



Board Special Meeting

Work Session: Budget; Operations Committee of the Whole: Student Assignment Plan; Executive Session: To Evaluate the Performance of a Public Employee

Wednesday, October 25, 2017, 4:30 - 8:30pm

Auditorium, John Stanford Center

2445 – 3rd Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134

Minutes

Call to Order

This meeting was called to order at 4:32pm Directors Burke, Blanford, Patu, Pinkham, Geary and Peters were present. Director Harris arrived at 4:52pm.

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

Work Session

Assistant Superintendent for Business & Finance JoLynn Berge summarized the agenda. Ms. Berge explained based on feedback from Audit & Finance committee suggestions for the list of programs/ operations information list. She explained the list is in no particular order. The Budget Office have done 30 of the 40 schools that were promised to the Board.

Director Geary asked about why Cascadia is on the list but Decatur is not listed. Ms. Berge explained that this is the first draft list and changes still will be made.

Director Peters asked what is the focus for English language learners (ELL). Ms. Berge explained that the State funding program focuses on ELL and we are looking for feedback, i.e. are we heading down the right track on what the board expects and what we can deliver. We have capacity to complete 10 more, and feedback from Board members is welcome.

Director Burke asked what we would do with this information. Ms. Berge explained it is within a budget SMART goal that we can identify schools or programs that we are interested in a deeper look at.

Director Burke asked about Operational efficiency. Ms. Berge explained we are looking at the District wide average cost of schools. The hope is this information helps with misinterpretations of some of the programs. Ms. Berge explained we would like to keep this list up, to continue to provide useful information to our families and board.

Director Blanford asked for qualitative and quantitative information, as it would be useful. Examples of additional essential information that would be helpful as we head into the next budget cycle. He would like the documents to be bigger than two pages, and to note what types of students were served in the past, how is intervention structured and information on the actual performance.

Director of Research & Evaluation, Eric Anderson explained how the previous template was developed and included the theory of action. He spoke about how he can use this as a starting point for a template.

Director Burke asked if we looked at additional programs that are within the SMART goals. Director Blanford suggested any programs within the opportunity gaps be added.

Director Geary suggested looking at committees calendars that will offer additional insight on what is coming down the line.

Director Peters suggested multi-tier support, advanced learning, international baccalaureate and elementary counselors.

Director Harris suggested Mentor Teachers, Career Ladder Stipends, Master teachers and STAR Mentors (#42-45 on page 6).

Director Blanford suggested Athletic Directors (#48).

Director Patu asked whether family support workers are supported by the city. Ms. Berge explained they are not funded, and more information will be explained more in a few slides.

Ms. Berge encouraged the Board to email her with their suggestions. She will do a feedback loop with what the final list is and make suggestions to move forward.

Mr. Anderson summarized the type of analysis that can be done over time. He summarized the categorization of the program reviews. Mr. Anderson spoke about additional information that would be included in the possible two pagers.

Mr. Anderson spoke about the three levels of analysis. He explained what went into each level including quantitative and qualitative analysis. He reviewed program significance and feasibility of analysis. He gave examples of what his office is able to help with and how they can add support for analysis of program review.

Director Peters asked about the program review analysis and how it shows similar schools across Washington. Mr. Anderson confirmed this was an example data set to give an average and an example.

Director Burke asked about level 1 analysis would REA team be doing that. Mr. Anderson explained his team could do a seminar on that. Any additional work would need to be evaluated on the team's ability to complete it.

Director Pinkham asked how do you measure dosage within the Native American program and whom are they compared to. Mr. Anderson explained a set of criteria questions that would be used and would go back to data quality.

Director Geary asked about a starting point that we have available to go forward and she understands and appreciates the need to have a starting point.

Ms. Berge spoke about some draft proposals from the Weighted Staffing Standard (WSS) committee. She spoke about the four possible proposals that the committee has agreed too or are very close to agreement on.

Director Patu asked about the \$93 per student. Ms. Berge explained for every school or every student \$93 is allocated for non-staff/supplies. And in high schools it is more for free and reduced lunch students. She also added each school uses these funds differently.

Director Pinkham asked if there is any confusion on equity allocation. Ms. Berge explained it may be based on free and reduced lunch but it really is for equity purposes. Director Burke asked if this a way to divide up a pie from the State. Ms. Berge explained the District will be coming forward with overall net adds. Then we will have to come back to the recommendations in order to reach a balance.

Budget Director Linda Sebring spoke about the supplies amount given per student for middle and high school from the State. All the numbers can be found on the WSS model that is on the District website. Ms. Sebring explained the general funds dollars are still going down due to the poverty level.

Director Blanford asked what is the composition of the WSS committee making the decisions. Ms. Berge explained the committee members are from schools, central office and are varied in positions. Director Pinkham asked to be able to see where the money is going to at the school level. Ms. Berge explained we have started to tracking that this year as we have started separate budget coding.

Ms. Berge explained the State pro-typical funding model, where we are understaffed and above staff. The state funds six family engagement coordinators for the entire district and we have nine nurses for the entire District. Mr. Nielsen explained the key is that it says it is for State allocation purposes only. Ms. Berge explained on average we pay \$32k more per FTE.

Director Burke asked what is the state funding us currently. Ms. Berge explained on average it is \$54k per teacher FTE.

Director Harris asked if this includes tripay. Ms. Berge confirmed it does include tripay.

Ms. Berge explained in Special Education we are over the State allocation. She summarized the costs of special education.

Ms. Berge spoke about the economic stabilization fund, based on the underspend amount we can project in 2016-17 we can repay the fund. We are recommending repaying the stabilization fund to bring the fund back up to the 3% minimum in the policy 6022. If a consensus can be reached tonight then it will be reflected in the end of year financial statements. She emphasized staff is confident in this recommendation.

Director Harris asked for the reasons to do this repayment. Ms. Berge gave the pros and cons making the early repayment.

Director Burke thinks this discussion of where else we can place these funds does not seem fully balanced on the other hand we pulled these funds due to a need and we are no longer in need. It makes sense to him to pay the funds back. Director Geary also agrees the funds should be put back. Director Blanford finds the importance to have funds in reserve if something happens and being conservative, he also supports repayment. Director Patu also supports a repayment. Director Harris is in favor of repayment, and she does not think 3% is high enough amount. Director Pinkham and Peters agrees the funds should be restored. All directors agree the funds should be put back.

Ms. Berge will get the exact amount of the 3% to the Directors. She summarized the fiscal year budget development calendar. Director Harris asked when allocations are pushed to the schools is it based on the number of students. Ms. Berge explained all decisions would need to be made to push out the allocations to schools on time.

This portion of the meeting concluded at 6:17pm.

Operations Committee of the Whole

Director Blanford called the session to order at 6:27pm. All directors were present. Deputy Superintendent Stephen Nielsen, Associate Superintendent Flip Herndon, Director of Enrollment & Planning Ashley Davies, Chief of Student Supports Wyeth Jessee, and Chief Engagement Officer Carri Campbell staffed the meeting.

Dr. Herndon introduced Ashley Davies, who reviewed the timeline for the student assignment plan and the five points summarizing changes for 2018-19.

#1: Remove "Transition" from the plan, making it serve as the stand-alone Student Assignment Plan

Director Burke spoke against the approach to remove the "transition" and replace the 2009 document with a new one. He spoke about the rich content of that document and wanted to consider this year's effort more of a spring cleaning. He acknowledged the need for an update due to new facilities and timelines to manage functional capacity but felt it would be better to make incremental changes this year. With all the pieces on the board at this time, including high school boundaries and BEX, he said he is more interested in having a consistent governance structure built and brought forward perhaps in the next cycle within a policy framework. This should include an expression of core values and a consistent governance structure.

Director Harris discussed distrust community members have expressed and the lack of an audit trail for this document from history. With all of the changes that are coming next year, it would be better to do the student assignment plan within that framework. She felt community confusion about details like the wait list and the 10% set-aside, and she questioned the use of superintendent procedures on the student assignment process.

Director Geary asked for language consistency throughout the document (i.e., use of "transition"). She talked about how families make long-term plans and choices envisioning a path. Use of the word "transition" is an indicator that the plan is still evolving so families can anticipate that. She suggested being clear about potential alternate paths with robust on-line services.

Director Blanford said his feelings were the same as had been discussed and that there were enough board members who have a concern about the removal of transition. He suggested that the district should move forward and make the assumption that "transition" should still be a part of the consideration.

Dr. Herndon noted that the 2019-20 school year is where many of the upcoming changes land, with not as many transitions after that. He said there will always be some annual change in the student assignment plan, but the transition could continue target the 2019-20 school year. Director Geary suggested that when the district is ready to remove the label that there is public engagement, that points are synthesized, vetted through a central process, showing EOG work. For 2019-20, this process needs to start now.

#2: Updating the transfer policy guidelines for families with a choice seat such that students who opt into a choice seat can transfer back to their attendance area school only if there is capacity available.

During the discussion about how choice seats work and what drives them, board members said:

- Have a conversation with principals and option schools and attendance area schools.
- The concern is around some have very limited capacity, cannot add additional capacity, even outside cost of portables.
- Utilize the space we have. There are classrooms available at options schools.
- Demonstrate the equity lens of schools involved. The update to this is around only if capacity available

Director Peters spoke about taking away the assurance of access of a family to their neighborhood school if the option school does not work out. She suggested that rather than modifying the system for individual schools that the problem be corrected. Director Pinkham noted that with schools who have extreme capacity issues, this policy sometimes is very difficult. Director Burke wondered about looking for a policy solution for something that is a localized problem. Director Geary noted it was the extreme capacity phrase that is not part of the policy or part of the test. Perhaps an emergency designation is better than trying to create a policy; taking away choice and option is probably not the way the district wants to do this.

Director Blanford said there has not been enough conversation about stability in schools. Families get a chance to make their choice, they get to make that choice. Then the district wants to keep them in that choice unless there is capacity. Allowing families to make multiple choices creates ups and downs that have detrimental impacts to schools. Director Harris said that family dynamics change (i.e., option school for K-2 to neighborhood school, or divorce may force a child onto a bus, or a school being crowded when it opens) and that the district may want more than one option for this item.

#3: Clarify space available to mean physical space available based on staffing capacity as it applies to choice seats allocated in the School Choice Process

Board members said that this item recognizes we are not changing policy but more clearly sharing how the district operates with the movement of wait lists. Discussion followed about how staff allocations, how physical space like Licton Springs has a capacity of 250 but cannot accommodate that many, allocating budget and staff to Cedar Park based on a projection that may not be realized, how to accommodate both schools (shifting boundaries or something else), and declaring seats available given staff capacity. Directors discussed the cycle of student projections driving the spring staffing and then moving staffing based on where students show up; they said footnotes provided more clarity in the document and did not want to govern by footnote, asking that issues like staffing vs. physical capacity be described in the body of the plan.

#4: Update language to clarify current Special Education services and placement

Director Geary wanted to see some different language re special education assignment, so that SpEd families do not feel like they are in a double jeopardy situation where they have to meet two different paths (neighborhood school vs. an alternative assignment pathway), moving forward with their cohort where that pathway goes or going to the attendance area school. A

disabling condition makes it harder for students to create relationships, and parents need a choice to opt for a socio-emotional environment, start fresh, or remain with the student's cohort. Director Peters felt that the SpEd community needs the same assurances that every other family has, attending the local school wherever possible, with resource specialists for every school. Director Pinkham asked that Native American programs be listed on page 8, so that cultural needs are addressed in programs and services. Wyeth Jessee spoke about the middle school feeder patterns for elementary schools, where similar services are in that feeder pattern within the guaranteed attendance area middle school.

#5: Align the School Choice deadline for students opting into HCC or continuing in the dual language immersion pathway with the general education timelines

Ashley Davies said that HCC families will have until May 31st to determine where they want to go, aligning with the rest of the general education timelines. Director Harris said that she hoped the net effect of this will be considerably better with timely predictability. Director Burke said that backmapping and reaching out to families before open enrollment would be helpful. Director Harris asked about any other lengthy calendar dates for any other programs and whether others would face the May 31st deadline as well. Director Peters asked about the district moving the HCC date back to what date. Staff said testing is on a different timeline now and families would be notified in January so that they are prepared for open enrollment in mid-February. Director Harris asked staff to look at the Chief Sealth dual language pathway.

Discover: Advanced Learning – The thoughtexchange results: Carri Campbell reviewed how the new platform works and said this repositions the district into being a listening organization, having a community conversation to help build solutions. She noted that participants had three topics that were predominant in the conversation:

- Equal access – availability to all students
- Availability of advanced education – access to a diversity of challenging classes
- Support advanced learners – continuing to meet educational needs

Extensive conversation about the thoughtexchange date produced followed. Directors discussed several of the questions that come up in their community meetings (i.e., Lincoln being an HCC pathway school). Wyeth Jessee said the goal is to expand pathways and opportunities, making sure students can remain in a culturally welcoming atmosphere of their own schools. He talked about Rainier Beach and how the impact of moving a program into one school (Garfield) impacted Rainier Beach negatively. Director Patu noted that Rainier Beach used to be very successful and that having programs like IB with appropriate staffing needs to be supported.

Discussion about the use of the racial equity toolkit followed, with directors expressing frustration that the student assignment plan does not provide the framework for a more equitable delivery of programs and services. Director Blanford spoke about a conference in New York that demonstrated a more robust tool that people used to demonstrate the implication of the choices being made. The move back to neighborhood schools resegregated the district, and (HCC) pathways can be part of undoing that. Director Burke expressed concern that this plan might miss the opportunity to make the incremental moves toward the 2019-20 plan.

Directors felt that it would be premature to bring this item forward while there were so many unanswered questions. While expressing concern for putting new board members in the position of voting on such an important issue, they sent the student assignment plan back to the Operations Committee for their November 2nd meeting, rescheduling it to come before the

board for introduction November 15th and acting on it December 6th. They asked that the issue of wait lists, boundaries and the integration with the pathways work be updated and system-wide for the open enrollment period, creating the space to incorporate community input.

This session recessed at 7:35pm.

Executive Session

At 8:45 pm, Director Peters announced that the Board was immediately recessing the Special Board meeting into executive session to Evaluate the Performance of a Public Employee and the session was scheduled for approximately 60 minutes, with an anticipated end time of 9:45 pm.

Director Peters called the executive session to order at 8:52 pm. All Directors were present.

At 9:16 pm, the Board recessed out of the executive session and Director Peters adjourned the meeting in the auditorium.

Adjourn