



Board Special Meeting

Work Sessions: Board Goals; Budget; BEX V Planning

Wednesday, December 13, 2017, 4:30 - 7:30pm

Board Auditorium, John Stanford Center

2445 – 3rd Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134

Minutes

Call to Order

Director Harris called the work session to order at 4:30pm.

Directors Harris, DeWolf, Burke, Pinkham, Geary, and Mack were in attendance. Director Patu was absent.

Work Session: Board Goals

Nate Van Duzer, Director of Policy and Board Relations, started the meeting by going over the 2017 Board Goals, noting the objective was to discuss options for the goals and evaluation process for 2018. The board directors discussed the five options laid out by Mr. Van Duzer, as well as some historical options that were used for evaluation in the past. Director Geary gave some suggestions on how the board could handle their own board efficiency. Erinn Bennett, Executive Director of Government Relations and Strategic Initiatives, described some context to the evaluation policy history. Directors continued to discuss the goals adopted for the board in 2017. Director Burke pointed out that the adopted goals seemed to be more like activities rather than goals, and asked whether we should be using the same format as previous years.

Mr. Van Duzer and directors discussed some options for how to reword the board goals to best articulate what the board is aiming for. Ms. Bennett explained how the goals have shifted in the past and gave some options on how the board could structure their goals for the future to best meet the methods of evaluation as desired by the board.

Mr. Van Duzer discussed next steps by asking that the board designate a point person or committee to work on language. Director DeWolf volunteered to be the point person.

Director Harris suggested that they push this topic to the Executive Committee with a turn around of the mid-January Executive Committee meeting, rather than designating a volunteer. Director Pinkham also volunteered to provide input on the board goals.

Mr. Van Duzer noted that he would follow up with individual board members and provide a summary based on their suggestions at the Executive Committee meeting in mid-January.

At 5:07 the board ended the discussion of Board Goals.

Work Session: Budget

This meeting was called to order at 5:11 pm Directors Burke, DeWolf, Pinkham, Harris, Geary and Mack were present.

This meeting was staffed by Deputy Superintendent Stephen Nielsen and Assistant Superintendent for Business & Finance JoLynn Berge.

Assistant Superintendent for Business & Finance JoLynn Berge summarized the agenda and gave a recap of the 2017-18 budget.

Director DeWolf asked if the five-year trend of actual expenditures are the same as the short fall and GAP. Ms. Berge explained it is not the same and she gave the examples of this.

Director Harris asked what is included in state activity. Ms. Berge explained it includes teaching Support, teaching activities, principal office, central administration and other support activities.

Ms. Berge spoke about how much is spent directly on students, and where does the District fund are spent by State program. She explained 80% of our budget is spent on staff, and that is at a school and a central office level. Ms. Berge gave an update on SMART goal 3, she stated the language within the goal will be updated with a Board Action Report to update the program review to program summary. She reviewed the final 10 recommended program summaries were selected based on the director feedback.

Director Harris asked if international baccalaureate will be included. Ms. Berge explained that was not originally planned and she would need to look into possibly having it included.

Director Mack asked what is the difference between STAR mentors, career ladder, mentor teachers and master teachers. Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources Clover Codd explained Career ladder teachers are stipend based and they work outside of their school. Mentor teachers are used to mentor new district employees, master teachers are higher level than career and mentor. They are classroom teacher and receive a stipend. STAR mentor is to coach and mentor new to profession teachers.

Director Harris asked if the format will be uniformed. Ms. Berge confirmed they will be uniformed and they have a template.

Director Pinkham asked about increase or decrease costs for athletic transportation. Assistant Superintendent for Operations Pegi McEvoy spoke about how transportation was pulled out of the cost analysis, it is being looked at and once the report is done she will give the report to the Board members.

Ms. Berge explained the analysis that is currently being decided on this year. She spoke about how these summaries and what additional information to keep in mind as the summaries are completed. She reviewed the Weighted Staffing Standard (WSS) committee process. She explained the recommendations that the WSS committee that will be brought forward at the January work session.

Director Pinkham asked if any confusion will be with renaming it to equity dollars. Ms. Berge explained the reason to change the name was to what its being spent on rather than what is driving it, and closing GAPS.

Director Geary asked what drives free and reduced lunch. Ms. Berge explained that is baseline and it is not included.

Budget Director Linda Sebring spoke about the reason for changing the name to equity dollars. She explained the District had it in place a long time.

Director Mack asked if we have the original language. Ms. Sebring explained we may have the original language in the red book from the 1990's.

Ms. Berge spoke about the draft proposal that is broken down by school level. High schools wanted more differentiation by enrollment and maintain flexibility. She reviewed what middle and elementary schools requested.

Director Burke asked about middle schools wanting reduced class size if it would be changing ratios. Ms. Berge explained this was the overwhelming request from middle school, currently the ratio is 30:1.

He also asked if Career and Technical Education CTE educator decisions site based or budget based. Ms. Berge explained it was site based and more work needs to be done before a recommendation can be made.

Director Harris asked where do the executive directors fit in on the WSS committee. Ms. Berge explained Executive Director's do not attend the meetings but if feedback is needed from a topic at WSS they are drawn in as needed.

Ms. Berge spoke about K-3 class size. She explained what the State funds. She explained how the equity tiering methodology is being used.

Director Burke asked if anything in the WSS that can be multi-year and not renewed annually. Ms. Berge explained the District has to plan for compliance requirements.

Ms. Berge reviewed the five-year trend for the fund balance. She spoke about the total ending balance in 2016-17. She summarized what is in each category of the fund balance and what is within the assigned fund balance. She reviewed the budget development calendar. She spoke specifically about the need for a budget consensus on the budget on January 24, 2018.

Director Mack asked when open enrollment closes and how will that effect budget consensus. Ms. Berge explained this is all tied to open enrollment and dates were considered when the calendar was created. It will be school based, and we need it to be able to roll out to the schools.

Ms. Berge spoke about the transportation funding, she explained in 2017-18 there may be a small surplus of dollars. Based on the previous year it can come back and change on us within the current year, and will not be known until March. She explained we would be in a deficit for \$2.3M.

Director Harris asked where was the \$2.3M previously coming from. Ms. Berge explained it was from the City of Seattle for the tiered transportation from the previous year.

Ms. Berge explained in January we will speak more about the levy changes and how it will affect Seattle voters. Ms. Berge reviewed the fiscal year (FY)18-19 projected budget. She explained major budget changes and gave additional details.

Ms. Berge explained the Projected Budget slide 35 was developed based on the Directors direct feedback in this past year. She explained the additional costs that were included in the annual costs she explained the two new laws, such as the sick leave law and new Family Medical Leave Act law also beginning next year. She spoke about potential solutions. She gave three onetime use options and FY18 projected underspend. This will bring us to a balanced budget.

This portion of the meeting concluded at 6:30pm.

Work Session: BEX V Planning

1. Director Jill Geary called the meeting to order at 6:43 pm. Directors Richard Burke, Zachary DeWolf, Lesley Harris, Eden Mack and Scott Pinkham were present. Director Betty Patu was not present.
2. Staff present: Associate Superintendent Flip Herndon, Capital Projects & Planning Director Richard Best, K-12 Planning Coordinator Becky Asencio, Deputy Superintendent Stephen Nielsen

Welcome/Introductions – Flip Herndon

1. Dr. Flip Herndon made introductory remarks, introducing Capital Projects Director Richard Best.
2. Mr. Best introduced his staff and contributors, Becky Asencio, K12planning coordinator; Tingyu Wang, Capital Planning analyst; Tom Redman, communications specialist; Eric Becker, Lucy Morello and Mike Skutack, senior project managers, Amanda Clausen and Michael Davis of Bassetti Architects.

BEX/BTA Capital Levy History/Planning Timeline – Flip Herndon

1. Dr. Herndon reviewed the agenda and the first few slides of the PowerPoint presentation that focused on the history of the Building Excellence (BEX) and Building, Technology and Academics (BTA) Capital Levies. He then reviewed the levy planning timeline for BEX V and the associated work and community outreach activities that need to occur during 2018 to be prepared to place the levy on the ballot.
2. After the initial slides were introduced, comments and questions came from the committee:
 - a. Director Harris, stated on behalf of Betty Patu, that she did not hear and questioned if a playground assessment had been implemented as part of Meng Analysis facilities assessment. She further noted that the Race and Equity tool should be utilized to prioritize which playgrounds be reconditioned first. Dr. Herndon responded that there has been discussion with staff surrounding topic and that a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) is being developed to update the facilities assessment and incorporate an assessment of playground conditions. He noted that staff will be using the race and equity lens to provide a priority list. He acknowledged the ability of some groups to raise funds while others do not have that capability.
 - b. Director Harris, again on Director Patu's behalf, stated that Rainier Beach High School should be on the top of the levy list, having the same amount of money funded as the other comprehensive high schools. Richard Best noted that a comprehensive master plan is being developed with Rainier Beach High School students, staff and community for Rainier Beach High School.
 - c. Director Mack questioned how the Facilities Masterplan fits in the picture of levy planning, Dr. Herndon stated that the update of the Facilities Masterplan is required by Board policy as part of developing the capital levy. Current building condition information has been collected in the facilities assessment developed by Meng Analysis and enrollment projections and capacity analysis are developed with staff from Enrollment Planning working collaboratively with Capital Planning and the information summarized in the long-range facilities plan; staff are currently working on the facilities assessment and he anticipates the effort will culminate in the masterplan which is anticipated to be ready August 2018.
 - d. Director DeWolf questioned the community meeting/public outreach process. Dr. Herndon stated that it is an interesting process in which improvement is consistently sought. In neighborhoods where English is not the first language, translators are present at the meetings. Ways of reaching out to those who do not come to the community meetings are being considered. Part of this is making sure materials are available in multiple languages. Notes

are taken; comment cards and email addresses are provided. Received responses are cataloged, the board is informed of the results. Buildings which were not funded in the last levy but commented on by the community are reviewed. Generally, the presentations are balanced, people are listened to; their comments seriously considered. The focus right now is to identify and reach out to groups who have not accessed the community meetings.

- e. Director Pinkham asked if we are saying that our new high school will be downtown and will it serve downtown? Dr. Herndon stated that a downtown high school is being considered at Memorial Stadium. He noted that it will ultimately come down to cost, the construction costs are very high. He noted that staff and must develop softs and he is recommending against utilizing a budget percentage soft cost allocation as it detrimentally impact students. A fairer approach is to allocate soft costs on a per student basis. Dr. Herndon note an example, when there are two projects and one costs twice as much as the other, the students are not getting the same amount and it needs to be adjusted to be fair to students. He concluded noting that there will be much more discussion surrounding the downtown high school.

Overview/considerations – Richard Best

Facilities Condition Assessment – Richard Best

1. Mr. Best reviewed the PowerPoint slides concerning facilities condition assessment.
 - a. Mr. Best noted that the most recent facilities condition assessment was performed in 2014 and that that report is available on the web. He indicated that it provides excellent information concerning the current condition of the various existing building systems.
 - b. Mr. Best noted that utilizing the facilities condition assessment information and collaborating with Facilities Department personnel who are the most familiar and knowledgeable about the school's condition, Capital Planning developed four criteria: educational adequacy (25%), facility condition (25%), building maintenance & repair ranking (25%) and Facilities Department personnel assessment (25%) to rank every school for modernization or replacement consideration. He concluded noting all 104 schools are included in the ranking. This document is also available on the web.
2. Comments and questions came from the committee:
 - a. Director DeWolf's question if cost estimates had been developed for board consideration, Mr. Best clarified that consultants are currently developing estimates and soft costs have yet to be developed. He emphasized that no recommendations have yet been made to the board; staff are currently collecting information for the board to consider. Director Pinkham requested clarification on the landmarking schedule. Mr. Best explained that a building must be at least 50 years old to be considered historic by the National Registry, however Seattle's ordinance encourages nomination consideration at 25 years of age. The district self-nominates all projects undergoing a significant renovation or modernization at 25 years of age.
 - b. Director Burke stated the communities concern that Lincoln High School faces a challenge in remodeling only the west wing since the east wing is insufficient for the gym and performing arts. He wondered is the east wing could be included in the condition assessment. Mr. Best responded that a master plan and associated cost estimate has been developed for the east wing and that this information could easily be included in the next BEX V board update.

Capacity Analysis – Becky Asencio

1. Becky Asencio reviewed enrollment projections and capacity analysis PowerPoint Slides.
2. Comments and questions came from the committee:

- a. Director DeWolf questioned how City of Seattle and Seattle Public School collaborate to exchange demographic information. Ms. Asencio explained that the district's Enrollment Planning demographer collaborates with her counterpart at the City of Seattle confirming data they are utilizing.
- b. Director Harris asked if we pay attention to the Housing and Affordability and Livability Agenda (HALA) process. Dr. Herndon noted that staff from Enrollment Planning and Capital are participating in some conversations with the City.
- c. Director Mack expressed she would like to see if the district can look at the cohort roll up model and do a more in-depth neighborhood study on density. Flip Herndon stated after five-years projections become hazier. The growth is being marked and the district is trying to get ahead of the curve; it is one of the biggest challenges. With the growth Seattle has experienced, it is hard to catch up; to build that fast you will pay a very high price. We must be creative.
- d. Ms. Asencio explained how in looking district-wide at the enrollment and capacity numbers, some regions are close to right size while other regions are not. She cautioned not to analyze the combined or aggregated information as it paints a false picture, she noted that you must analyze the data by service area and school to determine where the capacity issues exist. Dr. Herndon stated this is a problem that manifests itself with OSPI because they aggregate the information instead of reviewing individual situations.
- e. Director Harris questioned if charter enrollment has been figured in. Dr. Herndon replied that the district is tracking the trend. OSPI data can help in tracking. Not all students attending charter schools come from public schools; some students come from the private schools or other school districts.
- f. Director Mack stated that as a starting point she would like to see which regions need more capacity. She stated that as we get crunched we need to look for new property in the future. Dr. Herndon responded that we can do that, but we do want to highlight the buildings that need expansion, i.e. Alki, which also needs rebuilding from a condition assessment standpoint as well. Mr. Herndon noted that capacity is being reviewed in the aggregate by middle school service area but we are also trying to understand what is happening at each school. It can be noted if a region needs more property. Mr. Best emphasized that Capital Planning has done a great job of looking at data school by school. Each school has been looked at individually and excellent information is now available for determining future recommendations.
- g. Director Burke expressed his appreciation for the awesome data and excellent graphs; that it provides insight for looking at localized trends.
- h. Director Geary noted that there were no individual charts for either Magnolia or Lincoln High School. Mr. Best explained that until there is a defined boundary no analysis can be performed. Once the Board determines the boundaries for those schools Capital Planning will work with Enrollment Planning to refine the capacity analysis for those areas.
- i. Director Harris strongly expressed her belief that Seattle suffers from levy confusion and fatigue and the board should break out of how they have done things in the past. She expressed concern that with the city asking for so much, the SPS levy will be a heavy ask for our citizens. Dr. Herndon mentioned that there is an impact to moving the levy. If the calendar is changed, there are various thresholds which must be hit when going out for the levy next time. All the impacts need to be considered. The Operations and Maintenance levy benefits from both levies being offered together. He noted that subject will be discussed at small cabinet. Director Harris requested this effort start begin sooner rather than later.
- j. Director Burke suggested creating a document listing the pro/con analysis.
- k. Director Mack recommended it be presented at the February 2018 Operations Committee meeting.

1. Michael Davis and Amanda Clausen, Bassetti Architects, reviewed BEX V Master Planning/ Capital Projects Levy Presentation
 - a. The presentations included current master plans being considered for Rainier Beach High School and downtown high school site.
 - b. Mr. Davis emphasized that the presentation are not designs, but test fits used for cost estimating to assure adequate budget estimates are prepared. He clarified that these master plans are site specific and will provide excellent information to future design teams.
 - c. Dr. Herndon, in response to a question by Director Pinkham, stated that part of State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) requires notification to local Native American tribes.
 - d. Mr. Best stated that doing a masterplan allows the district to determine if it is possible to build the proposed project. He again emphasized that no decisions have been made and that all information is being and will be brought to the school board so that good decisions can be made. Sites evaluated for a downtown school include several properties around Seattle Center and Fort Lawton.
 - e. In response to Director Pinkham's question about transportation, Dr. Herndon stated that the lower corner of the plan indicates transportation availability and distance, but no traffic studies have yet been conducted.

Next Steps/Way Forward – Flip Herndon

1. Dr. Herndon concluded the presentation with the final slide listing the next steps, Activities through March 2018.
 - a. Director Mack would like a greater understanding of the specific meetings that are happening with the City and the Park. Dr. Herndon stated he would provide a list in the Friday Memo.
 - b. Director Burke requested the long-range Facility Masterplan, Mr. Best stated it would not be complete until August. Bassetti's draft copy of the master plan is currently available in the Board Office.

Appreciation for the work done by staff was expressed by the Board members.

Adjourn

This meeting adjourned at 7:49 pm.