



## ***MEMORANDUM***

To: Washington Learns K-12 Advisory Committee

From: Larry Picus and Allan Odden

RE: **Summary of Professional Judgment Panel Meetings April 25 and 26 and May 4, 2006**

This memo summarizes the discussions that took place during the Professional Judgment Panel (PJP) meetings on April 25 and 26, and May 4, 2006. The purpose of the meetings was to ask educators from across Washington to comment on the draft evidence based report prepared by Lawrence O. Picus and Associates.<sup>1</sup> Our intent was to get feedback from a group of respected Washington educators on the recommendation contained in that document and then provide that information to the Washington Learns K-12 Advisory Committee to help them in their deliberations regarding the provision of an adequate education. At the sessions on April 25 and 26, participants focused on the design of the Elementary, Middle and High School prototypes described in the report. At the May 4 session participants were asked to consider these recommendations, but also to comment on the recommendation for the central office, regional education districts (ESDs) and OSPI.

A total of 105 individuals participated in 5 PJP panel meetings across Washington on April 25 and 26, and May 4, 2006. The original intent was to have three separate panels – one for each school level – at each of the four meetings plus a separate group to consider the central office and state functions. Although we invited a total of 36 panelists to each of the four school level panel discussions, turnout at each location was lower than that. As a result, we combined school levels at each location as summarized below.

In Seattle on April 25, there were a total of 22 participants who were divided into an elementary group and a secondary or middle/high school group.

---

<sup>1</sup> Odden, A., Picus, L.O., Goetz, M. and Fermanich, M. (2006). *An Evidence Based Approach to School Finance Adequacy in Washington*. North Hollywood, CA: Lawrence O. Picus and Associates (April 1 version).

In Yakima on April 25, there were a total of 22 participants who were divided into an elementary/middle school group and a high school group

In Spokane on April 26, there were a total of 19 participants who were divided into an elementary group and a middle/high school group.

In Vancouver on April 26, there were a total of 23 participants who were divided into an elementary group and a middle/high school group.

In Seattle on May 4, another 19 participants provided feedback on the central office and State functions in two groups. In both of these groups, the morning was spent discussing and understanding the school level models and the afternoon was spent discussing how the central office, ESDs and State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction could best support school efforts to use resources effectively and dramatically boost student academic achievement.

Appendix A of this document contains the names of the participants in each location.

Appendix B includes a sample agenda (they were identical in each location) for the day for the school-focused panels. Each day began with an introduction and a discussion of Washington learns. Participants also heard a very brief description of the evidence based model before breaking into groups to discuss the model in detail.

Lawrence O. Picus and Associates provided trained moderators at each panel. The moderators took detailed notes on the group's discussion, ensured that each panel completed its work in the allotted time, and served as an initial reference for the details of the model. Table 1, taken from the evidence based report, served as the primary vehicle for directing the conversations in each panel.

At the end of the day, the groups returned to share their discussions with the other panelists.

This memo summarizes the major recommendations made by the panelists. It is organized by the rows of Table 1 and separate discussions – as appropriate – are provided by school level. The entire set of notes has been provided to staff of the Advisory Committee and OSPI .

Our overall sense of the comments from the panels is that they conclude that the resources provided through the evidence based model would offer more funding and resources for schools than the present model, and seemed strongly to support the vision of an effective schools that is embodied in the model. There were numerous suggestions that even more resources were needed to be devoted to certain aspects of schooling, but our sense is that all generally support what currently is included in the model.

## WASHINGTON LEARNS PJP PANEL SUMMARY

School Element	PJP Recommendations	Proposed Response
<b>School Characteristics</b>		
School Configuration	<p>Panelists in all 5 locations accepted the; K-5, 6-8 and 9-12 configuration of the prototypical schools; although one panel in Spokane and one in Yakima pointed out that other school configurations exist in the state and argued they should not be forced to change.</p> <p>One panelist suggested that K-8 is a better elementary configuration and will provide some research citations</p>	<i>No change in prototypical school configurations</i>
Prototypical school size	<p>Relatively little discussion about the school size.</p> <p>One group was concerned that 600 is a little too large for a high school; one group felt that most middle schools today are larger than 450 but did not recommend a larger size for the prototypes.</p> <p>One group wondered if elementary schools should be closer to 200 students</p>	<i>No change in prototypical school configurations</i>
Class Size	<p>There was general agreement that the recommendations would be better than current practice at all levels and our sense is that all thought the recommendation a good one. There were some additional comments:</p> <p><b>Elementary</b></p> <p>Some recommended smaller classes for grades 4 and 5 arguing the jump from 15-25 was too large with WASL test requirements. One suggested 18-30 for grades 3 and 4 and 25 in grade 5.</p>	<i>No change in prototypical school configurations</i>

	<p><b>Middle</b> There was one comment that 25 is too large</p> <p><b>High School</b> For secondary schools there was one suggestion that English classes be capped at 20, and one individual wanted classes of 20-22. Also some suggested that lab classes needed to be less than 25 for safety All groups expressed concern about the facility needs of such a dramatic reduction in class size.</p> <p><b>Central Office</b> Concern was expressed about the impact of the class size recommendations on facility needs across the state. The group realized that this problem varies considerably by location and is beyond the scope of this particular study, although they pointed out the importance of facility issues once adequacy has been defined and funded.</p>	
Full Day Kindergarten	<p>All elementary groups fully endorsed this. Concerns were expressed in Seattle about K student attention span in full day program. Seattle panel also recommended funding for pre assessment for K students (2 days) There was considerable discussion about importance of pre school at the Yakima elementary panel The Yakima elementary panel also discussed the importance of parent outreach programs The central office groups also supported this recommendation although an opinion was expressed that full day attendance should be optional.</p>	<p><i>No Change in the recommendation. Panels were aware that there is a separate advisory committee dealing with early childhood education</i></p>

Number of Teacher Work Days	<p>No one said this was too much, although there was some concern at one location that a ten day summer institute would conflict with summer school and there would not be enough time.</p> <p>Some panelists were concerned about districts already paying for 190 or more days and how that would play out if the state paid for more time</p>	<i>No change in recommendations</i>
Percent: Disabled ELL FRPL Minority	<p>The data in these cells was provided as a state average and then used in computations elsewhere in Table 1. Comments tended to be about individual district characteristics, which the model will accommodate through the allocation of resources to schools with higher concentrations of children in these categories.</p>	<i>No change in recommendations</i>
<b>Personnel Resources</b>		
Core Teachers	<p>General consensus that the core teachers are adequate. There was some concern that in high minority or high poverty schools the number was too low. Also, the Seattle Middle and High School panel felt that the number was too low to provide rich electives, AP classes and safe lab environments.</p> <p>One central office group expressed concern about small high school and their ability to offer all the courses the state requires.</p>	<p><i>No change, for poverty and minority schools, additional teacher resources are provided in the struggling student recommendations. For AP and electives, the specialist teachers would be adequate.</i></p> <p><i>The issue of meeting the State's required course of study in small schools is best addressed in a small school adjustment.</i></p>
Specialist Teachers	<p>Groups felt the Elementary percentage was fine. A number of groups felt that at the middle school there should be 25% to 33% specialists At the HS the Seattle group wanted more specialists and in Vancouver this was quantified as 36 to 37% citing research of Bill Denney</p>	<i>Leave final decision up to AC to make a recommendation</i>

Instructional Facilitators	<p>Overall support for concept of facilitators. Concern expressed that they not get burdened with administrative tasks and that they stay grounded in teaching as well – maybe work half time as facilitators and half time as teachers</p> <p>The central office and state groups liked the suggestion and both also suggested that training of facilitators for all districts and even provision of facilitators for small districts might be an excellent ESD function.</p>	<i>No change</i>
Tutors for Struggling students	<p>Support for this concept. Some concern over how to allocate. Some were concerned about struggling students in affluent areas, some were concerned about poverty as a measure. One suggestion was test scores and another was “drug involved children and those with mental issues”</p> <p>One group asked why qualified aides could not be used.</p> <p>Some concern expressed about under reporting of FRPL counts in the high schools.</p>	<p><i>Leave as is for now. Might want to consider student mobility as in WY.</i></p> <p><i>See report on use of qualified aides (Farkis).</i></p> <p><i>Also, WA experience with using test outcomes for allocation of funding created wrong incentives in some instances</i></p>
Teachers for ELL students	<p>Some suggested more is needed depending on level of literacy in both English and native language. General sentiment that slightly more teachers are needed for ELL</p> <p>Question was also posed about whether or not some minimum threshold was required as with the teacher tutors where schools get at least one.</p>	<p><i>Need to resolve our recommendation of 1 per 100 with State practice at present of 1.35 per 100.</i></p> <p><i>Problem with a minimum threshold is what to do when there are only 2 or 3 ELL students in a school, that option would be very expensive</i></p>

Extended Day	Positive response, concern expressed about transportation of students who stay after school	<i>No change</i>
Summer School	Positive response, concern expressed about transportation. Also some wanted summer school open to more children than FRPL	<i>No change</i> <i>Note that the FRPL counts only trigger money; once provided, funds can be used for any student.</i>
Alternative Learning Environment	Some were concerned about large Alternative schools (i.e. a school of 800). We realized that if an alternative high school of 800 were funded with the evidence based model it would generate approximately twice as many teachers as on that campus today plus a number of pupil support positions, so the feeling was that would be adequate and the ALE recommendation would only apply to very small alternative school models.  Almost every group including the central office groups recommended funding ALE at middle school level as well and two suggested elementary school ALE options  All seemed comfortable with the 1 AP plus 1 teacher per 8 students	<i>Fund at HS and determine need at lower grades after state has experience with all of Evidence Based recommendations</i>
Children with mild and moderate disabilities	Comments were mixed. Some felt resources were adequate, some did not. When offered the option of using the current system with a adequate base (See our special education memo) it appeared workable to most	<i>Need AC to decide which strategy to use</i>
Students with severe disabilities	Favored the 100% funding approach, but there was skepticism that the state would really fund 100% of all costs, and how children are identified and categorized.	<i>No change</i>

<p>Teachers for Gifted Students</p>	<p>Divided responses some thought this OK  One group suggested 1 FTE teacher per 450 students  One group suggested the Oregon model which requires an IEP for gifted students.</p> <p>Central office groups were concerned about the level of resources, but could not distinguish between an advanced regular curriculum like AP and courses that were for gifted children.</p>	<p><i>No change but more discussion might be required</i></p>
<p>Vocational Education</p>	<p>High school panels very concerned about career and technical education and adequate resources. One group discussed the WY recommendation of 1.3 weight and about \$7,000 in equipment and thought it adequate. Some groups want career and technical education in middle schools</p>	<p><i>Continue to discuss and review</i></p>
<p>Substitutes</p>	<p>Most panels thought this is adequate. Three said that 12 or 13 is more normal in contracts in WA.</p>	<p><i>No Change, 10 days is for funding purposes, not all teachers take all sick leave days so 10 should be adequate</i></p>
<p>Pupil Support Staff</p>	<p>Liked the recommendations, wanted to know if can be used a psychologists or counselors.  There were a number of questions about school safety and security</p>	<p><i>No change for support staff, could consider issue of school security</i></p>
<p>Non-Instructional Aides</p>	<p>4 panels said resources were adequate, 3 said more were needed and one was not clear on adequacy of number of aides  One of the central office groups felt this was too low, but the only comparison they could generate with data they had at hand suggested the district they were looking at did not have as many non-instructional aides as the model generates.</p>	<p><i>No change for now, but watch in the future</i></p>

<p>Librarians/media specialists</p>	<p>Most wanted to have a half or full-time technology person at each school in addition to the librarian  They also pointed out that librarians in WA are also teachers and they do a lot of teaching requiring an aide to mind the library while the librarian is teaching</p>	<p><i>LOP does not recommend more resources, but the AC might want to increase the number of technology aides. In a school of 500 students, which would be allocated 2.5 Instructional Facilitators, the 0.5 would be for a facilitator with technology knowledge and skills .</i></p>
<p>Principal</p>	<p>There was concern that the number of principal resources might be too low:  The teacher evaluation responsibilities are extensive in WA  There was a feeling that the resources might be adequate if all other parts of the model were implemented, but if there was a multi-implementation strategy, more principal resources are needed until everyone has all the other resources  The Middle and High school panels still felt more principal resources were needed  Also calls for an athletic director at the high schools</p> <p>At the central office groups, both felt resources were inadequate. One group felt that all schools need an AP and the other though all middle and high schools need at least one AP, and all elementary schools with more than 600 students need a full time AP. Reasons cited include number and scope of teacher evaluations, supervision and discipline of students and attendance at events outside of the school day</p>	<p><i>LOP with the compensation recommendations for a KSBP system has a different approach to evaluation.</i></p> <p><i>AC could consider adding more assistant principals due to the evaluation requirements.</i></p>

School site secretary	<p>Groups were mixed on this. HS seemed to feel more secretarial support is needed, and there were comments that high ELL schools needed more secretarial support</p> <p>One of the central office groups felt that additional secretarial support is needed at schools in high need areas.</p>	<i>LOP conclude sufficient resources but AC could consider 0.5 more staff per school possibly at schools with high numbers of free and reduced price lunch children</i>
<b>Dollar Per Pupil Resources</b>		
Professional Development	Support for recommendations, some wanted flexibility in use of ten teacher days for summer	<i>No change</i>
Technology	<p>Groups seemed to feel dollars were adequate. Those with concerns mostly had to do with staffing</p> <p>One of the central office groups felt that funding was not adequate and expressed concern that more tech support is needed for computers, networks and servers, arguing that “if we want teachers to embrace technology, technology has to be available all the time.” And argued that required tremendous tech support.</p>	<i>No change, personnel concerns are handled elsewhere in the model</i>
Instructional Materials	Most groups thought this is OK, one panelist faxed us a cost analysis of materials costs for a math and reading adoption across a school district that averaged \$203.27 per pupil	<i>Probably adequate in most situations</i>
Student Activities	<p>Some uncertainty about adequacy. Some expressed the need for an athletic director at HS and some thought it would not be enough for transportation to activities</p> <p>Others argued that they “don’t want the state to support football.”</p>	<i>No change</i>

## **Other comments from the Central Office and State Groups**

The following comments were derived from the discussions that took place in the Central Office/State PJP Panels on May 4. These are issues and items that did not fit neatly into one of the rows of the table above, but were important for consideration as the Advisory Committee deliberates the parameters of the adequacy model.

In general, the participants felt the mode needs to provide more clarity about who is responsible for curriculum and instruction support at the school and district levels. They argued that substantial district level or ESD staff are needed to support the instructional facilitators provided through the model. This support would include serving as resources for the knowledge base in the subject areas in which the facilitators specialize and as trainers of facilitators. However, within that context there was also concern expressed by the school level committees that district office staff not “control” the school based instructional facilitators.

One person said more capacity to manage data and assessments at the district office is needed. They felt this needs to be a full time job even in relatively small districts, although the size at which it becomes a full time job was not something she could estimate easily.

There was also discussion that a communication specialist is needed in the district office of school districts. The function of this position would be to improve community and press relationships, and to try to get more good stories about schools out to the public. .

One representative of a district with 7,000 students compared its central office staffing to the proposed staffing, by doubling the positions outlined for a 3,500 student district in the report. The model would provide 14 administrative and professional staff, and the district had 13 such positions; the model would provide 18 secretarial positions but the district had 24. The district numbers counted coordinators for reading and professional development as central office professional staff, even though they are paid as teachers and not on an administrator line.

One of the participants was a chief business officer who was concerned that staff in the business office need more skills than the clerical staff at schools or other offices. They don't need to be professional positions, but might require additional salary funding

There was a suggestion that it might be worth trying to build the central office model for a district of 15,000 to 20,000 students and see if there are economies of scale, or needs for other type of staff. They suggested that there might be thresholds where an additional staff member might need to be added.

There was also a concern that larger districts need an athletic coordinator.

Another thing one group thought was missing is that the central office piece does not reflect the systemic reform piece that is reflected in the school based model. They

wondered if the central office could be reformulated to provide the kind of support designed as schools are designed.

There was discussion about the \$300 per pupil to cover insurance and other costs. There was not a suggestion for a different amount however.

Funds for professional development at the district office need to be included. *We note that the model provides \$100 per pupil for training; the trainers could be central office individuals or externally hired consultants. Thus each district could determine how to use those funds.*

One group indicated that security is a concern. They said this included both securing the fixed asset and also the security of staff and students. They also felt this is largely building based and recognized that different areas will have different security needs.

There was some concern expressed about the Operations and Maintenance recommendations. One person felt the citations were from dated literature. Maintenance staff now needs to be more technology smart and staff need computer skills. There is a need to enrich duties of custodial staff due to needs of buildings today. Some were concerned that the draft used national average salaries, but were told that when cost estimates are finalized, actual salaries in Washington for those positions will be used

There was concern that large districts who hire electricians, etc. pay union wages that are very high and small districts don't pay that high a level either due to contract, or just don't have union issues.

*We conclude that the Central Office and Maintenance and Operations recommendations are adequate as proposed, but the Advisory Committee could recommend changes in light of the above comments, or input from AC members. We should note that because the Central Office recommendations are developed for a prototypical district of 3,500 students, twice as many positions would be available for a 7,000 student district and even more for larger districts, and that it is not until districts get larger than 3,500 that they begin to add more specialized staff such as communications coordinator, general counsel, etc. Thus, we are of the position that the recommendation includes substantial resources for such specialized staff, when the district is large enough to justify them.*

## **State and ESD**

Both groups felt that ESD's are critical to serve training functions to send instructional coaches and facilitators to get knowledge about best practices. ESDs can provide resource libraries so districts do not have to do the work independently. There is a huge role that local districts cannot possibly fulfill on their own. They need that regional support.

## Appendix B

### List of Attendees by Location

**Seattle, April 25**

Name	District
Patricia Peters	Pioneer
Tonya Carey	Franklin Pierce
Doug McCardle	Edmonds
Princess Shareef	Seattle
Maija Alves	Shoreline
Jane Goetz	Seattle
Fran Mester	Monroe
Tony Liu	Highline
Geri Rohlff	Auburn
Ralph Hayden	Bellingham
Chris Hoyos	Bellingham
Art Clarke	Chimacum
Malesha Dill	Puyallup
Gail Demo Smith	Central Kitsap
Rita Reandeau	South Kitsap
Jan Mezich	Sedro-Wooley
Joann Johnson	Bellingham
Jeffrey Hoyer-Logan	
Robin Sweeney	
Marguerite Jones	
BiHoa Caldwell	Seattle
Cori Pflug	Snoqualmie

**Yakima, April 25**

<b>Name</b>	<b>District</b>
Angela Watts	Wapato
Gary Vegar	Sunnyside
Denise Colley	Othello
Lisa McKeen	East valley
Christina Carlson	Yakima
Lorenzo Alvarado	Yakima
Leonor De Maldonado	Toppenish
Peter Finch	West Valley
Sandra Sheldon	Ellensburg
Jim Miller	Cle Ellum-Roslyn
Natalie Allen-Tibiling	Walla Walla
Gayle See	Walla Walla
Tamara Steen	Mabton
Dave Andrews	Toppenish
Jonah Maysam	Kenniwick
Allen Andringa	East Valley
Cindy nass	Walla Walla
Arcella Hall	Grandview
Ben Soria	Yakima
Craig Dwight	Yakima
Ola Rambo-King	Pasco

**Spokane, April 26**

<b>Name</b>	<b>District</b>
Dee Baumgartner	Pullman
Karen Hatley	Spokane
Teena McDonald	Chewelah
Connie Ramsey	Mead
Karen Azzinnaro	Cheney
Wayne Leonard	Mead
Polly Crowley	West Valley
Cynthia Ridings	Mead
Sandra Allen	Central Valley
Thomas Crowley	Rosalia
Vickie Kennedy	Cheney
Jeff Miller	East Valley
Jon Swett	Spokane
Victoria Jensen	Central Valley
Jim Wheeler	Grand Coulee Dam
Moleena Harris	Spokane
Gary Neal	West Valley
Shannon Espinoza	Cheney
Barb Taylor	Othello

**Vancouver, April 26**

<b>Name</b>	<b>District</b>
Christina Bird-Macaya	Camas
Betsy Caughie	Battle Ground
Brenda Hope	White Salmon
Joe Segram	Evergreen
Kim Maloney	Washougal
Patricia Jones	Hockinson
Springy Yamasaki	Camas
Patty Howard	Chehalis
Jeffrey Lewis	Ocean Beach
Jason Perrins	Battle Ground
Steve Warren	Centralia
Brian Talbott	White pass
Tanis Knight	Camas
Sandra Barlow	Evergreen
Renee Bernazzani	Evergreen
Cindy Nunamaker	Tenino
Glenys Hill	Kelso
Janet Gillingham	Vancouver
Margaret Bates	Hockinson
Lisa Satterfield	Vancouver
Molly Daley	Evergreen
Tom Dudley	Vancouver
Ron Porterfield	Vancouver

**Seattle May 5**

<b>Name</b>	<b>District</b>
Ted Thomas	Longview
Mary Alice Heuschel	OSPI
Anita Boyum	Ellensburg
Lexie Domaradzki	OSPI
Nancy Skerritt	Tahoma
Dean Mack	Issaquah
Jerry McDermott	ESD 101
Dana Anderson	ESD 113
Steve Nielsen	Seattle
Neil Sullivan	Spokane
Lee Goeke	Vancouver
Hertica Martin	Central Kitsap
James Kowalkowski	Pomeroy
Linda Byrnes	Arlington
Beverly Cheney	South Kistap
Marilyn Sollers	ESD 189
Monty Bridges	ESD 121
Twyla Barnes	ESD 112
Kevin Lavety	Mukilteo
Karen Madsen	Everett

## Appendix C Sample Agenda



### WASHINGTON LEARNS EVIDENCE BASED ADEQUACY STUDY PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT PANEL AGENDA

DATE  
LOCATION

8:30 AM to 9:00 AM	Continental Breakfast
9:00 AM to 9:30 AM	Introduction of Lawrence O. Picus and Staff (Larry Picus, Lisa Horwitch and Robert Reichardt) Description of Washington Learns Introduction to the day's activities and description of the Evidence Based Adequacy model
9:30 AM to Noon	Breakout discussions of the Evidence Based Model  Breaks as determined in each group
Noon to 1:00 PM	Lunch
1:00 PM to 3:30 PM	Breakout discussions of the Evidence Based Model  Breaks as determined in each group
3:30 PM to 4:00 PM	Entire group reviews small group recommendations
4:00 PM	Adjourn