Institutional Education Structure & Accountability Advisory Group Meeting

9 am – 12 pm
April 14, 2022
Zoom

Meeting Participants

Institutional Education (IE) Planning and Facilitation Team Members Present:
Ada Daniels, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, (OSPI), Cara Patrick, Emmelia Wargacki (OSPI), Haley Lowe (Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF), Mary Sprute Garlant (DCYF), Elizabeth Thorkildsen (DCYF), Mary Kay Dugan (American Institutes for Research (AIR), Simon Gonsoulin (AIR), Juliet Wu (AIR), Shoshana Rabinovsky (AIR), and Deanna Hoskins (JustLeadershipUSA), Ronald Simpson-Bey (JustLeadershipUSA)

Advisory Group Members Present:
Tim Touhey (Principal of Green Hill School in Chehalis)
Arthur Dennis (Education Advocate Director)
Kristi Sigafoos (Quality Improvement Director, Child Study & Treatment Center)*
Carolyn Watkins (Principal of Oakridge Community Facility)
Linda Drake (Director of Career and College Readiness Initiatives)*
Seema Bahl (SBE)* (alternate)
Cal Brodie (Deputy Superintendent ESD 113)
Matt Zuvich (Washington Federation of State Employees)*
Alice Coil (Deputy Director of Office of Juvenile Justice)
Jinju Park (Senior Education Ombud)*
Simone Boe (WEA – Alternate for Sean Hadaller)*
Jennie Marshall (Detention Manager of Spokane County Juvenile Court)*
Kristin Schutte (Executive Director of Student Services and Support ESD 114)
Jeff Allen (Director of Youth Services, Olympic ESD 114 Bremerton)
Neaners aka Jose Garcia (Second Chance Outreach, Hope for Homies)*
 Indicates Legislatively Appointed Advisory Group Members

Youth Advisory Group Members:
Echo Glen
Green Hill

Additional Participants Present:
Representative Lisa Callan (WA House of Representatives, 5th District), Allison Ilgenfritz (Principal at Echo Glen), Kiersten Bradney, Gerdon Jones (DCYF), Liza Hartlyn (OSPI), TJ Kelly (OSPI), Barret Daniels, Becky McLean (OSPI), Andrea Downs, Larry Gardner and Roy Johnson.

Public Attendees Present: Jen Chong Jewell, Amanda Rodriguez, Ethan Moreno (WA House of Representatives non-partisan member, Education Committee) and Megan Wargacki (Nonpartisan Staff, House of Representatives).

Meeting Agenda

Time	Activity	Speaker/Facilitator
9:00 AM – 9:10 AM	Welcome, Review of Agenda & Ice Breaker	Mary Kay Dugan, AIR
9:10 AM – 10:00 AM	Technical Working Group: System Performance and Education Outcomes March Meeting Report Out Q&A	Simon Gonsoulin, AIR
10:00 AM – 10:20 AM	Introduction of HB 1295 Youth Advisory Group Members	DeAnna Hoskins, Just Leadership USA Youth Advisory Group Members
10:20 AM – 10:35 AM	BREAK	
10:35 AM – 11:00 AM	Topic: SEL & Trauma-Informed Care Supports Discussion	Simon Gonsoulin & Mary Kay Dugan, AIR
11:00 AM – 11:40 AM	Topic: IE Funding Team Report Out Q&A	Becky McLean and TJ Kelly, OSPI
11:45 AM – 11:50 AM	Public Comment	Mary Kay Dugan, AIR
11: 50 – 12:00 PM	Wrap Up & Next Steps	Mary Kay Dugan, AIR

Meeting Notes

Notes submitted by Juliet Wu, American Institutes for Research (AIR)

Welcome, Review of Agenda and Ice Breaker – Mary Kay Dugan (AIR), Managing Director (Meeting Facilitator)

- Welcome
- Notice of Recording
- Review of Meeting Norms/Zoom Housekeeping
- Tribal Land Acknowledgement
- Icebreaker Activity
- Review of Agenda

Technical Working Group: System Performance and Education

Outcomes - March Meeting Report Out – Simon Gonsoulin (AIR), Principal Researcher

- *Presenter:* I am reminding everyone that in thinking about HB 1295, we must think about institutional education as it exists across different facility types/settings (from JR (Juvenile Rehabilitation) to detention to secure facilities).
- We need to think about youth transitioning into institutional education as well as the period of time that the youth is enrolled in these settings.
- Also, it is important to successfully release youth and ensure that they continue their education in either traditional high school, GED (General Educational Development), CTE (Career and Technical Education), job placement, etc.
- Successful transition of youth to and from institutional education. Some best practices include:
  - o Standardized intake/orientation process – i.e., a "warm" intake and orientation period for youth
  - o Accountability system
  - o Support from transition coordinators
  - o Regular communication around academic progress with the school the youth last attended
  - o Standardized transcript system with knowledgeable staff. This is not something that everyone can do. It is part of the responsibility of detention or JR education to pull together the full story on a youth's education. Oftentimes there are gaps and multiple schools attended.
  - o Records system that can build off previous educational achievement
  - o "Open up" schools so parents can visit children. We want to encourage parents to ask youth about school. There is research that shows that students in secure settings do better in school with parent involvement.
- Reentry best practices:
  - o An education reentry team planning meeting helps to build the overarching re-entry education path for youth.
  - o Provide youth with information on educational options available to them at time of release.
  - o Provide a mechanism to follow-up with the receiving school/facility to ensure successful and complete transmission of records and transcripts.
  - o Increase engagement with family/community/guardian by providing support upon release.

- Standards/expectations for youth enrolled in IE:
  - IE is student-centered based on students' wants/needs and engagement
  - Establish educational goals within a student's comprehensive learning plan
  - Provide whole child wraparound support system
  - Encourage continued engagement in the educational system upon release (I.e., let the youth know that there are different educational opportunities or pathways out there).
  - Complete a career interest inventory and provide coaching/prep for jobs and continued education/training (e.g., could be part of English Language Arts schooling).
- System performance and accountability best practices:
  - Hold IE accountable for meeting state and federal requirements for the provision of equitable educational services.
    - Clear indicators from a system and student standpoint – written, adopted, and operationalized
    - Education and facility staff have a clear plan to deliver a high-quality education that creates positive outcomes for students
    - Deliver professional development and train knowledgeable teaching force across all IE settings
    - Develop "road map" for HB 1295 reform
    - Establish leadership teams to usher in HB 1295 reforms
    - Create self-assessment tool to promote accountability
    - Collaborate across institutions in the state-exchange of information and coordination of efforts
    - Develop a special education monitoring system for students enrolled in institutional education (i.e., students with an IEP may require related services such as speech therapy, school-based counseling—this related service does not stop because of admission to IE).
    - Establish mechanism to check on youth re-enrollment in school or job placement 30-, 60-, and 90-days following release.
- Conversations are beginning about different funding structures and models to implement the recommendations.

Discussion by Advisory Group

- *Comment:* I am wondering how much these recommendations are impacted by staffing levels within the institutions?
- *Response:* First, you have to make sure you have the school staff to implement HB 1295, and it takes both the facility and the school staff in order to ensure that youth are successful.
- *Comment:* Do you have a special educator advisor to support your work in developing the Special Education model?
- *Response:* Our goal based on the work is to identify potentially what the special education model may look like. OSPI and the Department of Special Education's input will be critical to the process. Paula Kitzke, Special Education Program Supervisor at OSPI is part of the Technical Working Group to support and advise on the Special Education model.

Introduction of HB 1295 Youth Advisory Group Members – Deanna Hoskins (JustLeadershipUSA)

- *Presenter:* Overview of the Youth Advisory Group
  - Focus: Ensuring inclusivity of the most impacted by Institutional Education
  - Goal: Ensuring that the voices of youth provide lived experience
  - Strategy: Connecting and training youth at Echo Glen and Green Hill on the importance of their experience and how to communicate their experiences and desires
- Often, we get the systems perspective, but it is important to get the human perspective as well. Empowering these youth on how to communicate their lived experiences. This becomes a way to advocate for yourself in the community and knowing that you have the right to have your voice heard and share what you desire.
- Our new Advisory Group members are going to introduce themselves. They are listening today and taking notes so that we can debrief afterwards.
- *Introductions:* Echo Glen (young ladies)
  - Member 1– I have been here for almost a year and a half, and I have a year and a half left. I am 15 almost 16.
  - Member 2 – I am 15. I have been incarcerated since Jan 4 and will be staying until June 17.
  - Member 3– I arrived January 24 and will be here until May 8.
- *Introductions:* Green Hill (young men)
  - Member 1 – I have been here since 2018 and will be here until 2026.

- - **Presenter:** He has already experienced education in every setting and has already exhausted all the resources available to him for education. What can we offer him for the remaining time?
    - o Member 2 – I have been here for 4 months. I will be leaving on January 22nd, 2024.
- **Presenter:** Next Steps for Youth Advisory Group
    - o We will debrief with youth after this meeting.
    - o Members will present at the next Advisory Group Meeting on June 9.
    - o Members will use their notes to inform their recommendations. There may be some key issues and key things that we haven't thought about that individuals impacted by institutional education can uniquely offer.
- **Comment:** Curious about the youth that will be released soon. Is there an opportunity for them to still stay connected to this group?
    - o **Presenter:** Yes, that is part of the goal for their participation. The youth that are getting out have expressed their desire to remain connected to the Advisory Group. It will be very valuable to learn about the re-entry process.
    - o **Facilitator:** HB 1295 is a once in a lifetime opportunity to do what we need to make the changes that are going to be important for all of students and for the other youth that come after them in the institutions. I really appreciate our youth advisory group members joining us.

BREAK in Meeting

Social Emotional Learning & Trauma-Informed Care Supports (TIC) – Simon Gonsoulin and Mary Kay Dugan (AIR)

- HB 1295 ensures that we meet the complex needs of students in our care and this portion of the agenda involves us thinking about how to support youth through social and emotional learning and by recognizing trauma that may have been experienced before a youth enters a facility and during their time in a facility.
- There are three areas that are important to promote positive conditions for learning for youth. We will discuss the supports necessary for teaching staff and youth to be successful in these areas. The three areas need to work hand in hand and set the stage for what we need to be working towards, and include:
    - o Social Emotional Learning (SEL)
        - ▪ SEL is a framework or process through which youth acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes and skills necessary to

understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others.

- Promotes improvements in life skills – SEL is designed to promote academic and social success through a focus on the individual needs of youth.

o Cultural Competence
o Trauma-Informed Care (TIC) Supports

- TIC support is most likely to succeed when embedded in SEL opportunities and training for staff.
- 9 out of 10 youth in the justice system have experienced at least one Adverse Childhood Experience (ACE) and 7 out of 10 have experienced 3 or more ACEs in their lives.
- Trauma related to justice system involvement – i.e., being involved in the system itself is traumatizing.
  - Incarceration often exposes individuals to additional trauma.
  - Research tells us that trauma experienced while incarcerated is associated with worse post-release outcomes.
  - Several common practices in criminal justice settings may trigger or retraumatize individuals with histories of trauma (e.g., restraints, searches).
  - Recognizing that events that occur outside of the education day/classroom might influence education – e.g., interactions in living units.
  - Students must come to institutional education ready to learn.
  - TIC is a system-wide approach that goes beyond offering treatment for PTSD, it includes:
    - o 4 R's of TIC
      - Realize
      - Recognize
      - Respond to impact of trauma among clients/staff
      - Resist Retraumatizing
    - o TIC represents a significant shift in organizational culture and practice in criminal justice settings.
    - o TIC is widely endorsed by several national criminal justice organizations and federal agencies.

- We must identify the professional development and training needs to support all staff working with young people in facilities (not just the educational staff).
- Research tells us it is important for youth to have a caring adult to support them, and it is important as well to allow students to make their own decisions under adult supervision.
- Previous recommendations from the Advisory Group including the recommendation for a Comprehensive Learning Plan. This might be a nice tool to focus on some of the initial SEL standards.
- Essential elements of a Trauma-informed Justice System include:
  - Physical and psychological safety for youth
  - Physical and psychological safety for staff
  - Staff knowledge and training in cultural competence and TIC
  - Trauma-informed mental health services (including screening, assessing, and treating youth).

Discussion by Advisory Group

Facilitator: How do we support IE staff in their development in this area?

Comment: When we talk about staff, we often don't address the separation of the school and the facility. Both have staff and they are often running on different paradigms. If schooling is such a highly prized rehabilitation model by the institution, why is there no cohesive state-wide top-down model? It's always been separate from the institutions. If we're going to develop these partnerships, we must make that connection.

Comment: We would really like to do these things (SEL, TIC, Cultural Competence) but if we don't have the funds for counselors or social service personnel along with a set training schedule with funding for professional development, we can't make these things happen because TIC is great, but we just don't have the resources to implement it right now unless our funding model changes. I would like to see some type of state-wide training schedule for all teachers. So once a student does move from detention to the state, they should be able to continue their learning and their healing. Also, something needs to be built in for substitute teachers. No funding for substitute teachers. A lot of it comes down to funding sources.

Comment: These conversations need to take place in the context of whatever the system is in our facilities – i.e., talking about a Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT) model that is in place. I don't think we get to have isolated SEL conversations without acknowledging that and folding that model in.

Comment: Our teachers don't have substitutes and there aren't any staff to step in so teachers can attend training.

Comment: One solution is to implement training during the summer months so that we

do not have substitute issues.
Facilitator:
- What supports are currently in place in facilities for staff to gain skills in this area?
- How might we improve SEL and TIC in Washington's facilities?
- What supports of infrastructure needs to be in place to ensure it is implemented with fidelity and accountability?
- What recommendations for training or professional development needs to be put in place?

Question: For clarity, in reference to SEL Standards, does this mean the same standards and benchmarks that were adopted for students in 2020?
https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/resources-subject-area/social-emotional-learning-sel
Response: Yes, you would utilize the same SEL benchmarks or standards within the facility/IE that are required in all schools in Washington. The key would be to determine how this will be implemented in IE settings. This will not happen fully in the short term but may take a few years to fully implement. The key is that you are looking at conditions for learning and, for example, may want to form a committee to come together based on HB 1295 recommendations. The committee could be charged with determining how best to implement self-management and self-awareness into the curriculum in IE? In other words, to clearly connect the dots and figure out how to implement this in IE.
Comment: Related to the slide on having screening/assessment and treatment; when we do assess, we do screen in the county detention centers. But the opportunities for students to engage in true therapeutic work with a mental health professional is limited and often it is more of a triage in crisis mode. 100% of the youth in our facilities are impacted by drug use in some way, however, in the past, the only way that they could get any drug treatment was if they were identified for treatment. Whether it comes from institutional education or the institution itself, this necessity is here to treat. Treatment needs to be available. Not exclusively IE but more systemically available to youth.
Comment: Spokane County Mental Health provides services. There are a lot of wraparound services for the youth in this area – i.e., this is not something being missed in Spokane.
Comment: We have been lucky here in Spokane. We have discussed SEL. We had a fantastic collaborative effort between the school and detention center staff here working on SEL components, and the difference that it made for our youth was dramatic and powerful. They went from gang involvement/youth not being able to work together to sitting next to each other and painting murals on walls, writing some extremely powerful

poetry and sharing it. Youth asked to have a poetry slam, and this was a powerful event for them to share their experiences and their emotions with others. We also created an art Dojo – i.e., we brought in art students from the local art school and offered opportunities so that students could learn different mediums. Staff in the detention center follow up with the students and give them opportunities to practice. Westminster Congregational Church provided a lot of supplies and students made a mural to donate back to the church. Also, these students are getting credit for this work.

Comment: Wanted to reiterate how important it is for longevity. We can solve the education side by itself but it's not going to go anywhere if we don't have the entire facility on board. The idea of a statewide partnership is so appealing to me that we can really start looking at the center instead of looking at the two sides.

Facilitator: How might we do this? What are some concrete steps we can take to ensure that there's this team of folks that might look at this across the institution?

Comment: I liked what was said earlier – i.e., as we work to make our students more successful, I hope we work on ourselves first so that it trickles down to all staff. In addition, students need to receive the same SEL support from staff when they go back to their rooms (or living units) as they do in school. I am pleading that professional development is built in for both sides (i.e., across all staff in the facilities).

Comment: I think one of the things that we really need to spend some significant time on is coming together for a common purpose. I don't know if it's a mission statement or philosophical framework, but it is needed to begin building off in order to develop the corresponding systems and structures. Then we can look at training models. It's coming from a newbie's perspective that those things were not clear coming in. A lot of communication problems with the state in that there are no written policy procedures that go along with it. That's what we are working on in Echo Glen.

Comment: I am just so grateful that this conversation is happening right now. Partnership with partners is critically important. We will look at the recommendations from this Advisory Group and make adjustments. Ensuring that our outcomes are sound. If we don't partner with our partners, we stagnate because we need those collaborative conversations. How do we do this? We establish our partnerships right away. We must move forward in lock step and arm in arm figuring out what is best for our youth, the training, and how we make that training happen.

Comment: I love the comment about creating a philosophy/mission statement. What are our common values and what are the policies and procedures to ensure those values are being practiced across systems?

Comment: Thinking about this, one of the things that I've noticed in the 7 years of doing this is that the facility staff is often limited in their relationships, and they're stuck in authoritarian relationships with the youth. However, the schools have the ability to form

relationships off education which is built on trust. Students don't learn unless there is trust. How do we devise a paradigm for institutional staff that transitions them from an authoritarian relationship to that of a coach? There is a gap between the facility side and education side. Everyone wants to do TIC, but nobody knows what it looks like.
Comment: We need statewide communication to make sure all school districts understand how to work with institutions and understand how to work with the students who were formerly IE students.
Comment: It really helped to have our teachers and detention staff speaking the same language and setting the same goals for our youth so that we could provide wrap around support.

IE Funding Team Report Out - Becky McLean and TJ Kelly (OSPI)

- *Facilitator:* The OSPI funding team will present what the funding model has been and may look like in the future. They are interested in gathering input from the HB 1295 Advisory Group.
- On May 5th we will have a more in-depth technical working group meeting on funding. If you are interested in attending, please put your name in the chat and we can make sure that you get invited to this meeting.
- *Presenters:* The OSPI presenters walked through at a high level the current IE funding model and some of the factors that drive IE funding and addressed some of the work that has been done investigating alternate funding models.
- Working towards a proposal to fund the system in a way that's more transparent and looks more like a system that better meets the needs of the students.
- How the funding model currently works:
  - o IE funding is based on several factors. First, we count the students based on a specific day of the month – i.e., a snapshot of the student population counted on that one day.
  - o Student Full-time Equivalent (FTE) is based on 1,665 weekly minutes of instruction.
  - o Funding is based on the average of the 11 reported months.
  - o Monthly FTE is reported and averaged by the 11 months.
  - o Plug in the enrolment which then drives the staffing units. The staffing units are allocated, and it depends on the type of institution and program.
  - o Staffing factors in the current model came from the 1997-99 biennium budget.
  - o Teacher staff units receive funding for 220 school days. Classified and Administrative staff units are funded for 180 school days only.

- o Floor funding guarantees IE programs who have reported enrollment for the school and the funding is for 1 teacher.
- o Planning time is not provided.
- o Salary Allocation is based on the year's base salaries.
- o Districts that have a regionalization factor are applied to the base salaries.
- o Educational Service Districts (ESDs) do not have a regionalized factor.
- o $612.16 per AAFTE – MSOC (materials, supplies, and operating cost) rate not associated with specific like the prototypical model.
- o Mentally ill-offender's unit funding.
  - ▪ $125,160 is allocated to support students with severe mental health issues.
  - ▪ This allocation is split between Echo Glen and Green Hill.
- o Differentiated Instruction Funding:
  - ▪ Provided to all IE programs except Department of Corrections and Adult Jails.
- o Academic Records Support Funding.
- Ideas considered to "fix" IE Funding model
  - o Transition to prototypical school funding model – i.e., how basic education is currently funded.
    - ▪ Allocating staff units would be transparent
    - ▪ Based on IE program's needs
    - ▪ Staff unit factors can be adjusted through operating budget
    - ▪ Would provide teacher planning time
    - ▪ Consider a small high funding model
    - ▪ Categorical funding access
  - o Change the "Floor" funding
    - ▪ Conversations for changing floor funding to guarantee more than 1 teacher:
      - • Funding for at least 2 class sizes? Funding for at least 1 and a half teachers?
  - o Change to how student enrollment is counted:
    - ▪ Daily reporting?
  - o MSOC rate
    - ▪ Align this rate with the basic ed MSOC excluding items not for IE programs and would change yearly.
  - o Special Education Allocation

- Provide IE funding to provide special ed services.
- o Substitute Teacher Funding

Discussion by Advisory Group

Comment: With my school being at 220 students, I do not have enough time to do anything during the summer before the new year starts (if I want to enjoy any time off to recover). Substitutes during the summer would absolutely work though!

Comment and Question: I learned something today. I did not realize that classified and administrative staff are not apportioned for 220 days. This doesn't affect the detention centers because there is no apportionment in detention centers for classified admin staff. Why are these two categories not funded for 220 days because they'll be there as well?

Presenter Response: I don't know why that is the case. We are looking back to the 1997 budget but there is nothing to say why it was allocated the way it was. We recommend that we move to a prototypical model so we can enter factors and adjust and do what is realistically needed at the facilities.

Comment: I am concerned about the funding structuring being based on FTE rather than what the students currently need to complete their credits. We can't expect our teachers to do 3 or more preps and then provide high quality education, especially in our long-term facilities. We need to be thinking about how we support our teachers in a way that also stays within contractual obligations with our school districts as well. Teachers are going above and beyond but it's not sustainable.

Comment: A big issue that came up during one of our technical working group meetings was that there is no state-wide standardization of record-keeping, so even if students earn (partial) credits while in institutional settings, most schools are not in a position to track and honor the credit achievements of students. I am wondering whether the funding will address upgrades or standardizations to these systems. It would require working with local school districts, Charter schools, and institutions that provide educational services. Even if you reform the IE system, what about the lives on the outside that we are preparing the youth for?

Comment: From the grassroots efforts and the task force that led to HB 1295, we found that no one wanted to make significant funding model decisions without first understanding what is the transformative way we are going to provide education? In other words, only once we understand best practices, how the two systems of juvenile justice operations intersect and interact with each other, can we address the funding. In addition to delivering the education, we consider all of the system components that we were just talking about (e.g., credit management and transcripts) can we determine what the cost is going to actually be. How the system will change will drive the ultimate change. Obviously, the underlying funding model is broken. The prototypical model that

was talked about today represents a significant increase in funding. In the task force we saw that those states that are having good outcomes were about 4 times more expensive. We can expect to spend more money, but we need to really flip the conversation from what does it take to operate a school, and what does it take to operate a long-term rehabilitation center, to what does it take to deliver and achieve the outcomes that we want for our youth that we place in the center. It will be a multi-year phasing and approach to build out database systems. The current model is not working and will never work in this environment. I have a lot of hope that we will have a funding model built out of where we want to go as a vision from the work, not starting with funding and figuring out what we can do with the work based on the funding.

Comment: I want to bring back the attention of the group to how we are going to educate the currently enrolled youth and fund these improvements along the way. Our kids are still incarcerated and must still be educated, and I do not want to lose any of that conversation either.

Comment: To provide an education so that some of these youth can come out of an institution and feel like they have skills (e.g., they can go pay rent or buy a car) are critically important. But you must really create a safe place for learning to happen with institutions. It occurred to me that there are folks there that are living that life right now and I would like to really hear from them. Is there a safe environment for learning currently? What could we do better? How could they go to school and focus more on the skills they need to learn, given what they see around them now?

Comment: As we think about a model for IE, it cannot be a permanent model. We have been stuck in this permanent model for 30 years. We need to commit to the best of our ability to revisit the model regularly and periodically so that it is flexible and responsive to the needs that we have.

Comment: We have already pointed out the importance of the deep collaboration in these systems between IE and the institutional operation component. Whether it is DCYF or a county operating the facility, there needs to be a conversation about that transformation. What does it look like as well and what does that cost? There needs to be a parallel conversation between this context of how we fund the educational component and how we collaborate on the work between the county or DCYF and the residential components and how they blend together.

Comment by presenters: We appreciated Representative's Callan's comments and agreed with some of the follow up statements. Long term mission and question: is the system really performing the way that we want it to? If not, let's figure out what that looks like first, and then we can figure out how to fund it. There are streams of educational funding that are different than when we had the conversation in 2016 when you look at programs like Open Doors and other areas of competency-based systems. We do not

really have a desired outcome in terms of a predetermined structure. We are willing to engage in conversations with the practitioners and members and figure out what the best solution is going forward. We believe it needs to be tied to inflationary measures and how we would provide for some sort of increased investment over time. There are a lot of things to consider as we move forward, but fundamentally, the question is how do we want the system to work for the benefit of the students? And, then we will figure out how we create a funding structure that best meets those needs.

Public Comment – Mary Kay Dugan (AIR)
Member of the public speaking:

- o I appreciate the opportunity to join as a member of the public. There are two items to comment on based on listening to today's meeting:
    - First, it is disappointing to hear how under resourced our Institutional Education system is today. Thinking about Rep. Callan's discussion about other states with better outcomes - where the funding is about 4 times more than in Washington.
    - Second, related to Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) and bridging areas of disconnect. I have a really big concern whether our youth who are experiencing incarceration are experiencing the same things that students in general education are receiving such as IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) accommodations, multiethnic studies, comprehensive sexual education, etc. I am wondering about districts trying to do that and their relationships with institutional education.

Wrap up and Next Steps – Mary Kay Dugan (AIR)
The notes from this meeting and slides will be distributed.
If you are interested in attending the Technical Working Group meeting on Funding Models (May 5th, from 9-noon PT), please contact Juliet Wu at juwu@air.org.
The next HB 1295 Advisory Group Meeting will be held on June 9th from 9-noon PT.
Meeting adjourned 11:47 AM PT.