

Washington State Board of Education  
Regular Meeting  
Puget Sound Educational Service District, Renton  
October 26–27, 2006

MINUTES

Thursday, October 26, 2006

Chair Mary Jean Ryan called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting. She introduced Monte Bridges, superintendent of Puget Sound Educational Service District (ESD). Superintendent Bridges welcomed the Board back to the ESD and read a poem by Marge Piercy.

Chair Ryan reviewed the agenda for the meeting. Executive Director Edie Harding provided information on the Resource Notebook for Board members, thanking staff.

Chair Ryan thanked Bob Butts for all his help during the time Executive Director Harding was out of country. She also thanked the members of the Board for all the work they have done over the last few weeks.

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, Dr. Kristina Mayer, Mary Jean Ryan, John C. Schuster, Warren T. Smith Sr., Jeff Vincent, and Student Representatives Zac Kinman and Tiffany Thompson.

Member Excused: Eric Liu

Staff Present: Edie Harding, Bob Butts, Pat Eirish, Laura Moore, Sarah Bland, Casey Corr, and Assistant Attorney General Colleen Warren.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** Moved by Mr. Smith and seconded by Dr. Bergeson to approve the minutes as amended. Motion carried.

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

Chair Ryan introduced Scott Palmer and Jonathan Furr from Holland+Knight LLP, providing background information on each.

Mr. Palmer works with the education policy division of Holland+Knight. Mr. Furr formerly worked for the Illinois State Board of Education during the time it was reconstituted.

Mr. Palmer noted that some states have been finding ways to gain more flexibility while still working with the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) rules and regulations.

*The Movement toward Accountability*

- ✓ Establish and implement single statewide accountability systems
  - Federal legal requirements (including NCLB)

- State and local educational policy interests—standards-based reforms
- ✓ Accountability discussion, systems, and requirements are in transition.

*State's accountability system be valid and reliable in the sense that the state:*

1. Establish clear, appropriate goals regarding what is expected in terms of educational outcomes;
2. Examine fair, accurate, meaningful measures related to the achievement of those outcomes to determine and classify performance;
3. Target appropriate actions, assistance, and interventions based on its accountability determinations;
4. Which in turn lead to improved student achievement and closing achievement gaps.

### *Legal Foundations for Accountability*

#### Federal and National Context

Federal law should reinforce state education practices.

- ✓ NCLB constituted a significant shift in federalism, dramatically increasing the federal and state role with increased scope of requirements, increased specificity of requirements, increased breadth of reach, and increased focus on accountability.
- ✓ At the broadest level, federal law sets an agenda for state action, and requires that state actions be educationally sound for all students.
- ✓ In terms of accountability, broadly speaking, federal law requires that each state build a single, statewide accountability system with rewards and sanctions, and expects the system to be valid and reliable in terms of its usefulness in improving student achievement. NCLB also includes substantial specific requirements.

#### *National Trends and Issues*

- ✓ Movement toward alignment, content and skills, and goals of graduation from high school—ready for college and work.
- ✓ Growth of growth models and focus on progress—most states didn't have the data systems available until now; models are slow to come on line.
- ✓ Discussion of accountability as process and differentiation of consequences—need to have tiers and levels of accomplishment.
- ✓ Discussion of adaptive testing and focus on individual student learning—Oregon has web-based assessments that tie into the end-of-year assessments; individual learning plans for students.
- ✓ Discussion of teacher/principal effectiveness and incorporation of growth in student achievement—there are several models that both have and do not have union support already in place; need to move from highly qualified teachers to highly effective teachers.
- ✓ Focus on capacity, including state-to-district assistance and interventions.

Mr. Furr reviewed the new duties of the State Board of Education and the goals of the Basic Education Act. He then reviewed the statutory accountability requirements for the Board.

#### *Key Statutory Themes and Requirements*

- ✓ Personalizing education for all students
- ✓ Knowledge of concepts as well as analytical thinking and problem solving
- ✓ Emphasis on both college- and work-readiness (raising the bar) and drop-out prevention (closing the gap)
- ✓ Reading, writing, science and math as core elements

- ✓ Schools and districts in improvement may require assistance and interventions, with a range of intervention strategies

#### *Current State Context*

- ✓ Federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) constitutes the core of state accountability determinations (with good leverage of basic flexibility options and good innovations in some areas, e.g., graduation rates).
- ✓ Federal system of consequences for schools and districts constitutes the core of state assistance and interventions (applying only to Title I schools and districts).
- ✓ Focus of Board and focus on accountability exists within broader state education reform context, particularly including Washington Learns (with focus on globalization, list of education goals, discussion of accountability, etc.).

In response to a question, Mr. Palmer stated that there is little information coming out on the restructuring efforts in other states—not so much on restructuring but more district level support changes. The system needs to be well balanced and well thought out so that all aspects are taken into consideration.

#### *Guiding Principles for Accountability*

- ✓ Student achievement—focus on improving teaching/learning and student achievement, consistent with the state’s education goals;
- ✓ Disaggregation—focus on raising student achievement and closing the gaps;
- ✓ High standards—promote appropriate, high standards and expectations, aligned with college, work and citizenship;

#### *Goals for the Accountability System*

1. A better statement is “all students proficient or on the path to proficiency by 2014” rather than just all students proficient.
2. There are issues on readiness for college and work and issues around diversity. There are some key questions that need to be asked that are framed by the Basic Education Act.

Chair Ryan asked Mr. Palmer and Mr. Furr to discuss what other states have been doing in this area. She also asked them to discuss the reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act. Members suggested several other topics for discussion.

#### *What have states done?*

- ✓ Examine the broader educational issues than the federal law.
- ✓ Care about all the students and their progress.

Several states had strong accountability systems (Delaware, Kentucky, Ohio) that needed to incorporate NCLB into their systems. Georgia was one of the states in the middle with a new system that had to merge NCLB before launching its new system. Ohio has a strong model that incorporated NCLB but retained the emphasis on the state system as the more important. Louisiana used its system for the “don’t know schools”—if the “don’t know schools” didn’t perform well on the state accountability system, they would be considered in AYP. Wyoming uses AYP as a filter but leaves it to the school to diagnose and fix. The state has also linked accreditation to the accountability system. The state sends in a team to look at the problems and sees what needs to be done. The growth oriented model has a lot of positives and a lot of challenges (Tennessee and North Carolina are in a pilot project). This system is outcome-based

moving students to proficiency. According to Dr. Bergeson, Tennessee has a data system that tracks student performance over time, but until recently has not been able to use this in conjunction with teacher performance/non-performance. The students need to be proficient or on the path to proficiency as measured by an annual assessment. The Washington system has areas that need work on validity and reliability.

#### *Local Control*

- ✓ Nebraska and Iowa do not have state standards.
- ✓ According to the law, districts determine AYP; in practice the states are making the district and school determinations. There needs to be a balance between strict local control and state intervention.

How do you make improvement models valid and reliable is a system issue that has to be addressed. There have been some restrictions placed on local control in other states. One of the biggest issues is how to build capacity to help schools. In Illinois they have the ability to intervene from the state level which has brought districts to the table to discuss options. In Washington, there is a team that works with the districts/schools with a leader from the district to provide assistance. New Jersey and Arkansas are states that have taken over districts—Arkansas' interventions were fiscal based.

#### *Highly Qualified Teachers*

- ✓ In Washington High Objective Uniform State System of Evaluation (HOUSSE) is used to evaluate teachers with multiple assignments. We have a lot of teachers who hold K-8 certificates.
- ✓ Highly Qualified
- ✓ Bachelors degree
- ✓ Mastery
- ✓ Subject matter competency

How do you move from highly qualified to highly effective—professional development, etc? Highly qualified is not meant to be a ceiling, but a floor; however, there are exceptions to the rule—occupational education teachers.

1. Where do we go from here on highly qualified? Ratchet up requirements; use a filter to look at performance more closely.
2. Student performance—among assessments, is there growth occurring? Look at Texas, Florida, Delaware, and Tennessee.

#### *ESEA Reauthorization*

- ✓ If Congressman George Miller becomes the chair of the House Education and Workforce Committee, there will be a strengthening of NCLB.
- ✓ There needs to be incentives to help teachers achieve more.
- ✓ Suggest that the Board become involved with NASBE.
- ✓ There will probably not be anything through the next presidential election. This is a complicated issue; there is not a lot moving through Congress and there is no money. We have to adopt something more than a four year or four month time frame. The conversations have started to change. The major work will begin in January. Because of what has happened in the past years, there could be a conversation through the presidential election or a bunch of quick fixes.
- ✓ If the state could come up with a clear, clean model that would work, it would be better than a bunch of tweaks here and there.

- ✓ There is a provision in the law to allow the states more flexibility in implementation but it has been labeled as a “waiver”.
- ✓ Senator Patty Murray would be a good person to work with because of her involvement in key committees.
- ✓ The department codified the current practice for including limited English proficient students after one year.

Mr. Palmer stated that they will provide information on other programs and models for the Board to consider.

All of the conversation about accountability is about opportunity to learn for all students.

### **COLLECTION OF EVIDENCE**

Chair Ryan reviewed the plan for the afternoon’s discussion and hearing. Steve Dal Porto thanked his subcommittee members, Dr. Sheila Fox and Jack Schuster. He reviewed what the Board is being asked to approve tomorrow. Today the Board will be taking public comment and then the subcommittee will meet tonight to discuss further the procedures for tomorrow’s approval.

Dr. Lesley Klenk, Assessment Alternatives with OSPI, noted that the materials represented an additional copy of the booklet and some new materials just produced this week. Dr. Bergeson provided background information and support options for schools and students.

Dr. Joe Willhoft, Assistant Superintendent for Assessment and Research at OSPI, introduced Dr. Lesley Klenk and Anton Jackson of the Assessment staff. Dr. Willhoft provided history and information on the Collection of Evidence through a PowerPoint presentation.

#### *Professionally-Accepted Standards*

University-level research, application of assessment principles, and involvement of two panels of national assessment experts took place in order to design a Collection of Evidence system that meets professionally-accepted standards of validity and reliability. Dr. Cathy Taylor used the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing as the primary source to develop standards for assessments occurring at the classroom level. She presented six validity standards and four reliability standards applicable to classroom-based assessments, aligning with the national standards. Each standard in the Taylor paper is cross walked with the Collection of Evidence component(s) and analyzed to show the coverage of the standard. The two national panels are the National Technical Advisory Committee (current and emeritus university professors) [NTAC] and the Certificate of Academic Achievement (CAA) Options Technical Advisory Committee (state and national experts in assessment, psychometrics, and curriculum and instruction) [Option-TAC]. A third panel will be formed involving school-level and district-level practitioners. Both the NTAC and Option-TAC endorsed the Collection of Evidence.

#### *Comparability of Collection of Evidence (COE) to the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL)*

- ✓ Legislative requirement
- ✓ Two tests: Sufficiency and Proficiency
- ✓ Sufficiency assures adequate coverage of the content domain
- ✓ Proficiency assures overall quality of work is adequate

Capacity of the system is one of the main concerns for staff. Nine thousand (9,000) students are eligible to use the Collection as an alternative to earning the CAA. The signatures of the student and teacher are affirmations that the work is what the student knows and is able to do, but does not address the instruction issue.

The WASL has 40 some questions resulting in 60 some points. The Collection has 8 to 12 items submitted. The Collection needs to represent the same domains as the WASL. The mathematics WASL has 65 points; a submission of 12 items in the Collection generates 48 points which must be broad enough to equal the WASL points.

Once the notebooks are scored, the standard setting process will take place. How proficient will the notebooks have to be to equal 60% of the scores possible on the WASL to meet standard? The standard setting process will be similar to the process used for Grades 3, 5, 6, and 8. The Board will be asked to look at notebooks and score during a full day meeting.

There is a proposal to change the timelines to later in the year which will reduce the number of submissions to two total: June 15 submission with scores back in August; second submission by February 15 and with scores before the testing in the spring. Questions were raised on shortening the timelines—what effect will this have on next year's seniors—only one submission possible as is proposed now.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING ON COLLECTION OF EVIDENCE**

Wendy Rader-Konofalski, Washington Education Association, introduced Mary Lindquist, Mercer Island High School, and Michael Campbell, Lewis & Clark High School, Spokane. She provided written testimony (on file with these minutes). The WEA supports an authentic Collection of Evidence that is fair, equitable, valid, empowering and honors classroom-based assessments. Mr. Campbell provided comments from a teacher's perspective. His main concerns are timelines and burdensome paperwork along with the lack support materials. Ms. Lindquist agreed that this has potential to be a powerful piece of work. She is concerned with the timeline, even the restructured timeline. Teacher liability is a concern and clear protocols and guidelines for teachers are needed. Ms. Konofakski expressed concerns about the access for students. WEA would like to see the implementation delayed until the process is free of problems. It was stated that funding appeared to be \$600 per high school and insufficient. Concern was expressed that a student must fail twice before the alternative option is available.

Dave Balcolm, principal of Moses Lake High School and president of Washington Association of Secondary School Principals (WASSP), presented concerns with the timeline, no classes for the Collection of Evidence, and the alignment to 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade work. He noted that in some collective bargaining agreements teachers don't write learning plans for students.

Vickey Puckett, principal of Woodinville High School, provided information on a typical high school day. There was only one training so far with another proposed. Who will participate in the training? Many schools are on mid-winter breaks at the proposed time. How do we as principals explain this to parents? If the Collection is done over the summer, who will ensure the validity of the work? Mobility is another issue that concerns principals—what will be done to help them? Ms. Puckett urged the Board to reconsider the timelines and provide the appropriate training for teachers. She asked where they would find substitute teachers for teachers to attend trainings.

Bob McMullen, Association of Washington School Principals staff, stated that this is exploratory work. He presented information based on the number of Board members and what their

“students” would face. He asked the Board members to look at the mathematics standards and think about working with the standards. Suggestions include:

- ✓ Continue and enrich the training.
- ✓ Continue developing alternative assessment for mathematics.
- ✓ Delay until the summer retakes.
- ✓ Delay mathematics Collection for a year.

Principals need to be at the table to help with the corrections.

Barbara Mertens, Washington Association School Administrators, supports the continued work in this area. Concerns:

- ✓ Implementation and access for students
- ✓ SB 6618—charges Washington State Institute for Public Policy to look at the alternative assessments. This needs to feed into the institute’s study.

Anne Varkados, Assistant Superintendent of Bethel School District, stated that this is an important consideration for all students. She is concerned about the timeline; mathematics should be delayed. This will take teachers away from the classroom. She is concerned about graduation rates and resources.

Dr. Jim Koval, Superintendent of North Thurston School District, expressed concern that the Collection focuses on a specific group of students. He is concerned that the focus is not on the student. The district focus is on mathematics. He is afraid this will take the focus away from students. The Collection is an impediment to getting students to the standard.

Dave Lehnis, principal of Timberline High School, North Thurston School Districts, presented a couple of concerns:

- ✓ Does the building need more staff? How does he go to the teachers and say this will work?
- ✓ What impact will this have on the mathematics and the curriculum? We don’t know as much about mathematics as we do about reading and writing.
- ✓ Test anxiety has not been a reason for not passing the WASL. Most of his students don’t have the skills to pass the WASL and his school will continue to focus on that aspect.
- ✓ How do we make this happen?

Lynn Brogan, Issaquah School District, stated that the district supports the alternative assessments. In the trainings and other work with the Collection development, they have come away with more questions. The district is concerned that the resources needed are not available. There will need to be an extra FTE per building to manage the process. There has been no training for teachers to become high stakes assessment question developers. The district feels the Collection is not as rigorous as the WASL. The lack of clarity and complexity of the Collection make it not a viable option for students. The validity and reliability are not available at the building level. The recommendation is to delay implementation until resources are available or an outside agency can manage the process.

Gil Mendoza, Tacoma School District, noted he is part of the Options-CAA pilot. There have been two years of development for the Collection. Districts in Pierce County are well aware of the process. He fully supports the Taylor/Willhoft paper. If we had been doing assessments for the last ten years, the Collection would be a natural outcome of the system. Tacoma was a participant in the pilot for the Collection.

Kimberly Mueller is the coordinator the culminating project in Tacoma School District.

- ✓ What are the skills and knowledge students must have to put the Collection together?
- ✓ Why weren't kids involved in the process?
- ✓ The training should model what is believed about professional development.
- ✓ What do teachers need to have to provide the support needed?
- ✓ What resources are available to help support the Collection process?

Darlene Quayle, president of the Washington Association for Learning Alternatives, noted her written comments were submitted earlier. Alternative schools do not always have textbooks available for all students. The online schools also provide another set of problems for an increased workload for the students. Mobile students may not be able to put the Collection together. Alternative programs and small and rural schools may have to develop special assignments for the Collection. She raised several questions regarding the implementation of the Collection.

Susan Leavell, Central Kitsap School District, provided information on the problems of students with mobility and/or poverty issues. The Collection is a paperwork, time consuming nightmare. Please put kids first.

### **PUBLIC HEARING ON GOVERNANCE RULES**

Pat Eirish, State Board staff, provided background information on the purpose of the rule adoption. These are technical amendments. In response to a question, Ms. Eirish noted that the language being struck in 180-55 applies to public schools not the mission driven private schools.

### **AGENDA REVIEW**

- ✓ Mathematics discussion—draft of the mathematics action plan, short term options, and framework.
- ✓ Tribal MOA—recommendations from the subcommittee and a recommendation from the executive committee.
- ✓ Collection of Evidence—Board member question on what is the Board's responsibility with the Collection. Does the Board want to take a narrow approach or the broader approach to include implementation in the validity and reliability discussion? Executive Director Harding noted that the law is specific in what is required for the Board to decide. Discussion was held on the various aspects of the decision to be made on Friday, October 27.

Meeting recessed at 5:19



Friday, October 27, 2006

Vice Chair Warren Smith called the meeting to order at 8:16 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, Dr. Kristina Mayer, Mary Jean Ryan, John C. Schuster, Warren T. Smith Sr., Jeff Vincent, and Student Representative Tiffany Thompson.

Members Excused: Eric Liu and Student Representative Zachary Kinman

Staff Present: Edie Harding, Bob Butts, Pat Eirish, Laura Moore, Sarah Bland, Casey Corr, and Assistant Attorney General Colleen Warren.

### **COLLECTION OF EVIDENCE**

Dr. Steve Dal Porto presented information on the meeting held by the subcommittee on Thursday evening, October 26. The committee proposed the following:

The Board determines that there is validity and reliability for the guidelines, protocols, and scoring criteria for reading and writing, taking no position on mathematics. The process will be in place to determine that the Collections will be comparable in rigor to the WASL. The decision on the mathematics Collection of Evidence should be postponed until the Board reviews input on mathematics proposals from presenters and the joint action plan and options for the class of 2008 and then make a recommendation at the November meeting.

**Motion:** Moved by Dr. Dal Porto and seconded by Dr. Fox that the State Board of Education approve the guidelines for types of work samples, protocols for submission and scoring criteria for the reading and writing Collection of samples authorized as alternative assessments to the WASL. This approval decision and determination is conditional upon completion of the following by OSPI: (a) post quality work samples on the OSPI Web site; (b) require that schools submit work samples by June 15, 2007.

Dr. Bergeson stated that the law requires the Board to make a decision on all parts of Collection as to validity, reliability, and rigor compared to the WASL. The implementation and other issues are separate from the decision that has to be made. She is concerned about schools not wanting to divert from mathematics instruction to do the Collections. She would like bring back a better implementation plan to the November meeting.

Dr. Mayer supported Dr. Bergeson's statements. She would like to see more implementation concerns addressed.

Mr. Floyd is concerned with standard five addressing equal access and opportunity for all three parts of the Collection.

Dr. Dal Porto stated that the committee also considered tabling the adoption of the Collection to November.

Mrs. Bragdon stated that not including mathematics would open a "can of worms" that would make suspect any decisions made on mathematics by the Board. She supports Dr. Bergeson.

Dr. Fox stated that implementation is related to standard three and has to be considered. There can be separate details provided on implementation.

Mrs. Lamb asked who was providing the clarity to the teachers and students. She also asked if there were any negative consequences for students.

Mr. Schuster spoke in favor of the motion. He stated that the discussion was a long one on validity and reliability. Students who fail the WASL twice need an alternative in place this year. He is concerned that the Collection for mathematics is being adopted before the discussion of the mathematics WASL.

**Motion:** Moved by Dr. Bergeson and seconded by Mrs. Frank to amend the motion that the Washington State Board of Education approved the guidelines for types and numbers of work samples, protocols for submission and scoring criteria for reading, writing, and mathematics Collection of samples authorized as alternative assessments to the WASL. This approval decision and determination is conditional upon completion of the following by OSPI: (a) post quality work samples on the OSPI Web site; (b) require that schools submit initial work samples by June 15, 2007; (c) a plan developed by OSPI with stakeholders to address the implementation issues brought to the State Board by stakeholders. Amendment passed.

Mrs. Lamb still questioned who would provide clarity and the opportunity and access to learning.

Dr. Fox supported Dr. Bergeson's amendment.

Dr. Bergeson stated that the implementation issues, professional development, and curriculum issues will be there for all assessments.

In response to a question, Mrs. Lamb stated that as long the issues of clarity and equity are addressed by OSPI staff she can support the amendment.

Mr. Floyd suggested tabling the process until the November meeting.

**Motion:** Moved by Mr. Floyd and seconded by Dr. Dal Porto to table the motion. Motion failed.

**Motion as amended passed on a roll call vote of 10 yes, 2 no, and 1 excused.**

## **MATHEMATICS DISCUSSION**

Dr. Bergeson provided background on what the agency has been doing to help supplement mathematics curriculum and choosing other curricula that can help students learn mathematics. There are no comparable materials for mathematics like those that have helped reading and writing to achieve the results currently seen.

The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) came out with new standards for mathematics for grades K-8 in a document called *Focal Points*. OSPI has put together a team to look at the standards changes from NCTM compared to the Washington State standards. She presented a paper prepared by the OSPI mathematics team and this is being vetted by a national group. If this paper is accepted, there will need to be a discussion on changes to the

Grade Level Expectations (GLEs). Fluency in the ability to use and recall for students is a key component.

Bev Neitzel presented some of the omissions and differences between the state GLEs and the *Focal Points* document. The *Focal Points* is a content document; GLEs are content and process.

The state is working on a segmented mathematics test for use in the 2007-08 school year. This will allow students to be tested on components of the curriculum.

Parents have been left out of the equation to this point. The key is for parents to have a way to help their children at home to succeed.

In response to a question, Dr. Bergeson stated that what is being worked on at high school they are looking at for the younger grades. In response to a question, Ms. Neitzel noted that some of the work being done now will be available online. They are also looking at already developed programs (Bridge to Algebra and Cognitive Tutor) for use by students.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATHEMATICS**

Chair Ryan presented the framework the Board is discussing on mathematics through the joint mathematics action plan.

Representatives Ross Hunter (48<sup>th</sup> district) and Fred Jarrett (41<sup>st</sup> district) presented their mathematics plan. The plan is a bi-partisan proposal. There are actions that need to be taken by schools, students, and parents. Curriculum needs to be improved. Rep. Hunter would like to see a limited menu of curriculum choices available to school districts. The plan creates a sequence for learning for all students—be on track to have three to four years of mathematics in high school. Remediation needs to be funded at the middle and elementary levels. Teachers need to be better trained especially at the middle and elementary levels—the K-8 certificate does not make the grade. There needs to be strong graduation requirements—there needs to be a sense of urgency for the state and students. The level one students cannot be left behind; they need to be brought up to standard. There needs to be substantial changes in the way mathematics and science are taught. There needs to be age appropriate remedial funding for students.

Representative Glenn Anderson provided some statistics on what students in Washington cannot do at the present time. Private tutoring has increased considerably. The Washington State system is a total failure. This is the Trends in International Math and Science Study (TIMSS) and Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) world not a NCTM world. Rep. Anderson's program is for the long term fix, not for the short term. The Board will adopt the TIMSS/PISA standards. There will be an advisory panel to look at the standards and make recommendations for curriculum, teacher preparation, and testing. This will delay the WASL for at least two years. The substitute will be the SAT or ACT scores.

Representative Gigi Talcott wants to see the Grade Level Expectations at the international level as stated by Rep. Anderson. She stated that the cut scores for the SAT/ACT could be set low and raised over time. This is the responsibility of the Board. The whole education reform movement is in jeopardy at this time. In response to a question, setting the score low will not help students, but would help the system for the short-term.

Mike Hamilton, principal of Kalama High School, provided information on the program at Kalama. He elaborated on how the district made significant changes in the mathematics

program within the district, including a belief system that ALL students can learn and are worthy. They have received help from ESD 112 in Vancouver as well WSU-Vancouver and a grant secured through Senator Cantwell. Small districts have problems in securing qualified teachers and technicians. He recommended that the state stay the course. The Teacher Assistant Program needs to be expanded to all teachers along with holding regional mathematics summits. Tim Swett and Jenelee Herz, mathematics teachers, provided information on what is happening in the classroom and what is needed.

Joanne Robinson, Washington State Mathematics Council, stressed professional development for teachers. She also presented written testimony with recommendations as follows:

- ✓ Maintaining the focus on current standards with a clear definition of what fluency means.
- ✓ Keeping in place the graduation requirements for passing the WASL, especially the mathematics portion.
- ✓ Offering remediation at all levels.
- ✓ Requiring three or four years of mathematics to graduate.
- ✓ Promote programs to recruit, train, and retain highly qualified mathematics teachers with sustained professional development.
- ✓ Conducting a public relations campaign that stresses the theme “math is important” at home.
- ✓ Develop parent workshop at all levels of mathematics.

Ted Thomas, Washington State School Directors’ Association (WSSDA) Vice President and Longview School Board member, stated that we need high expectations and an effective system to increase student learning. He outlined the process his district used to increase the mathematics program for the various schools. WSSDA recommended delaying the mathematics requirement for graduation to 2011 until the system is changed to help the students prepare and the curriculum is aligned. They would welcome a menu of curriculum options. Professional development and resources to implement the programs are important. He requested that the Board remember that there are 296 districts in the state—reach out and don’t look through a single lens. Don’t focus on seat time only.

Mark Frazer, Washington Round Table, stated that mathematics should prepare students for higher education. There should be four years of high school mathematics. There at least needs to be mathematics to algebra 2. The Round Table believes that the graduation requirement in mathematics should stay.

Charles Hasse, Washington Education Association, feels that there needs to be a delay in the mathematics graduation requirement. The system is not ready to help students, especially English language learners. During the delay, the test should be looked at seriously. WEA recommends using a blended assessment model during the interim period. Other assessments, such as end of course assessments, should be explored. The WEA is against a single assessment for high stakes testing. There needs to be class size reductions in the schools.

Larry Nyland and Barbara Mertens, Washington Association of School Administrators (WASA), presented a position paper from the Snohomish County administrators. Recommendations: (1) professional development with concern that teachers are not prepared to teach mathematics the way we test mathematics; (2) aligned standards, materials, assessments; (3) coherent intervention plans with incremental testing and diagnostics. Mr. Nyland explained each of the recommendations. Ms. Mertens stated that a survey of WASA members is leaning to a delay of the mathematics requirement until 2010. There needs to be systemic changes.

Representative Dave Quall (40<sup>th</sup> district) provided comments on the information presented so far during the public comment period. There needs to be a strategy for mathematics that works for all students. The system has failed certain groups of students.

Jerry Bender and Phil Brockman, Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP), support the current state graduation requirements. The AWSP is suggesting that passage of an additional year of mathematics be an alternative to earning the Certificate of Academic Achievement (CAA). They have several recommendations. Mr. Brockman related that his teachers are not together on mathematics issues; funding is needed for professional development and for other support systems. There needs to be sustainable funding.

Julie Wright, parent, stated that current mathematics programs are failing students. The mathematics standards need to be aligned with TIMSS and PISA. Curricula need to align with international standards. There needs to be a committee formed to do this.

Burton Guttman, Professor Emeritus at The Evergreen State College, stated that over the last ten years mathematics proficiency has declined. The fuzzy mathematics curriculum is not helping students to succeed. He suggested adopting Rep. Anderson's proposal.

Linda Coble, Assistant Superintendent for North Thurston School District, stated that there needs to be a systemic change along with helping the students at the high school level. Segmented testing is a good process. There needs to be more help for the level one students.

Ruth Parker, CEO of Mathematics Collaboration, noted that mathematics textbooks have improved. The WASL is a good assessment system. (1) teachers cannot teach well what they don't know; (2) teachers cannot teach something that the parents and communities do not understand; parents need to be at the table on what should be done; (3) administrators cannot lead what they don't understand; (4) the state needs to build capacity in the system. This is a K-20 problem not a K-12 problem. She feels the WASL is a very solid test; a model for the nation.

Bob Brandt, retired software engineer, related problems he has incurred in his home school district. Minimal guidance does not work with students in the elementary grades. Structured learning is much preferred. Coherent standards are needed for K-8 and curricula that matches.

Dr. Michael Gilbert, Eastern Washington University, stated that good professional development is essential to making curriculum and teaching work for all students. Teachers are not dealing with mathematics reasoning. They are asking low-level questions. The content knowledge of teachers needs to be increased.

Linda Kozin, business owner and Bellevue parent, supports Representatives Hunter and Jarrett comments. There is no specific information on the WASL score report that provides information for parents to help their students. Parents need to have a mathematics tutor or advocate present when looking at the test of their students. Other learning disabilities have not been addressed.

Mary Jean McDermott, Seattle parent, stated that the curriculum is not teaching students what they need to know. She demonstrated some of the new teaching methods.

David Myerson, Mercer Island parent, doesn't feel the GLEs and Focal Points fit together. The curriculum is deficient.

Linh-Co Nguyen, teacher and Seattle parent, advocates not staying the course. Professional development is great for those who make money from it. There is a need to identify specific outcomes for professional development.

### **MATHEMATICS ACTION PLAN**

Chair Ryan provided background information on the proposed plan. Steve Floyd, Amy Bragdon, and Dr. Sheila Fox have volunteered to work on the plan during the month for presentation at the November meeting. The goal is to present the plan during the November/December legislative weekend. The plan has several recommendations including a third party review of the standards. There has to be alignment on standards, assessment, and curriculum. There will be debates on several of the items contained in the action plan. Graduation requirements will have to be looked at for rigor, alignment, etc. There is a suggestion for students to take a college entrance exam with remediation during the senior year.

Mrs. Frank suggested adding supplementary time for learning using time as a resource.

Dr. Mayer suggested adding accountability for the three entities; an evaluation instrument for the process; special populations as a whole should be considered; performance pay language should be included.

In response to a question, Chair Ryan stated that she wrote the first draft followed by staff and input from OSPI and Professional Educator Standards Board. Dr. Dal Porto would like to have the section on requiring four years of rigorous mathematics be costed out. He suggested that the timeline for implementation is too short. Dr. Mayer suggested costing the entire plan.

Mr. Schuster asked that it be costed out to see what would happen to such programs as the arts when a new academic requirement is added.

Mrs. Lamb suggested that the standards should be reviewed before anything else to assure what the outcomes we are looking for. Not all students are on track to go to college—this needs to be considered. Dr. Mayer stated that we are falling into the trap of remediation but need to look at acceleration of learning at an early age. We need highly qualified teachers to instruct students and what compensation would be available.

Dr. Baca, in looking at the interventions, noted they are not included in the timelines. Dr. Mayer noted that English language learners are being given more time to graduate but no change in the help that they are getting.

Mr. Vincent stated that if you want a quality product in a short period of time you must increase resources substantially. Mrs. Lamb noted that the funding formula currently being used does not allow flexibility—is seat-time based rather than the performance-based funding needed to help students?

Mr. Floyd asked for a sense of what the Board wants to be generated in the next two years. The costing out may have to wait until the plan is more developed.

Mrs. Frank suggested that there needs to be a study of learning loss over summer and a possible realignment of the school calendar. Her comments were supported by Mr. Schuster.

### *Options for Mathematics*

Chair Ryan reviewed the options and including SAT/ACT scores at a lower level of achievement (cut score) with the ability to raise over time. The subcommittee will come back with recommendations.

Mr. Vincent feels this will cause a higher level of debate on this issue. He suggested an open debate on the subject with the pros and cons of each issue provided.

Mrs. Lamb suggested looking at the cut score data to possibly lower the rate of passage. She is against having two of the three passed for getting a diploma.

Mr. Vincent provided some insight for members to considered:

- ✓ There is a problem to fix with a deadline associated with it and the mathematics at a minimum level to succeed.
- ✓ We need to have a better sense of what a year from now will look like. We need to keep the pressure on.
- ✓ What safety net are we going to put in place for those who cannot reach the finish line?
- ✓ We should stay the course.

### **MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT**

Chair Ryan thanked the members of the committee (Dr. Bernal Baca, Mrs. Linda Lamb, and Dr. Steve Dal Porto)

**Motion:** Moved by Dr. Baca and seconded by Dr. Dal Porto to approve that the chair of the State Board of Education sign the substitute resolution and the Memorandum of Agreement.

Dr. Baca reviewed the information presented to the Board and the recommendation to have the Board chair sign the memorandum of agreement.

Dr. Dal Porto said that he looked at the memorandum as requesting a separate high school credit. Having worked with the tribal leaders, he does not want to be deceptive. He noted that there is a budget proposal for funding curriculum development at the statewide level.

Mrs. Lamb provided some of the background information on the committee work. She felt that signing the memorandum puts the Board in an impossible situation. Executive Director Harding felt that there would be time to consider the proposal during the discussion of a meaningful high school diploma.

Mr. Schuster was supportive of the proposal.

Dr. Baca noted that his discussions with Rep. McCoy and Denny Hurtado, OSPI Indian Education Director, have been positive and feels this will work.

Dr. Dal Porto pointed out that the Board does not have the authority to require tribal history and culture as part of Washington State history. Chair Ryan said that, after the review, the Board will advocate for a change in the law, if the Board determines it should be a part of Washington State history.

**Motion carried.**

## **ADOPTION OF RULES**

**Motion:** Moved by Mr. Schuster and seconded by Dr. Mayer to adopt the rules as presented.

**Motion:** Moved by Mrs. Lamb and seconded by Mrs. Frank, in Chapter 180-55 WAC, that sections A-E and G be retained as noted. Motion carried.

**Motion carried on a roll call vote of 8 yes, 0 against, and 3 abstain.**

## **HONORING OF MARCIA RIGGERS**

Jack Schuster presented OSPI Assistant Superintendent Marcia Riggers with a resolution of appreciation. Ms. Riggers thanked the Board and noted that Pat Eirish has been her partner and is a wonderful resource for the Board.

## **PRIVATE SCHOOL APPROVAL**

Pat Eirish, State Board staff, provided the revised list of schools needing approval.

**Motion:** Moved by Mr. Floyd and seconded by Dr. Fox to approve the list as presented. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 2:41 p.m.

Adopted as presented: November 28, 2006

In response to a constituent concern, it is noted that there is not alignment between the Singapore mathematics curriculum and the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) standards. Email from Daniel Wu, Associate Professor of Medicine/Oncology at the University of Washington and member of "Where's the Math" is on file with these minutes.