plan after high school.
- Every student graduates from high school ready for college or work.

Their Core Principles include:

- The state is responsible for providing every student reasonable opportunities to meet the state's high school graduation requirements.
- The new finance system is organized to drive improvements in student achievement.
- The funding responsibilities of the state and local school districts are clearly delineated and separated.
- Local decision makers are given flexibility to determine the best use of money while being held accountable.
- Revenue distribution is simplified and school budgets are transparent.

The LEV suggests a way forward by redefining Washington's basic education commitment, strengthening accountability, creating a new Core K-12 education and a new targeted interventions fund, and building a better compensation system for teachers and staff.

#### Paul Rosier, Washington Association of School Administrators

The Full Funding Coalition's goal is to create a new system that redefines and fully funds basic education at levels that meet Washington's constitutional requirements. By doing so, schools would have the resources to provide all students the opportunity to achieve the state's learning goals within a policy framework that emphasizes shared accountability. The following Washington State associations have asked the legislature to fully and equitably fund K-12 schools: Washington State School Directors Association, Washington Association of Superintendents and Administrators, Association of Washington School Principals, Public School Employees, and the Washington Education Association.

Schools do not have a choice regarding the programs they must offer and the goals they must achieve; therefore, the Coalition proposes a redefinition of basic education to include all the educational programs necessary to address all expectations, goals, requirements, practices, and policies included in state and federal legislation, rules, and regulations. Funding must be sufficient to ensure schools have the capability to meet all specified state and federal requirements.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m. by Chair Ryan

### **Thursday, July 24, 2008**

Members Present: Chair Mary Jean Ryan, Co-Chair Warren Smith, Mr. Steve Floyd, Ms. Phyllis Frank, Mr. Eric Liu, Dr. Steve Dal Porto, Ms. Lorilyn Roller, Dr. Kris Mayer, Dr. Terry Bergeson, Mr. Jeff Vincent, Ms. Amy Bragdon, Ms. Linda W. Lamb, Dr. Sheila Fox, Dr. Bernal Baca (telephone) (14)

Members Absent: Ms. Austianna Quick (excused), Mr. Jack Schuster (excused) (2)

Staff Present: Ms. Edie Harding, Ms. Kath Taylor, Ms. Loy McColm, Ms. Ashley Harris, Ms. Colleen Warren, Ms. Jessica Ganet, Mr. Brad Burnham (7)

The meeting was called to order at 8:45 a.m. by Chair Ryan.

### **OSPI District Improvement Program Update**

Dr. Janell Newman, Assistant Superintendent, OSPI

Summit districts, under the new OSPI initiative, are rising to the challenge of raising student achievement to new heights. These summit districts are in an initial phase intended to develop and expand the knowledge base, tools, and training to support a systems approach that can, with sufficient funding, be scaled statewide.

Districts selected to participate in the Summit Initiative Field Test Model have been identified based on greatest need and strongest commitment, which reflects a combination of district and school improvement status and student performance data, as well as the expressed willingness of the district to engage in a comprehensive program to build capacity for sustained improvement in each classroom and in each period.

Summit Partners include:

<b>Districts</b>	<b>Consultants</b>
Mount Adams	Baker Education Research Consultation
Mount Vernon	Center for Educational Effectiveness
Othello	Teachscape
Renton	WestEd
Wapato	

The areas of focus for the model include: effective leadership, quality instruction, access and use of data, assessment, intervention, monitoring, and system alignment and coherence.

The Needs Analysis Process is as follows:

### **Week One – Needs Assessment**

- Evaluate the strengths and needs of the district, using state and local measures of program quality.
- Verify the results of the measures by interviews, focus groups, and school/classroom visits.
- Gather additional data related to the level of implementation.
- Identify specific academic problems of low-achieving students.

### **Week Two – Action Planning**

- Work with the district leadership team to identify three to five high priority areas for improvement.
- Facilitate the work of the district leadership team and stakeholder representatives to develop action plans addressing the priority areas identified by the leadership team in collaboration with the external team.
- Facilitate development of an on-line action plan that will be maintained and updated.

### **Update on System Performance Accountability Public Outreach and Consultants' Work for Policy Barriers Study and State/Local Partnerships**

Dr. Kris Mayer, Board Lead

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director

Northwest Regional Educational Lab (NWREL) conducted a macro systems report, using literature review and interviews with sample policy makers, key stakeholders, and practitioners to obtain perceptions on Washington policy barriers to student achievement. The findings from the policy barriers study will be used in the work done to strengthen state and local partnerships, to improve the performance of Priority Schools in Washington. The seven districts selected for the review are: Shelton, Moses Lake, Yakima, Sedro Woolley, Everett, Vancouver, and Seattle.

Sixteen potential barriers were identified in the literature review:

1. Lack of coherence across multiple initiatives or programs to sustain an orderly, organized strategy for school change.
2. Student support systems, such as counseling, academic remediation, and dropout prevention and intervention services are fragmented and conducted on an ad hoc basis.
3. Lack of flexibility, in the 180 days and 1,000 hours school year requirements, to design school days and the school year calendar in ways that would result in more effective instruction time.
4. Lack of school staff with expertise in how to focus school improvement efforts.
5. Lack of enough knowledgeable and willing partners from outside the school district to work with schools in their school improvement efforts on a regular and ongoing basis.
6. Schools do not have sufficient data or capacity to access and analyze data on individual student performance, to improve instruction.
7. School and district financial resources are insufficient to assure that all students achieve at grade-level.
8. School and district financial resources are inflexible to target funding where highest needs are, to improve student achievement.
9. Lack of administrative capacity to effectively focus improvement efforts.
10. Lack of a coherent system for supporting the entry, development, and retention of quality staff.
11. Inability to dismiss ineffective staff.
12. Inability to enact differential pay for staff.
13. Lack of strategic alignment between professional development and school/district goals.
14. Lack of time for professional development and teacher collaboration time.
15. Inadequate incentives for the best qualified staff to go to the highest need schools.
16. Classes are too large for teachers to be able to teach effectively.

The primary policy findings include:

- Lack of program coherence.
- Perceived funding and program impermanence.
- Time for professional development and teacher collaboration.
- Need for operating flexibility.
- Systems that support the entry, development, and retention of quality staff members.

The secondary policy findings include:

- All barriers judged removable.
- Discretion in resource allocation.
- Self-sufficient focus.
- Significant differences existing between groups.
- Barrier removal recognized as a joint responsibility.
- Different opinions about national board certification.

### Serving Every Child Well: Washington's Commitment to Help Challenged Schools Succeed

Ms. Jennifer Vranek, Education First Consulting

Mr. Andy Calkins, Mass Insight Inc.

Ms. Meghan O'Keefe, Mass Insight Inc.

Mr. Bill Guenther, Mass Insight, Inc.

The task of Mass Insight was to develop draft proposals and recommendations for state and local partnerships to turn around schools identified as Priority Schools, the state's new "Tier 4" of school underperformance. The goal is to significantly increase student achievement in these schools and to eliminate the poverty and racial achievement gap. To achieve this, the consultants incorporated viewpoints of all key Washington State stakeholders through varied outreach efforts, including a deeply involved design team, as well as national research on turnaround.

Guiding principles that emerged from the development process include:

1. The initiative is driven by one mission: student success.
2. The solution we develop is collective.
3. There is a reciprocal accountability among all stakeholders.
4. To have meaning, reciprocal accountability is backed by reciprocal consequences.
5. The solution directly addresses common barriers to reform.
6. The solution requires a sustained commitment.
7. The solution requires absolute clarity on roles.

There are four key questions the initiative needs to address clearly:

1. At what point, if any, does it become mandatory for schools to participate?
2. What is the best way to achieve flexible authority over key school resources, such as staff, money, and time?
3. What should the state's final "buck stops here" school accountability status look like?
4. What specific roles should each play in implementing the initiative?

This is a school-based and district-based initiative, which focuses on transformation where it counts – at the school level. However, it is designed to achieve that transformation systemically, across clusters of schools organized by districts and their partners. District reform must be part of the long-term solution for underperforming schools.

The key roles for this process include:

#### **SBE**

- Prepare, submit, and advocate for package to legislature for 2009 session
- Set initial factors for participation in the Innovation Zone (first round of vetting) and essential elements required of all Zone turnaround plans
- Select and approve plans, with OSPI's input
- Use decision-making authority on outcomes for Priority Schools after two years and monitor-schools placed under greater state authority, with OSPI's assistance
- Act as a catalyst in developing deeper role for, and resource base of, leadership partners

#### **OSPI**

- Diagnostic role and assistance in development and implementation of proposals to enter the Innovation Zone
- On-going management of Zone initiative in general
- Analysis and monitoring of school progress and recommendations to SBE, after two years of implementation
- Assistance on expansion of lead turnaround partner capacity in the state

A work session is scheduled for August 12. Pete Bylsma is working on the accountability index and will have a report at the meeting. Time will be spent with stakeholders in August and September about the rough draft. A proposal should be ready for the Board to consider at the September 24 and 25 Board meeting in Pasco.

#### **Public Comment**

##### Wendy Rader-Konofolski, Washington Education Association (WEA)

Ms. Rader-Konofolski distributed a letter from Mary Lindquist, addressing concerns regarding the 16 barriers. Ms. Rader-Konofolski thanked the Board for allowing the WEA to participate in the barrier study; however, the Association is concerned about the validity of the report. She addressed barriers # 7, 8, 10, and 14, as listed in the Mass Insight report.

Two major concerns were brought forward:

1. The last-minute change of an agreed upon barrier, with one that did not appear on the original 16, is unacceptable.
2. The new barrier that appeared lends credence to an unfounded perception that schools would improve if school administrators and other leaders did not have to take locally bargained contract language into account.

As the two consultant reports merge, there is a pattern saying that collective bargaining is a barrier to school improvement.

##### Karen Davis, WEA

Ms. Davis is participating on the design team and the System Performance Accountability (SPA) group. When No Child Left Behind (NCLB) was implemented in 2001, it became her primary responsibility. As a member of the design team, she appreciates being included and thinks the team is working well together. The WEA doesn't believe that people work harder if they think there is a consequence. For educators coming out of the NCLB unit measures from legislation, consequences don't come with any support whatsoever. Taking kids out of one school and putting them in another is getting supplemental services that educators can't provide and they view that negatively. She urged the Board to reflect on the consequences issue. If we go ahead with -statewide accountability without the resources, with the information we now know, after hearing Ms. Priddy's presentation yesterday, we will build upon what's already happening with NCLB, which is seriously underfunded.

Steve Pulkkinen, Formerly Seattle Education Association (SEA)

Mr. Pulkkinen appreciates the design team work and is hopeful, but not necessarily optimistic. The SEA members care about achievement and closing the gap. Teaching and reaching kids is their passion. Collective bargaining is a means for advocating for students and closing the achievement gap. When the SEA members are treated like a barrier, they act like a barrier and it would be best to avoid that. When asked whether we should try to close the achievement gap, 72% of the 5,000 SEA members said yes. The members recognize that a large percentage of our teaching staff is white and they don't know how to deal with other cultures and those in poverty. The members want racially and culturally responsive teaching strategies and curriculum, as well as an aligned curriculum. Collective bargaining in Seattle has made significant changes in the process and is worth looking at because of the barriers that have been eliminated through that process.

Rosemary Fryer, Evergreen School District

Ms. Fryer thanked the Board for the work being done to bring our system into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. She is working on K-12 alignment on curriculum across the districts and works in a high needs high school by choice. Collective bargaining agreements can be used creatively. In her high school, teachers meet weekly to develop professional development needs and other problems. Teachers aren't afraid of accountability, as long as it's objective as well as subjective. She asked the Board to be flexible and not make this a quick fix. She thanked the Board for continuing to listen.

Ann Varkados, Bethel School District

Bethel School District currently requires three credits in math and students are encouraged to take Algebra in 8<sup>th</sup> grade. Sometimes that's a problem because they aren't used to the rigor. We want kids to take risks and have the rigor sooner to get into the Advanced Placement (AP) classes in high school. Some kids won't have a parent, or someone who knows their capabilities, to come in and advocate for the child. Parent involvement is an added workload for teachers and counselors and parents would have to come in at night. Before implementing CORE 24, there needs to be a system for the kids who don't have the support.

Lisa MacFarlane, League of Education Voters (LEV)

The LEV has a long and distinguished track record on research and has worked on levy and bond campaigns. The financial point that the Board is hearing from stakeholders is real and so is the reality that there is a huge gap in terms of high school exit and college entrance. School districts can't take another unfunded mandate. We won't see big resources for schools until we see student achievement from kids. The LEV will be with the Board, in Olympia, to fight for the resources. She urged the Board to put a stake in the ground for CORE 24 and set a course.

Dave Burrows, Evergreen Education Association (EEA)

The EEA is concerned about collective bargaining being perceived as a barrier. Locally, we agree with building kids' skills and providing adequate teachers, but that's not the problem. By definition, the collective bargaining agreements are locally agreed upon by the district and the teachers. Mr. Burrows suggested that the further the teachers' interface goes away from the students, the less important the class size is. Varying class size, due to funding, might not be the right approach. There needs to be an evaluation process to determine if a teacher is being effective. He asked the Board to be careful about the temptation to create a scapegoat out of collective bargaining. Teachers are not the problem.

Martha Rice, Washington State School Directors Association (WSSDA)

Ms. Rice thanked the Board for their dedication to our students. She appreciates the flexibility that the Board has shown with participation of the stakeholder groups. The Board has made some changes to the CORE 24 proposal, as a result of feedback received. The WSSDA is concerned about moving from 19 credits to 24 credits and asked that the Board consider the impacts and consequences. The change to CORE 24 will require changes for districts including

scheduling, course offerings, and others that haven't been thought of yet, that will come to the forefront during the implementation. Ours is a performance-based system so what is the correlation of a performance-based system and one that has seat time as a requirement for graduation? We need to move to an integrated performance-based system. She asked the Board to consider the impacts that it will have on small and medium size districts, because they don't have the staff, facility, or infrastructure to support a big change such as this. The perception is that the Board will force districts to change schedules. Establishing a framework such as this might require students who are seeking to make up credit, to do so outside of the schedule. Depending on their schedules this might be barrier laden and will force students to drop out. She asked the Board to consider the challenges of creating sufficient staff to support the change and credit requirements, especially where we know there are staff shortages already. Ms. Rice encouraged the Board to consider outreach so all stakeholder groups can be involved. There are many in the communities that are watching and have concerns and suggestions that they might want to make known in a future forum.

#### Holly Williams, Evergreen School District

The WASL is an important metric, but we feel it's not the only metric for assessment. She suggested using a growth model in the data analysis, which might alleviate some issues around mobility and small schools. She advocates that the Board include some metrics that speak to students already achieving at WASL levels. Thanks to the Gates Grant, we were able to put an effective Advanced Placement program in our high schools. It's important that students wanting to advance have the same opportunities as those at one of the affluent high schools.

#### Ricardo Sanchez, Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB)

Mr. Sanchez commended the Board on their thoughtfulness and deliberative process in considering the high school diploma. There is broad support from the HECB for the diploma work and its quality. Good questions have been raised, such as why graduation requirements would exceed the HECB requirements. He reminded the Board that the minimum college requirements for admission are just that – minimum. Students are encouraged to go beyond the minimums. Admissions are more competitive every year and that won't go away. Institutions are looking for rigor of coursework when accepting students for college admission. They're looking for well-rounded students.

### **Business Items**

#### Approval of Framework for High School Graduation Requirements Draft Recommendations

MOTION was made

1. To establish a CORE 24 Graduation Requirements Policy Framework, consisting of subject area requirements, culminating project, and high school and beyond plan to be phased in over four years, beginning with the class of 2013 and becoming fully implemented with the class of 2016, contingent upon funding approved by the legislature.
2. To maintain the culminating project and high school and beyond plan as graduation requirements, with modifications developed in consultation with the Boards implementation advisors. Begin the high school and beyond plan in middle school.
3. To direct staff to establish an implementation task force to make recommendations to the Board by June 2009, to address implementation issues identified through public outreach and cited in the larger paper. These include but are not limited to:
  - Ways to operationalize competency-based methods of meeting graduation requirements;
  - Ways to assist struggling students with credit retrieval and advancing their skills to grade level; and
  - Phasing in CORE 24 to address issues such as teacher supply, facility infrastructure, etc.;

- Ways to provide appropriate career exploration courses as well as career concentration options.
4. To affirm the intention of the Board to advocate for funding for a six-period high school day, a comprehensive education and career guidance system, and support for students who need additional help to meet the requirements. The Board will direct staff to prepare a funding request for the 2009-2011 biennium to begin implementation of CORE 24.

MOTION seconded

MOTION was made to approve above motion with two technical changes to the motions on the change sheet. See #3 directly below.

MOTION seconded

AMENDED MOTIONS were made:

1. To make clear in the Adoption document attachment that it is the Board's intent to allow one of the arts credits and one of the world language credits to be met in middle school
2. To make clear in the Adoption document attachment that it is the Board's intent to develop improved ways to allow English Language Learner students to meet the world language requirement by demonstrating competency in their own language.
3. Technical Amendment to Recommendation #1: To establish the CORE 24 Graduation Requirements Policy Framework, per the attached Adoption document, consisting of subject area requirements, Culminating Project, High School and Beyond Plan to be phased in over four years, beginning with the class of 2013 and becoming fully implemented with the class of 2016, contingent upon funding approved by the legislature.

Board discussion

MOTION #1 was withdrawn and staff was directed to ensure, in its communications, that their intentions about CTE and ELL are discussed.

MOTION #2 was withdrawn and staff was directed to ensure, in its communications, that their intentions about CTE and ELL are discussed.

MOTION #3 was carried

AMENDED MOTION was made to Recommendation #1:

To establish a revised CORE 24 Graduation Requirements Policy Framework consisting of subject area requirements, culminating project, and high school and beyond plan to be phased in over four years, beginning with the class of 2013 and becoming fully implemented with the class of 2016, contingent upon funding approved by the legislature. The revised framework would:

- Increase the Career Concentration requirements to seven credits by incorporating the two credits previously designated for world language and the two credits previously designated for electives into the Career Concentration credits.
- Maintain the current definition of Career Concentration, while the addition of the following: selection of courses shall be clearly linked to the High School and Beyond Plan.

MOTION seconded

MOTION failed

AMENDED MOTION was made to Recommendation #3:

To direct staff to establish an implementation task force to provide regular feedback and make recommendations to the Board by June 2009, to address implementation issues identified through public outreach and cited in the larger paper. These include, but are not limited to:

- a. An implementation schedule that prioritizes phase-in of new credit requirements;
- b. Ways to operationalize competency-based methods of meeting graduation requirements;
- c. Ways to assist struggling students with credit retrieval and advancing their skills to grade level;
- d. Phasing in CORE 24 to address issues, such as teacher supply, facility infrastructure, etc.;
- e. Ways to provide appropriate career exploration courses as well as career concentration options;
- f. Scheduling approaches to 24 credits that can meet the required 150 instructional hours.

MOTION seconded

Board Discussion

MOTION carried

AMENDED MOTION was made to Recommendation #4:

To affirm the intention of the Board to link the implementation of CORE 24 directly to sufficient funding to local school districts for a six-period high school day, a comprehensive education and career guidance system, and support for students who need additional help to meet the requirements. The Board will direct staff to prepare a funding request for the 2009-2011 biennium to begin implementation of CORE 24.

MOTION seconded

Board discussion

MOTION carried

AMENDED MOTION was made to Recommendation #4

To affirm the intention of the Board to advocate for a comprehensive funding package and revision to the Basic Education Funding formula, which among other necessary investments, should include funding for a six-period high school day, a comprehensive education and career guidance system, and support for students who need additional help to meet the requirements. The Board will direct staff to prepare a funding request for the 2009-2011 biennium to begin implementation of CORE 24.

MOTION seconded

Board discussion

MOTION withdrawn and the Board directed staff to incorporate the advocacy of a comprehensive funding package into one motion, which was completed by staff as follows:

4. Affirm the intention of the Board to advocate for a comprehensive funding package and revision to the Basic Education Funding formula, which among other necessary investments should link the implementation of CORE 24 directly to sufficient funding to local school districts for a six-period high school day, a comprehensive education and career guidance system, and support for students who need additional help to meet the requirements. The Board directed staff to prepare a funding request for the 2009-2011 biennium to begin implementation of CORE 24.

MOTION was made to Affirm the intention of the Board to advocate for a comprehensive funding package and revision to the Basic Education Funding formula, which among other necessary investments should link the implementation of CORE 24 directly to sufficient funding to local school districts for a six-period high school day, a comprehensive education and career guidance system, and support for students who need additional help to meet the requirements. The Board directed staff to prepare a funding request for the 2009-2011 biennium to begin implementation of CORE 24.

MOTION seconded

Motion carried unanimously

Amended MOTION is as follows:

1. To establish the CORE 24 Graduation Requirements Policy Framework, per the attached Adoption document, consisting of subject area requirements, Culminating Project, High School and Beyond Plan to be phased in over four years, beginning with the class of 2013 and becoming fully implemented with the class of 2016, contingent upon funding approved by the legislature.
2. To maintain the culminating project and high school and beyond plan as graduation requirements, with modifications developed in consultation with the Boards implementation advisors. Begin the high school and beyond plan in middle school.
3. To direct staff to establish an implementation task force to provide regular feedback and make recommendations to the Board by June 2009, to address implementation issues identified through public outreach and cited in the larger paper. These include, but are not limited to:
  - a. An implementation schedule that prioritizes phase-in of new credit requirements;
  - b. Ways to operationalize competency-based methods of meeting graduation requirements;
  - c. Ways to assist struggling students with credit retrieval and advancing their skills to grade level;
  - d. Phasing in CORE 24 to address issues, such as teacher supply, facility infrastructure, etc.;
  - e. Ways to provide appropriate career exploration courses as well as career concentration options;
  - f. Scheduling approaches to 24 credits that can meet the required 150 instructional hours.
4. Affirm the intention of the Board to advocate for a comprehensive funding package and revision to the Basic Education Funding formula, which among other necessary investments should link the implementation of CORE 24 directly to sufficient funding to local school districts for a six-period high school day, a comprehensive education and career guidance system, and support for students who need additional help to meet the requirements. The Board directed staff to prepare a funding request for the 2009-2011 biennium to begin implementation of CORE 24.

MOTION carried

Strategic Teaching Report on Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II Standards

MOTION was made to approve Strategic Teaching's "Final Draft of Revised High School Standards" Report for Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II.

MOTION seconded

MOTION carried

Third math credit Rule and High School and Beyond Plan Rule

MOTION was made to adopt the amendments to WAC 180-51-060 and 180-51-061 and the adoption of a new rule WAC 180-51-066, as set forth in the CR102 filed with the Code Reviser on June 11, 2008 and direct staff to file the CR103 making the amendments to the existing rules and the new rule permanent.

MOTION seconded

AMENDED MOTION was made to WAC 180-51-066, 1bi:

- i. Including one from each of the following:
  - (A) Algebra I, Integrated Mathematics I, or equivalent Career and Technical Education (CTE) mathematics course;
  - (B) Geometry, Integrated Mathematics II, or equivalent CTE mathematics course
  - (C) Algebra II, Integrated Mathematics III, or equivalent CTE mathematics course, or district determined content.

Board discussion

MOTION denied

MOTION carried for original third math credit motion

ACT Writing Cut Scores for Alternative to Washington Assessment of Student Learning

MOTION was made to adopt an ACT-Writing score of "15" as necessary to demonstrate a student has met the state standard in writing, once eligibility requirements for use of the SAT/ACT/AP option have been met.

MOTION seconded

MOTION carried unanimously

180-Day Waivers

MOTION was made that the State Board of Education approve the waiver requests from the minimum 180-day school year for the school districts listed on page 297 and 298 of the July Agenda with the exception of Lyle School District.

MOTION seconded

Board discussion

MOTION amendment to add the four waiver days for Lyle School District, as identified in the approval package.

MOTION seconded

MOTION carried

#### State Board FY09 Operating Budget

MOTION was made to approve the State Board of Education's FY 2009 Operating Budget set forth on page 309 of the Agenda.

MOTION seconded

MOTION carried

#### 2009 Board Meeting Dates

MOTION was made to approve the State Board of Education Proposed Meeting Dates for 2009, set for the on page 307 of the Agenda.

MOTION seconded

MOTION denied. Proposal was referred to the Executive Committee for approval and will be presented at the September Board meeting.

#### Contract Amendment for Science Standards

MOTION was made to approve the proposed amendments to the contract with David Heil and Associates, set forth on pages 299-301 of the Agenda

MOTION seconded

MOTION carried

#### Contract for Curricular Materials Review by SBE

MOTION was made to award the contract for the Mathematics Curriculum Review to Strategic Teaching and authorize the Executive Director to execute the contract provided at this meeting.

MOTION seconded

MOTION carried

Staff was asked to make Private School information available, electronically, for review and to include the Washington certified teacher to student ratios for all of the schools.

#### Private Schools for 2008-09

MOTION was made that the list of private schools submitted to the State Board of Education by OSPI, having met the requirements of RCW 28A.195 and the regulations contained in WAC 180-90, be accredited and approved as private schools for the 2008-09 school years.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

### Reflection of Meeting

Mr. Eric Liu – I want to give credit and say thank you to Ms. Taylor for her work on the CORE 24 and high school diploma.

Dr. Steve Dal Porto – We need to realize that the CORE 24 Framework will be interpreted by some as the CORE 24 “framework”. He suggested not taking the framework too literally because it’s too rigid. Look at the framework and be careful of the unintended consequences, which will require data and communication with stakeholders and communities throughout the state.

Ms. Phyllis Frank – She took advantage of attending as many Meaningful High School Diploma meetings as possible and appreciates the work involved. CORE 24 will be an infrastructure for our students.

Mr. Steve Floyd – Thank you for the work done on math. We’ve taken huge steps. Thanks to all those who participated who aren’t here today who worked hard.

Ms. Edie Harding – Thanked Ms. Harris and Ms. McColm for the CORE 24 and math credit binders. Thanks to Kathe on the CORE 24 work. Thanks to Colleen and Brad for the third math credit rule work.

Chair Mary Jean Ryan – I am moved by the meeting because of the interaction of the Board and the interaction between the Board and those who attended the meeting. Feel a sense of huge responsibility. The more we see the big picture the more we try to do what we can.

Mr. Warren Smith – This is a day that represents a culmination of a group of people who has never worked together before. I am proud and honored to work with each member of the Board and the Board as a whole. There are many challenges and it’s remarkable to come together and make the decisions that have been made here today. All the things we do – are because of the Board staff – thanks for the tremendous amount of work that the staff does. Thanks to those who attend our Board meetings for their commitment and dedication to their constituents.

Ms. Linda W. Lamb – Thanks for the well organized agenda. It was the best laid out meeting with all the tasks that needed to be accomplished. I appreciate the respect of other members during discussions. Thanks to the Executive Committee for their organization. Thanks to Mr. Burnham on the 180-Day Waivers process and handling it well on his own.

Ms. Amy Bragdon – I appreciate where we have come as a Board and staff. There has been lots of growth. Thanks to the staff. Retreat planning information is on its way to everyone.

Mr. Jeff Vincent – Thanked Dr. Dal Porto for his input and expressed commitment to making sure that the action plans are in place and to be careful with unintended consequences. Thanks to Chair Ryan’s leadership and to the staff. We heard an important presentation about the financial situation of the state. We have to be real and need to work to address this. It will take the leadership of everyone who was here these two days and have the political courage to make it happen.

Dr. Terry Bergeson – I had a discussion with the Board in April to make sure we don’t commit to something we can’t finish. I know that the Board is committed to making it happen. Listening to the financial crisis is scary because it’s so big. The young people and leaders that joined us today asked for our help in being successful in their education in the United States. Yesterday I

we heard people saying, “We’re going to help you.” If we don’t have the will of excitement moving forward to make the next step we can’t do it.

Dr. Kris Mayer – I am relieved that the CORE 24 Framework is now moving to another level. I am grateful for Eric’s presentation on creativity and am excited about kids having more creativity in their education. I am sad and worried about the financial crisis, after yesterday’s presentation. It was fun to see the kids here to today and to hear what they had to say – that’s why we’re here – for the kids.

Ms. Lorilyn Roller – Thanks to the Board for doing more listening than talking. The public comment was important and the time you took to listen to our audience was very important.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:16 p.m. by Chair Ryan.