

**Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
September 8, 2014**

Committee Members in attendance:

Amy Van on behalf of Zharina Angeles, *Commission on Asian Pacific American Affairs*
Dr. James Smith, *Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee*
Brad Fulkerson on behalf of Jennifer Harris, *Office of the Education Ombuds*
Edri Geiger, *Washington State School Directors' Association*
Gloria Ochoa, *Commission on Hispanic American Affairs*
Jess Lewis, *Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction*
Myra Johnson, *Washington Education Association*
Paul Alig, *TeamChild*
Tim Stensager, *K-12 Data Governance Committee*
Tracy Sherman, *League of Education Voters*

Committee Members not in attendance:

Edward Prince, *Commission on African American Affairs*
Matt Vaeena, *Commission on Asian Pacific American Affairs*
Mia Williams, *Association of Washington School Principals*
Rosemarie Search, *Washington Association of School Administrators*
Trevor Greene, *Association of Washington School Principals*

Staff and Public in attendance:

Ailey Kato, *Senate Committee Services*
Megan Eliasson, *Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction*
Megan Wargacki, *House Office of Program Research*

Introductions, agenda overview, and approval of meeting minutes

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by OSPI staff. The July meeting minutes were approved. Agenda items were reviewed and the task force decided to reorganize the order of agenda items. These minutes reflect the reorganized agenda.

Work Session: Review Draft Data Elements Homework

Discussion:

- Remediation data is available at the district, but post K-12 data is difficult to acquire.
- We need to track the services provided upon return. Districts have an inordinate number of kids suspended and expelled.
- We must determine what subgroups are being effected and collect data on those not receiving services.
- Data spotlight on services, asking: what, how, and where served?
- Ideally online data could be compared across districts, but we need to first determine the granularity of items for comparison.
- Codes are frequently exhausted by administrators.
- Districts will skew data to look good; there is a need for oversight and accountability.
- Should we audit to see fulfillment, including monitoring at district for this level of detail?
- State Auditor conducts a similar process. Jess will be involved in OSPI's system evaluation.
- Consolidated Program Review (CPR) findings require a change to be made within 45 days.
- CPR is an opportunity to look at policies, procedures, and practice.
- We can make shifts with conversations, starting with: all students can learn.
- Professional Development and one on one Technical Assistance is offered.
- There is a potential for OSPI to withhold funds for districts out of compliance.

Data Displays for Dropout Cohorts

Tim Stensager, *Director of Data Governance, OSPI*

- The Education Research & Data Center (ERDC) defines all public and private schools in their National Clearinghouse.
- The ERDC collects remediation data for Reading, Writing, Math, or Combined.
- Washington in comparison to other states has the lowest percentage of students going to college from the lowest income bracket.
- Dr. Keim, Executive Director of Washington Association of School Administrators (WASA) showed National Assessment of Academic Progress (NAAP) scores and unpacked data showing that for students in poverty - we are doing the worst.
- This is why data disaggregation is so important; we need to show pockets of students needing help.
- Tim shared the 1960 student grad rate – 100 started school, 48 graduated.
- Title of responsible Department (at OSPI and districts): Curriculum and Instruction.
- Altruistic and Economic changes in the U.S. produced Teaching and Learning systems: Core, Core +, Title/LAP, Special Education, ELL.
- Barriers to instruction include: abuse, hunger, drug and alcohol, and mental illness, but these cannot be captured in CEDARS.
- With the Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) you can click on a year and select a district. We can compare to districts with similar demographics, using animated data selecting race/ethnicity and gender.
- The K-12 Data and Reports site provides a statewide display.
- Where is the accountability for making positive change?
- State Board of Education (SBE) Education Health Indicators has paused discipline conversation to see what this task force comes up with for recommendations.
- We need to create an urgency for districts. The community will be an internal force.
- Districts need to show that prior to suspension or expulsion all other options were exhausted.
- Every district does office referrals differently; our collection is missing a “referrals” component.
- The problem is we are not seeing prior discipline; kids are pre-excluded.
- We need to be proactive on the front end with prevention. We are focused on the back end.
- Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) Cultural Competency Requirements need training.
- Training and monitoring of teachers who oversee disciplined students. Our analytics should reveal administrative problems for staff to treat. Do we have data on excessive discipline?
- We need multidisciplinary teams with an interdisciplinary perspective.
- These are institutionalized practices. What is the global question; what is our gateway entry?
- Legislators want to utilize this data, particularly with McCleary and the power to redefine Basic Education.

Public Comment

Public was invited to comment and no comment was provided.

Final Session: Draft Data Elements

1. Have you done interventions prior to suspension? (Priority 2)
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
2. Education Services (type and location) during the Suspension or Expulsion? (Priority 1)
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

If yes, did it include academic instruction/services?

 - a) Yes
 - b) No

If yes, did it include behavior interventions?

 - a) Yes
 - b) No

Academic Progress- currently captured in CEDARS (Priority 1)

3. Reengagement Meeting Held? (Priority 2)
 - a. Yes
 - b. NoIf yes, date of meeting _____
4. Reengagement Plan? (Priority 2)
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
5. Parents Notified of Due Process Rights? (Priority 3)
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
6. Petition for Readmission? (Priority 1)
 - a. Yes
 - b. NoIf yes, did student submit a petition for readmission?
 - a) Yes
 - b) NoIf yes, date _____
If yes, was the student's petition for readmission granted?
 - a) Yes
 - b) NoIf yes, date _____
7. Was the suspension or expulsion appealed? (Priority 2)
 - a. Yes
 - b. NoWas it upheld?
 - a) Yes
 - b) NoIf yes, was it appealed to the school board?
 - a) Yes
 - b) NoIf yes, did school board shorten?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No
8. Was the petition made by the district to exceed more than one calendar year? (Priority 1)
 - a. Yes
 - b. NoIf yes, was the petition granted?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No

Priority 4: Will include remaining data elements

Work Session: "Other" Discretionary Discipline Elements

Definitions finalized in December 2013 have been revised in CEDARS manual. Collection will begin this school year (2014-15).

Definitions finalized in January 2014 and September 2014 will be included with next revision of CEDARS manual. Collection will begin in the 2015-16 school year.

New definition- Multiple/ Accumulated Offenses: discipline for culmination of multiple infractions that occurred during a school year.

Finalize Legally Defined Behaviors for CEDARS

The task force proposed to postpone this session to the November meeting. OSPI staff will draft legally defined behavior definitions. Draft definitions will be sent to members to review and capture edits or comments before the November meeting.

Planning: Report/Recommendations and November Agenda

- November 10, 2014 is scheduled as the final task force meeting; December 8, 2014 is being held tentatively pending completion of remaining decision items.
- A draft recommendations report will be reviewed at the November meeting. The task force will work through remaining data elements and areas of recommendations outside of the charge.
- The task force requested follow up from Tim Stensager (or available Student Information staff) on the following items:
 - Update on the CEDARS Stakeholder meeting and proposal of data elements
 - Review sufficiency of existing CEDARS data elements for credit retrieval and school dropout
- The task force will finalize definitions for legally defined behaviors following review and editing of OSPI draft definitions.

With no further comment, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.