

The Washington State Board of Education

Governance | Achievement | High School and College Preparation | Math & Science | Effective Workforce

November 9-10, 2011
Educational Services District 112
Vancouver, Washington

MINUTES

Wednesday, November 9, 2011

Members Attending: Chair Jeff Vincent, Vice-chair Steve Dal Porto, Dr. Bernal Baca, Ms. Amy Bragdon, Mr. Jared Costanzo, Mr. Randy Dorn, Ms. Connie Fletcher, Dr. Sheila Fox, Ms. Phyllis (Bunker) Frank, Mr. Bob Hughes, Dr. Kris Mayer, Ms. Mary Jean Ryan, Mr. Tre' Maxie, Mr. Matthew Spencer (14)

Members Absent: Mr. Jack Schuster (excused) (1)

Staff Attending: Mr. Ben Rarick, Ms. Sarah Rich, Dr. Kathe Taylor, Ms. Loy McColm, Ms. Ashley Harris, Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Ms. Colleen Warren (7)

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

Dr. Twyla Barnes, ESD 112 Superintendent, welcomed the Board to Vancouver and introduced her executive team. She gave an overview of the responsibilities of the ESD.

Consent Agenda

Motion was made to approve the Consent Agenda:

- September 14-15, 2011 Board meeting minutes
- Basic Education Compliance of the state's 295 districts

Motion seconded

Motion carried

The private schools approval was moved to the Business Items on November 10, at the request of Ms. Frank.

Strategic Plan Update

Mr. Ben Rarick, Executive Director

Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Communications and Legislative Director

At the September meeting, Chair Vincent instructed staff to begin a review of the 2011-2014 Strategic Plan. The proposed revisions to the Strategic Plan were included in the FYI packet for Members to review. Mr. Rarick provided a review of the work thus far and encouraged Members to consider the revisions prior to an anticipated January 2012 work session.

Waiver Criteria

Ms. Sarah Rich, Research Director

In response to recurring concerns about 180-day waivers, staff has analyzed the 180-day waiver request process and recommends setting specific criteria and parameters around these types of waiver requests.

Ms. Rich gave an overview of the current options for waivers from the 180-day requirement. The options include:

- Option One is the regular request that has been available since 1995 to enhance the educational program and improve student achievement. This option requires Board approval. There are currently 49 districts with Option One waivers for the 2011-12 school years and beyond, down from 66 districts in 2010-11.
- Option Two is a pilot for purposes of economy and efficiency for eligible districts to operate one or more schools on a flexible calendar. It expires August 31, 2014. Three districts were approved for this Option in 2009. This waiver will expire after the 2011-12 school year.
- Option Three is a fast track process implemented in 2010 that allows districts meeting eligibility requirements to use up to three waived days for specified innovative strategies. This Option requires staff review. Thirty districts have Option Three waivers for school years 2011-12 and beyond, up from seven in school year 2010-11.
- Innovation Waivers are a result of HB1546. Statewide, up to 34 applications for designation as innovation schools/innovation zones will be approved by Educational Service Districts and the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. Two types of schools, zones, and programs are authorized in the legislation:
 - ✓ Those focused on the arts, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.
 - ✓ Other innovative schools, zones, and models that implement instructional delivery methods that are engaging, rigorous, and culturally relevant at each grade.

A special Board meeting is scheduled for February 23, 2012, to review waiver requests that are included in the innovation applications. According to HB1546, the Board shall grant these waivers unless it is likely to decrease student achievement.

Three solutions were presented for discussion:

Solution A would eliminate Option One entirely and leave Options Two, Three, and Innovation waivers in place. The impact to the field would be that districts that have a persistently lowest-achieving school would not be eligible to apply for a waiver at all. These waivers cannot be renewed unless the district increased student achievement on state assessments in reading and mathematics for all grades tested, reduced the achievement gap for student subgroups; and improved on-time and extended high school graduation rates (only for districts containing high schools). For districts that do not meet these conditions, current WAC language indicates that they could apply for an Option One waiver, which under this solution would be eliminated. Therefore if this solution is selected, the SBE may want to revisit the conditions under which a district can renew their Option Three waiver. The language in WAC 180-18-050 would need to be edited to reflect the elimination of Option One. A further decision would be whether SBE intends to include parent teacher conferences as an acceptable use of a waiver day because it is not currently listed as acceptable under Option Three.

Pros: Solution A would tighten up the waiver criteria so that districts can only receive a maximum of three waiver days for specific activities. Districts seeking waivers for innovative schools can apply for a waiver through the innovation process.

Solution B would maintain all current waiver options but would cap the number of days available in Option One at five. Most of the current Option One waivers are for five or fewer days already, so this solution will have only a modest impact on future waivers.

Pros: Solution B would address the concerns that arise when districts present waiver requests for a significant number of days.

Solution C does not cap days for Option One. Other than the changes that are common to all solutions, as outlined above, there are no changes.

Pros: Solution C retains the greatest degree of local control for districts. Districts would have discretion to apply for as many waiver days as needed.

The review of Board input from July 2011 and September 2011 were presented as follows:

Topic	July Board Input	September Board Input
Instructional Days Should SBE cap the number of waiver days allowable under Option One?	Yes, cap at five days.	No cap as long as districts meet 1,000 instructional hours.
Instructional Hours Should SBE require districts applying for a waiver to provide evidence of 1,000 average hours and provide a calendar?	Yes.	Yes.
Accountability Should SBE require a Summary Report on implementation of past waiver days (agendas, amounts of time spent, how waiver days impacted student achievement)?	Yes, and require district staff to report to their local school boards.	Yes, and require district staff to report to their local schools boards.
Conferences Should districts be granted waivers for parent teacher conferences?	No clear consensus.	Yes.

Four recommended changes (regardless of the solutions above) were presented as follows:

1. Instructional Hours: Districts requesting any 180-day waiver will provide a school calendar and explanation of how they calculate 1,000 instructional hours.
2. Accountability: Districts will provide a summary report upon completion of a waiver to include agendas, amounts of time spent, and types of activities. Districts are required to report this information their school board.
3. Conference: Add language to Option Three rule to include parent/teacher conferences as an acceptable use of a waiver day.
4. To address potential cuts to the 180-day school year: Add language to the Option Three rule to reflect the motion language used for approval of Option One waivers if the Legislature reduces the number of school days. This would reduce the number of waiver days by the number of days a district reduces its school calendar.

The Members asked staff to bring criteria for approving waivers to the January 2012 meeting. The Board will review draft rules in January and may review and approve rules in March 2012.

Outreach and Feedback on Proposed SBE High School Graduation Requirements and Credit Definition Rules

Dr. Kathe Taylor, Policy Director

Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Communications and Legislative Director

In November 2010, the Board approved Washington Career and College Ready Graduation Requirements. The framework reflected the Boards efforts to:

1. Prepare students for postsecondary education, gainful employment, and citizenship.

2. Prepare Washington students at levels comparable to students in other states.
3. Align better with entrance requirements at Washington's public postsecondary institutions.

The Board was asked to consider whether to take the first step in moving the state forward on this new framework by adopting changes to the graduation requirements rule, WAC 180-51-066 and to the definition of a credit rule, WAC 180-51-050. Only those changes determined by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to have no fiscal cost were put forward. The changes determined by OSPI to have no fiscal cost assumed that the total credits (20) already required in rule for the Class of 2013 would remain the same, but would be reconfigured in the following ways:

- Increase English from 3 to 4 credits.
- Increase social studies from 2.5 to 3 credits, including .5 credits of civics.
- Reduce electives from 5.5 to 4 credits.
- Clarify that 2 credits of health and fitness means .5 credits of health and 1.5 credits of fitness.
- Make Washington State History and Government a noncredit requirement that must be satisfactorily completed.
- Add a "2 for 1" policy to allow students who take career and technical education equivalent courses to satisfy two graduation requirements while earning one credit.

In addition, OSPI determined that there would be no fiscal cost if the Board removed the 150 hour definition of a credit to permit districts to establish policies that specify how they will know students have successfully completed the state's subject area content expectations sufficiently to earn a credit.

An outreach campaign was implemented in September and October 2011 to maximize opportunity for input prior to the graduation requirements rule revision language vote. Staff contacted several publics, including the Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA) and school districts affected by the credit changes.

Staff consolidated feedback and shared the responses with Members before and during the meeting, allowing time for members to discuss the issues raised. Members also discussed feedback received during the regional WSSDA meetings held in September and October.

Public Comment

Dennis Kampe, Clark County Skills Center

Mr. Kampe presented a two pathway proposal for high school graduation as follows:

1. Four-year College or University Pathway – the SBE proposed a pathway with a recommended title change from "Career and College Ready Pathway" to "Four-year College and University Pathway."
2. Community and Technical College and Technical Employment Pathway – a proposed additional pathway.

Mr. Kampe gave an overview of the credits listed for each pathway. He commended the Board for their work and asked them to consider the two pathways.

Janet Quinn, Northshore School Board

Ms. Quinn suggested that the Board reconsider the 2016 implementation timeline, as districts may need more time. Northshore School District has four high schools, including an alternative high school, and one of the high schools currently requires four credits of English. The others require three credits of English. While over 80 percent of Northshore students currently take a fourth credit of English, approximately 225 students do not. Making this a requirement is an unfunded mandate. Northshore currently spends over \$18 million annually on unfunded mandates, which represents about 10 percent of its budget. It is estimated that Northshore will lose another \$4 million, based on the Governor's budget. Ms. Quinn does not know what will

be the final straw that breaks the camel's back, but she believes the District is at the breaking point now. Northshore has amazing educators and the District is continually asking more of them and they respond. At some point they won't be able to do it anymore and that point is now. The District is struggling to hold on to opportunities for students as requirements increase and funding decreases, which the District can't continue to do. She urged the Board not to add another unfunded mandate, which is what this would be. Students need elective options as well.

Cari Pepper, Mountain View High School

Every decision made about education affects the classroom. Ms. Pepper believes in rigor for herself and her students. She gave an overview of her education and accomplishments in education. Her student population is diverse and requires significant intervention, yet with a cap of 34 students and class periods of 50-55 minutes, she has approximately over a minute with each student. Standardized testing conservatively takes over three weeks of classroom instruction time away. There is no more money for professional development; training and support for ELL and special education inclusion; and rigorous, up-to-date, engaging books and resources. The original language of CORE 24 was that no new mandates would be implemented without funding – there is no funding for this. Every decision made about education affects the classroom.

Ed Madden, Private Citizen

It is the paramount duty of the state to provide an education for all children. Mr. Madden thanked the Board for their important service. He discussed the SBE web page, including the responsibilities of the Board and the vision statement. The proposed pathway for graduation requirements disregards the mandate of the constitution. He suggested that the Board acknowledge that a college degree is not the only mode for success.

Marie Sullivan, Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA)

After the active conversation on waivers today, Ms. Sullivan is concerned about next steps. The public didn't get a chance to see materials until yesterday in the late afternoon. It's difficult to get districts to come and talk about waivers because of it. Before going any further on waivers, Ms. Sullivan asked the Board to consider a work session on waivers, invite districts to share their perspectives. She's not sure when more funding will be coming for K-12. Nobody knows where it's going to end up. There needs to be an understanding of what local levy districts can handle. She's concerned about adopting the four criteria for January waivers. There may be districts applying in January, so changing the rules now without letting them know what the Board is planning is a disservice to the districts. Consider the implications that changes would have for them.

Courtney Hoover, Vancouver School District

As a ten-year CTE teacher, Ms. Hoover has seen more and more infringements on electives. This needs to stop. We used to have full preparation pathways in the high schools. Students could take four years and levels of wood shop, video production, business and accounting, sciences, and English. Ms. Hoover took mythology as an English elective in her senior year in high school – not because it was required, but because it was something she was interested in. Students need the option to take up to four years of any subject if it is their passion, or even if they just want to see and make sure it is their passion. High school should be for exploring, taking electives, and deciding what career interests students. High school students also need to know that not everyone has to earn a degree from a university. There are many other ways to earn their way into a company and up a ladder. Ms. Hoover enjoys sharing with her students that she is a high school teacher without a degree. Although education is one field that is rare to get into without a degree, there are many fields that do not require it.

Carol Sandison, Vancouver School District

As a biology teacher, Ms. Sandison sets up labs for 160 students on a daily basis in addition to teaching students. Due to budget cuts, more custodial work becomes the responsibility of the teachers, who are already overloaded with a larger numbers of students. There are a high number of students who don't know how to read and who are struggling, which makes it difficult to give all students the attention they deserve. All students need a well-balanced education and life, which isn't happening now. Ms. Sandison encouraged the Board to remember the technical fields as well when considering graduation requirements.

Louis Watanabe, Coalition for Refugees and Immigrants

Mr. Watanabe referenced the letter sent to the Board before this meeting. He said that policy does not make education. If there are no resources to back up the need, it won't be successful. Can the Board do something with policies to make them more effective, such as a local option? Is there a way to certify individuals in the communities who teach their own language to their children? Is there a way to certify that in the district? Is there a way to provide more English language opportunities for students? He asked the Board to look at the big picture when talking about policies. There is little autonomy in the front lines making a difference for students. Mr. Watanabe referenced a book entitled "Creating Significant Learning Experiences," which asks 'what do we want our kids to learn and remember.' Clarification is needed to achieve successful students.

Beth Ann Back, Clark County Skills Center

Ms. Back encouraged the Board to think about the comments made by Mr. Kampe in his public comment regarding the suggestion of a two pathway proposal for graduation requirements. It would allow for a much more well-rounded workforce. If and when the Board chooses to have the two pathways – how will it be communicated in the schools to ensure that the message is clear and concise?

Teacher of the Year Recognition

Mark Ray was introduced as the 2012 Washington State Teacher of the Year. Mr. Ray is a teacher-librarian at Skyview High School in Vancouver. Mr. Ray has spent most of his 20 year career in the same district. He believes passionately that teachers must begin stepping into more leadership roles and embrace the risk of trying something new if we are to meet the educational imperative of educating a new type of student and create a truly 21st century school system. Mr. Ray answered questions from the Members and was congratulated on his accomplishments. He provided feedback from his colleagues who wanted to share their concerns.

Public Hearing – Proposed Amendments to WAC 180-51-066 (High School Graduation Requirements) and WAC 180-51-050 (Definition of High School Credit)

Chair Jeff Vincent

At 1:00 p.m., public notice was given in accordance with the law for the State Board of Education to hold a public hearing regarding proposed revisions to SBE High School Graduation Requirements Rule WAC 180-51-066 with a new section WAC 180-51-067 and credit definition rule WAC 180-51-050.

Public Hearing Comments

Ben Caldwell, Student, Vancouver School of Arts Academics (VSAA)

Mr. Caldwell said that writing is his world and has been an integral part of his life since the day he first picked up a book and began reading. Because of the joy of reading, he realized that there was no other way to continue the adventure of reading than by writing his own novels, stories, and poetry. Should students give up because there's nothing in math, chemistry, or English that speaks to them enough to keep trying? Hope, an artistic vision, a dream, an American dream drives the ambition of many students today. Mr.

Caldwell encouraged the Board to show these students what they've been missing. Students should be given the opportunity to experience art, to analyze it, to criticize it, to interact with it, to appreciate it, and most importantly – to create it. Each generation has a handful of artists that defines it and a sea of lost souls who never had the chance to express that fundamental part of themselves. He asked the Board not to let them go to waste. If the Board reduces the number of required elective credits for schools then it will never click for many students and they'll give up before they realize what they're made of and what they can be. If elective credits are reduced, less will be asked of students who can give so much more. More and more Mr. Caldwell's generation closes its ears, eyes, and mind to the education their teachers are presenting to them. They decide they can't learn, won't learn, or that they just don't care. Art classes are all about thinking outside the box, looking for relevance and meaning, thinking critically and existentially. Many students need this. They need fewer diagrams and more portraits, less assigned reading and more staged reading, fewer lectures and more discussion – this is how they learn. He asked the Board to please help the students.

Kaitlin Lee, Mountain View High School

Ms. Lee talked about the concerns of removing music credits. She gave examples of how music impacts students now and in the future. Students should be allowed to choose their classes to assist them in planning their future endeavors.

Wendy Rader-Konofalski, Washington Education Association (WEA)

If the Board can fund it, great; if not, don't take pieces of it and push them forward under the pretense that it won't have a cost to schools, students, and teachers or that the integrity of the whole proposal will not be unbalanced to the detriment of the arts, music, CTE, and the whole child. WEA has never opposed CORE 24, but it has always said that a new graduation requirements package will work only if fully funded as a full package and in addition to full and adequate funding for the current requirements. Moving forward with reforms even incrementally with no extra funding or resources fits into a long and unfortunate tendency in this state, which was concluded in our gradually becoming 47th in the nation in per pupil funding today. The stark reality is that billions of dollars have been cut out of an already underfunded basic education system. More will be cut this year. Counselors are being cut. After school programs, summer school programs, programs for the ELL students, math preparation are all being slashed; classes are larger than ever. Kids are in need of wraparound services more than ever before because of increased homelessness, unemployment in their families, loss of health care, and a sense of stability in their lives. We know that this is frustrating to the Board because it makes the goals of CORE 24 even more distant. Frustrated doesn't even begin to describe how our teachers and education support staff feel. WEA asks the Board to resist the temptation to piecemeal its plan because it will undermine the balance and integrity of the Board's vision. It means that if only English and social studies move forward then the arts, physical education, band, shop, and other subjects that the Board meant to put on equal footing, will not be, and the balance will be disrupted to the detriment of the whole child. What can we do now that doesn't cost money that could help our students' right now? Listen to teachers. They know what they are talking about, as Mark Ray and the other teachers who spoke today show.

Deborah Heart, Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA)

Ms. Heart spoke regarding the proposed rule change. In her capacity as President of the Washington State School Directors' Association, she has heard from directors across the state regarding the Board's proposed change to graduation requirement rules. It was an agenda item at all of the latest WSSDA regional meetings, during which directors expressed concern over the erroneously labeled "non-fiscal" impact. Bunker Frank, Connie Fletcher, Steve Del Porto, and Bob Hughes were also in attendance and can substantiate her testimony. Given the state of our economy and increasing budget cuts, public schools are making difficult choices at the expense of our children, who will experience fewer electives and enrichment programs as districts balance diminishing resources to meet federal and state edicts. Now is not the time to increase costs. She suggested that it is better to focus on efficiencies that will enhance student achievement rather than minimizing local governance. She recognizes that only a portion of districts

currently do not meet the proposed credit increases but stipulate that each of those districts will incur additional costs to implement the proposed changes. Goldendale School District currently requires 24 credits to graduate but only 3 in English. The District will have to hire additional certificated staff, encumbering between \$68,000 and \$72,000 per annum plus over \$10,000 for additional curriculum. The District already spends almost \$2,300 per student and cannot foresee from where additional monies may be allocated. As a Goldendale school director, this concerns her. As President of WSSDA, it concerns her to a greater degree. She implored the members of the Board, not to implement anything that will change credit requirements at this time. If however, the Board is compelled to adopt these requirements, she asked it to make them voluntary in nature rather than compulsory. This will allow local district flexibility.

Marie Sullivan, Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA)

WSSDA supports the WAC 180-51-050 but is not in support of the changes to the WAC 180-51-066. Ms. Sullivan asked the Board not to proceed. WSSDA heard about local impact and feedback from members at the regional meetings. WSSDA considers changes to be an unfunded mandate. Until we have a better sense of how much local levy dollars are available, the proposed rule changes should not move forward. Asking the question of how many would be impacted that don't have the local levy funds would have been a good question to ask. Some districts have a huge amount of mobility, which impacts students coming from other districts. She encouraged the Board, when working through the changes, to use the Concise Explanatory Statement. She asked the Board to consider carefully the change to the Washington State history requirement as voluntary.

Bob McMullen, Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP)

AWSP is concerned that the Board's proposed changes to the graduation requirements and credit definition rules will increase the underfunding impact upon Washington's schools and districts by further diminishing learning resources and adversely impacting education outcomes for children. For the last several years, Washington has not adequately supported public education, leaving districts with fund shrinkages that impact expected education delivery. More children have fewer teachers, counselors, specialists, and aides to assure all are learning. More children have fewer building administrators to assure schools are effective, caring and safe places. There are fewer and older materials from which to learn. Children have fewer opportunities for intervention and enrichment. There is a general agreement that enactment of the proposed graduation requirements and credit definition changes will be beneficial and are long overdue. The principals have stated that continued stalling of the graduation requirements changes is frustrating to everyone and needs to be pushed ahead; however they are facing the harsh realities of underfunding in their own building, unable to offer additional language courses to increasing numbers of students preparing for college entrance.

Bruce Caldwell, Washington Music Educators Association

Mr. Caldwell encouraged the Board to delay and provide further review of the proposed reduction in elective opportunities for students. Although music education will be negatively impacted by such a decision, the Washington Music Educators Association is concerned that student intellectual and personal growth in all areas can be impacted by a narrowing of the curriculum. The primary concern is that the elective program is already under fire in many districts that have graduation requirements above and beyond those imposed by the state. Those added requirements will ultimately be taken from the electives, thus diminishing the choices for students to select classes of particular interest to them and their future plans. It's important that the ultimate decision makes it clear that electives are inviolate and are truly available for the students to choose. It is very appropriate to require that students take electives, which might be beginning classes in a new subject to the student or advanced classes in an already studied area of special interest. It is inappropriate for the districts to take away electives in order to meet other requirements. That is not helping our students achieve their true individual potential. Mr. Caldwell encouraged the Board to delay the decision and re-examine the impact it could have on students, programs, and the future.

Wes Pruitt, Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board

The proposed graduation requirements establish a career concentration as a default requirement and will provide the flexibility for students to prepare for their career of interest by concentrating in career and technical education coursework. Adoption of the two-for-one rule proposed by the Board will also assist students who intend to concentrate in Career and Technical Education coursework. The proposed new rules for the Culminating Project will provide students with an opportunity to apply their academic skills in a real world context and an opportunity to learn competencies needed in the work. The Workforce Board endorses the Board's proposal for requiring two credits of a career concentration in the college and career ready graduation requirements, the proposed two for one policy for career and technical education courses deemed equivalent to core academic courses and the proposed rules for the High School and Beyond Plan and the Culminating Project. The Legislature should re-prioritize state spending to accommodate the fiscal impacts of these new requirements.

Patty Wood, Kelso School Board

Ms. Wood asked the Board not to make a change to 180-51-066 at this time. This is an unfunded mandate and it will require districts to invest resources. None of us are opposed to a rigorous education system; philosophically she doesn't know anyone who doesn't want that. In reality, school districts are trying to get there. Her concern with this change is the narrowing of the definition of "core" and the diminishing opportunity for electives. Who is to say that this definition of "core" subjects is more relevant and critical to the success of our soon-to-be-released young citizens than another, such as a fourth year of English diagramming sentences and reading or a communications class in public speaking? She believes public education is the foundation of our society and the means by which we create our citizenry. The single most important service we can provide our students is to teach them how to think for themselves, how to acquire the skills and knowledge necessary to keep them relevant, engaged, and employed 15 years from now when the iPad is a relic and reading goggles take a new definition. She asked the Board not to narrow the options with short-sighted definitions of "core" and reduce our elective opportunity. She encouraged the Board not to implement a rule change to our graduation requirements.

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

Mr. Knue submitted a letter for the Board's information. Two years of conversation about graduation requirements and it looks like we're close to being finished. There's value in CTE courses for students who do not want a four-year degree. It's about timing, and Mr. Knue asked the Board to do whatever it can to support student choices. CTE is a college ready program and anything the Board can do to move forward with this will be appreciated.

Jana Carlisle, Partnership for Learning

Ms. Carlisle spoke on behalf of the Washington Roundtable and Partnership for Learning in support of the Board's moving forward now with the implementation of the high school graduation standards. Washington students are not prepared to compete with their counterparts nationally or internationally. This is evident in our NAEP, PISA, AP, and state standardized test scores and high two- and four- year college remediation rates. We import a high percentage of college graduates for many of our skilled family wage and technical jobs. Future education and family wage jobs are dependent on higher graduation rates and higher levels of career and college readiness skills among our graduates. Our young people require this strong foundation in order to have options after high school – whether apprenticeship, certificate, community college, or four-year college. Much of our current unemployment is attributable to a skills and jobs mismatch. It is called structural unemployment. The Washington Roundtable and Partnership for Learning urge the Board to take this first step – and it's only a first step – to implement the more rigorous graduation requirements. This is, and will remain, one of our key priorities. No more delays. Our kids need economic and education choices. This is not an either electives and CTE or higher graduation requirements decision. Districts can and have figured this out though it will and does necessitate working, scheduling, staffing, and delivering instruction and curriculum differently. We must work differently. It is possible to both raise the bar for students and

provide them with choices during and after they depart from secondary school. The Washington Roundtable and Partnership for Learning urge the Board to vote for students to have 21st century options.

Eric Withee, Stand for Children

Mr. Withee is in favor of increasing the graduation requirements and the removal of the 150 hour definition of a credit, which gives districts and students added flexibility in their preparation for post-secondary education. Stand for Children feels that competency is the most important marker of a student's ability to move on to a higher level of education, not necessarily the amount of time a student spends in class. Mr. Withee thanked the Board for its work in laying the groundwork for college and career readiness in Washington. The Boards continued push toward aligning graduation requirements with college entrance requirements has helped move Washington toward a system where all students leave high school prepared for the next level. He urged the Board to continue the push by implementing the no-cost increases to graduation requirements. The numbers are dismal in Washington State for college preparation. Twenty-eight percent of Hispanic students, 35 percent of Native American students, 41 percent of African Americans students, 50 percent of Caucasian students, and 61 percent of Asian American students are taking the courses needed to make them eligible for a public four-year school. In community colleges, over half of the students must take remedial classes at a cost of over \$18 million to those families who can least afford it and over \$65 million to an already financially anemic community college system. In the case of math, this does not account for the almost 30 percent of students who are not even taking math. These standards are really about preparing our students for the future that lies ahead of them and aligning our education system with economic reality in order to give students the best shot possible. In Washington, our economy is driven by technology and innovation; unfortunately our education system does not currently reflect this. By any measure, Washington is a leader in innovation. The Kauffman Foundation New Economy Index placed Washington at number two of all states, behind only Massachusetts. The state is number one in the percentage of payroll going toward high technology jobs. Our economy is driven by a well-educated workforce. The problem is that this workforce is not our own children. Of 100 students entering grade nine, only 18 will complete a four-year degree within six years. Only half of our high school graduates move directly to college. Of the top ten high tech states, we rank last in both of these categories and well below even the national average. This is unacceptable. We cannot continue to watch our students fall through the cracks while we simultaneously bring tens of thousands of high skilled, technology driven workers into the state to fill the gap our education system has created. We cannot continue to lag behind the rest of the country in our high school requirements when there are amazing opportunities for our students' right in our back yard.

Lisa McFarlane, League of Education Voters (LEV)

McFarlane is testifying today in favor of passing the rule changes. LEV has fought for the last decade for the resources and reforms that schools need to provide ALL kids an excellent education. LEV's support for higher graduation requirements is unwavering. LEV has rented buses and brought the voice of parents, students, and community members to the Board meetings. LEV has testified alongside superintendents and school board members who have said this is the right thing to do. The Board has received 163 letters in support of this. Delay is not a strategy. The lion's share of districts did not wait for the state to get its act together on this issue because they saw it was in their students' best interests to better align high school graduation requirements with college entrance. Even Seattle, the largest district in the state (with a mountain of fiscal challenges) and a holdout by only requiring three years of English, supports raising graduation requirements in general and these rule changes in particular. The current construct is so bad for kids in Seattle that half of the high schools have raised their schools' graduation requirements. What is unconscionable is that the schools that have raised the bar are serving our higher income students and the schools with the lower bar are serving our most disadvantaged students. We all know that education is the fuel of growing healthy economies. We all know that increasing numbers of jobs will require a college degree or workforce credential. We hear a lot that not everyone needs to go to college. But, she urged the Board to consider the following:

- In 1970, 40 percent of the highest income quartile kids got a BA. In 2010, that number has doubled to 82 percent.
- In 1970, 6 percent of our lowest income kids had a BA. Forty years later, that number has risen only to 8 percent.

Not everyone has to go to college, but the rich have certainly figured out that their kids need to go to college.

Kevin Laverty, Mukilteo School Board

Mukilteo School Board is not in support of 180-51-066. The idea of raising standards has been out there for a period of time. We have not had the political will to have the conversation of funding and the help needed to move each child toward graduation and on to a meaningful career. He understands the Board's intention is not to create barriers; however, when reducing the flexibility and curriculum that local school districts have to provide a meaningful education to each child, flexibility is needed. This becomes an unfunded mandate. He asked the Board to allow districts the opportunity to get the students where they need to be for graduation. Focus needs to be placed on poverty to get those kids to where they need to be.

Mark Mansell, La Center School District

Dr. Mansell encouraged the Board to set the bar for districts. This is a very stressful issue for all districts. La Center School District took the challenge from the Board and moved forward. The District provided students the opportunity to continue with arts and set their own pathway. Not every district is at that same point. Mr. Mansell thanked the Board for setting the bar high.

The public hearing closed at 1:49 p.m.

Governance Draft Work Plan Discussion

Mr. Ben Rarick, Executive Director

Since September, the following developments have occurred:

1. Outreach to:
 - Stand for Children
 - Department of Early Learning
 - State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
 - Education Service Districts
 - Association of Washington State Principals
 - Washington Education Association
 - And others
2. Concept Development:
 - Website concept: indicator skeleton; concepts of interaction; back-end 'print and go' report structure
3. Technology:
 - What can we achieve with current resources?
 - What's an achievable goal?

Staff considered major concepts as follows:

1. Lead System Indicators:
 - Systems focus on key transition point indicators.
 - Limit to no more than three to five (less is more in this context).
 - Laser-like focus.
2. Foundation Indicators:
 - Detail metrics that build to the LSI.

- Example: What preconditions are necessary to support third grade literacy? (Affordable early care; basic skills inventory/K-readiness).
3. Performance Improvement Goals:
- Goals set to the indicators.
 - Term derives from SBE statute – obligation to set system goals.

Stages of the process are as follows:

- Stage One: design a blueprint.
- Stage two: develop indicators and establish goals.
- Stage three: convene stakeholders on system strategies.

Challenges include:

1. Technology – limits to what the SBE can achieve on its own. Site will initially be static until developer gets involved.
2. Legislative Session – funding reductions to SBE, coupled with the collective pre-occupation with events of session by stakeholders.
3. Naming Convention – is it a dashboard or a report card?

Discussion followed.

Common Core Standards and Impacts on Assessment Policy

Dr. Kathe Taylor, Policy Director

Ms. Jessica Vavrus, Assistant Superintendent, OSPI

In preparation for implementation of Common Core State Standards (CCSS), Washington will need to consider several policy questions relative to graduation requirements and statewide assessments. At a minimum, the Board may elect to play a role in facilitating conversations about these issues in order to anticipate and be better informed about them.

The role of the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) and state partners includes communication, coordination, and commitment. With the 2011 adoption of the CCSS in mathematics and English Language Arts, the state completed the first phase of its implementation strategy. OSPI has begun to build statewide capacity through Phase Two – development and alignment of resources and materials, while initiating Phase Three – teacher and leader professional development and classroom transition.

Phase Four – assessment of the CCSS – will begin in 2012-14 with a pilot of test items. Assessments aligned to the CCSS and administered in grades 3-8 and 11 should be ready for administration in 2014-15. The tests are designed to measure college and career readiness; cut scores will be set in August 2014 by the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC), a consortium of states to which Washington belongs. SBAC will also develop optional interim assessments that could be administered in grades 9 and 10 to provide feedback on student progress.

The introduction of a new assessment system brings with it a series of interesting policy questions, particularly at the high school level. Two fundamental questions are, “Will the new CCSS 11th grade assessments supplement or replace the state’s assessments in reading, writing, and math? Will proficiency on the new CCSS 11th grade assessments become a graduation requirement, and if so, what level of proficiency will be expected?” In 2015, the state assessment system in high school could include some or all of the assessments in the following table.

2015 High School State Assessments

Purpose	Level	English/Language Arts	Math	Science
Graduation	High school	HSPE in reading and writing	EOC in algebra and geometry and/or	EOC in biology
Federal Accountability	11 th Grade	SBAC summative assessment	SBAC summative assessment	

Decisions about assessments will be driven by economic and academic considerations. For instance, the state will need to:

- Consider the cost of adding assessments, versus substituting new assessments for old ones.
- Consider the cost of aligning current state assessments to the new CCSS, if the current assessments are retained.
- Evaluate once again the advantages and disadvantages of summative vs. end-of-course assessments.
- Provide timely opportunities for remediation and retakes, should the 11th grade tests become a graduation requirement.

The state has been awarded grant money from the following sources to support implementation of the CCSS:

- Learning Forward/Sandlar Foundation – transforming professional learning and implementing a common core initiative.
- Lumina/Hewlett/Gates Foundations – Common Core state standards and assessment: K-12/postsecondary alignment grants.

Joint Discussion – With Professional Educator Standards Board

Mr. Ron Mayberry, Principal, Internet Academy, Truman High School

Mr. Mayberry gave an overview of the District's digital learning program, which offers both part-time and full-time learning. Discussion followed with clarifying questions.

Ms. Sue Collins, Principal Owner, Collins Consults

Ms. Collins gave an overview of the main reason schools offer online learning, which includes:

- Credit recovery
- Access to unavailable courses
- Advancement
- Remediation
- Dual credit

The SBE and PESB Members gathered for dinner with a performance by the Heritage High School Chamber Choir, led by Mr. Joel Karn, Director.

Thursday, November 10, 2011

Members Attending: Chair Jeff Vincent, Vice-chair Steve Dal Porto, Dr. Bernal Baca, Ms. Amy Bragdon, Mr. Jared Costanzo, Mr. Randy Dorn, Ms. Connie Fletcher, Dr. Sheila Fox, Ms. Phyllis (Bunker) Frank, Mr. Bob Hughes, Dr. Kris Mayer, Ms. Mary Jean Ryan, Mr. Tre' Maxie, Mr. Matthew Spencer (14)

Members Absent: Mr. Jack Schuster (excused) (1)

Staff Attending: Mr. Ben Rarick, Ms. Sarah Rich, Ms. Kathe Taylor, Ms. Loy McColm, Ms. Ashley Harris, Mr. Aaron Wyatt, Ms. Colleen Warren (7)

Preparing Washington State Students

Mr. Matthew Spencer, Student Board Member

Mr. Spencer gave an overview of his public school career, spotlighting his perspective on the qualities of a good teacher, which include being approachable, knowledgeable, empathetic, and interactive. He gave examples of where his teachers fit in these categories. Mr. Spencer graduated from Wellington Elementary School in 2007. His elementary school highlights included citizen of the year, patrol-man, Camp Casey, and Ancestor's Cultural Studies. Mr. Spencer graduated from junior high in 2010, where his highlights were: video production class, rockets and sludge, endangered species project, and yearbook design team. Mr. Spencer will graduate from high school in the class of 2013 and currently his highlights include biology capstone project, literary analysis, student Board Member of the SBE, and world history project. Teachers change the world one child at a time. Quality teachers impact students in the following way:

- Increase student involvement.
- Increase educational learning.
- Provide reliable, trustworthy outlets for students.
- Raise students' comfort levels in the classroom and school.

Alternative Learning Experience – 2011 Session Issues

Mr. Ben Rarick, Executive Director

Alternative Learning Experience (ALE) programs are public school alternative options primarily characterized by learning activities that occur away from the regular public school classroom. Although ALE programs encompass a wide variety of program models, the one common characteristic of these programs is that they do not rely on a "seat time" model, whereas traditional public schools rely on a Bricks and Mortar setting and on seat time as the basis for defining full or part-time participation (and funding). ALE programs are delivered through a variety of flexibly structured models to meet the needs of students who might not otherwise succeed in a traditional setting. In ALE programs, the requirements for each child's program are established in a written student learning plan (WSLP), which must be developed and supervised by a public school teacher.

ALE students generally fall into the following three major categories of program offerings:

1. Digital or Online Learning Programs.
2. Parent Partnership Programs.
3. Contract-based Learning Programs.

The basic provisions of ESHB 2065 made several significant changes to ALE programs, but also left significant policy unresolved. It's anticipated that the Legislature will revisit some of these unresolved policy issues in the 2012 Legislative Session, providing an opportunity for the Board to help formulate ALE policy moving forward.

The seven policy principles are as follows:

1. Mixed model instructional programs: those that strategically integrate virtual and in-person instructional delivery models are the wave of the future. State policies should aid, not hinder, this trend.
2. It's important to develop some concept of basic education entitlement for virtual learners.

- Bricks and Mortar students are entitled to access 1,000 hours and at least 180 days. They are also entitled to a minimum staffing ratio of 46 certified instructional staff per 1,000 students. What is the ALE equivalent?
3. Virtual learning should be viewed as a complement to, rather than a replacement for, in-person instruction.
 - It should not be possible to progress through K-12 public schools without any in-person or real time instruction with a certified educator.
 - Difference between curriculum and instruction.
 4. Current school funding models, originally developed to fund Bricks and Mortar programs, need to be re-thought in the context of non-seat time-based programs. Misfits include:
 - Levy equalization.
 - School construction.
 - LAP funding.
 - Non-high funding.
 5. ALE programs are more effective in certain contexts.
 - Older students are better equipped to take advantage of independent learning models.
 - Certain subjects lend themselves to virtual delivery, others don't.
 - Students acquire certain interpersonal and communication skills in face-to-face situations.
 6. Home schooling is an excellent educational delivery model for certain families; however, in difficult economic times, the state cannot afford to subsidize them, at the expense of general education programs.
 - Parent partnership programs.
 - If these K-6 programs did not exist, would the parent send their child to public school?
 7. The different ALE program labels, online (including three sub-categories), parent partnerships, and alternative high schools are so broad, encompassing such a vast array of programs that they cease to be meaningful. A different vocabulary is needed.

Transitional Bilingual Formula Proposal and Legislative Update

Senator Joseph Zarelli, 18th Legislative District

The statewide Transitional Bilingual Instruction Program (TBIP) was created by the Legislature in 1979 and is included in the Legislature's definition of basic education. Students are eligible for support in TBIP if they have a primary language other than English and their English language skills are sufficiently deficient or absent to impair learning. Initial assessment must be made by the district to identify eligible students. An individual annual reassessment must be made for a student to continue in the program.

Since school year 2005-06, the state has used the Washington Language Proficiency Test (WLPT-II) to measure students' English language proficiency in reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Students scoring at levels one through three are eligible for TBIP participation; level four students transition to the regular program of instruction.

State funding supports school staff and training intended to teach English to students in the public K-12 school system. State funding formulas provide enhanced funding to TBIP students above the basic education allocation. In school year 2010-11, this additional funding was \$901.46 per eligible bilingual students, net of 1.5 percent deduction for testing. Under the new prototypical funding formulas, beginning with school year 2011-12, the additional funding is expressed in hours per week.

Senator Zarelli talked about the bill and budget proviso that he sponsored during the 2011 Legislative Session to enable TBIP funding formula changes. The formula provides differential per-pupil funding, based on students' levels of English proficiency. It also provides bonus money to districts exiting students from the highest level of TBIP eligibility. If the changes in the formula are revenue neutral, the funding for the TBIP

does not change. Senator Zarelli noted that the introduction of bonuses could potentially divert funding away from students traditionally served by the TBIP. It is not clear whether the funding formula changes will address the concerns raised by the Quality Education Council's (QEC) TBIP Technical Work Group in 2010 about the need for more program accountability and for statewide teacher professional development to work more effectively with English Language Learners.

Legislators were aware that overall state resources were dwindling but wondered if something could be done within the funding structure to help. The change is not intended to be a budget cut but to begin as a fiscally neutral step. It is expected that in the next several years, expenditures for the program will increase if the change is successful. Any savings would be a result of long-term success helping students gain proficiency.

The budget proviso requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to report to the Senate and House of Representatives Ways and Means Committees and Education Committees annually by December 31 of each year through 2018, regarding any measurable changes in proficiency, time in program, and transition experience. The formula restructure is intended to facilitate improved proficiency and results for students. The Legislature intends to monitor the results closely to ensure the restructure is having the desired effect.

Discussion followed.

State Transitional Bilingual Policy

Dr. Kathe Taylor, Policy Director

Ms. Isabel Muñoz-Colón, Program and Policy Advisor, Office for Education, City of Seattle

The state has been exploring ways to improve support for English Language Learners (ELL) for several years. The Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program (TBIP) has been a primary point of focus, as evidenced by the following actions since 2009:

- The 2009 Legislature enacts Education Reform Bill. The 2010 Legislature specifies funding distribution formulas.
- The Quality Education Council (QEC) establishes the TBIP Technical Work Group. The Work Group makes recommendations in 2010.
- The QEC includes some TBIP recommendations in its report to the 2011 Legislature.
- The 2011 Legislature enacts TBIP funding formula changes.

In the 2011 appropriations bill, the Legislature directed OSPI to implement a new funding formula for the 2012-2013 school year scaled to provide more support to students requiring more intensive intervention. The new program will also provide up to two years of bonus funding upon exit from the bilingual program to facilitate successful transition to a standard program of education.

Ms. Muñoz-Colón reviewed recommendations from the QEC TBIP Technical Working Group, the Bilingual Education Advisory Committee, and draft recommendations from the Roadmap English Language Learners Policy and Data Work Groups. The Roadmap ELL Work Groups consist of regional experts from seven South King County school districts. The recommendations spoke to funding models for the Transitional Bilingual Education Program in general, and specifically to the new differentiated funding model. (The TBIP Technical Work Group recommendations from the December 2010 final report were included in the Agenda packet).

Discussion followed.

Further discussion with more data to consider will be included for the January 2012 Board meeting in Olympia.

Washington STEM Partnerships

Ms. Julia Novy-Hildesley, Executive Director, Washington STEM

Ms. Heidi Rhodes, Secondary Math Specialist, Evergreen Public Schools

Washington STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) is a nonprofit organization created through the collaboration of business and philanthropic leaders to cultivate and spread breakthrough approaches in effective STEM teaching and learning so that students are prepared to succeed in the 21st century.

Washington STEM is a unique resource that is pulling together expertise, financial support, and creative thinking to improve STEM education. Currently the organization offers three levels of investment as follows:

- One-year: micro-investment entrepreneurial awards, given to educators who are pioneering breakthrough approaches to STEM teaching and learning.
- Three-year: mid-size portfolio investments. Bellevue School District is the only district awarded to date.
- Multi-year: learning networks intended to generate new knowledge, foster collaborative learning, and support struggling schools.

Washington STEM serves as a venture fund for improving STEM education through strategies that catalyze change and generate results:

- Invest: Through a portfolio of investments, Washington STEM identifies and spreads innovative and evidence-based effective STEM teaching and learning practices.
- Generate: With its funded partners, Washington STEM generates and shares new knowledge about how to improve STEM education.
- Engage: Through community engagement, Washington STEM expands and diversifies the network of partners working together to improve student success in STEM outcomes; including parents, educators, community leaders, and STEM professionals.
- Advocate: Washington STEM contributes its investment and community driven insights to advocate for and sustain improvements at scale through policy change.

Washington ranks first in concentration of jobs in STEM and in the creation of software companies. It ranks second on the 2010 New Economy index for innovation and entrepreneurship and fourth in the nation in technology-based corporations.

The total percentage of Washington jobs in 2018 that will be in STEM fields will be 8 percent, a 24 percent increase in STEM jobs by 2018. Washington will score above the national average in STEM jobs by seven points. Ninety-four percent of 2018 STEM jobs will require post-secondary education.

Washington's achievement gap in STEM is large and growing. In grade eight, Washington is:

- One of nine states where the Caucasian/African American gap is growing.
- One of seven states where the Caucasian/Hispanic gap is growing.
- One of eighteen states where the gap between low-poverty and high-poverty students is growing.

The ESD 112/Evergreen Public Schools Program was presented. The ESD 112 received a \$10,000 Entrepreneur Award for the program.

School Improvement Grant/Required Action District Update

Mr. Dan Newell, Assistant Superintendent, OSPI

Ms. Erin Jones, Assistant Superintendent, OSPI

Mr. Bill Mason, Director, School Improvement, OSPI

Cohort I schools receiving School Improvement Grants (SIG, also known as Models of Equity and Excellence through Rapid Improvement and Turnaround (MERIT)) have shown gains on state assessments, and outpaced the state in five of six grades. One school also made AYP. There is significant progress in the nine characteristics of high-performing schools, with gains in 15 of 19 indicators.

Required Action Districts (RAD) and other MERIT schools have:

- Addressed all SIG requirements and audit/review recommendations through a 90 day planning process.
- Used data extensively for student placement and academic interventions; extending learning time and moving staff.
- Engaged communities, staff, and parents in meeting challenges of school turnaround.

A comparison of Tier I and Tier II achievement and demographic data was reviewed. Cohort I and II districts were also discussed.

The purpose of MERIT schools is to ensure schools/districts fully implement selected intervention so they substantially increase student achievement and exit improvement status. Staffing changes in MERIT schools include: 1) leadership changes, prior to year one; 2) staffing changes, after year one. The external assessment of progress is:

1. Areas of greatest growth:
 - Shared vision around student learning.
 - Support to students in need, personalized learning.
 - Effective leadership.
 - Collaboration and communication
2. Areas of challenge:
 - Improved instructional practice and assessment systems.
 - Rigorous teaching and learning.

The areas of focus for the federal requirements for turnaround and transformation models include:

- Teachers and leaders.
- Instructional and support strategies.
- Extended learning time and support.
- Governance.

The Cohort I progress on state assessments average change from 2010-2011 on reading and math were reviewed.

RAD – the first five months:

- Action plan and budget review.
- Professional development and technical assistance.
- Networking and making connections.
- District and school 90-day benchmark plans and rubrics.
- Liaison support and monitoring.

Examples of progress were reviewed in the following districts:

- Morton Junior/Senior High School
- Onalaska Middle School
- Lakeridge
- Soap Lake Middle School/High School

Projected federal funding for Cohort I and II was discussed.

ESEA/NCLB Waivers and Discussion

Ms. Sarah Rich, Research Director

In September, Secretary of Education Arne Duncan announced that because Congress had not yet succeeded in reauthorizing ESEA, the U.S. Department of Education would begin to grant broad waivers to states from some of the most contentious ESEA requirements, in exchange for a series of reforms similar to the expectations within Race to the Top and the Obama administration's Blueprint for Reform, its 2010 policy recommendations for reauthorization. Washington State is deciding whether to pursue a waiver.

In October, the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee held hearings on a reauthorization bill sponsored by the Committee Chair, Senator Tom Harkin, Democrat from Iowa, and Ranking Member Senator Michael Enzi, Republican from Wyoming. The bill will continue to be debated in Senate hearings. Senator Harkin believes it is possible that the bill could be approved by Congress before January 1, 2012, which would eliminate the need for state waivers to ESEA.

The U.S. Department of Education's intent is to provide relief from the less popular elements of ESEA, but is not intended as a retreat from accountability. The intent is that states build their own robust accountability systems. All states that meet the required principles would receive a waiver. Currently 42 states and territories have contacted the USDOE to express intent to apply.

The ESEA provisions that will be waived include:

- The 2014 deadline for all students to be proficient. Instead, states would set ambitious but achievable goals.
- Sanctions built in to school improvement steps, including corrective action, restructuring, school choice, and supplemental educational services; parental notification, and required set-asides for professional development. In the 2009-10 school year, according to OSPI, districts spent more than \$12 million on required sanctions including supplemental tutoring and public school choice. If Washington receives a waiver, districts would not be required to spend these funds on required sanctions but would still have the flexibility to do so.
- Lower poverty thresholds for establishing a Title I school-wide program.
- More flexibility in using federal funds for rural schools and greater transferability to move federal funds among programs.

States are required to meet the following four principles to receive a waiver:

1. College and career ready standards and assessments for all students.
2. State developed differentiated systems of recognition, accountability, and support.
3. Supporting effective instruction and leadership through educator evaluation.
4. States must reduce unnecessary burden of reporting and ensure that what states require directly impacts student achievement and is not duplicative.

Public Comment

Marie Sullivan, Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA)

The conversations this morning on Online learning – WSSDA thinks that online learning ought to be treated differently from ALE. WSSDA would like more conversation with the Board about online learning and ALE. She clarified that diplomas for online learning come from school districts. WSSDA is very interested on the transitional bilingual learning and hopes to work collaboratively with the Board. In September, Ms. Sullivan testified giving three suggestions. She commended staff for listening to the suggestions and following through with the suggestion of receiving feedback from districts. We don't know what will happen with budget changes this year.

Karen Madsen, Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA)

Ms. Madsen was a teacher for ten years, a school board member for 12 years, a member of the WSSDA Board for six years and a member of the Core 24 Implementation Task Force. After an extensive three-year review and public outreach, the Board approved Washington Career and College Ready Graduation Requirements in November 2010. Ms. Madsen reminded the Board of what was approved at that time. Proposed changes would go into effect for the graduating class of 2016, this year's 8th graders, which allows for five years to prepare, not to mention the full year since the Board signaled its intention to make these changes, which, in an ideal world, would have had each and every district getting to work on implementing them ahead of the requirement curve. Within the 20 credits required by the Board's graduation requirements, WAC 180-51-066, the credits and policy changes determined to have no fiscal cost included:

- Increase English from 3 credits to 4 credits. (More than 80 percent currently have, only 28 districts do not).
- Increase social studies from 2.5 credits to 3 credits; require .5 credit of civics, per RCW 28A.230.093. (More than 80 percent currently have, only 27 do not).
- Note that only 12 districts would need to increase number of credits required in both.
- Decrease electives from 5.5 to 4 credits.
- Make successful completion of Washington State History and Government a non-credit requirement.
- Clarify that the 2 credits of health and fitness includes .5 credit of health and 1.5 credits of fitness. (Current academic learning requirements at grade 10 which include health benchmarks).
- Create a "two for one" policy that would enable students taking a CTE-equivalent course to satisfy two graduation requirements while earning one credit.

Under the Board's high school credit definition WAC 180-51-050, SBE would remove the 150 hour definition of a credit and permit districts to establish policies that specify how they will know students have successfully completed the state's subject area content expectations sufficiently to earn a credit. She encouraged the Board members to search their hearts, and if these are not the right things to do for kids, then vote no. But if these changes are the right changes to make for kids, please, let's get going.

Wendy Rader-Konofalski, Washington Education Association (WEA)

Ms. Rader-Konofalski asked the Board to keep in mind that they are pushing a four year university graduation requirement for ALL students right at a time when cuts to higher education will make it harder than ever for students who are financially challenged to attain the dream of going to a four year university; both because of tuition increases and course availability. It is important to remember that students do not need four credits of English and three of Social Studies to get into any of our wonderful community or technical colleges from which they can then transfer to a four year university if they so choose. She applauded the success so far of the SIGs and RADs. WEA worked with the Board for many months to get language that we could all live with. It is gratifying to see that none of the worst expectations have come to pass. As WEA always testified, if there is funding, if there is collaboration with all stakeholders and the community, if there is good will, our educators would rise to the occasion and participate enthusiastically. But the conversation earlier today about what will happen when the funding is gone concerned her. Please do not think that without funding the successes gained when there was funding will continue. There was talk about things continuing, but if we have learned anything from this effort, it is that the funding is the key and by no means optional—it is what makes the innovation and successes possible. Without it, the Board can expect that the gains will not be able to be maintained with the best of intentions.

Business Items

1. Rule Amendments/Adoption

- High School Graduation Requirements – Adoption of New Section WAC 180-51-067

Motion was made to adopt new section WAC 180-51-067

Motion seconded

Discussion

Motion was made to amend proposed WAC 180-51-067 to add section (12) to read as follows:

A school district may obtain a two year extension from the effective date for the implementation of the 4 credits of English and/or the 3 credits of social studies required under this rule upon the filing of a written resolution by the district's school board with the State Board of Education stating the district's intent to delay implementation of the increased English and/or Social Studies requirements effective for the class of 2016. The resolution must be filed by June 1, 2012. A district filing a timely resolution with the State Board of Education shall maintain the English and Social Studies, credits in effect under WAC 180-51-066 for the period of the exemption.

Motion seconded

Discussion

Motion was made to amend proposed WAC 180-51-067 to add section (12) to read as follows:

A school district may obtain a two year extension from the effective date for the implementation of the 4 credits of English and/or the 3 credits of social studies required under this rule upon the filing of a written resolution by the district's school board with the State Board of Education stating the district's intent to delay implementation of the increased English and/or Social Studies requirements effective for the class of 2016. The resolution must be filed by June 1, 2012. A district filing a timely resolution with the State Board of Education shall maintain the English, Social Studies, and elective credits in effect under WAC 180-51-066 for the period of the extension.

Motion seconded

Motion carried with two nays: Steve Dal Porto and Bob Hughes.

Motion was made to amend the language in proposed New Section, WAC 180-51-067 as follows: In section (1), Paragraph 1, line 3: add "unless as otherwise provided in section (12),..."

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Motion was made to amend the proposed language in WAC 180-51-067 as follows: In section (4) b(i) to change "and" to "or".

Motion seconded

Motion carried

Motion was made to table consideration of the adoption of New Section WAC 180-51-067 until the March 2012 Board Meeting.

Motion seconded

Motion failed with seven nays: Mary Jean Ryan, Tre' Maxie, Kris Mayer, Jeff Vincent, Sheila Fox, Bernal Baca, Amy Bragdon.

Motion to adopt new section WAC 180-51-067 carried with 3 nays: Steve Dal Porto, Randy Dorn, Bob Hughes.

- High School Graduation Requirements – Adoption of proposed amendment to WAC 180-51-066

Motion was made to adopt the proposed amendment to WAC 180-51-066

Motion seconded

Motion carried with five nays: Bob Hughes, Steve Dal Porto, Connie Fletcher, Phyllis Frank, Randy Dorn.

- High School Graduation Definition – Adoption of proposed amendments to WAC 180-51-050

Motion was made to adopt the proposed amendments to WAC 180-51-050.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

2. 180 Day Waiver Criteria

Motion was made to direct staff to commence the rule making process proposing amendments to the waiver language in WAC 180-18-050 that would reduce the number of waiver days granted under the rule by each day a district reduces its school calendar in response to legislation reducing the number of school days currently required under state law.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

3. 2012-2013 Meeting Dates/Locations

Motion was made to move to approve the changes to the 2012-2013 meeting dates, as provided on page 225 of the Board Agenda, and the scheduling of a Special Board Meeting on February 23, 2012.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

4. Private Schools

Motion was made to approve Lake and Park School as a Private School for the 2011-2012 academic school year.

Motion seconded

Motion carried

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m. by Chair Vincent