

# Board Special Meeting OPERATIONS (OPS) COMMITTEE OF THE SCHOOL BOARD

September 16, 2010, 4:00p – 6:00p

School Board Office Conference Room

John Stanford Center, 2445 Third Avenue South, Seattle, WA 98134  
2445 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue South, Seattle WA 98124



Work Session: Community Engagement Options for Future School Schedules  
Wednesday, September 14, 2016, 4:30-6:00pm  
Auditorium, John Stanford Center

## Minutes

Director Patu called the meeting to order at 4:30pm.

All Directors were present.

Staff present: Superintendent Nyland, Associate Superintendent for Teaching & Learning Michael Tolley, Chief Engagement Officer Carri Campbell, and Assistant Superintendent of Operations Pegi McEvoy.

### **Work Session: Community Engagement Options for Future School Schedules**

Supt. Nyland noted a handout of coming attractions that will also be included in the Friday Memo, and he discussed the timeline of the upcoming meetings. He noted that Seattle Public Schools (SPS) has to bid transportation in November, and there is a lot of work to do between now and then. Supt. Nyland noted that two of those six topics will be discussed today, the other four conversations will be coming.

Michael Tolley noted the purpose of the work session is to gain Director feedback on the level and type of community and family engagement the Board desires regarding the 20 minutes of additional instruction time and one-hour, one day per week of late arrival or early dismissal. Mr. Tolley noted all six aspects around the interrelated initiatives for 2017-18 and noted upcoming work sessions that will be discussing the other four aspects as outlined on slide 3 (e.g. 24 credits, boundaries). Mr. Tolley discussed the community engagement that will also be conducted around these six interrelated initiatives. He noted opening of new schools for the 2017-18 school year resulting in boundary changes, which will be another work session and community engagement process.

Mr. Tolley noted the focus of today is to determine what level of engagement for each decision, 20 minutes and late arrival or early dismissal, as well as implications for each option. . Mr. Tolley presented a draft timeline for the Directors to review, as noted on slide 6. Mr. Tolley noted assumptions that staff had designated when looking at the scope of work to be done.

Dir. Harris asked if the 20-minute addition was negotiable, and if it is another unfunded mandate from the state. Dir. Harris also asked what is the dollar amount that defines “cost prohibitive?” Mr. Tolley noted that the 20 minutes is in some ways a mandate, as there is basic education requirements and academic assurances SPS has to meet. He noted that in terms of

the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) that was Board approved, the 20 minutes of instructional time was built in to the contract, and SPS has already agreed to pay teachers for that additional time. Pegi McEvoy noted there is a slide discussing the funding later, but that no additional funding source has been identified for increased transportation costs.

Dir. Geary asked in regards to community engagement if staff is already putting out feelers since it is a tight timeline, and do respondents know the time in which they need to respond. Carri Campbell noted that the purpose of today is to get the Board feedback on the Board's desired level of engagement, and noted that feelers have not gone out yet. Dir. Geary noted to make sure that the net gets cast wide enough, and give more time to make ensure mindfulness of the process. Ms. Campbell noted that by the end of the meeting, Directors will have an opportunity to inform the breadth of engagement.

Dir. Pinkham asked why there was a need to add 20 minutes per day, but also take back 60 minutes per week later. He also noted some community conversations around needing a longer lunch and recess. Mr. Tolley noted that in regards to longer lunch and recess, the CBA was to increase core instructional time, and was not intended to be used to increase lunch/recess. He noted that in the CBA process and in partnership with the Seattle Education Association (SEA), that part of the conversation was around lunch and recess time, but not in relation to the additional 20 minutes of core instructional time.

Dir. Peters noted under Assumptions, that to provide a two-tier transportation system (i.e. two start times rather than three) \$3.8 million was the price tag, and asked what would be the threshold for being cost prohibitive. She would like to consider what it means when we pass along decisions to the public and they absorb the costs, in childcare and other issues. Dir. Peters asked if there is flexibility, and is this a one-time only financial consideration. Ms. McEvoy noted that the dollar amount she referenced was the current amount on the transportation system we have now, which is only the services to and from school. She noted that it is our best estimate right now as some boundaries will be changing as new schools come online. Dir. Peters asked if SPS would get reimbursed the following year if we spent the money on a two tier system in 2016-17. Ms. McEvoy noted that it depends on the State formula and that she can ask the State what they think the reimbursement rate would look like. Ms. McEvoy also stated the State tends to prefer and fund three tier systems.

Ms. Campbell presented the community engagement model and the tiers that were selected on June 4 at the Board retreat. She noted it was a great exercise to run the 20 minute and late arrival/early dismissal decisions through the model. She discussed the analysis and the recommendations as presented on slide 9. Ms. Campbell discussed issues concerning child care costs for families, transportation, budget constraints, as well as reduced sleep times as all considerations in the final decision. She noted that the decisions are all interrelated and cannot be brought to the public independently. The staff recommended a tier 2 approach, and that families should be asked for feedback.

Mr. Tolley noted the recommended level of engagement as outlined on slide 10. He discussed the goals and strategies as outlined on slides 13-14 around the 20 minutes of additional core instructional time, and late arrival or early dismissal. Mr. Tolley discussed the data as listed on slide 16, regarding the Student's ABC's (Attendance, Behavior and Coursework). He noted that the increase in instructional time will help address the opportunity gaps and other initiatives within the district.

Dir. Burke asked if this included disaggregated data on middle and high schools. Mr. Tolley noted this was specifically speaking to the Elementary schools. Dir. Harris asked about school time in Tacoma and Spokane. She also asked about the data shared on the TRI-Day, and if it was a training day. Mr. Tolley noted the district wide TRI-day was training at the school sites and this was a summary of the student achievement data presented. Dir. Peters asked how other students of color are impacted related to achievement and discipline gaps. The data shared showed gaps between white students and African American/Black students. Mr. Tolley noted that while we are sharing data that highlights gaps between two groups of students, we are focused on all students of color in our communities, and it is work staff is focused on. Dir. Peters asked if adding this instructional time will address the gap. Mr. Tolley noted that it will help as well. Dir. Harris asked about slide 17, K-5, do we have a sense of what middle school and high school look like. Sherri Kokx noted that they are pretty similar in comparison to K-5, with the exception of those schools that run an 8 period schedule.

Dir. Blanford noted previous conversations in the negotiation, and that SPS was ranked the third worst in the state related to instructional time, and asked if it was for all of the grades. Supt. Nyland noted it was just in elementary. Dir. Blanford noted that it is not good either way, but is a significant issue to increase the amount of time teachers spend with our students, and that it will show improvements in 2017-18. Dir. Peters noted the history is that SPS used to have a longer elementary school day, but cut back when there was a double levy failure. Reducing teacher-student contact time was the district's cost saving measure. Mr. Tolley confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Tolley discussed the "why's" on slide 19 and 20, around compliance and to allow for teachers to participate in teacher collaboration time. Mr. Tolley noted the summary slide 21, and asked if there were any questions. Dir. Patu noted the current hours of instruction and asked what is the goal for instructional hours. Mr. Tolley noted that the goal is 1080 hours at the high school level and 1000 hours for grades 1 through 8, or a district average of 1027 hours. He noted that our current district average is 1039. Dir. Burke asked for what the academic assurances were. Mr. Tolley noted that it is a combination of basic education requirements that are state law, and other expected experiences for students to acquire prior to graduation. Dir. Burke asked if there was a place where this is documented and asked if everyone knows what they are. Mr. Tolley noted that it could be put in writing and distributed.

Dir. Pinkham noted that on slide 20 there was no mention of recess, and asked if SPS could use some of this time for increasing recess for schools. Mr. Tolley noted that the way increased instructional time was bargained, the 20-minute addition was supposed to be core instructional time, this is not in reference to what the state uses for instructional hours as written in law. Ms. Kokx noted a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in the CBA for recess which is a 30-minute requirement. Supt. Nyland noted a conversation with the community regarding the desire to have more recess time, and that 5 minutes is \$1million to implement, and noted there are several issues tied up in the recess piece. He noted that there is some push back from teachers that the 30 minutes is a backward arrangement and there are complications with equitability across the district due to funding.

Mr. Tolley referred back to slide 23 on the CBA, and noted the additional of 20 minutes, the collaboration time, recess requirement, and the salary adjustments were all listed there. Dir. Burke asked what "specialists" mean. Ms. Kokx noted it was arts, PE and music. Dir. Patu noted that she heard that SPS does not have PE in high school anymore, and asked for clarity. Mr. Tolley said this was incorrect. Dir. Patu asked if it was a requirement for high school. Mr.

Tolley noted that it was a requirement, yet there is a waiver process where the physical activity part can be waived if they meet other aspects of the cognitive learning. Dir. Harris asked about the waiver of PE in terms of physical activity and asked if it is a site based management decision. Mr. Tolley noted that yes it was. Dir. Harris asked if staff felt there was uniformity in the way waivers are granted. Mr. Tolley noted that there are two high school principals currently on special assignment (Principals Hudson and Medsker) who are meeting with principals to discuss the philosophy and to work on principals within the district being on the same page.

Mr. Tolley discussed the opportunities around adding the instructional time. Ms. McEvoy noted the four options to consider on slide 26, and discussed each option listed. She listed the pros and cons for each of the options, as outlined on the slide. She discussed equity and impacts across the different tiers. Ms. McEvoy noted cautions on transportation costs, which is to general transportation, not sports and other specialty activities. She discussed the issues listed for each of the options listed on the slide. She noted an error in the slide on Option #3, that said “no cost impact” on both pro/con columns and it should have been only listed as a pro. Ms. McEvoy handed out a packet representing the sunrise/sunset timelines and the impacts on early arrivals and late dismissals. She discussed the changes through the calendar year, and the effects on when the students are walking to and from school, as well as the impacts of daylight saving time.

Mr. Tolley asked for questions and comments. Dir. Patu noted in regards to the handout on time of day and students walking to and from school, what safety measures are going to be in place. Ms. McEvoy noted that the Bell Times Task Force looked in to that to maximize safety for schools, and there will be a roll out of reflectors to students in November. She further noted working with the Department of Transportation and “safe routes to schools” to find the routes that are of the most concern.

Dir. Geary noted that she feels the Directors are being directed toward the two tier option, and noted that was not an option due to cost during the Bell Times decision last year. She asked to get a better understanding of the funding for such a system. Ms. McEvoy noted that the staff is actually recommending option C at this point. She noted the Board would need more information as to where the money would come from if moving to a two tier system, and she hasn't seen a way to get the funding in an efficient way. Dir. Geary noted needing to work with legislators, representatives and other community/state leaders, as they are also hearing about the safety concerns from families. Supt. Nyland noted that SPS has some of that information from OSPI Transportation, and noted that the state expects everyone in the state to work on a three tier model and will not fund it. Ms. McEvoy noted that the state expects that we operate in a way that compares to other urban districts. She noted that she is unaware of any flexibility, and noted that it is hard to speculate on any future funding formulas as that has been their stance for a number of years.

Dir. Burke noted an observation he had in this process is that we want to be cognizant of not redoing the work of the bell times change last year and that perhaps, in hindsight that the district should have waited a year to move forward with this. His like of efficiency is pushing him toward a two tier system, as the only con is money. Dir. Burke noted in the other areas, there is more of a human factor for the cons, and there are a number of cons. He asked how to go about the decision process. Ms. McEvoy noted to pick one of the school day options on slide 26 first, then to move on to the early/late dismissal decision based upon the school day option selected.

Mr. Tolley noted the CBA in regards to collaboration time, and read through slide 30. He discussed the late arrival or early dismissal options and provided an overview of slides 32- 33, in regards to the pros and cons. Dir. Harris asked if SPS quotes Hattie when it suits us or across the board. Mr. Tolley noted that Hattie observes data across thousands of analysis factors which gives the district an overall understanding of data and trends.

Dir. Patu noted concerns around child care as a big problem for families in her district, specifically that the older kids can no longer supervise the younger kids in the family. She asked what is being done to solve this problem and help families in the community. Mr. Tolley noted conversation this past year on partnerships, and noted that the district needs to continue to grow the community based organizations in order to help our families. Supt. Nyland noted the net is still a longer school day and better outcomes for our students. He noted that similar to the three day later start for the kindergarten, it is a net gain that there is now full day kindergarten, as opposed to half day.

Dir. Peters noted that she feels the community will be upset with this, as they are already upset with the current three tier system. She also noted other districts such as Bellevue do a weekly early dismissal, and asked how can we learn from them and not reinvent the wheel. Mr. Tolley noted that staff will look at options, and will survey what other districts do. He noted that this conversation today is around what level of engagement and communication the Board wants with the community. He discussed the outcomes that staff are asking for from today's work session.

Dir. Pinkham asked if schools will still be accessible during the days in which school start earlier or later, and can we somehow have the schools be open to lessen the impact on families. Mr. Tolley noted that is a consideration, but that it may not be an option across the district at every school. Ms. McEvoy noted that transportation would only be able to go to each school once for pick up/drop offs, so in those cases, they would have to have a set time for the schools to drop off or pick up. Dir. Blanford noted that certain times of the day have more impact and to seek feedback and engagement from teachers. Dir. Harris asked if we have reached out to partners to get their input now, as opposed to waiting until after the Board decides. Mr. Tolley noted that he would agree with engaging the teachers and partners earlier. Misa Garmoe noted that Clover Codd was unable to attend the meeting and introduced Stanislaw Damas, Executive Director of Labor and Employee Relations, who is working with the labor partners on the negotiations. Mr. Damas noted that a specific date has yet to be set, but is upcoming. Dir. Harris asked since this is a tight timeline, can staff get on the phone and discuss with families and community partners. She suspects that families would prefer the wrap around the weekend. Supt. Nyland noted that with approval from labor partners, a poll could be set up a to see what is most accessible for staff. He noted that another district where families did appreciate the Friday, but they also questioned whether the teachers were actually doing professional development or not, so that district went back to Wednesday.

Ms. Campbell noted handouts called Public Expectation Worksheets. She noted that the recommendation is to work through the decisions (20 minutes and late arrival/early dismissal) together as they are so interrelated. She discussed the options again and provided context for the Board on what the schedules may look like for families. She noted that her team went through various options and scenarios prior to making recommendations. Ms. Campbell asked the Directors to provide ideas for who to engage.

**Engagement Partner ideas from Directors:** Principals, litmus test with families through Parent Teacher Student Associations (PTSA), Childcare services and impact, Special Education PTSA complexities, After school organization (i.e. boys and girls clubs, etc.), ethnic specific groups, Chamber of Commerce for employment flexibility in work schedules, neighborhood associations, the outreach list for the bell times task force, safe passage group, police officers, City& Parks departments, Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) for foster parents.

Dir. Patu asked if SPS still has childcare in our schools. Ms. Campbell noted that through the Alignment Initiative we still have childcare providers in our elementary and K-8 schools, however that they may not have the capacity meet the needs of every family. Need exceeds the capacity of our partners to support.

Ms. Campbell summarized the input from the Directors, and noted that surveys would be a way to go out to these folks and asked for other method ideas from Directors.

**Engagement Method ideas from Directors:** personal conversations as much as possible with the community partners, using the schools as they know the parents and we can leverage that relationship, work with family support workers and principals, cultural and community centers to help those that speak foreign languages, flyers in multiple languages to send home to kids and also post at schools, Neighbor2Neighbor.

Dir. Blanford noted a meeting he was at earlier where a partner said that when you try to conduct culturally responsive outreach and are also pressed for time, those two actions are counter intuitive. He noted that there isn't enough time to do it well, to be effective and also be culturally responsive. Culturally responsive strategies take time. Dir. Blanford noted that this isn't just an activity to check the box, if we don't get representative responses then the important work hasn't been done. He wants to figure out a way to see far ahead to start sooner, to get out to underrepresented groups to have enough valid data from all groups engaged. Supt. Nyland noted the astute observation, and that SPS could look to places where we already have established relationships and seek assistance from different advisory groups to get some qualitative feedback in a short amount of time.

Dir. Harris asked if pushing back the timeline is an option. Mr. Tolley noted the key dates for the transportation standards due to the Operations Committee in November. Dir. Harris asked what happens if this is delayed. Ms. McEvoy noted the challenges with the transportation standards, the Request for Proposals (RFP) and the contractors. Dir. Harris asked if we could have the contractors work on a plan A and B. Ms. McEvoy noted in the past that was done and there bid was not as accurate. She noted the balance of being efficient with our funds and provide reasonable outreach for our families. She noted the desire to accomplish both, yet there is a polarity. Dir. Harris suggests that it needs to be done right, and if the transportation companies want our business they would meet us in the middle. She noted her frustration with operational issues causing distress.

Dir. Patu noted that in her work for the district in previous years, that in order to get notice out to parents she would work with the designated person at the school that is responsible for outreach to the families. She further noted that by those individuals calling or going to homes that it really made a difference to make that extra connection. Dir. Patu encouraged the use of the schools' connections to reach out with families that are not typically involved.

Ms. Campbell noted the month-long timeline and noted her appreciation for the feedback and ideas from the Directors. Dir. Peters noted voting on the transportation standards has been delayed in years past, and although not ideal, it has been done. She asked about the potential to delay in order to have time for genuine community input. Ms. McEvoy noted the delay two years ago was due to the Student Assignment being incomplete, but that was a year the transportation contract was rolling over, not a new negotiation seeking RFPs. Ms. McEvoy noted that she will explore options to delay.

Dir. Burke noted to think about this from a parent perspective, and even with a disruption of schedule, there can be clear messaging on the educational advantages that this plan provides. Dir. Pinkham noted that the parents need to be explained the benefits with the messaging around the changes in schedule and school times.

Dir. Geary appreciates the willingness to look in to adjusting the timeline of this engagement process, but also noted that if the transportation piece is shifted it may cause a larger disruption, which will also not be good for our families and students.

Mr. Tolley noted that this work session discussed two of the six interrelated items, and that there will be four more conversations to come, including discussions with the community.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:04pm.