



DRAFT



**FAMILIES AND EDUCATION LEVY
LEVY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 12, 2014**

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tim Burgess, Elise Chayet, Kevin Washington, Greg Wong, Sandi Everlove

OTHERS PRESENT: Holly Miller (OFE), Erica Johnson (OFE), Leilani Dela Cruz (HSD), Erin McGary-Hamilton (OFE Consultant), Long Phan (OFE), John Donaghy (Seattle Education Association), Isabel Munoz-Colon, Sarah Wilhelm (Health), Kathryn Aisenberg (OFE), John Pehrson (Former LOC member), Dora Taylor (Parents Across America), Forrest Longman (CBO), Brian Goodnight (Council Central Staff), Nate Van Duzer (CM Burgess staff), Sid Sidorowicz (OFE), Eric Anderson (SPS), Clover Codd (SPS)

Tim Burgess called the meeting to order. Introductions were made and the minutes from the September 9th LOC meeting were approved.

Staff from Seattle Public Schools, Clover Codd and Eric Anderson, were introduced to present the SPS Strategic Plan. C. Codd described the development of the plan which included a 70-member task force. Last school year represented the first year implementing the plan. Three main goals were adopted:

- Heavy focus on equitable outcomes
- Improve systems
- Strengthen partnerships.

Goal 1 includes the multi-tier support system to improve outcomes for all students. Goal 2 is intended to improve SPS' day-to-day infrastructure and Goal 3 includes community engagement. The plan is robust and ambitious.

K. Washington noted that the LOC has had several presentations by staff from the SPS IT area. We've been working on data improvement for a long, long time. Every year people from the district talk about how to improve data use. Does the current plan include a process to bring data pieces together to drive decision making?

C. Codd responded that this is an important strategy for Goal 2. SPS is looking at different data systems and considering how to integrate them. This is a major overhaul of systems that will be a multimillion dollar project. Phase I was the development of the academic data warehouse. SPS is not the only School District in the nation that deals with this problem and it is a priority for Deputy Superintendent Charles Wright. We are ready to tackle the problem as we are just as frustrated internally with the lack of data we can pull for decisions and the amount of time it takes. Central office is not designed to support the data needs that we have.

E. Anderson noted that with Power School implementation moving along, staffing has picked up for data requests and the warehouse is yielding more reports. The main customer for data support is the school principal. For each key customer, there is one kind of data access. Automated data reports for community projects is ongoing. E. Anderson added that data access remains a top priority.

G. Wong asked how raw goals of the plan are broken down into milestones. E. Anderson responded that there are annually reported metrics. These are summative measures on progress of the Strategic Plan priorities. Is the project on track? Is it being implemented well? A full time project manager and director of continuous improvement is on board now. This is one area where we've become a lot more formal.

S. Everlove asked what do you need to address data needs over the next 5 years? C. Codd responded that Deputy Superintendent Charles Wright and other SPS staff review data requests weekly. Data use in and of itself has exploded over last few years. Data needs now are not the same as five years ago and systems have not caught up with the demand.

E. Chayet and G. Wong asked if there might be places the Levy could intersect or dovetail with the SPS plan. C. Codd replied that it is our intent to be aligned and not working over one another and pouring duplicative resources into the same kids. I. Munoz-Colon added that OFE has already been partnering with staff at SPS. Once a month we come together as a whole to talk about areas we can leverage. We look at how can we better support data use across the district and how to partner together on professional development. One example of that is the MTSS RULER. Elementary schools in SE and SW have a social/emotional curriculum that builds their skills on how to interact with student and teacher. There is a seamless expectation on how we support students on self-regulation.

E. Anderson added that staff continuity has helped collaboration. SPS staff can reach out to OFE when we have new ideas. They are thought partners who help with strategic thinking. H. Miller added that this is a great prediction of where collaborative work is going. Recent focus has been on districtwide systems while Levy investments have been school by school. What's been more difficult is to focus on systems. SPS is making tremendous headway.

E. Anderson described the score card measures and targets. The purpose is to support communication to the public and in an annual report. Academic milestones are in support of goals 1 and 3 of the Strategic Plan. We are trying to be more strategic on what is important to measure. In addition, we are trying to be more transparent in the way we disaggregate data. We show results for English Language Learners (ELL), special education students, and those historically underserved (for example, African, Asian Pacific Islander, etc.).

Explaining the SPS metrics, E. Anderson stated that ELL student progress is a critical piece for SPS to follow. WaKIDS assessment gives us information on incoming kindergarten students. Research shows that reading skills and math skills developed by 3rd grade are indicators of subsequent academic success. SPS chose 7th grade indicators because 6th grade can be difficult transition year for many students. We are trying to be clear and precise around opportunity gaps and the disproportionality in special education, suspensions/expulsions, equitable access to preschool, arts/music, and physical education. What is happening in elementary

schools is not the same as in middle and high schools. We will measure results annually and report publicly.

C. Codd added that in the past, the District had school choice, which led to some competition for programming at schools and created inequities. When SPS changed from that to a new student assignment plan, families receive core academic assurances. However, SPS doesn't know exactly what students have access to at each school and what they don't. It is bigger task than what you might imagine. G. Wong asked if the district is also looking at gifted and talented programs. This seems to be not as addressed as much. E. Anderson answered yes, the board has asked for this. C. Codd added that it's a priority. G. Wong stated that as a parent, there appear to be many barriers for kids, and it should be easy to change those things. E. Anderson responded that the district has taken some steps. Last year SPS gave cognitive abilities tests to every 2nd grader. In addition, there is a Task Force working on this issue.

E. Anderson explained that in showing opportunity gaps, SPS selected large groups of students. We have a large ELL population in our schools so their results are shown. They are one of 3 groups of students on the Annual Report front page. Disaggregation by special education, and combined ethnicities is also shown. We are redesigning school reports so there is consistency across schools. We are also making the data more interactive for public. K. Washington pointed out that in structuring information this way, it serves a particular purpose. Is SPS continuing to disaggregate data by subgroups so student results are not being masked? Is that going on in the background? E. Anderson responded that that level of data is not a decision-making data point for the strategic plan. Interim assessment tools that teachers have access to and other information is used to address opportunity gaps at lower levels.

E. Anderson explained the effective teachers and leaders measures. The focus is on equitable access to quality teachers and retention rates. S. Everlove asked what measures are being used. E. Anderson responded that SPS uses evaluation rubrics and student growth measures, and is exploring the future use of student perception surveys. Surveys would be designed to protect staff and student anonymity. E. Anderson commented that a "multiple measures" approach to measuring teacher effectiveness is recommended, and referenced findings from a large scale project by the Gates Foundation. S. Everlove asked about the value-added measure. E. Anderson replied that "value added" is a methodology for analyzing student achievement growth..

Stakeholder engagement is a new layer of information. SPS is using a tool from Denver public schools. Finally, measures are being developed to reach out to community partners.

E. Chayet asked about the current state of these measures. Did the survey include all parents? E. Anderson said it did not. The survey was planned for January, but pushed back to March/April. SPS used a callback method. The Board has requested the percentage of families responding to survey.

E. Anderson was asked why the survey data was not disaggregated. C. Codd responded that the survey would have to be linked to the student id for that information. SPS doesn't have the ability to pull that off right now, so the report is in the aggregate. E. Anderson added that parents were asked to self-report demographic information. We'll wait until we can reliably disaggregate data. K. Washington asked, on principal customer satisfaction, is that the principal as provider or principal as customer? C. Codd replied that using the Denver model, it

is the principal as customer. SPS plans on expanding the survey out to school secretaries and non-certificated staff. E. Anderson added that SPS used the leadership institute to get principal feedback.

S. Everlove asked if there are other academic milestones, or is the only metric how kids end up on Common Core? Is the assumption students are getting 21st century skills if they meet CC standards? E. Anderson replied that if a child passes the 11th grade exam we expect them to be ready for college and career even though it is not a whole child assessment.

John Pehrson pointed out that a meaningful Strategic Plan is a lot more than measurement. The Strategic Plan is about changing student performance.

Holly welcomed back Kathryn Aisenberg and introduced Long Phan who is working on communications and community engagement for Earl Learning programs.

H. Miller described the continuing outreach underway for the Seattle Preschool Program. She gave an overview of what's driving this and what it is going to constitute. To set stage, the goal is getting SPP classrooms open in September of 2015. On February 23rd, the Implementation Plan is due to City Council. It must first be approved by the Central Budget Office and the Mayor. We have this month and next month to put the plan together. We believe the best way to get meaningful communication from community is to very transparently engage people in giving us advice.

K. Washington asked do you know what are the Mayor's issues and concerns? E. Johnson responded that it is to engage in diversity. The entire outreach plan is framed by the Race and Social Justice Initiative. We briefed the LOC previously on different program areas we'll use for the community meetings. These reflect the Action plan attached to the SPP ordinance. The 2nd goal is to be open and transparent. We want the community to feel valued. Finally, there will be an Advisory committee appointed by the Mayor with input from City Council.

H. Miller added that four new LOC members will be appointed. Hopefully, these can be drawn from the advisory committee. Holly invited LOC members to come to the community meetings for as long or as short as they want.

L. Phan described the six community meetings, starting Saturday, November 14th. Each meeting has a similar format but different content. We have consultants who will facilitate, capture notes and pictures. They will post results online and push information out in a variety of ways. Simultaneous interpretation and translation, free childcare, and food will be provided.

H. Miller added that the District has been invited to the Advisory Committee and the Interdepartmental Team. The Mayor and Superintendent are meeting soon to hammer out an agreement to collaborate on planning. This will be publicly announced. The District is front and center in the planning process. G. Wong asked if the Seattle Education Association is participating as well. H. Miller responded that the IDT is generally city agencies and the district. They will be addressing curriculum, assessment, and space needs. The City is not imposing SPP on the District.

S. Everlove asked if the meetings are these designed so that if someone comes to just one they won't be lost. L. Phan responded that the format is similar for each meeting. People can drop in on any they are interested in.

The meeting was adjourned.