

May 13-14, 2010
Northeast Washington Educational Services District 101
Spokane, Washington

MINUTES

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

Absent: Chair Jeff Vincent (excused), Mr. Warren Smith (excused) (2)

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

Staff Absent: Ms. Ashley Harris (excused) (1)

May 13, 2010

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Vice Chair Steve Dal Porto.

Announcements

Dr. Mike Dunn, Superintendent of NEWESD 101, gave the welcome saying that it's a privilege to have the Board in Spokane and commended the Board on its work for the kids of our state.

Mr. Jared Costanzo was introduced as the new student Board member from Eastern Washington. Mr. Costanzo attends Chiawana High School in Pasco, Washington and looks forward to his tenure on the SBE.

Approval of Minutes from the March 17-18, 2010 Meeting

Motion was made to approve the minutes as presented

Motion seconded

Motion carried

High School Graduation Requirements Update: Core 24 Update and Next Steps

Dr. Kathe Taylor, Policy Director

Mr. Jack Schuster, Board Co-lead

Dr. Steve Dal Porto, Board Co-lead

Dr. Mark Mansell, Core 24 Implementation Task Force Co-chair

Ms. Jennifer Shaw, Core 24 Implementation Task Force Co-chair

Dr. Taylor presented a PowerPoint that summarized and updated the evidence that shaped the Meaningful High School Diploma (MHSD) work and gave rise to the Core 24 framework. The Board defined the MHSD as one that would leave all options open for students and provide graduates with the skills and knowledge necessary for postsecondary education, training, and careers.

The presentation recalled the Board's reframing of the vision for college/career readiness as follows:

FROM	TO
Minimum graduation requirements	Essential or core graduation requirements
High school graduation as an ending	High school graduation as a beginning
A K-12 system view	A P-20 system view

It also put the pace of change in perspective, with the following overview:

1985	19 credits, 150 hours per credit were established
2000	Culminating Project and High School and Beyond Plan were added, along with clarification of high school-level standards.
2007	Meaningful High School Diploma Committee began.
2008	Culminating Project and High School and Beyond Plan became graduation requirements. The Board rewrote the purpose of the diploma and adopted the Core 24 Framework and added one math credit.
2009	The Core 24 Implementation Task Force (ITF) began their work.
2010	The Core 24 ITF will complete their work and the Board will consider the ITF recommendations and stakeholder feedback.
2011	The Board will adopt new graduation requirements rules. The legislature appropriates funding necessary for graduation requirements.
2016-2017	The graduation requirements will go into effect for the class of 2016 or 2017.

The presentation reviewed the demands of the different entities that receive high school graduates (e.g., work/apprenticeship requirements, two-year and four-year college admission requirements, and military admission requirements). It also compared Washington's position on a variety of national rankings. For instance, Washington State is 22nd in the nation in state success indicators leading to education beyond high school, full-time work, and a living wage. It is 43rd in the nation in high school graduation rates and 42nd in the nation in college participation rates for students from low-income families.

The presentation also compared the Class of 2013 state graduation requirements with the minimum Washington four-year public college admission requirements and cited data from the Board's transcript study of 2008 graduates to demonstrate that fewer American Indian, African American, and Hispanic students than White and Asian students were taking the courses that would put them in the pipeline for admission to a four-year college:

Subject	2013 state-mandated minimum credits to graduate from high school	2012 Higher Education Coordinating Board-mandated minimum four-year public college admission credit requirements
English	3	4
Math	3	3-4 (requires Algebra II)
Science	2 (1 lab)	2-3 (2 labs)
Social Studies	2.5	3
Arts	1	0-1
World Language	0	2
Health and Fitness	2	0
Occupational Education	1	0
Electives	5.5	0
Total	20	15-16

The presentation concluded by summarizing the primary concerns voiced by stakeholders in the past two years and reviewed the next steps for the Board, according to the Core 24 work plan.

Concerns included:

1. Insufficient flexibility because of too many state-mandated credits:
 - Not enough room for support/credit recovery classes.
 - Leaves less opportunity for local control.
 - May keep students from skill centers.
 - Difficult for small school districts with limited staff.
2. Credits should be allocated differently:
 - Arts and career concentration.
3. Will increase the achievement gap.
4. Confusing.
5. Funding:
 - Need resources for staff, facilities, and guidance.

Next steps

May 2010	The Board received and discussed Core 24 Implementation Task Force recommendations and other stakeholder input.
July 2010	The Board will take action on Core 24 framework.
Late summer/fall 2010	Public outreach on Core 24 framework approved in July.
September/November 2010	Review and approve draft rule.
2010/2011	Work with Quality Education Council (QEC) to include funding in 2011-2013 biennial ESHB 2261 budget package.
2011 Legislative Session	Discuss proposed changes with legislature and advocate for funding.
Summer 2011	Finalize the rule, assuming legislative approval of funding.

Core 24 Implementation Task Force (ITF) Report

Dr. Mansell was joined by fellow ITF members Ms. Bridget Lewis, Ms. Karen Madsen, and Mr. Sergio Hernandez to present the Core 24 ITF recommendations. Ms. Jennifer Shaw was unable to co-present with Dr. Mansell as planned.

The Board created the Core 24 Implementation Task Force (ITF) to examine the implementation issues associated with the Core 24 high school graduation requirements framework, passed by the Board in July 2008. The Board chartered the ITF to advise them on strategies needed to implement the requirements, including a phase-in process that would begin with the graduating class of 2013. The Board charged the ITF to produce the following deliverables:

1. Recommendations with analyses of advantages and disadvantages related to the issues itemized in Motion #3 passed in July 2008.
2. Recommendations with analyses of advantages and disadvantages related to other relevant issues the ITF identifies.
3. Regular feedback from the field on Core 24 perceptions, concerns, and support.

The Board asked the ITF to look at the issue of automatic enrollment and to recommend a process connected to the High School and Beyond Plan for students to elect and formally declare a college or career emphasis if they want to elect an alternative to pursuing the default college and career ready requirements.

On March 15, 2010, the ITF voted on each recommendation using an audience response system to tally the votes. The recommendations are as follows:

1. Phase-in Policy.
2. Two-for-one policy.
3. Redefine "credit" in WAC policy.
4. Limited local waiver authority policy.
5. Competency-based credit policy.
6. Career concentration policy.
7. Credit recovery advocacy.
8. High School and Beyond Plan starting at middle school policy.
9. Flexibility to meet high school requirements at middle level standards policy.
10. Automatic enrollment policy.

The ITF considered, but did not formally vote on the possibility that local administrators could waive state-mandated graduation requirements for students who receive an international Baccalaureate Diploma or Cambridge Diploma.

Mr. Schuster commended the ITF for their exceptional work.

Public Comment

Robert Douthitt, Spokane Public Schools

The Spokane Public Schools agrees with the Board regarding its recommendations for Core 24 as follows:

1. The purpose of a diploma as defined in January 2008.
2. The concept that higher standards encourage high achievement.
3. Aligning high school graduation requirements with college admission standards as noted in the July 2008 Memo titled "Meaningful High School Diploma."
4. The concept of multiple pathways to a diploma.
5. The six guiding principles on page 15 of the July 2008 Board meeting memo.

Core 24 is not flexible under the current framework. The Spokane School Board submitted a letter outlining solutions to promote more flexibility in three key areas: 1) removing some of the current requirements on a second credit of art and the career concentration concept; 2) addressing the costs and logistics in larger schools and districts to implement 24 credits; 3) addressing the need for time for successful implementation of the High School and Beyond Plan and Culminating Project. The Spokane Public Schools has one philosophical disagreement with the proposal and believes that there is one methodological flaw, which causes the Board to seriously underestimate the cost and logistics of implementation in larger districts and larger schools. They think the Board should recognize that the requirements for a Culminating Project and a High School and Beyond Plan require time in and of themselves. The Board should budget for such time as part of its proposal, particularly if it wants these requirements to be consistently implemented in a meaningful way throughout the state.

Dennis Kampe, Clark County Skills Center

On behalf of the Washington State Skills Center Association, Mr. Kampe expressed concerns and voiced suggestions on changes that the Association feels will improve the Core 24 proposal for all students if adopted by the Board. Core 24 should not be implemented until it is funded and there is a seven period day. The Association has supported the efforts of the Board in its Core 24 six guiding principles and three of the four key tenets. The Association, and many others within the career and technical education field, have testified to the Board and presented to the ITF sharing their concerns and ideas as to how to improve the final Core 24 proposal. The Association asks that as the Board moves forward to strengthen the language within the proposal that it will ensure that all career concentration credits will meet the first guiding principle to shape Core 24 to equip all students.

Bob McMullen, Association of Washington State Principals (AWSP)

We're on the point of a threshold. We all know the world of credits and what we're doing is making a change in our world view from seat time to competencies. We should ask ourselves "how do I behave and how can I do things differently." He asked the Board to ask the same questions. Maybe the time has come to do some implementation simulation. The Board is at the point to take the bold step and put implementation in motion. The principals say, move boldly ahead and see how it really works.

Cindy McMullen, Central Valley School District

Ms. McMullen commended the Task Force for the excellent recommendations. Regarding waivers for various issues – the ITF recommends giving authority to administrators and Ms. McMullen suggested giving the authority to districts, which would give them the opportunity to set policies in place for when waivers are given or not given. There's a concern about keeping kids in school. Requirements should not directly translate to credits. The districts can give them discipline and learning and Ms. McMullen asked the Board to clarify what high schools should look like. She suggested "learning centers" rather than a checklist of requirements. She asked the question: "How do we balance making sure that kids are learning and reaching competency with on time graduation". It might be different in each district and should be clarified.

Lorna Walsh, Parent and Member of Stand for Children

As a parent of kids in schools, Ms. Walsh encouraged the Board to adopt the ITF recommendations made because there is flexibility and options. There is concern about funding, but it's very hard to advocate for funding to the legislature without knowing what you want funding for. By adopting the recommendations, it will be easier to go after the funding. Don't sacrifice what's good, because you are looking to attain something that is absolutely perfect.

Don Barlow, Former Legislator and Former School Board Member

Dr. Barlow gave background of his experience, which has given him the opportunity to view education from a different perspective. While Core 24 will enable students to be better prepared to achieve at a higher level and give them career exploration opportunities at an earlier age, we must be vigilant and involved. We need to continue to focus on the dropout problem because we are losing too many students before graduation and this is not acceptable.

Frank Ordway, League of Education Voters (LEV)

The LEV urges the Board to keep focusing on Core 24. This is not the time to retreat on higher graduation requirements. It's important to set kids up to succeed. We are not growing enough home grown talent. Other states have raised the standards on dropout rates and have increased graduation rates at the same time. Looking at the new initiative can be daunting but if we can give the legislature a clear product, we have the opportunity to get the legislative funding. We need to be specific with what we're doing with our dollars. It is important to have clarity of purpose.

Austin DePaul, College Success Foundation

Mr. DePaul thanked the Board for its work and raising the understanding of the purpose of graduation requirements. He said that he has mentored students in the foster care system for many years. He talked about the challenging courses he took for his education because of the standards being raised. Students and teachers will rise to the challenge. Good communication with parents will benefit all communities.

Deana Brower, Parent and Active Volunteer

Ms. Brower is excited about her oldest child starting middle school because of the new requirements and high standards that the Board is moving toward. Students deserve this. She thanked Ms. Bragdon for attending a citizen's advisory committee and for the time she took to listen to the group. She is concerned about the dropout rate and asked the Board to work to keep it from happening in the future. Students need connections with their clubs, which is important for their high school experience. She commended the Board for being on the right path to higher standards.

Board Discussion on Graduation Requirements

The Board continued its discussion on graduation requirements and decided to convene a special meeting in June to continue the discussion to allow for more dialogue.

Lunch Recognition

Ms. Quick was recognized for her service as a student Board member for the past two years.

Math Standard Setting Plan for Grades 3-8 and Race to the Top Assessment Grant

Dr. Joe Willhoff, Assistant Superintendent, OSPI

Dr. Thomas Hirsch, Co-founder, Assessment and Evaluation Services

The Board is required to develop performance standards and levels for the statewide assessments. To develop these standards and levels, the Board will work in collaboration with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). OSPI, along with its National Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), is currently developing the math standards setting plan for the new state math assessments, "Measurements of Student Progress," for grades three through eight. Standard setting is a formalized process to determine how students need to perform on an assessment to be classified into performance levels.

The grade three through eight standard setting process includes:

- Students in grades three through eight are taking the new Measurements of Student Progress in mathematics.
- The Board is authorized to set passing scores and performance levels on Washington's achievement tests.
- Six standard-setting panels with thirty educators each are convened in late July or early August.
- Recommendations to the Board come from grade level panels and a cross grade articulation committee.
- Superintendent Dorn also provides recommendations from a policy panel.
- The Board sets standards in a special meeting scheduled for August 10, 2010.

The Colorado Growth Model is currently being used in several states. The Model has been developed by the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment. Washington's National TAC has vetted the model and approves its use.

The roll-out plan for Washington's Growth Model includes the following:

- Use 2010 (and earlier) test scores to produce individual student-level scores.
- Release student-level scores in late fall and early winter 2010.
- Train state TAC (assessment and curriculum coordinators from across the state) as regional experts.
- Use December WERA/OSPI conference as a training opportunity.
- During 2010-2011, develop and implement training vehicles for district staff, teachers, and parents.
- Establish roll-out of school and district level reports during 2010-2011.

Washington Education Reform Plan and Race to the Top Update

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director

Washington is completing its Round Two application for RTTT, which is due June 1, 2010 to the U.S. Department of Education. Winners for Round Two will be announced on September 30, 2010.

The Board Chair is one of three signatures required for the RTTT application, along with the Governor and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Washington could potentially gain up to \$250 million to use for four years to implement Washington's education reform agenda. This includes:

- \$137 million for districts that sign partnership agreements.
- \$55 million for innovation clusters to districts.
- \$58 million for state capacity partnership and implementation of the four federal assurances, which are:
 1. Develop and adopt common standards and assessments.
 2. Data systems for increased access and use.
 3. Support of effective teachers and school leaders.
 4. Turn around struggling schools.

The U.S. Department of Education will score all applications, based on a 500 point scale. The points are divided into six criteria and one competitive priority as follows:

Criteria	Points
Criteria A: State Success Factors	125
Criteria B: Standards and Assessments	70
Criteria C: Data systems to drive instruction	47
Criteria D: Great teachers and leaders	138
Criteria E: Turning around the lowest achieving schools	50
Criteria F: General criteria	55
Competitive Priority: STEM	15

Outreach includes the following:

Week of April 26	Requests for letters of support sent.
Weeks of April 12, 19, 26/ May 3 and 10	Calls, meetings, presentations, press conferences, and media interviews regarding partnership agreement signatures.
May 17	Letter from Governor Gregoire going to districts who have yet to sign on.
Week of May 17	Use of web, twitter, Facebook, media advisories, and networks to communicate status.
Week of May 17	Collecting letters of support

Partnership Agreement

The essence of a partnership agreement includes:

1. Generally, a state action is linked to a similar district action.
2. The idea is to build on current programs and practices and not necessarily start programs from scratch.
3. Emphasis is on enhancing existing programs and filling gaps.
4. Many items are required by state law, many are included in the recently passed E2SSB 6696.

The state's role in the partnership agreement is:

1. Work collaboratively with district in carrying out the plan outlined in the partnership agreement.
2. Distribute district RTTT funds in a timely manner.
3. Provide feedback and status reports.
4. Provide technical assistance.

The district's role in the partnership agreement is:

1. Implement the plan outlined.
2. Participate in RTTT sharing activities.
3. Follow the U.S. Department of Education's guidelines for posting products developed through RTTT and completing evaluation requirements.
4. Be supportive and committed to working on all or a significant portion of the state reform plan.
5. Provide a final scope of work to the state no later than 90 days following the grant award.
6. Align provisions of RTTT with applicable district/association collective bargaining agreement.
7. Four-year grant.
8. Agreement null and void if grant is not awarded.

Education Reform Plan Framework

Washington has four goals for the Education Reform Plan Framework that all Washington students will:

1. Enter kindergarten prepared for success.
2. Complete in math and science nationally and internationally.
3. Attain high academic standards regardless of race, ethnicity, income or gender and close the achievement gap.
4. Graduate able to succeed in college, training, and careers.

Our kindergarten students are often unprepared for success. Despite some success on national measures, our students struggle to meet the state's academic standards, most often in math and science. There is a significant and persistent achievement gap and graduation and dropout rates are constant. Washington ranks 45th in high school students that go directly to college, compared to other states. Ms. Harding gave examples of the strategies to obtain the four goals listed.

Next Steps

Current	Review by the Attorney General's office
Weeks of May 10 and 17	Drafts of narrative budgets, appendices, tables, and charts being cross checked and aligned with narratives
May 23	Finalize the draft Education Reform Plan Framework

May 21-25	Reviews and edit draft application
May 26-28	Assemble application
June 1	Submit grant to the U.S. Department of Education
June 2010	Develop a plan for finalizing the Education Reform plan completion
July 2010	Finalists announced
September 2010	Grantee winners announced
Summer 2010 – winter 2011	Formalize draft components, plan broad based constituent discussions, cart recommendations, take to legislature, QEC and others
September – November 2010	Washington districts develop 90 day plans
December 2010 – March 2011 (TBD)	Innovation clusters grant process

Elementary and Secondary Education Reauthorization and U.S. Department of Education Discussion of SBE Accountability Index

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director

Ms. Sarah Rich, Research Director

In March 2010, the Obama Administration unveiled a Blueprint for Reform, which is a proposal for Elementary and Secondary Education (ESEA) reauthorization. ESEA, which was called No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in its most recent iteration, has been up for renewal since 2007. The Blueprint has spurred a series of congressional committee hearings, public debates, and news coverage. The goal for the administration is to keep what was positive about NCLB, while addressing the major criticisms of the existing laws. The proposal intends to eliminate the perverse incentives in NCLB, which encouraged states to lower standards and focus on test preparation.

The Blueprint has been received positively by the Council of Chief State School Officers, National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), National School Boards Association (NASBA,) the Alliance for Excellent Education and other policy groups. OSPI has issued a set of legislative recommendations that are aligned to the Blueprint themes.

The National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) oppose linking teacher evaluation to student achievement. They argue that teachers have too much responsibility and not enough authority. Only teachers' unions have expressed overall opposition to the Blueprint.

The Board will need to monitor changes closely and consider postponing major policy decisions such as revisions to the school improvement plans and other elements of the reauthorization process until it has been finalized. Congress is expected to take action on ESEA Reauthorization in 2011, although timing is unpredictable.

System Performance Accountability (SPA) Update (Recognition for Achievement Gap Awards)

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director

Dr. Kris Mayer, Board Lead

Dr. Pete Bylsma, Board Consultant

Using the SBE Accountability Index, the OSPI and SBE recognized 174 schools through their new joint recognition program, which occurred on May 5, 2010. The possible awards were as follows:

1. Language arts (reading and writing combined).
2. Math.
3. Science.
4. Extended graduation rate.
5. Gifted programs.

The plan was to recognize schools that closed the socioeconomic achievement gap, but the criteria established to receive this award were determined as too stringent, so no schools met the criteria and no recognition was given.

At the April 13 SPA meeting, two awards for closing the achievement gap were recommended:

1. Use the Accountability Index matrix; look at gap based on socioeconomic status (SES).
2. Use modified matrix for subgroups; look at gap based on race/ethnicity.

In addition, the SPA Work Group suggested an award for improvement as well as not awarding schools on overall excellence if they had a significant achievement gap.

Board members want to understand more about OSPI's English Language Learner (ELL) data and progress toward closing the achievement gap for those students. It was suggested that the Board meet with the Achievement Gap Advisory Group to work on this together.

Public Comment

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

Mr. Knue thanked the Board for the work on Core 24, saying that flexibility is not only key, but paramount to achieving Core 24. The WACTE always stands ready on where Core 24 is going to go. The Board has raised the rigor by advancing to career – not just college – to fully understand next steps that are available. When we create choices, we inadvertently put a value on statements, such as “opt-out of default curriculum.” We have to be careful when rolling out the choices.

Elissa Dyson, Onion Creek School District, School Board Member

Ms. Dyson thanked the Board for the many hours of devotion to our children's needs. She thanked Ms. Amy Bradgon for her recent visit to Onion Creek. Ms. Dyson has been fortunate to visit 75 small districts in the state and said that education is a central part of her life. As the years and initiatives come and go, she is concerned about the bad rap that students are getting from the discussion of failing schools. If we produce higher test scores, we may be providing our students with a worse education. The expectations go way beyond passing a test. She encouraged the Board to define what a good education for students should be during the strategic planning session on Friday.

Kim Howard, Washington State Parent Teacher Association (WSPTA)

Some PTA members have expressed strong support for the implementation of Core 24 because they are involved parents whose children come into the system prepared. They also continue to support their children through the K-12 experience. This group of children typically does well in the current system. Many parents indicated that they could benefit from increased rigor and challenge. They want their kids to be prepared for success in the 21st century and understand that our current system is not adequate in meeting today's needs. Our concern is that if we impose additional requirements for high school graduation on a system that is already inadequately funded to meet the needs of many students, we are creating an inherently unfair burden on students and districts. We must advocate for adequate resources to support the needs of both those students who come into the system prepared and those who need additional support to succeed. When adequate support and funding are available for all students, the WSPTA will fully support the implementation of Core 24. Our kids deserve no less.

Arden Watson, Marysville School District Teachers Association

Ms. Watson is a fourth grade teacher. She indicated that one of the roles of the Board is reform around struggling schools. She shared her experience in Marysville, saying that there are two schools identified for a school improvement grant – Tulalip Elementary School and Totem Middle School. When she learned about the two schools as being identified as the lower five

percent she knew the tribes would be very concerned. The tribes care about their children and have invested time and energy in the schools. She's been involved in meetings with the school district and OSPI staff who gave support going through the process. The collaboration between the association and district is critical for working together to figure it out. The district chose the transformation model. The way Washington looks at school achievement is 'right on'. The district is trying to manage data that is time consuming for teachers who don't have a lot of time. Teachers need time to collaborate with each other; otherwise we're not going to get there. We continue to lose funding and have no more learning improvement days left. Waivers and early release days is where we're stuck when there are no resources. Teachers got layoff notices in Marysville this week and classified staff will be cut in the next couple of weeks. We need to find a way to fix the funding issues in the state.

180 Day Waiver Requests

Mr. Brad Burnham, Policy and Legislative Specialist

The new waiver options for districts include:

1. Long standing procedure will continue where districts can propose requests without restrictions to number of days and types of strategies and activities. Requests are approved by the full Board during a regular Board meeting.
2. Waivers for economy and efficiency, where districts can propose requests for the purposes of economy and efficiency. There are no restrictions of number of days and types of strategies and activities and requests are approved by the full Board during a regular Board meeting.
3. The new "fast track" option approved by the Board in March 2010 includes:
 - ✓ Staff reviews districts' plans to ensure they meet the criteria and eligibility requirements.
 - ✓ The Board does not review plans for approval if plans meet the criteria and eligibility requirements.
 - ✓ The maximum days requested are three.
 - ✓ Districts must use one or more of the specified strategies and activities.

Mr. Burnham presented the eight districts requesting waivers for consideration during the business meeting on Friday and gave an overview of each request. Those requesting waivers include:

1. Colton School District
2. Elma School District
3. Granite Falls School District
4. Oakesdale School District
5. Riverside School District
6. Rosalia School District
7. St. John-Endicott School District
8. White Pass School District

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m. by Vice-chair Steve Dal Porto.

May 14, 2010

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

Absent: Ms. Austianna Quick (excused), Mr. Warren Smith (excused) (2)

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

Staff Absent: Ms. Ashley Harris (excused) (1)

Call to Order

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

Announcements

Chair Vincent announced that the special Board meeting for further discussion on Core 24 graduation requirements is scheduled for June 15.

Wrap Up from 2010 Session: Budget and Key Legislation

Mr. Brad Burnham, Policy and Legislative Specialist

The House and Senate budget-writers worked to complete a compromise tax package to raise approximately \$800 million. The legislature closed the \$2.8 billion budget gap by:

- Reducing expenditures by approximately \$755 million.
- Incorporating approximately \$618 million of approved or anticipated additional federal relief to Washington State.
- Transferring \$690 million in the Budget Stabilization Account and other funds to the state general fund.
- Raising \$757 million in new revenue.

The legislature protected spending on all programs considered basic education. They continue to fully fund basic education programs such as the highly capable or gifted program, all day kindergarten for the 20 percent of schools with the highest poverty levels, and children's food programs. Key policy bills passed that affect the SBE include the education reform bill under SB 6696 with its accountability provision, including required action intervention, a STEM work group, creation of a biology end of course assessment and dropout reengagement programs.

SBE will sustain a two percent cut overall and must also cut its staff compensation using ten furlough days unless an alternate plan is approved.

SBE Strategic Planning

Ms. Bonnie Berk, Berk & Associates

Ms. Natasha Fedo, Berk & Associates

The elements to consider in the Board's Strategic Planning process are to develop a common understanding of the policy environment. The four federal assurances were noted as follows:

1. Standards and assurances.
2. Data systems to support instruction.
3. Great teachers and leaders.
4. Turning around lowest-achieving schools.

The members broke out in five groups and discussed the goals of the Board and came together for discussion on the outcomes of each group. The goals that were presented after the breakout session are as follows:

1. Be a top state for post secondary attainment, the 21st century world of work and citizenship.
2. Close the achievement gap for all students.
3. Most effective teacher workforce.

4. Build public/private partnership through the STEM Center by 2011.
5. A rational, accountable, and effective governance structure for public education.

Ms. Fedo and Ms. Berk will prepare draft 1.0 from today's discussion, which will be sent out to the Members by close of business Monday, May 17.

The five groups will meet together to discuss further ideas on their goals (what's missing, how we can make goals actionable). Feedback should be sent to Ms. Harding who will then send it on to Ms. Berk and Ms. Fedo. A team lead was identified for each goal to refine for 2.0 version of goals with actionable strategies and timelines.

Public Comment

Jim Kowalkowski, Rural Education Center and Davenport School District

Mr. Kowalkowski commended the Board for the work it's doing for kids. He thanked the nine Board members who met with ESD superintendents on May 12 and said he appreciated that the Board members listened to what the superintendents had to say. He supports the Core 24 ITF recommendation to change the definition of credit, saying it's not about seat time it's about competency. The credit recovery advocacy was a 15 to 0 vote. He thinks that needs to be in place before anything else. Districts are struggling with this. Credit and competency can be used interchangeably. He supports credits and competencies in middle school. The high school and beyond plan vote is good. Discussion has to take place at an early age.

Wally Endicott, Kids at Hope

Hope is a powerful concept that we learn rather than being born with it. High school kids have been tracked for some time, looking at their tests, college entry, etc. to determine success in college. From research, we know that we believe in the success of our children and kids need meaningful, sustainable relationships with adults, to define their success. We need to bring a culture together and create communities.

Business Items

Math Standard Setting Plan for Grades 3-8

Motion was made to adopt the math standard setting plan for the new math assessments for grades 3-8.

Motion seconded

Motion carried with Ms. Ryan and Chair Vincent abstaining

Authorization of State Board of Education Chair to Sign Race to the Top Education Reform Grant Application

Motion was made to authorize the Board's Chair to sign the Washington Race to the Top Education Reform Grant Application, provided that the Chair deems the following three conditions are met:

1. The Race to the Top application clearly shows:
 - a. How the state education agency will organize itself to implement the state's education reform plan; and
 - b. How the state will organize the overall governance structure to oversee the execution of the state's education reform plan.

2. The Race to the Top application contains clear baseline information, action strategies, and ways to measure progress for each of the state's four major reform goals.
3. A final state education reform plan complete with implementation detail will be completed by September 15, 2010 with a more full, robust engagement with our stakeholders. Work plan tasks and timelines will be signed off by each member of the steering committee prior to the Race to the Top application sign-off.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Authorization of State Board of Education Chair to Sign Race to the Top Assessment Program Grant Application

Motion was made to authorize the Board's Chair to sign Washington State's Race to the Top Assessment Program Grant Application

Motion seconded

Motion carried

180 Day Waiver Requests

Motion was made to approve Colton, Elma, Granite Falls, Oakesdale, Riverside, Rosalia, St. John-Endicott, and White Pass School District's request for waivers from the 180 school day requirement for the number of days and school years requested in their applications to the Board.

Motion seconded

Motion carried with Ms. Bragdon, Chair Vincent, and Dr. Mayer abstaining

Evergreen School District Basic Education Compliance

Motion was made to certify Evergreen School District of Clark County as being in compliance with the basic education allocation entitlement requirements for the 2009-10 school year.

Motion seconded

Motion carried with Ms. Bragdon and Chair Vincent abstaining

Arts Contest

Ms. Anna Laura Kastama, Student Board Member

Mr. Jared Costanzo, Student Board Member

Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Communications Manager

Students were asked to create a short video addressing this year's question: "Why are the Arts Important to Students?" There were 28 entries in the contest and Best in Show Awards were given to:

- ✓ Vashon High School to participating students Leah Andrews, Corrine Pruet, and Conrad Pearson.
- ✓ Oakland Bay Junior High School, in the Shelton School District, to participating students Coreless Fletcher, Colby Fuller, and Priscilla Ramirez.

There were twelve other schools receiving Honorable Mention.

Since this year's student video contest was a success, it will become a yearly event. Each year's topic will revolve around one component of our high school graduation requirements framework.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m. by Chair Jeff Vincent.