

Washington State Board of Education
Regular Meeting
North Thurston Administration Building, Lacey
June 15-16, 2006

MINUTES

Thursday, June 15, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 9:07 a.m. Chair Ryan welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed various items on the agenda. The Washington Learns report will be today rather than on Friday.

Members Present: Dr. Bernal Baca, Amy Bragdon, Dr. Terry Bergeson, Dr. Steve Dal Porto, Steve Floyd, Dr. Sheila Fox, Phyllis Bunker Frank, Linda W. Lamb, Eric Liu, Dr. Kristina Mayer, Mary Jean Ryan, Jeff Vincent, and Student Representative Zachary Kinman

Members Excused: John C. Schuster, Warren T. Smith Sr., and Student Representative Tiffany Thompson

Staff Present: Bob Butts, Pat Eirish, Laura Moore, and Sarah Bland

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: Moved by Dr. Bergeson and seconded by Mrs. Lamb to approve the May 11-12 and June 5 minutes with an editorial change to May 11-12. Motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE PANEL

Chair Ryan introduced Representative Dave Quall, 40th District; and Representative Gigi Talcott, 28th District. Representative Quall provided information on his background. He stated there is a possibility that children of color had not received needed assistance. He also suggested that the WASL shouldn't be given until students have had a full year of algebra and geometry. Mathematics instruction should be tied to the standards. Students should have an opportunity to learn; the system does not seem fair to students. He asked the Board to consider these things in their deliberations. He reminded the Board that Accountability Commission had the discussion about requiring all or at least two of three sections meet standard for graduation. Representative Quall questioned the need to have a test in science. Accountability—we should not be beating people over the head for what they are not doing but helping them to achieve more. He would also like to see a third year of mathematics. If the Board has any recommendations, they need to be presented to the committee in December.

Representative Talcott provided history on the changes to the State Board of Education. The Legislature wants academic achievement, accountability, and advocacy from the State Board. She feels that the accountability system created in the state was better than that of the federal government through No Child Left Behind (NCLB). She sees parallels between the phonics wars of the past and the mathematics wars now. There has to be a balance between systematic thinking and the language driven approach. She doesn't want to see the Board become a rubber stamp for what is brought before it. The Board should not lower scores but should expect the scores to rise. Don't get buried in the minutia.

Mr. Floyd stated that ACT has added science as part of their testing procedure. In response to a question, both representatives felt the mathematics needs to be at a higher level than eighth grade. Representative Quall felt that students should have to pass two of the three sections of the WASL until mathematics is fixed. In response to a question, Representative Talcott stated that the only two options are the NCLB accountability system and the graduation requirements for 2008. Representative Quall felt the new duties were the most important that the Board could be given. Representative Talcott asked that the Board not establish a statewide curriculum.

WASHINGTON STATE SCHOOL DIRECTORS' ASSOCIATION (WSSDA)

Martharose Laffey, executive director of WSSDA, which is the professional association for school board members in the state, invited members to the fall conference and stated that the chair will be invited to speak. She introduced Marilee Scarbrough, legal counsel for WSSDA, who attends the State Board meetings. In her review of the four goals for the new State Board, Ms. Laffey disagreed with the state representatives. The Board should provide the non-partisan oversight for the education system. She offered WSSDA communication services to help the Board with its communication. Ms. Laffey stated that the high school WASL should be closely monitored by the State Board with regard to validity, reliability, and opportunity to learn. The Board needs to look for best practices to serve all students, including those minority students facing the achievement gap. She urged participation in memorandum of understanding on HB 1495 and continued support for the First Peoples Language and Cultural Pilot Project. She admonished the Board to advocate for itself and press for more funding to do its job. She asked the Board to consider asking for school construction to be returned to the Board. She provided information on the Learning First Alliance and urged the Board to again become members of the Alliance. Typically the executive director and chair of each organization belong. Ms. Laffey suggested creating listservs for various publics for the Board to use. In response to a question, Ms. Laffey stated that WSSDA will be willing to help in the election process next year to get the voting rates higher. In response to another question, Ms. Laffey stated that the Board presents a positive image of education; the Legislature needs to be more supportive of the Board through providing more resources; and there needs to be a strong accountability system but not state intervention in school districts.

WASHINGTON ROUNDTABLE

Bruce Williams and Marc Frazer of the Washington Roundtable provided information on the Roundtable to the Board members. Mr. Williams outlined changes that have taken place over the last few years, and what the needs of a two-year-old child today will be in sixteen years. He feels that there is a lack of confidence in the public education system. The WASL is one of the divisions in the system at present. The mathematics scores are disappointing but provide an opportunity to improve the system. Focus items—world class graduation requirements and standards (report on file with minutes); evaluate mathematics standards and requirements; help for districts and schools where half the students did not meet standard; focus on innovation and accountability. The Roundtable is encouraging the Board to work with other states and not reinvent the wheel. In response to a question, the Roundtable did discuss the WASL scores, but also on what can be done to improve the standards. Mr. Williams and Mr. Frazer encouraged the Board to have districts/schools become more innovative. The system has to serve all students no matter what their backgrounds are. The Roundtable suggests that a mathematics audit be done in low performing districts to find out what the problems are. There should be state authority to do something when performance does not increase. They offered support through the Partnership for Learning organization.

ACCOUNTABILITY DISCUSSION

Bob Butts provided background information on the accountability discussions that have taken place and what the discussion today will encompass. He introduced Rob MacGregor, assistant superintendent for School Improvement at the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). Mr. MacGregor introduced contractors Bill Rossman, Victoria Romero, Craig Shureck, and Terry Hodge who work as school improvement facilitators. He reviewed the school improvement model and assistance for members. Dr. Bergeson stated that the facilitators work for OSPI not the districts/schools they are serving. Mr. MacGregor reviewed the school and district improvement when adequate yearly progress (AYP) is not met for two years. The OSPI has no authority to intervene in districts as required by NCLB. Members asked for more detailed information on the district improvement process and what schools and districts are in improvement. There is a report due to the U.S. Dept. of Education in July on the quality of teachers in the low performing districts. The facilitators stated that the process works; there is a need for more teeth on the accountability part of the equation. In response to a question, Ms. Hodge stated that the facilitators work as coaches, mentors, trainers, or whatever is needed. Mr. Shureck stated that the Association of Washington School Principals has started a program around the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards to help with principal leadership in the schools, especially those in improvement programs. At the present time, there is a disconnect with the school boards as a whole. Mr. MacGregor stated that he felt there needs to be a recognition system for those schools/districts are making progress but still not making AYP. The system needs to marry school improvement and district improvement assistance.

WASHINGTON LEARNS

Dr. Bergeson reviewed the Washington Learns K-12 Advisory Committee work and what will be happening this summer. They have not looked at the finance side of the system. They will be looking at what needs to be done to improve the system and make a proposal to improve.

Goals from the K-12 Advisory

- ✓ Readiness of kindergarten
 - What kindergarten needs to do to have students ready for 1-12;
 - What 1-12 needs to do for kindergarten?

End of third grade

- ✓ Grade level expectations met

Middle school goals

- ✓ Basic needs
- ✓ Harness their energy—change expectations
- ✓ Civics project

High school

- ✓ Increased graduation requirements—students accepted (college or work) without remediation
- ✓ Increasing expectation measures—relevance to individual plan
- ✓ Celebration of diverse community and place in the world—understanding cultures

There is something beyond the WASL. Someone has to be accountable for results. Accountability has to produce results. There has to be directed funding if there are increases in dollars available. There is inequity in the funding system based on the ability of the local district to raise additional funds through levies. Not all students can be funded at the same level because of the special needs of struggling students (English language learners, minorities,

special education, etc.). The Board needs to think about the positives and not strictly focus on compliance issues. The Board will have to take a stand on financing of education.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

Chair Ryan introduced Mary Campbell, who facilitated the strategic planning portion of the meeting.

Why do we need a strategic plan?

Ms. Campbell explained that a strategic plan is intended to answer three Questions:

1. Where are we now?
2. Where do we want to go? An aspiration or an achievement
3. How to we get there

The Board is required to submit a strategic plan to OFM with their budget request, and OFM stipulates the elements required in the plan. All of those elements can be helpful to the board as a basis for their work plan and a communication tool with constituents.

If the Board has strategic oversight over the K-12 system, the board can use the strategic planning process to determine the strategies that will be most effective in driving the system to deliver the intended results.

Ms. Campbell reminded the Board of the ground rules that were established at the March meeting for working together. Adherence to the ground rules will keep us on track for today's session. Mary also suggested that we focus on describing the concepts we would want to capture in the elements of the plan, and not spend Board time wordsmithing.

What is the K-12 system over which the Board has strategic oversight authority?

We began by defining the organizations and entities with implementation authority in K-12. These include:

- School boards
- State Board of Education
- OSPI
- Teachers
- Professional Educators Standards Board
- Superintendents and principals
- ESD
- Educator Preparation

Outside of K-12, there are other organizations with influence over the implementers:

- Legislature
- PTA
- Governor
- Voc Ed
- Professional associations

What is the Board's vision for the K-12 system?

Ms. Campbell asked the board to brainstorm the long-term vision they hold for K-12 in Washington.

- Students have the best opportunity to live, learn and work **in their world**.
- Business comes here for educated workforce.
- Kids can lead productive satisfying lives.
- System not an octopus.
- Legislature gets a good return on investment
- Proud of working on it
- **Learner focused**
- System not self preserving
- Evolving and **dynamic**
- Dramatically improved
- User friendly

- No boundaries
- More choices
- Relevance to interests and future
- We're doing it.
- **Innovative**—self regulation
- Teacher leadership—home grown,
- innovative
- Seen as a resource (like Asian concept of revering teachers)
- Nimble and responsive

Ms. Campbell asked the board to identify the most compelling words or phrases that they would want to see reflected in a vision. Those words are bolded in the vision brainstorm. Other additional concepts include:

- Competitive—not competitive in the sense of going against one another—excelling
- **Initiative** and Creative Students
- **Excitement**
- **Personalized**
- **Common sense**
- Dynamic
- Learner focused—empowerment
- **Responsive to student demands**
- **Rigorous**
- **Prepared** to tackle
- **Disciplined**
- Inclusive of all students
- **Rewards competency**
- Global environment
- Safe environment

What role does the Board play in the K-12 system?

Ms. Campbell suggested that the board approach the discussion of the Board's mission by asking:

1. Who expects something from the board?
2. What do they expect? What contribution does the Board make in K-12?
3. How will the Board's contribution affect the K-12 system and its results?

The group brainstormed the following aspects of the Board's role:

- Set standards
- Hold people accountable—implementing and system—including Board
- Clearly communicate to stakeholders where we are
- Visionary/futuristic
- Advocacy and leadership
- Cutting edge; best practices
- Common sense policy; resources
- Recommend steps to improve
- Defining and measuring the end product
- Flexibility of resources
- Address and resolve policy issues
- Forum—convening policy leaders
- Advocacy for resources
- Help the legislature to define basic education and fund it.

Ms. Campbell asked the members to indicate their concurrence with the brainstormed list of responsibilities by flashing a green, red or yellow card. All members flashed a green card. Staff will develop a mission statement from these concepts and bring it back to the board for approval over email or at the next meeting.

How will the State Board advance its vision?

The Board's next task is to identify three to five goals—the major accomplishments that the Board would want to look back on completing in three years. The Board has been given profound authority but limited resources to implement the authority—so it must be very strategic in what it chooses.

Ms. Campbell led the board in a SLOT exercise to identify:

1. Strengths - What do the State Board and its K-12 partners have going for them? What assets and strengths can they draw on to forward the vision?
2. Limitations – Where are we tripping over each other or not working as effectively as possible?
3. Opportunities - What forces or influences outside of K-12 can we harness or leverage to achieve our vision?
4. Threats - What external forces or influences could adversely impact our ability to achieve our vision?

Strengths

- Commitment—positive progress; move to a place where we are all proud of
- More believers
- Readiness for change—big hill to climb; ready for new solutions and ready for the definitions
- Highly competent and skilled people
- Experience of what hasn't worked in the pass
- Student perspective
- Gifted staff
- Diverse perspectives
- Shared purpose
- Teachers more focused on standards
- Healthy skepticism
- New start, new set of eyes

Limitations

- Different constituencies and difference views of relationship to them
- Different views of accountabilities
- Answerable to different groups
- Roles of have changed—turfs issues emerging as roles changes
- Lack of confidence by the public
- Gap between higher ed preparation and teachers in the field
- Lack of resources—not aligned with vision
- Gaps between early childhood-K-12-higher education widen with more definition
- Past track record, skepticism
- Anxiety—crash before liftoff
- No common forum for “the system”
- Authority vs. real power to do something
- System is very slow and has been too cautious
- Governance fragmented
- Lack of courage
- Stove pipes—teachers—local curricula; schools boards—small/large; superintendents/principals; elementary vs. high school
- Accountability overload”—home grown plus federal plus new emphasis
- 180-day—contact time
- Fear of loss of local control

Opportunities

- People in the general public care—huge and should be leveraged
- Legislature has high expectations
- Governor willing to fight
- Terry willing to fight
- Washington Learns in sync with this
- National resources in our state—Gates, Education Trust, national leaders
- Communities of color pushing

- standards
- Public asking questions about how we do testing

- NCLB may be reauthorized—can be revisited

Threats

- Lack of confidence by public
- Tax system
- Feds might withhold dollars
- Worry about loss of local control
- Legislature could go sideways

Given the results of the SLOT analysis, Mary asked each board member to identify the three things that they felt the board should focus on accomplishing. The focus question was: if the board can only make a difference in THREE areas in the next three years, what three difference should the board focus on making?

Each member identified three priority areas in which to make a difference, then worked with two other members to identify three priorities from their combined lists. The three priorities from each group were posted on the wall and the board looked for similar themes among the posted priorities. Seven categories emerged as listed below. Each category includes the individual priorities set off in parentheses. All agreed that the state board would be viewed as proactively leading if it was able to make measurable progress in any or all of these 7 areas.

- 1. Student Outcomes and Policy Environment**
 - 25% (all groups) move to postsecondary education;
 - grad rate up/dropout rate down
 - graduation credit requirements for 21st century
 - graduates with viable options
 - mathematics achievement up significantly
- 2. Resources and tools needed to achieve vision**
 - Everyone in K-12 understands role in achievement
 - more seamless strategic governance
 - adequate long term resources
 - use of resources and structures
- 3. Accountability system (how are we implementing the vision?)**
 - accountability (students/teaches/systems) system accepted
 - reward-driven accountability;
 - accountability=continuous learning culture
- 4. Opportunity to learn**
 - remove barriers to educational excellence and equity
 - equitable opportunity for safe learning environment
 - major achievement gains for English language learners (ELL)
- 5. Improved teacher quality—high quality teacher for every kid every year**

Candid discussions about whether it is getting done, and what lies ahead

- annual “State of Education” report

6. Navigation 101 has personalized learning

The staff will work with Mary to draft a vision, mission and goals for the board and bring them to the board for approval.

COMMUNICATIONS

Casey Corr provided some suggestions on communications at the stakeholder and “Aunt Mabel” levels.

WASHINGTON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Chair Ryan introduced Charles Hasse, president of the Washington Education Association. Mr. Hasse reviewed the “Take the Lead” Campaign—a long-term effort to permanently increase funding for Washington’s public schools (report and slides on file with these minutes). Success of the program depends on:

- ✓ Washington Learns
- ✓ Potential network for excellence in Washington schools (NEWS) lawsuit
- ✓ November elections
- ✓ Growing public support to make a permanent change
- ✓ Collective will of the voters that it’s time to “Take the Lead” for our children

Mr. Hasse spoke against using the WASL as a high stakes requirement or the only test for Washington students. He noted that more discussion needs to take place regarding mathematics. Mr. Hasse responded to several questions regarding the single test format; meeting standards; etc.

Meeting recessed at 5:22 p.m.

Friday, June 16, 2006

Chair Ryan called the meeting to order at 8:02 a.m.

Members Present: Dr. Bernal Baca, Amy Bragdon, Dr. Terry Bergeson, Dr. Steve Dal Porto, Steve Floyd, Dr. Sheila Fox, Phyllis Bunker Frank, Linda W. Lamb, Eric Liu, Dr. Kristina Mayer, Mary Jean Ryan, Jeff Vincent, and Student Representative Zachary Kinman

Members Excused: John C. Schuster, Warren T. Smith Sr., and Student Representative Tiffany Thompson

Staff Present: Bob Butts, Pat Eirish, Laura Moore, and Sarah Bland

Chair Ryan thanked staff for their work. She also asked for any items for upcoming meetings be sent to her or staff.

TAB 4—BUSINESS ITEMS

- ✓ Executive Director Search—Sheila Emery reported on the progress being made for the executive director replacement.
- ✓ Citizens Advisory Panel—Steve Floyd reported on the process and progress in selecting members to the panel. Mr. Floyd asked that Amy Bragdon and Steve Dal Porto be on the screening committee.

Motion: Moved by Mrs. Frank and seconded by Dr. Baca to approve the selection committee of Steve Floyd, Amy Bragdon and Steve Dal Porto. Motion carried.

- ✓ Liaison Relationships—Bob Butts reviewed the liaison positions with the various education family members. Mrs. Frank provided information on past liaison relations with the various groups. Mrs. Lamb stated that where the groups are vital to the Board's work plan should be accommodated. Mr. Butts noted that AWSP, WASA, and WSSDA have requested liaisons. Consensus of the Board was to hold on the liaison appointments until the Board has settled its work plan. Zachary Kinman will report on the Washington Association of Student Councils (WASC) fall conference at the July meeting.
- ✓ Committees—Yakima Caucus (Bernal Baca and Phyllis Bunker Frank) will help with planning for the Yakima Meeting. Kris Mayer will work with Bob Butts and Mary Campbell on the strategic and work plans. The Executive Committee will work on the search process.
- ✓ Executive Director Report—Bob Butts reported on:
 - the ACT Council meeting (Washington Learns K-12 Advisory Group is not looking at entrance testing—the Higher Ed Advisory Group is; having WASL results available to higher education would be helpful; the discussion on the use of the WASL links to students having a fifth year plan);
 - online high school (Insight School) telephone conference call—based in the Quillayute Valley School District. Board members felt that the Board should be more aware and on top of the situation now;
 - the next Washington Learns meetings were listed—June 28: K-12 Advisory Committee meeting in Lacey, and Higher Ed Advisory Committee at the University of Washington; July 10: Steering Committee meeting;
 - OSPI Summer Institutes—June 19-22 (Spokane), July 31-Aug. 3 (Yakima), Aug. 14-17 (SeaTac)
 - Accountability—suggested a white paper on best practices from the ten years of accountability, etc. Dr. Fox suggested continuous monitoring of individuals over time and rewarding districts who improve student achievement over several years. Mr. Vincent felt that waiting to do the paper until October/November was too late. What does the 26th ranking of the state mean? Mr. Butts reviewed information on the ranking provided to members. Dr. Dal Porto noted that, with the testing requirements of NCLB, the study of students over time will be made easier. We need to get started as soon as possible to have it ready for the Legislature. A consultant may need to be hired to help with the writing project.

TAB 5—180-DAY WAIVER REQUESTS FOR EDMONDS, GRAPEVIEW, MARY WALKER, NORTH MASON, RIVERSIDE, AND SULTAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Pat Eirish, State Board staff, presented information on the six districts requesting waivers from the 180-day requirements. Questions were raised about the districts being paid for tri-days. Dr. Dal Porto asked for information on how many days are being paid beyond the 180-day contract and what personnel are doing with those days. Dr. Mayer suggested the Board ask the Legislature to reinstitute the Learning Improvement Days (LID) rather than continually granting waivers.

Mrs. Lamb said she appreciated the school district's inclusion of assessment scores, but noted none for the social sciences, arts or health and fitness which have classroom-based assessments available and are also required of districts.

Motion: Moved by Mrs. Lamb and seconded by Mrs. Frank to approve the requested waiver days for Edmonds, Grapeview, Mary Walker, North Mason, Riverside, and Sultan School Districts for one year. Motion carried with one abstention.

Dr. Fox would like to have the Board look to a performance-based system and start moving in that direction.

Chair Ryan stated that the Board will be reviewing the rule concerning waivers, looking at the evidence of success and require more data. The increase in the LID days is a separate issue that should be raised with Washington Learns and the Legislature. Mrs. Lamb noted that the current funding system holds K-12 back from moving to a performance-based system.

Zachary Kinman announced that Student Representative Tiffany Thompson had won a \$1,000 scholarship at Girls State. She is competing for another scholarship.

MATHEMATICS DISCUSSION

What are the factors that contribute to Achievement in Mathematics? (what do we know?)

What does the State Board **choose** to do to influence or leverage those factors? (strategy)

What constitutes "evidence"?

1. Research
2. Experience in the field
3. Sound logic

Dr. Bergeson provided the information on mathematics results from the spring high school WASL testing through the statistical information. The Promoting Academic Success (PAS) program will generate dollars for summer school help as well as extra help during the coming school year. The small districts have an additional funding base to help them. PAS dollars are only for high school students. In response to a question, credit retrieval courses are being changed to incorporate the standards modules and giving credit to students. Dr. Bergeson stated that the on-time graduation rate is 70%; fifth year rate is 75%. The minority populations have much worse graduation rates.

Mrs. Lamb asked about a diagnostic or pre-assessment tool to identify gaps in knowledge. She also hoped that someone would hold a summit on the drop out rate to find out what the various groups are doing.

Bob Butts proposed three phases on the discussion/work.

1. What do we know?
2. What are our options?
3. Here are the options based on what is out there
 - ✓ What do we know—what questions do members want answered?
 - ✓ Why are students not meeting standard?
 - ✓ What is possible for intensive teacher retraining in the short term?
 - ✓ What would staff recommend for curriculum options?

- ✓ Shouldn't we be teaching for the test? Same curriculum would help.
- ✓ Disaggregate by race/ethnicity; immigrant/non-immigrant; English language learners
- ✓ What kinds of barriers are holding students back?
- ✓ What curriculum programs are designed around the EALRs?
- ✓ How difficult is the test?
- ✓ Short-term: In what ways are mathematics skills presented with relevance? Long-term: teacher endorsements in mathematics.
- ✓ Consider the same type of model as used for reading and writing for the mathematics problems.
- ✓ How are we holding the kids responsible?
- ✓ What kind of mathematics credits should a student have for college and work?
- ✓ What are other countries doing that is different from us?
- ✓ We need to take a look at the mathematics curricula in a district from 1st grade through 12th grade—mathematics audit.
- ✓ How are districts defining integrated mathematics?
- ✓ How do student retrieve credits in mathematics when he/she fails a year of mathematics?
- ✓ Is algebra at the middle school the same as at the high school?
- ✓ What do districts require in mathematics credits?
- ✓ What mathematics series are used and is there a correlation for success?
- ✓ What proof is there continuity between 7th and 8th grade and high school mathematics?
- ✓ We need to take a serious look at time and learning and opportunity to learn.
- ✓ How does the pass/fail rates compare 7th pass/fail rates?
- ✓ What can we learn from the wealthy school districts and their successes?
- ✓ Are students entering with a foundation ready to meet standards and pass the WASL?
- ✓ What are the qualifications of the middle school mathematics teaches?
- ✓ Is there a hook on the PAS money for teacher preparation?
- ✓ What is the applied methodology and does it need changing?
- ✓ How rigorous is the mathematics certification?
- ✓ What should the State Board be doing versus what OSPI should be doing versus what the districts are doing?

Eric Liu suggested taking the WASL to see what we are looking at before jumping into the middle of everything.

TAB 6—PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR STANDARDS BOARD (PESB)

Chair Ryan introduced Jennifer Wallace, executive director of the Professional Educator Standards Board. Ms. Wallace introduced Gina Hobbs, new executive assistant for the Board. Ms. Wallace reviewed the structure of the Standards Board and its responsibilities. She also reviewed the accountability role of the board and its new charge from the Legislature. The Legislature requested an analysis of the preparation programs and that the study becomes the basis for the work plan.

Washington needs—a state-level system for assessing and publicly reporting education preparation program quality

- ✓ Review all current measures of program quality
- ✓ Multiple, meaningful indicators; exemplars; needed improvements

- ✓ Explicit connects between preparation and classroom-required knowledge skills

State-facilitated strategic planning across sectors grounded in student performance data:

- ✓ OSPI school improvement/curriculum/assessments, ESDs with educator preparation programs
- ✓ P-12 schools and educator preparation—pilot collaboration planning and documented lessons learned.

Agreed-upon and widely understood system for review and revision of preparation standards and certification requirements for all educators. Ensure that standards reflect:

- ✓ Focus on diverse learning and learning
- ✓ Use of technology in global world
- ✓ Focus on applied learning
- ✓ Personalization

What we don't know—

- ✓ Whether and where teaching assignments match qualifications
- ✓ Teacher qualifications related to student demographics
- ✓ True picture of out-of-field assignment

State-level capacity and coordination in collecting and analyzing critical data for decision making

- ✓ Make development and implementation of an educator workforce data system a priority

Realistic strategies for ending out-of-field assignment

- ✓ Access, opportunity, affordable—get credential
- ✓ Limit conditional certs and waivers

PESB establish new state standards and a state system to guide the approval and evaluation of providers of professional development that meet continuing education requirements. Web-based centralized professional development registry and evaluation system.

How we can work together?

- ✓ Upcoming joint report to the Legislature
- ✓ Schedule periodic joint Executive Committee and/or Executive Director meetings
- ✓ Standing agenda item to report related to shared concerns at each meeting
- ✓ Consider cross-board appointments to ad hoc committees focused on issues of mutual concern
- ✓ Focus on SBE actions that might have implications for professional preparation

Compensation lacks funding for a performance-based system. This needs to change. Students are failing at the early grades. Elementary teachers have to prepare for nine subjects. This is the critical time for student learning.

MATHEMATICS DISCUSSION (CONTINUED)

The graduation requirements state two credits in mathematics but they have to be to the EALRs and GLEs. Chair Ryan discussed a proposed communication to school districts on the graduation requirement and the districts' responsibility and provide the evidence of meeting these requirements. The letter should be addressed to both superintendents and boards of directors along with principals. Information from a local school district was reviewed. A caution was given that this does not include the information on the elementary preparation. There has to be a close correlation between grades and WASL scores. It is law and rule that the courses be aligned to the EALRs and the GLEs and districts need to make sure that this is happening. The expectation is that students keep taking more mathematics classes are needed. The districts

need to look at all mathematics classes or at least beginning with middle school mathematics to insure that rigor is in the classes before the WASL is administered at the 10th grade. How do we make sure the students are ready for the standards based courses in the 9th grade and beyond?

New modules, based on the recently enacted legislation, are being developed for use in all grades according to Bev Neitzel, Mathematics Initiative administrator for OSPI. There is no standardized pre-assessment tool for students. *First Steps* is the only diagnostic that has been found to this point; geared for grades 1-9. Mathematics is also important for the vocational group of students.

Another question is how do we change the WACs affected to strengthen what is required of districts?

Motion: Moved by Mrs. Lamb and seconded by Dr. Mayer to authorize the chair to send out the letter as discussed to superintendents, boards of directors, and principals regarding the requirements for mathematics. Motion carried.

TAB 7—WASL CUTSCORE APPROVAL

Joe Willhoft, assistant superintendent for Assessment and Research with OSPI; and Tom Hirsch, AES, provided information on the standards setting process that the Board needs to approve. Following the process, the panel will make recommendations that will come to the Board for approval at the July meeting. Dr. Willhoft provided some history of the process.

Standard Setting Process

- ✓ National TAC approves a standard setting procedure and an agenda to be followed
- ✓ Governing body approves the process
- ✓ Standard setting panel(s) is assembled
- ✓ Operational tests are scored, items are calibrated, and ordered booklets are assembled
- ✓ Panel(s) convenes, uses Bookmark method to arrive at recommended cut scores
- ✓ Articulation Committee refines recommended cut scores (if necessary) for coherence
- ✓ National TAC affirms that the approved procedures and agenda were followed
- ✓ Governing body receives recommendations and sets cut scores

Panelists will be attending the July State Board meeting. Observers are limited to technical staff from the contractor and TAC. There is a review for bias of all test items through a panel of diverse citizens and statistically after the first use of the test. In setting the bookmarks, the panelists are looking for the fence line between just barely meeting standard and meeting standard, etc. There is very little predetermined for panelists—they are not allowed to re-arrange the booklets. Disparity does happen between panel members.

Summary of what the bookmark method looks like to a panel members

- ✓ Introduction
 1. Discussion of purpose of assessments
 2. Overview of standard setting process
 3. Advisory role of standard setting panels
- ✓ Review current WASL (e.g. 4th grade reading)
- ✓ Take and score the test (e.g. 3rd grade reading)
- ✓ Understand “Performance Level Descriptors”
- ✓ Learning about Bookmark procedure
- ✓ Round 1
 1. Go through ordered booklet
 2. For each item:
 - a) If 2/3 of “barely proficient” students would get it correct, move on;

- b) If not, place bookmark
- c) Repeat for “barely advanced” and “barely basic”
- ✓ Round 2
 1. Look at Round 1 results for the group; discuss at small tables
 2. Look at impact data (actual item difficulties)
 3. Go through ordered booklet and reconsider placement of bookmarks from Round 1
- ✓ Round 3
 1. Look at Round 2 results for the group; discuss at small tables
 2. Go through ordered booklet and make final placement of bookmarks
- ✓ Discussion of recommendations across all panels
- ✓ Articulation Committee meets to review coherence of entire system

Standard setting is a juried process but not an arbitrary process.

Motion: Moved by Mrs. Frank and seconded by Mrs. Lamb to approve the standard setting process. Motion carried.

TAB 8—COLLECTION OF EVIDENCE

Joe Willhoft and Lesley Klenk, program manager on collection of evidence with OSPI. Sharon Schilperoort, Writing Assessment Specialist, OSPI; Dennis McPhee, student at New Market Skills Center; and Les Holiday, English Instructor at New Market Skills Center in Tumwater, were present to answer questions. She also introduced Rod Duckworth, director of Career and Technical Education with OSPI.

OSPI Responsibilities (SB 6475)

- ✓ Develop alternative methods that evaluate classroom work samples prepared by students
- ✓ Develop guidelines including types and number of work samples collected from academic, career and technical courses
- ✓ Develop administrative protocols for collection procedures
- ✓ Develop uniform scoring criteria, scoring process and state and/or regional level scoring panel
- ✓ Develop COE pathways for CTE students in which work samples may come from academic, CTE work samples, and/or work samples representing skills from a state or nationally approved industry certificate program

State Board of Education Responsibilities

- ✓ Review and approve the content guidelines and the administrative protocols for the COE.
 1. Approval date: August 23-24, 2006
- ✓ Review and approve the uniform scoring criteria for the COE and the Professionally Accepted Standards for Reliability and Validity
 1. Approval date: December 1, 2006

Ms. Klenk reviewed the content guidelines. In response to a question, Dr. Willhoft stated that the contact will have to be at the school level. The Educational Service Districts will help with the professional development delivery system. There will be a state level scoring team. There is also information on the OSPI website (www.k12.wa.us) under Assessment for this procedure.

Les Holiday and Dennis McPhee reviewed their experiences with the Collection of Evidence process. Mr. McPhee turned in one of the best Collections. Mr. Holiday stated that he would go through the process and feels that it is valuable. Mr. McPhee stated that he volunteered because he felt that he would be successful and the work didn't look too hard. He also wanted to help make a difference for those students who don't test well. This opened an opportunity for him he wouldn't have had otherwise. In response to a question, Mr. Holiday stated that he was

more concerned with sufficiency rather than proficiency. On a whole, the collections were not sufficient to pass. The students were not always working with the high school standards. In response to a question, Mr. McPhee stated that this should not be looked at as a test, but an opportunity to do their best. Also, that there needs to be more guidance for students and teachers. This allowed him to pick the topics rather than sitting and answering questions.

Dr. Willhoft and Ms. Klenk reviewed the content guidelines for members. These are still in draft form. There has to be one “on-demand” work sample—the student walks into the classroom and completes an assignment in the classroom and turns it in. Timelines were reviewed. Web-based collection of the samples is in the future.

Key messages—Chair Ryan suggested allowing Bob Butts to work with Casey Corr to synthesize the hot topics from the meeting to get to the members.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.