

Social Emotional Learning Advisory Committee (SELAC) Meeting Agenda

9:00AM–12:00PM
April 29, 2025
[Zoom](#)

| Time | Item |
|-------------|--|
| 9:00– 9:10 | Opening & Announcements |
| 9:10–9:20 | Inclusive Welcome |
| 9:20–11:40 | Recommendation Review/Discussion and Breakouts |
| 11:40–11:50 | Subcommittee Review |
| 11:50–11:55 | Public Comment |
| 11:55–12:00 | Next Steps and Adjournment |

Attendees

Committee Members

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---------------------|---|------------------|---|
| Anna Armstrong | | Christopher Belisle | x | Xyzlora Brownell | x |
| Sarah Butcher | x | Tabatha Copeland | | Lauren Day | x |
| Laurie Dils | x | Jeannie Dodd | | Nadine Philp | x |
| Sharman Ensminger | | Mary Fertakis | | Kristine Harper | x |
| Suzie Henning | x | Demetricia Hodges | x | Dr. Mona Johnson | x |
| James Layman | x | Lauren Macdonald | | Caryn Park | x |
| Tammy Bolen | x | Emily Santiago | x | Monika Schuller | x |
| Leiani Sherwin | x | Rayann Silva | | Anna Smith | |
| Tiffany Moss | x | Nigar Suleman | x | Cynthia Tamayo | x |
| Scott Lehrman | | Frieda Takamura | | Maddy Vonhoff | x |

Guests

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------|---|--------------|---|
| Anna Hernandez-French | x | Dixie Grunenfelder | x | Heather Rees | x |
| Jenny Plaja | x | Salina James | x | | |

Social Emotional Learning Advisory Committee (SELAC) April 29, 2025 Meeting Notes

Opening & Announcements

During the meeting, we welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda and breakdown of the day's activities. We began with a Tribal Land Acknowledgement, followed by the OSPI Equity Statement. We then discussed the SELAC Community agreements and protocols. Finally, we welcomed our new member, Scott Lehrman (not present).

Inclusive Welcome

James started the meeting with an inclusive welcome, including a weather report and an emotional check-in. We then moved into breakout rooms for a 5-minute discussion, after which James welcomed stories and connections from the breakout rooms.

Tammy outlined the committee charge, detailing responsibilities of the committee as identified in the RCW that mandates OSPI to convene and staff the committee. Tammy reminded the members of the presentation by OSPI on learning standard process from the January meeting. She noted that Kara and Angela (OSPI presenters) thanked the committee for their dedication and feedback on resource development for families and caregivers. She mentioned the task of the Committee to identify professional development opportunities and the charge to update the SEL Online Module. She reminded the Committee that this was developed in partnership with the Committee and OSPI. Some members of the Committee participated in a major update of the Module segments three years ago and this year, there were only minor changes that OSPI made to these.

Tammy then focused on the recommendations and the legislative report. She went over the report requirements. She reminded the Committee that they voted to continue forward with the 2024 recommendations and the Committee and co-chairs asked OSPI for feedback on how to make the recommendations actionable, and clear. Tammy addressed the timeline for

finalizing the report, which is due to the legislature by June 1. She reviewed what has been accomplished so far and what still needs to be done. The report will be finalized and sent to OSPI by May 9 in preparation for submission to the legislature by June 1.

Recommendation Review/Discussion & Breakouts

Tammy and Dixie prefaced the discussion that this is a collaborative effort between the committee and OSPI. OSPI Government Relations (GR) were involved in the discussion and addressed questions from the committee.

The committee began the review of the recommendation document that had feedback from GR on how to make the recommendations clearer and more actionable.

Recommendations 1 & 2 – did not have any feedback.

Tammy shared her screen to show the feedback for recommendations 3-5; she invited GR to discuss each recommendation and elaborate on the feedback.

Recommendation 3 – Jenny (GR) discussed what she would do if she were a legislator looking at the recommendation to move it forward. She recommended that the committee be more specific, considering funding and the current budget climate. She suggested referencing decision packages and provided other ideas to make the recommendation more actionable for legislators. Jenny also read through the recommendation feedback. The floor was open for questions from the committee regarding recommendation #3. No questions.

Recommendation 4 – Jenny reviewed and discussed the feedback, emphasizing the need for the Committee to be more specific and direct with the recommendation. She suggested adding more explicit wording to clarify what the expanded role would entail and considering the scope, whether to keep it student-focused or to expand and make additions. Jenny also addressed the deliverables and tasks of the committee, opening the floor for questions and thoughts. No questions.

Recommendation 5 – Jenny discussed the feedback given by GR on this recommendation, emphasizing the importance of ensuring that the rationale and recommendation align and are clearly defined. While the rationale language was very clear, the recommendation needed further clarification. Jenny opened the floor for questions to address these points.

Suzie highlighted that the recommendation is rooted in our framework, elements,

and guiding principles; viewed through a trauma-informed lens and suggested adding this wording to the rationale. She also noted that the document originally aligned with EOGOAC recommendations and encouraged reminding the committee that SEL is working to align with EOGOAC and support students of color.

Monika expressed the need for a better understanding of the process, emphasizing the importance of keeping public education at the forefront of social and emotional learning.

Jenny responded by pointing out the various ways this could be implemented and that structures need to be built statewide that can filter down to districts and that considers cultural aspects.

Committee members entered breakouts for 30-minutes to look at and edit recommendations 3-5.

Large group discussion/breakout groups share-out:

Recommendation #3 share out – Suzie and the rest of the breakout group realized that we are encouraging SEL through a 3-legged stool approach within the MTSS framework, which includes direct instruction, adult capacity, integration, and school culture and climate. She suggested two key points: first, SEL must be explicitly integrated into MTSS implementation in school buildings; second, fully funding SEL involves supporting the 3-legged stool components—direct instruction, professional learning and capacity building, and school culture and climate. The group aimed to make the funding more specific, emphasizing the need to fund both MTSS and the partnership/team for SEL and MTSS. Kris added by clarifying what funding meant and provided several ways to utilize the funding.

Member Thoughts & Questions:

- How do school districts allocate the funding?
 - School districts allocate funding with a mix of local decision-making and specified implementation guidelines. They usually have considerable flexibility and local control, though legislative direction can be made more specific. However, overly specific recommendations may face pushbacks.
- How do we become stronger in MTSS? Do legislators understand the educational foundation of MTSS? Should there be professional development for politicians to understand MTSS? Are there other departments in OSPI pushing through MTSS and we

can partner with/piggyback on regarding funding?

- To strengthen MTSS, we need to address budget constraints and recent changes, as school districts face implementation challenges with limited resources and staff cuts. Professional development for legislators could enhance their understanding of MTSS. Partnering with other OSPI departments might help secure additional funding, especially after the loss of federal MTSS funding. Prioritizing impactful strategies is crucial to move the work forward effectively.
- Is there an intent to codify MTSS in statute by 2027 so that it is a non-negotiable? What direction is the agency heading, is MTSS work being moved to Special Education for funding?
 - Currently, there is no plan to codify MTSS in statute, as adding requirements prematurely could harm the work. The focus is on resourcing and boosting MTSS, with future considerations for amending the statute. MTSS is centered in Special Education due to robust supports and resources, but it remains a school-wide initiative, not specific to Special Education.

GR commented on the adjustments made to recommendation #3, noting that it is getting stronger and appreciated the added focus and intentionality. They mentioned that more conversations might be necessary if the recommendation is picked up for a bill or budget proviso to be clear and actionable.

Recommendation #4 share out – Emily shared what her group discussed during breakouts. She pointed out the role of the advisory committee being focused on education and questioned whether the committee should collaborate with other committees and be making recommendations to them or receiving recommendations from them. Emily suggested amending the RCW to include named bodies like PESB, the State Board of Community and Technical Colleges, and DCYF Early Learning, to increase partners and representatives. She also proposed including someone from the governor's office to support the committee if the SELAC role expands. Emily emphasized the importance of including the whole child model in the RCW, noting that the current scope is school/student-centered and questioned whether the committee should be expanded to include other agencies through collaboration.

Member Thoughts & Questions:

The committee discussed the importance of implementing SEL and building adult capacity in this recommendation, with a focus on a holistic approach to support the whole child. With this lens, they discussed the alignment between higher education, K-12, and early learning and including more representatives to include build a more collaborative approach. The committee

considered which voices were missing from the work, suggesting the inclusion of PESB and possibly higher education partners. There was a question about whether feedback from agencies listed in the RCW is required when submitting the report to the legislature; it was clarified that the goal is that members would seek feedback from their respective agencies. There was a discussion on who should be included in the RCW and whether the recommendation should be elevated to the governor's level. Members supported adding PESB and moving forward with the recommendation, while expanding the scope of the committee, and whether or not it should be at the governor's level was noted for future discussion.

Recommendation #5 share out – Caryn shared that the breakout group discussed the recommendation and the need for clarity in the language; they changed the order of the paragraph within the rationale to better explain the collaboration and directing of both agencies. There was a discussion on whether the recommendation should be a priority, questioning the effectiveness of the K-12 needs assessment given current system challenges. The group considered if there are more pressing recommendations and why their recommendations had not received support over the years. They posed the question of what the best way may be to understand the lack of movement in the committee's recommendations, and how the committee can learn more about why the recommendations have not gained any traction. The question was asked how the committee can better situate themselves and be successful in moving recommendations forward.

One member shared that the priority should be to build building-level infrastructure and identity. Without foundational work in educator preparation and professional development, systems won't change. Therefore, now is not the time to prioritize needs assessments.

Member Thoughts and Questions:

Members emphasized the importance of remembering the charge of the committee and focusing on students and teachers, with SEL implementation at the classroom level. This year's recommendations should prioritize classroom activities to ensure they are effective and sustainable. There was a call to prioritize and fine-tune the long-term focus of the recommendations.

The questions posed in the share out led to a discussion on whether fewer recommendations would increase the likelihood of them being considered by the legislature and how to best gain traction. The committee posed this question to GR. They suggested prioritizing and scaling the recommendations or focus and submitting 1-2 key recommendations. There was debate on whether to move forward with one recommendation, especially one without funding ties, to

align with the current climate, or to scale all five recommendations.

The decision was made to move forward with all five recommendations since that was what was voted on in the February meeting but to prioritize them. Recommendation 3 was identified as the top priority by 77% of the group through a polling process. After further discussion, there was consensus to elevate Recommendation 1, with the rest remaining as bulk priorities.

Tammy closed out this discussion by addressing the next steps. Tammy will make the edits to the recommendations and add them to the Legislative Report; the committee will have one week to review the report for minor changes before it is submitted to OSPI for a final review.

Subcommittee Review

Subcommittee members were asked to make corrections to the list on the screen and clarify who was involved over the last year for the legislative report. It was confirmed that some subcommittee members are not actual members of SELAC, which is acceptable.

One subcommittee asked for direction as one of their co-chairs has not been present, and the other is no longer with OSPI. This was noted and pinned for later discussion.

Another member, Tiffany Moss, took over for a past member, Michelle Sorensen, but is unsure of her committee assignment.

There were updates on subcommittee membership: Debbie Tully and Jennifer Indo were added to the EPP subcommittee. Demetricia confirmed her involvement in the SEL Assessment subcommittee and/or Implementation Data. Christopher Belisle requested his name be replaced with Carola Brenes in the Family & Community Engagement subcommittee. Lauren MacDonald and Rayann Silva were also noted as members of the SEL Assessment subcommittee.

Next Steps & Adjournment

OSPI Staff addressed that due to capacity, the loss of SEL's Program Lead, and hiring and budget constraints, the May and June meetings are cancelled, and OSPI will be starting the annual recruiting process with the intent to resume Committee meetings in the fall. Tammy checked in with the committee, asking how everyone is feeling about this and if there are any questions.

There were questions about OSPI hiring for the position to support SELAC next year; OSPI stated there have been discussions about hiring a replacement or a facilitator but considering the budget uncertainty that OSPI is still grappling with a decision has not been able to be determined until OSPI sorts out the budget (that had passed two days before). Dixie mentioned that there is budget support for ongoing SELAC activities, and work will continue on. OSPI will be finalizing the report and recruiting members to align with the committee's charge, even though the committee is not meeting during this time. It was clarified that the funding challenges and support is agency-wide, not only impacting the Committee but programs, and workgroups across the agency.