

The special school board meeting held on Thursday, July 30, 2009 in the Board Room of the Administration Service Center was called to order at 10:35 a.m. Present were board President Brian Deagle, directors Connie Fletcher, Chad Magendanz, Suzanne Weaver, Jan Woldseth and Superintendent Steve Rasmussen.

Also present at the table were cabinet members Ron Thiele, Kathy Miyauchi, Marilyn Holm, Milton Ellis, Patrick Murphy, Colleen Dixon, Jake Kuper, Jody Bongard and Sara Niegowski.

Mr. Wright Noel attended to observe.

The agenda for this meeting is available at:

<http://www.issaquah.wednet.edu/board/events/ViewEvent.aspx?ID=154&KEY=8Nc116zG>

There was considerable discussion about information/data needs for effective monitoring of policies, what “indicators” and “evidence” is needed by the Board, and areas where the Board needs to do more work on clarifying intent of policy, so that the administration can better assess if the “mark” is being met; and, if the mark isn’t being met, why? From there, choices can be made about where to put resources and/or emphasis.

It was suggested that there are multiple steps needed to effectively monitor Ends and ELs. This would potentially be a 6-week “runway” to monitor: two weeks before to look at the draft and then 4 weeks to complete. This concept would apply to both Ends and ELs.

Meeting #1: Agree on what are the criteria to govern, what are the principles of success? Cost to get? A draft of the monitoring report, specifically interpretations, would be presented to the Board at a meeting or a work/study seeking confirmation from the board that the interpretations are on target.

Meeting #1 or #2: The administration will present draft to the Board a listing to identify the “body of evidence” that will be used to support the interpretation(s). If this data/evidence is adequate/satisfactory, the monitoring report can be presented at the next meeting. If not, the administration will follow Board direction to meet identified needs.

Meeting #2 or #3: A second draft or revised report could be provided if revisions were significant or for some reason desirable.

Meeting #3 or #4: Once criteria, interpretations and body of evidence are satisfactorily identified, the final monitoring report will be presented to the Board and there would likely be little or no further substantive discussion.

The discussion continued about building systems for monitoring, setting criteria for monitoring, and the need for analysis. Also, the report may not show a desirable result, but the *process* for developing the report should be clearly defined and agreed upon ahead of time. Then the *results* shown can be addressed/questioned/discussed, but there should be no further need to discussion/question the data/evidence/interpretations presented.

Other questions/comments repeated or emphasized included:

- The need to know and be clear “why” monitoring is being done.
- It is the Board’s responsibility to establish indicators that lead to interpretation, and there would be agreement in advance on what the Board is going to accept.
- Value/cost are factors: that data/evidence must be worth the cost of collecting, and there is no undue additional staff time or effort to create.
- The *content* of the report could give the board “information the Board doesn’t want to hear” but that can be valuable for planning where resources are going to be applied, and even if that is the case, the report *itself* should be prepared the way the board wants it prepared.
- Policy states board members will be prepared for the meeting; it is important the materials are provided with adequate study time prior to the meeting. It will be important that board members do study the materials prior to the meeting; and per policy GP-2, board members are encouraged to call to ask questions prior to meeting.

- If a good system is in place, and it's agreed ahead of time that the Board has identified what the Board really wants, if new evidence or data needs are thought of, they can be applied to the next monitoring cycle, or a re-monitoring can be requested at a given date/time.
- There will be short-term and long-term work to be accomplished.
- For realistic time management when calendaring monitoring, all aspects/meetings necessary should be calendared, not just the meeting for final presentation.

The Board monitors for three reasons:

- Monitor student achievement progress
- Monitor accountability and justification for expenditures of resources
- Bring organization and focus to the board's work/strategic planning

Based on the discussion, the Board agreed that it would be helpful to have two Board sub-committees do some preliminary work: (1) Suzanne Weaver and Connie Fletcher will work with Ron Thiele, Patrick Murphy and Jodi Bongard on guidelines for interpreting and evidentiary support; (2) Superintendent Rasmussen, Jan Woldseth and Brian Deagle will look at policies and identify those that are okay for streamlining and which ones to calendar for full steps.

Other thoughts/suggestions to remember:

- More discussion is needed around desired linkage meetings for 2009-10, though it was agreed that the linkages with governmental agencies (cities) done in the past should continue.
- The information available and processes involved in the Continuous Improvement Plans developed at each building, including a District-wide plan, is very valuable and provides extensive evidence/data for the Board.
- Calendar will be discussed at the August 12<sup>th</sup> board meeting.
- A suggestion to have a board development session with Tom Doyle.
- Strong, clear, consistent communications around AYP will be necessary once state data is available.

4:15 p.m. the Board moved out of work/study session and into executive session per RCW 42.30.110 (g) for superintendent evaluation.

6:00 p.m. the executive session concluded and the meeting was immediately adjourned.