STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Certificate of Mastery Study Committee

DRAFT MINUTES

∩f

Meeting of November 27, 2001 SeaTac Occupational Skills Center

<u>Committee Members Present:</u> Nick Brossoit, Barb Clausen, Lynn Fielding, Gary Gainer, Greg Hall, Don Hanson, Gary Kipp, Bill Moore, Steve Mullin, Larry Norwood (for Bob McMullen), Wes Pruitt, Patty Raichle, Marv Sather, Laura Jo Severson, Chris Thompson, Dennis Wallace, Andy Wheeler, Ron Woldeit

<u>Committee Members Unable to Attend:</u> Lacey Androsko, Terry Densley, Marc Frazer, Linda Hernandez, Denny Hurtado, Gay Selby

Guests: Laura Fuhrman, Geoff Praeger, Doug Scrima, Ron Woodruff

Staff: Larry Davis, Pat Eirish, Bob Butts

...

The meeting was called to order at 3:05^{pm} by State Board of Education and committee member, Ron Woldeit. Members and guests introduced themselves. Larry Davis, Executive Director for the State Board and staff to the committee, introduced Mr. Geoff Praeger, consultant hired by Educational Service District No. 101 (Spokane) via contract with the State Board. Mr. Praeger is providing direct support to the committee via funding provided by the Legislature to the State Board.

Mr. Praeger shared with the committee, and answered questions, information about his work effort to date. (See attached documents.) Mr. Praeger suggested three levels of Opportunity to Learn (OTL) strategies:

- 1. Legal Compliance Level
 - Appropriate curriculum available
 - Sufficient OTL
- 2. Fairness Level
 - What is fair for all kids?
 - Have all kids had the OTL?

Certificate of Mastery Study Committee Minutes of November 27, 2001 Meeting Page Two

- 3. Capacity Level
 - What do we need to build?

Mr. Praeger is proposing organizing the <u>system</u> readiness Opportunity To Learn (OTL) issues into six components: Elements of Curriculum Alignment, Elements of Teacher Preparedness, Elements of Student Awareness, Elements of Parent Awareness, Elements of Special Populations Preparedness, and Support Issues.

Suggestions were made by committee members to separate Curriculum Alignment into three components: Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment; and create new components relating to Early Literacy and Accountability.

Four groups were formed to address the questions under each of the presented components:

- Small group: Elements of Curriculum Alignment
- Small group: Elements of Teacher Preparedness
- Small group: Elements of Student and Parent Awareness
- Small group: Elements of Special Populations Preparedness/Support Issues.

Each group was asked to consider the following:

- What will you need to know in order to make a judgment about the K-12 system's readiness to provide the conditions necessary to assure student opportunity to learn?
- What are your top three areas for in-depth discussion?
- What questions should be eliminated?
- What questions would you like to add?
- Are there terms that need to be defined?

At 6:15 the small groups reported back to the full committee. The input provided to Mr. Praeger will be used by him to further refine the components and questions for development of a draft survey that will be reviewed by the committee at its next meeting. The purpose of the survey instrument will be to establish baseline data as to the readiness of the K-12 system to provide students the Opportunity To Learn the Student Learning Goals (SLGs) and Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs) before students take the high school Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL).

...

Certificate of Mastery Study Committee Minutes of November 27, 2001 Meeting Page Three

Questions and issues raised during the meeting, not necessarily resolved, included:

- Survey questions should not be simple "yes" or "no" answers, but answered using a rating scale or something similar.
- Ask one open-ended question, such as: "Is there one question or concern you would like addressed? (Use only the space provided.)
- In looking at system OTL issues, which of the issues are essential to address for legal purposes? Which of the issues are essential to address for fairness purposes?
 Which of the issues are essential to address for capacity building purposes?
- Is it possible to conduct the survey other than using a statewide sample so that a baseline readiness profile can be established for each district?
- What percent of the baseline database will be represented by the survey information? If the survey will not comprise the full baseline database, what other information gathering strategies will/can be used? (e.g., interviews?, in-depth examination of selected districts?)
- Who will analyze the survey results? What groups might be asked or given the opportunity to help analyze and interpret the survey results?
- Is it possible to build a web-based survey instrument? (Security issues can be problematic.)
- Should districts be asked to self-assess and report to the state?
- Do not make the survey a statutory requirement.
- The State Board of Education needs to make high school WASL performance a
 required information element on the state standardized transcript. [NOTE: The SBE
 has already established this requirement, currently effective with the graduating
 Class of 2007. Attainment of the COM or having met the standard (not the specific
 WASL scores) for a component subject of the COM reading, writing,
 communications, math will be noted on the transcript.]
- A report regarding the COM will be given to the Legislature in January 2002. A draft will be emailed to the committee prior to December 17, 2001.

...

Certificate of Mastery Study Committee Minutes of November 27, 2001 Meeting Page Four

Possible/probable agenda items for the next meeting were discussed, including:

- Presentation by State Superintendent Terry Bergeson on possible compensatory scoring of the WASL and discussion of alternative assessment options.
- Committee discussion of incentive options to encourage students to do their best on the WASL.
- Committee discussion of criteria to be used by the committee to make judgments about the readiness sufficiency of Opportunity To Learn components of the K-12 system.

• Discussion with Geoff Praeger of draft formal survey instrument.

Next meeting date will be emailed to all committee members after checking with Dr. Bergeson's office.

Meeting adjourned at 7:04^{pm} by committee chair, Gary Gainer.

Attachments:

- Feasibility Study Graphic
- Timeline
- OTL Study Components
- Annual Sufficiency Rating Template [drafted by Larry Davis]).