

Washington State Board of Education
Special Board Meeting Teleconference
December 10, 2008

MINUTES

Members Attending: Chair Mary Jean Ryan, Co-Chair Warren Smith, Mr. Jack Schuster, Ms. Linda Lamb, Dr. Steve Dal Porto, Ms. Amy Bragdon, Mr. Steve Floyd, Dr. Sheila Fox, Ms. Phyllis Frank, Dr. Terry Bergeson, Mr. Jeff Vincent, Dr. Kris Mayer (12)

Members Absent: Ms. Lorilyn Roller (excused), Ms. Austianna Quick (excused), Dr. Bernal Baca (excused), Mr. Eric Liu (excused) (4)

Staff Attending: Ms. Edie Harding, Dr. Kathe Taylor, Ms. Loy McColm, Mr. Brad Burnham, Ms. Colleen Warren (5)

Meeting was called to order at 11:06 a.m. by Mr. Floyd.

Ms. Harding gave a brief overview of the agenda saying that the Board is talking about math curriculum and science standards at today's meeting. Superintendent Bergeson will give the Board an update on her recommendations; however, no action is required or will be taken at this meeting.

Math

The Board approved the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's (OSPI) adoption of K-8 math standards in April 2008 and the 9-12 math standards in July 2008. OSPI reviewed and ranked the math curriculum for K-8 to determine how they matched the new standards in August 2008. In September 2008 OSPI presented to the Board its recommendations for two math curriculum programs in elementary to include: Math Connects and Bridges in Mathematics and two math curriculum programs for middle school to include: Holt and Math Connects.

The SBE, with the help of its consultant, Strategic Teaching and the SBE Math Panel, reviewed the top four ranking programs in both elementary and middle school. Strategic Teaching reported to the Board in November 2008 that it supported Math Connects and suggested another program – Math Expressions, but not Bridges in Mathematics in elementary. Strategic Teaching also reported to the Board that it supported Math Connects, Holt, and suggested adding Prentice Hall in middle school. The Board approved the Strategic Teaching Report and asked OSPI to review its recommendations of Bridges in Mathematics, in light of the Strategic Teachings findings.

Science

In fall 2007, the Board contracted with Heil & Associates to review current science standards. The contractor worked with the SBE Science Panel, conducted public outreach and made final recommendations to the Board, which the Board approved in May 2008 and sent to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Unlike math, the Board does not approve adoption of science standards.

Dr. Bergeson will present her new science standards, which were due on December 1, 2008. A short report from Heil & Associates will be discussed as well.

By May 15, 2009, the superintendent shall present recommendations, to the Board, for no more than three basic science curricula each for elementary, middle and high school. By June 30, 2009, the Board shall provide official comment and recommendations to OSPI. Since there is no funding to hire a consultant, the Board can meet with the Science Panel and take public comment at the May meeting.¹

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction Briefing on Its finalization of K-8 Mathematics Curricular Recommendations

Dr. Terry Bergeson, Superintendent, OSPI

Dr. Bergeson provided the Board with the final recommendations of basic mathematics curricula for the elementary (K-5) and middle school (6-8) grade spans. The high school (9-12) curricula recommendations will be presented at the January 2009 Board meeting, along with the results of the K-12 supplemental materials review. This work is in response to requirements outlined in the 2008 Second Substitute House Bill 2598 that requires the OSPI to present recommendations of no more than three basic mathematics curricula at the elementary, middle, and high school grade spans to the Board for their review and comment. The final recommendations have been made.

The final recommendations from OSPI are as follows:

1. Elementary (K-5)
 - Math Connects
 - Bridges in Mathematics
 - Math Expressions
2. Middle (6-8)
 - Holt Mathematics
 - Math Connects
 - Prentice Hall Mathematics

The legislature directed OSPI to recommend no more than three programs at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. All six programs recommended for elementary and middle grades are mathematically sound. Recommendations are

¹ Note: the Governor has provided funding in her supplemental budget for the SBE to do this as of December 18, 2008, but we will have to wait to see if the legislature concurs.

based on alignment to strong mathematics standards. The alignment review process was rigorous, inclusive, and transparent.

Next Steps:

- Some degree of supplementation will be necessary with every program reviewed, as no one program aligns completely to the 2008 revised mathematics standards.
- There are viable programs being used in Washington State that are not included in the recommendations. Districts will need support from OSPI in adapting these programs to align with the 2008 Mathematics Standards.
- Results of the K-12 Supplemental Mathematics materials will be issued in January 2009.

Steve thanked Ms. Domaradzki, Dr. Bergeson, and the team who worked so hard and long to get this work accomplished. Terry thanked the Board and Strategic Teaching for their work and willingness to work with OSPI to get the work accomplished.

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction Presentation of Revised Science Standards.

Dr. Terry Bergeson, Superintendent, OSPI

Ms. Mary McClellan, Science Director, OSPI

Ms. Lexie Domaradzki, Assistant Superintendent, OSPI

The goal for the new science standards is to better prepare our students for secondary education, meet the workforce needs of tomorrow, and contribute to the future of our state and the world as scientifically literate citizens. The legislature passed HB1906, in 2007, calling for the State Board of Education review and OSPI revision of science standards.

OSPI's commitment, to the new standards, includes:

- The revised science standards are being generated by the educators, scientists, and citizens of Washington State
- The revised science standards will balance:
 1. Washington's unique strengths and needs
 2. Expert advice from expert educators
 3. Conformity to national directions

Ms. McClellan responded to the 11 recommendations that were submitted by Heil & Associates and answered questions from the members.

Report by David Heil & Associates on the Revised Science Standards

Mr. David Heil, David Heil & Associates

Dr. Rodger Bybee, David Heil & Associates

Ms. Kasey McCracken, David Heil & Associates

David Heil & Associates, Inc. supported OSPI's efforts to revise the Washington science standards with the following activities:

- Collaborating with OSPI staff and their consultant, Ms. Cary Sneider, to plan and conduct a two-day workshop for the Science Standards Revision Team
- Reviewing two drafts of the Revised Science Standards
- Facilitating two meetings of the Washington Science Advisory Panel
- Providing summaries of the Panel's comments and feedback.

The final report to the Board summarizes the Heil & Associates team findings from a review of the final draft of the Revised Washington State K-12 Science Standards, dated December 1, 2008. The Team reviewed the document with attention to how well it addresses each of the 11 recommendations that were outlined in the Final Report of the Review of the Washington Science Standards and endorsed by the Board.

Mr. Vincent thanked the OSPI staff and the Heil team for the outstanding work done on the science standards.

Ms. Frank asked that it be on record that the Board needs to pay attention to how this work will connect with the assessments and students and teachers should be held accountable.

Update on math and Science Joint Action Plans

Mr. Jeff Vincent, Science Board Lead

Mr. Steve Floyd, Math Board Lead

Mr. Floyd indicated that the math standards and curriculum pieces are two obvious issues to bring the plan to fruition. Recruitment and retention of math teachers; professional development; continued development of colleges and universities for students coming in to our schools; and looking at standards and curriculum on an ongoing basis is a huge undertaking and will be difficult for the Board to do on its own.

Much work is needed to strengthen our expectations and measurements for our students. The legislature weighed in on math and came up with end of course for high school math courses. As science becomes closer to a graduation requirement, do we have the right test? We're making progress in improvements of what students should know. It's important when strengthening standards to make sure they're getting taught. How do we make sure that the students actually meet the new standards? There are real challenges going from where we are today to where we need to be with the standards.

Draft Resolution on Accountability Framework

Ms. Edie Harding, Executive Director

Feedback was received on the Accountability Framework resolution and a draft was created for the January meeting. Edie presented the Framework, explaining that it is in

resolution language. If the members have feedback issues Edie asked that they contact her via email with the further feedback.

A Q&A has been prepared, from concerns expressed at the WSSDA conference in November. The Q& A will be posted on the SBE Web site soon.

Public Comment

Scott Stowell

Mr. Stowell had several comments regarding the science standards. The domains of science have been moved up and under the systems category. He feels that's not a good organizer. There has been a big improvement in terms of the standards. The organization of the new standards has good clarity. He has an issue of elevating the idea of systems which is a unifying theme to the status of a key essential learning. That among a number of other themes is in the national standards. Other broad themes are things like change, constancy, interaction, organization, continuity and change over time, which are broad themes that cut across most of the disciplines and weave ideas together. To single out systems as separate, is somewhat artificial in the world of systems. He has advocated that the systems be put in the same category under the application and label that application as connection so you end up with three essential learning's. The other issue is 11th and 12th grade science. We need to be clear with what kids need to understand and be able to do in science to enter the world of work, specifically in engineering programs. He's not sure that the new standards address grades 11 and 12. Too many of our kids are ill prepared when they go in to secondary education.

Wendy Rader-Konofolski, Washington Education Association (WEA)

Ms. Rader-Konofolski thanked the Board for allowing stakeholders to speak.

The WEA is dedicated to the proposition that all students can and should be educated for the 21st century and that the union has a very important role in helping that happen. She gave feedback, as follows, on the Accountability Framework:

1. How does the resolution correlate to the detailed report by Mass Insight, which is on the SBE Web site and dated December 2008? The very existence of the report sends a message. The WEA wonders if we shouldn't be talking about that document instead of the resolution the Board has drafted, partly because there are those out there who are likely to look at the big report as the "operating manual" to the resolution.
2. The WEA notes that there is still much in the report that does not resolve the many concerns expressed by them and other stakeholders with regard to the Innovation Zones and the problem with funding for only some schools. Complex system set up with limited funding, assumptions about "turnaround leaders" having authority to do a number of things, which are under the purview of the collective bargaining agreement, and statements such as "...the state should

seek to provide maximum flexibility from both federal and state restrictions that may inhibit turnaround implementation” that raises all kinds of questions for the WEA and their members.

The WEA strongly encourages the Board to accept responsibility for where the proposal goes and for the possibility that it will be enacted with insufficient funding, despite all the best intentions.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:05 p.m. by Mr. Floyd