

Minutes of the Seattle/Shoreline Skills Center Study Review Committee Meeting held May 24, 2007, 1:30 pm at the Workforce Development Council office in The West Room.

Those present:

- Ms. Kathy Ackerman, Special Education, Seattle Public Schools (SPS)
- Ms. Olga Addae, Vice President, Seattle Education Association
- Mr. Peter Coates, King County Brightwater Project
- Mr. Leroy Drake, Special Assistant for Partnerships, Seattle Central Community College
- Mr. Dan Fey, Seattle/King County Workforce Development Council (WDC)
- Mr. Jonathan Knapp, Instructor, West Seattle High School
- Mr. Brian Lindquist, CTE/WBL Specialist, SPS
- Mr. Darren Linker, Dept. of Environmental & Occupational Health Sciences, University of Washington
- Ms. Berta Lloyd, Shoreline Community College
- Mr. Tom Lopp, High Performance Standards, Inc.
- Ms. Bobbie Peterson, Director, CTE, Shoreline School District
- Ms. Denise Salo, Labor Relations, Sound Transit
- Mr. Shep Siegel, Manager, CTE, SPS
- Mr. Neal Storme, Audio Producer
- Mr. Jim Street, Reinvesting In Youth
- Representative Pat Sullivan, 47th District, WA State Legislature
- Mr. Paul Wozniak, Senior Facilities Planner, Facilities and Construction, SPS

Mr. Siegel opened the meeting. Mr. Fey welcomed the Review Committee members to The West Room of the Workforce Development Council.

Mr. Siegel explained the purpose of today's meeting was to review the 1st Draft of the Final Report prepared by Mr. Lopp. He had forwarded a copy to Mr. Wozniak for his review and constructive comments (meeting handout). For the meeting, the report was broken out into five sections, 0 – 4:

- 0 Acknowledgements
 - Introduction
 - Research: King & Snohomish County Profiles
 - Research: County Demographics, Population, Demographics, Employment
 - Research: School districts Demographic Profiles, Student Population, Demographics, Graduation and Dropout, Tech Prep, Seattle CTE Policy
 - Seattle CTE Procedure

- 1 Purpose
 - Regional Map – School District
 - Boundaries
 - Proposed Host District

- 2 Proposed Site-Core Facility/Branch
 - Campus/Satellites
 - Projected Program
 - Selections/Implementation
 - Projected FTEs
 - Proposed Time Schedule

- 3 Proposed Dropout Program
 - Administrative Structure
 - Financial Obligations
 - Cooperative Agreement
 - Funding Related Issues

- 4 Building/Parking/Transportation
 - Proposed Name
 - Labor Market
 - Conclusion/Recommendations
 - Survey Conclusion
 - Study Conclusion/Recommendations

Mr. Siegel welcomed Representative Pat Sullivan from the 47th Legislative District.

Representative Sullivan stated there is good interest in the Legislature for the construction of skills centers in Washington State.

Mr. Siegel said that Seattle Public Schools' leadership is receptive to a skills center as it would be a new element in the school district, but they do want to know what CTE programs are offered in the high schools and how those programs will fit together at the skills center. He added that the north/south city relationships will need to be addressed.

Mr. Siegel stated he had contacted Mr. Gordon Beck, the steward for the OSPI grant for the skills center feasibility study about an extension for the deadline. The grant will end at the end of June and the Final Report will be presented to Mr. Duckworth, OSPI CTE Director by the June 30, 2007 deadline.

Mr. Lopp explained that the State's economy is doing well and that the skills center would most probably be 100% funded by the Legislature. He cautioned that the Legislature deciding to "move forward" does not mean a final approval of the skills center. The Seattle/Shoreline Skills Center Study Final Report must contain enough information for OSPI to evaluate to move forward.

Mr. Siegel asked Representative Sullivan who the audience will be to hear the Final Report. He answered that it would be OSPI, with copies provided to the legislators.

Mr. Siegel made available a copy of the Survey Report and Survey Report Appendices (notebooks) for the members' review.

Mr. Siegel asked the members to choose one of the report sections (1-4) and to break out into small groups to read and critique the report. He requested they legibly write down their comments for Mr. Lopp to use for the Final Report. Section 0, the introductory portion of the report, was not reviewed by the members.

The meeting reconvened. Mr. Siegel asked that a spokesperson from each group present their critiques.

Report Section #1 – Ms. Addae

Purpose:

- Correct typographical and grammatical errors noted in the section:
 - 1st Paragraph: Rework sentence
 - 2nd Paragraph: Add the word “to” – “The skills center is to be operated...”

- Questioned the following:
 - Under Skills Center Definitions, use of the word “Internetworking”
 - Capstone Programs: Rework the paragraph
 - Under Skills Center Summer School:
 - 1st bullet: Change “Provides expanded opportunities” to “Increase opportunities...”
 - Remove the words “college-bound” (*suggestion - n that Skills Center is for all students*)
 - Add a bullet (???)
 - “Personalized Learning” – *warning against verbiage that suggests “double dosing” at the Skills Center*

Regional Map – School District:

- Suggestion - to combine both schools districts on one map

Boundaries:

- Suggestion - to add a definition regarding Shoreline School District boundary lines

Report Section #2 – Ms. Lloyd

Proposed Site-Core Facility/Branch:

- Correct typographical and grammatical errors noted in the section:
 - Page 31, 1st Paragraph, 3rd Sentence: Change “would be allows” to “would allow...”
 - Page 31, 1st Paragraph, 3rd Sentence: Plural “student”

- Page 31, 2nd Paragraph, 2nd Sentence: Question sentence structure for “to have at least core facility...”
 - Page 31, 2nd Paragraph, 4th Sentence: Plural “skill”
 - Page 31, 4th Paragraph, last Sentence: Rework the sentence
- Questioned the following:
 - Page 31, 3rd Paragraph: Suggestion - adding a summarizing statement to better define core facility, branch campus and satellite sites (*how coordination happens; administration, etc.*)
 - Page 31, 4th Paragraph: Suggestion - taking out the first sentence and expanding upon the CTE programs offered in the high schools.

Projected Program:

- Page 32, 1st Paragraph: Add verbiage for Career Laddering
- Page 32, 1st Paragraph: Add verbiage about articulation with community colleges

Selections/Implementation:

- Page 32: Eliminate use of different fonts
- Questioned the following:
 - Page 32: Add verbiage for Shared Lab Space (*Ms. Lloyd*)
 - Page 32: Move Nanotechnology (4 to 6 years) and Green/Eco Tech (7 years and beyond) up the list, to be under 1 to 3 years

Projected FTE's:

- Questioned the following:
 - Page 33: Change verbiage to “headcount” instead of “FTE”
 - Page 33: Suggestion of adding ranges for better definition of T&I
 - Page 33: Add verbiage to better define preparatory and exploratory Business/Marketing/Information Technology courses offered at the high schools and at the skills center

Projected Hours of Operation:

- Page 33, Correct typographical error: Change to “Projected Hours of Operation”
- Questioned the following:
 - Page 33: Suggestion - earlier start in the day – 7:30 am
 - Page 33: Provide for a longer time interval between the 1st and 2nd session – 12:30-3:30 pm
 - Page 33: Push the evening session back to 4:15-7:15 pm

Additional Comments:

- The skills center could offer high-cost programs such as CISCO Networking, or low interest high school programs such as Computer Repair. (Mr. Siegel)
- Career Academies Preparatory courses will remain at the high schools offering those programs. (Mr. Siegel)
- Very difficult to predict FTE for the skills center; must be 150 FTE (300 students) to “open the doors”; 155 FTE by year two. (Mr. Siegel)
- Revenue comes from FTE; 300 headcount (150 FTE) will not meet the needs of a \$300 million skills center facility, and, as such, the school districts will need to provide dollars until the skills center becomes a self-sustaining facility. (New Market runs a 700-850 headcount) (Mr. Wozniak)
- A Core facility will have its own principal and administration. (Mr. Siegel)
- A Branch facility has 3-4 programs maximum, beyond that the facility would become a Core facility. (Mr. Siegel)
- Suggestion of combining Seattle’s and Shoreline’s General Advisory Councils into one GAC, as a single governance board to govern CTE for the districts’ high schools and the skills center(s). (Mr. Siegel)
- Suggestion to add a Central District skills center site. (Mr. Drake)
- The Seattle 82% and Shoreline 18% Projected FTEs was derived by the following formula: 2 high schools @ Shoreline @ 9% = 18%; 9 Seattle high schools @ 9% = 82% (rounded up due to additional Seattle high school/alternative schools). (Mr. Siegel)

- Using the 21% FTE figure for Business & Marketing is too high for a skills center, as these programs are very popular in the high schools; could pose “political” problems between the high schools and the skills center. (Mr. Drake)
- Technology & Industry courses do dominate at a skills center (Mr. Siegel)
- Question of designating Green/Eco / Nano / Bio Diesel Technologies under Agriculture or T&I? (Mr. Siegel)
- Representative Marilyn Chase from Shoreline area is very interested in the areas of Green/Eco / Nano / Bio Diesel Technologies. (Ms. Peterson)
- A skills center schedule must be three 3-hour sessions in a single day. (Mr. Siegel)
- One-half hour travel time may not be sufficient. (Mr. Siegel)
- Students participating in the high school sports programs will attend the morning skills center session. (Mr. Lopp)
- Mr. Lopp was requested to look at other skills centers’ schedules for a good model. (Mr. Siegel)

Report Section #3 – Ms. Salo

Proposed Dropout Program:

- Questioned the following:
 - Page 34, 1st Paragraph: Suggestion - expanding verbiage referencing recruitment.
Will there be a web page?
 - Page 34, 2nd Paragraph: Suggestion - using a different word for “hand holding”

Administrative Structure:

- Correct typographical and grammatical errors noted in the section:
 - Page 35, Italic Sentence under Financial Obligations: Delete the word “even”
 - Page 36, Cooperative Agreement, 2nd Paragraph: Correct the word “agreed”
 - Page 36, Item IV: Correct to “A.”
- Questioned the following:
 - Page 36, Item IV: Add verbiage for Business and Labor and Student Council.

- Page 37, Item 9: (*Look at Work Study for structure*)
- Page 38, Operational Costs: Addition of verbiage for Host and Member Districts
- Page 39, Item f: Change “grades 9-12” to “grades 11 and 12”
- Page 40, Item VII: Suggestion to expand Item F. Mediation

Funding Related Issues:

- Questioned the following:
 - Page 42, 5th Bullet: Equipment allocation – update verbiage
 - Page 42, 7th Bullet, last sentence: Add verbiage to include transportation, car and driver license

Report Section #4 – Kathy Ackerman

Building/Parking/Transportation:

- Page 44, 1st and 2nd Paragraphs: Expand feasibility...more clarification needed (*Mr. Wozniak’s comments*)

Labor Market:

- Page 45: WDC will assist figures agreement with U.S. Department of Labor statistics

Conclusions/Recommendations:

- Page 45: Expand the verbiage (*Mr. Wozniak’s comments*)
- Page 45: Suggestion to add verbiage for “Pros and Cons”, Problems, Laws, What a Skills Center Can Do and Cannot Do
- Page 45: Suggested to use 10-year projections

Study Conclusion/Recommendations

- Page 47: Add verbiage on how the skills center will form co-ops—community colleges, private industry

Additional Comments:

- Suggestion was made to look at other skills centers urban models, i.e., Iowa, North Carolina to deliver a firm cost for dollars per square foot for the facility.
(Mr. Siegel)

The next Seattle/Shoreline Skills Center Study Executive Council Meeting will be June 5, 2007 at 1:30 pm. (By e-mail addendum from Mr. Siegel, this meeting has been rescheduled to Monday, June 18, 2007 at 1:30 pm.)

Respectfully submitted,

Robyn Redfield