

Board Special Meeting Work Session

August 22, 2018, 6:30pm
Auditorium, John Stanford Center
2445 – 3rd Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134



Minutes

Call to order: Director Mack called the meeting to order at 6:34 pm. Also in attendance were Directors Harris, Geary, DeWolf, Burke, and Pinkham and Superintendent Juneau. Director Patu was excused from this meeting due to illness.

Director Mack reviewed the requirements of policy 6901 and the guiding principles established by the Board for the BEX V levy. She noted that this information had also been presented to the Facilities Master Plan Task Force. She outlined that this work session is a review of the list of possible projects, the scoring criteria, and supporting information for the board to consider. The next Work Session will be the time to apply the scoring criteria and narrow the project list.

Associate Superintendent Flip Herndon introduced key staff: Director of Capital Projects and Planning, Richard Best, K-12 Planning Coordinator, Becky Asencio, Director of Research and Evaluation, Eric Anderson, Chief Information Officer, John Krull, and DoTS Principal Project Manager, Carrie McKenzie.

Assoc. Superintendent Herndon reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

Work Session Outcomes: Assoc. Superintendent Herndon presented the desired outcomes for the work session and the timeline and status surrounding levy planning activities working back from the levy vote on February 12, 2019.

Director De Wolf requested an update on the equity training that the Facilities Master Plan Task Force (FMPTF) was required to receive, as required by the associated BAR.

Facilities Master Plan Task Force Update: Best reported that nineteen community members and one representative from the City of Seattle comprised the FMPTF. The group met five times over the summer during the months of July and August 2018. Their charge was to identify parts of the district where enrollment and capacity indicated most pressing need, and to validate the scoring criteria for potential BEX V capacity/condition projects.

Best replied to Director DeWolf's question noting the FMPTF received training on multiple occasions during the five meetings. He noted that a conscious effort was made to keep conversations concerning equity and implicit bias at the forefront of the FMPTF and formal trainings were conducted on July 9, 2018, July 30, 2018, and August 6, 2018. The FMPTF recommendations indicate that they were very cognizant of what they learned. Best encouraged Director DeWolf to reach out to the members of the task force to hear individual perspectives on the training. Director De Wolf thanked Best for being thoughtful and intentional with the implementation of the Board's direction.

Best identified District staff whose efforts supported the FMPTF, including: Director of Enrollment Planning, Ashley Davies; K-12 Planning Coordinator, Becky Asencio; Director of Department of Racial Equity Advancement, Concie Pedroza; Manager of Partnership Data, Nick Hernandez; and, Director of Research and Evaluation, Eric Anderson.

Best presented the FMPTF overarching recommendations for all projects in the levy and corresponding documentation. He then went into detail for the recommendations for elementary, middle and high schools. He informed the Board that, due to limited time, the FMPTF did not complete its recommendations for high schools. Therefore, a poll has been issued to the FMPTF soliciting their input on four potential recommendations. The one high school recommendation the FMPTF put forward was that the renovation or replacement of Rainier Beach High School be a top priority. The FMPTF was considering a recommendation to include rigorous education program offerings and program attractions – however it was not further defined. Best added that Rainier Beach includes space for community partners and that must be considered when addressing changes to the building. Best also identified the scoring criteria recommendations that are being considered by the FMPTF for additional feedback.

Best noted that the FMPTF struggled with the overarching guiding principle and questioned the Board surrounding their thoughts concerning “What it means that equity be an overarching criterion? Is it included in the scoring criteria or is it weighted separately?”

Director Mack noted the FMPTF conversation regarding the proposed new high school. She reported a lot of discussion about if it is needed for capacity and that the current proposal may not resolve the capacity problem. She indicated from the discussion it is unclear if the debate centers more around the need for a 12th high school or the proposed location of the 12th high school?

Director Burke probed into the structure of the poll that’s been issued to the FMPTF. Best replied that there are several options that are being considered in the poll, with room for respondents to address various contingencies.

Director Geary inquired into what does North End mean and how is Garfield High School being considered in that? She also requested clarity about identifying the elementary and middle schools to support a new downtown school. Director Mack explained that Garfield High School is not projected to be over capacity at this point. Her major concerns are Ballard High School and Roosevelt High School, in large part because they are high demand schools. That raises the question of how would the District draw the boundaries that would appropriately pull students northward, or if it’s an option school how do you address matters of equity. Director Geary and Director DeWolf requested further clarification about Garfield High School’s capacity. Assoc. Superintendent Herndon explained that when examining current capacity issues and projecting for future capacity needs the issue became if it would be more cost effective to add more portables to increase capacity. That led to an idea about employing larger high schools, which is beyond the scope of the FMPTF. The FMPTF’s concern at this time is about projections that highlight Magnolia, Queen Anne and communities further north.

Facilities Master Plan Capacity/Condition Project Scoring: Becky Asencio presented the scored project list that was originally presented to the Board as a graph at the May 30, 2018 work session. She explained that the Board’s comments were incorporated and presented to the FMPTF. The FMPTF discussed the same criteria as the Board. To that, the FMPTF added criteria, which is now reflected in the matrix. The new matrix is presented to provide an idea of the information that Capital Projects used to create the project scores.

Director Mack clarified that the categories of the matrix are based on the Board’s guiding principles. Asencio agreed and specified that the matrix is a representation of the state of the scoring criteria. She indicated that the next step is to identify how to balance the five scores to determine the final project list.

Eric Anderson presented an unweighted scoring example, such that if all the scores are weighed equally, then equity is included at twenty-percent, the same as the other categories. He proposed another option, to make equity one-third and the others combine to make two-thirds. Anderson explained that equity tiering

was developed to address race, ethnicity, language and culture – it takes into account a number of different demographics. He defined achievement as Smarter Balance scores in English Language Arts. Further, achievement is looked at but not weighted in such a way to be used against students and schools who are achieving strong scores in the exam.

Anderson also proposed three alternatives to the example shown for Board consideration, including:

- 1) Consider equity separately, look at condition and capacity and then look at equity separately and then discuss why equity was viewed in such a manner;
- 2) There are more technical ways to do it – such as an equity adjustor, in terms of weighting and scaling;
- 3) With projects budget estimates we could do it as dollars allocated per student group, whether it benefits or disadvantages key student groups

Anderson recommended that staff prepare a few scoring options with depth and then discuss in two-by-two meetings with board members. Then incorporate Board feedback and bring it to the next Board work session.

Director Mack raised concern about the timeline. DeWolf responded to assert the need to be fair and intentional about the Board's equity goals.

Director Pinkham raised questions about the notations in the project list. He wanted to know how a school that needs to be replaced can be scored higher than one being modified. Best replied that modification of a school may involve protecting and working around historical landmarks.

Director Burke – requested an historical snapshot on smaller projects to convey the investment on buildings to date. He wants to highlight which are the schools that are feeling financially neglected. Further, he asserted that there ought to be a ranking for smaller projects, and one for replacement and modification, such that a portion of the budget would be allocated for each category

Director Mack requested that the two-by-two meetings include information about which percentage of each levy has gone to each category.

Director Harris requested to know which schools ended up on the bubble and were left behind on each of the prior BEX and BTA levies. For example, do some schools get left behind repeatedly. She cited this an issue of trust and transparency to make sure that we aren't putting off the same schools and communities. Director Mack asked if that statement was a request for information about which projects have not been touched in the past cycles.

Director DeWolf returned to the issue of larger and smaller projects. He expressed excitement for the weighted scoring and concern about superseding the equity work. He requested clarification of the phrasing “which school's feel's neglected.” Director Burke clarified his original comment as a request to see the granularity of smaller projects that have been completed and made an impact on the respective schools and communities.

BEX V Levy Program Needs:

- **Facility Needs: Richard Best**

Best presented the list of all the capacity/condition projects that have been studied. He directed the board to additional detailed information, available in binders in the board office. He clarified that this list comprises all the potential ideas, identified due to capacity issues and/or condition.

Director Pinkham called out the score for Memorial Stadium and asked what the parking scored. Best explained that the cost includes building parking under the stadium or two levels of parking under a new high school. He indicated that the current parking does not have a score.

Director Mack confirmed that one idea proposed is to relocate Aki Kurose Middle School to the Old Van Asselt site and utilize the Aki Kurose building as an interim site. She made the Board aware of the FMPTF's feelings of alarm at this proposal as discussions had not occurred with the community. She brought the Board's attention to the FMPTF request that the Board bring the proposal to the community before making a decision on the project.

Director Harris agreed with the spirit of the concern but spoke to a need for authentic engagement and transparency. She asserted that if there's only one solution, then on the triangle of community engagement, the answer is to inform them that we don't have other buildings rather than proceed as if there are multiple solutions. Director Mack noted another idea to move the Aki Kurose program temporarily while the building is remodeled, however there is no interim site in that region of the city. Director Harris continued, if we have no other options then we need to say that, and if other options exist, then we need to see that, wrestle with it, and take it to the community. Assoc. Superintendent Herndon concluded that Capital Projects is contemplating how to plan for larger schools and have not ruled out other ideas.

Director Mack called out that a downtown elementary school is not on the project list, as a placeholder, without having the site settled.

Director Mack moved the discussion to the smaller projects. Best reminded the Board of BTA IV capital levy, which identified the need for \$250M of improvement projects of which had to be reduced for capacity projects. The current building systems repairs and replacement list started with those projects and added to it, such as roofs in desperate shape today. He highlighted that priority one items are items that are failing at this moment in time and need to be implemented prior to BTA V.

Director Mack identified that, after equity, the Board's number one priority is the security of the students. Best explained the two categories of security improvements. One category addressed intruder alarms on doors and windows, while the other included security cameras, Ai-phones, card readers. Director Mack questioned why the dollar amount escalates in each level and whether there is enough funding set aside to support the staffing for all of it. Best clarified that it increases because there are more projects being completed under each priority listing. Director Harris specified that levy planning and election costs are different than project planning costs, and requested that they be identified separately. She continued noting that keeping our children safe is more important than educating them. She requested that the list be reconfigured to show the higher priority for security equipment. Director Mack agreed, security equipment needs to be in the forefront of the capital levy.

Director Pinkham also had a question about the presentation on the list and requested clarification between priority 1a and 1b. Best replied that the presentation is based on the dollar amount of the levy, such that Priority 1a is the dollar amount we were asked to stay below, and Priority 1b is the recommendation of staff.

- **Technology Needs: John Krull**

Krull reminded everyone of the full project list and that greater detail can be discussed in the two-by-two or one-on-one meetings coming soon. Krull focused his presentation on Priority 1a and 1b. He highlighted that he was working with needs as defined by stakeholders.

Krull referred the board to the three technology categories, which are defined by board goals. He reminded them that technology operations are funded by capital dollars, and make a fourth category in the budget.

Director Mack highlighted that this is because the state is not fully funding technology and its needs, so the levy funds both capacity and technology.

Krull continued that a technology plan for student learning is being developed and noted that the end result will be research based. Director DeWolf requested as to who is doing the research and who funds it be examined as part of the plan. Krull replied that the research is both internal and external.

Director Harris recognized that technology and student learning is a hot topic. She expressed a desire for community engagement and the inclusion of conflicting voices. Some of the debate surrounds questions of replacing teachers with computers and human interaction with technical interfaces. She asserted the need for thoughtful debates with experts on both sides. She reminded everyone that this is about curriculum adoption and that's statutory responsibility that the Board owns.

Krull responded, explaining that the process includes an advisory committee, and that deeper community engagement is coming later to explore the tie to technology to support teaching and learning. He then provided the highlights of the philosophy in its current state. Krull spoke to equity in terms of a budget for high needs schools to support what they're trying to do for school improvement and by applying the same equity tiering that Anderson addressed earlier in the meeting.

Director Burke called out the significance of aligning technology with an educational purpose and in a way, that is research supported, rather than a blanket order for computers.

Director DeWolf questioned the four-year replacement cycle. Krull explained that the cycle came from industry experts, teachers, and librarians who report that student laptops endure hard use. Regarding staff machines, Krull replied that it was the industry standard for laptops.

Director Geary returned to the issue of high need schools. She expressed concern that the computers not be used strictly for implementing assessments and wanted assurance that the District was thoughtful that those students have the means to use computers in ways that are tied to robust use of the technology. Krull responded that technology professional development money may be allocated to those schools to train the teachers on how to use the provided technology.

Director Pinkham returned to the matter of replacement cycles, suggesting that machines will last longer in the future. But Krull saw that as limited to more expensive computers and replied that with the consumerization of computers there are lower end machines being sold. The District wants to plan for schools having appropriate machines in advance. Due to past practices, we currently have machines that are seven or eight years old and don't serve students, typically in schools where the Parent Teacher Student Association is not funding new technology.

Director Burke requested a per unit cost for student and teacher machines. Krull outlined: \$2K for staff, \$4K with all the peripherals to give teachers a computer that will replace having a desktop and a laptop, and \$500 per student unit to include set-up, etching, and delivering to schools

- **Academics/Athletics Needs: Associate Superintendent Flip Herndon**

Herndon focused on field replacement necessary to make the fields safe for students.

Director Mack asked if Memorial Stadium would fit under this category. Herndon replied that the fields are in priority 1b of the budget.

Director Harris asked if club sports can be provided with trainers to prevent concussion issues, but Herndon explained that expense is not capital levy funding eligible.

Levy Rates:

Assistant Superintendent, JoLynn Berge, presented an historical perspective on how BTA and BEX rates have climbed.

Director Mack asked for the current BEX IV levy, Asst. Superintendent Berge noted our assessed valuation is falling, which is lowering the rate per thousand for the taxpayer. When BEX IV capital levy was passed the rate per thousand was 90 cents today it is 54 cents per thousand.

Director Mack asked if continuation of the levy by rate per thousand would be continuing at 50 cents per thousands, which Asst. Superintendent Berge confirmed as the current rate.

Director Mack noted that in the ballot language this is a continuation of the previous levy, Asst. Superintendent Berge noted that the ballot usually has the total amount of the levy and that our informational materials will outline rates.

Community Engagement: Tom Redman

Presented the upcoming events, including: ribbon cutting events on September 4, 2018, at E.C. Hughes and Loyal Heights Elementary School and five levy community meetings in September.

Director Burke requested clarification about what information the District is bringing to the community and what feedback is being requested.

Assoc. Superintendent Herndon replied that the District will share progress made thus far, for example: The Board's new guiding principles, especially the well-defined equity piece, and the possible projects as they are associated with each of the guiding principles, highlighting the projects as investments in the guiding principles.

Director Harris asserted the need to communicate in an inclusive fashion. She emphasized that how we communicate this matters and that charts will not be sufficient. Herndon agreed and suggested that relating how these dollars are investments may help. He assured the Board that Capital Projects and Planning will specifically formulate the communication in accordance with the Board priorities.

Next Steps/Meeting Wrap-up: Director Eden Mack reviewed the next steps, in particular the two-by-two meetings that will happen soon, in advance of the next work session.

The meeting adjourned at 8:40pm.

jsl