

Board Special Meeting



2445 – 3rd Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134

Work Session: 24 Credits Requirement; Work Session: Budget;
Oversight Work Session: Communications
Thursday, June 08, 2016, 4:30-7:45pm
Auditorium, John Stanford Center

Minutes

Call to Order:

This meeting was called to order at 4:34pm. Directors Blanford, Burke, Geary, Harris, Patu, Peters and Pinkham were present.

Work Session: 24 Credits Requirement

Michael Tolley, Associate Superintendent of Teaching & Learning, thanked the School Board for providing the opportunity to present information on the 24 Credit Task Force Recommendations and asked Directors to provide input/suggestions on the task force recommendations. Mr. Tolley introduced Kris McBride, Academic Intervention Specialist from Garfield High School, Shauna Heath, Executive Director of Curriculum, Assessment & Instruction, Cashel Toner, Interim Executive Director of Curriculum, Assessment & Instruction/Director of Early Learning, Ruth Medsker, Principal at West Seattle High School and Dr. Concie Pedroza, Principal at Seattle World School. Dr. Julie McCleery facilitated the work of the task force and help draft the report.

Background: 24-Credit Requirement:

Mr. Tolley asked the School Board to keep in mind that the number of credits that a student is able to earn is 24 credits in 4 years, given our current schedules. With this change, eliminated the ability for students to recover credits. The waiver has been in place this school year and next school year. The 24 Credit requirement will be implemented for incoming 9th grade students for the 2017-18 school year.

Mr. Tolley noted that it is not just increasing credits; there are specific requirements for World Language (2 years of the same language). We have an expectation that all students have the opportunity to earn 2 years of the same language. Currently, the district is not able to provide this. We will need to increase staff capacity in order to provide World Language.

Shauna Heath explained that she will go over the PowerPoint and then have Q&A after. SPS requested a two-year waiver in 2014 to get more time to evaluate what needs to be done and how to implement the 24-credit requirement effectively. Students entering 9th grade in the fall of 2017 will have this requirement. The state currently has this requirement in effect. The 24 Credit Task Force is made up of teachers, parents and administrators.

Ms. Heath explained that in December they realized the need to reenergize the involvement of the task force and timelines, which includes the involvement of principals and teachers. The task force was created and the High School Steering Committee was utilized. The High School Steering Committee was the technical reviewers – looking at the implications of

changing schedules and opportunity for students.

Ms. Heath discussed the amount of community involvement, which consisted of 700 students and over 1,500 parents.

Ms. Heath spoke about the task force guiding principles. There was a belief that there was a sense of re-visioning how we conduct high school as they entered into this work.

Recommendation 1: High School & Beyond Planning:

The High School & Beyond plan has always been a requirement, but was never a best practice. We need to make it useful and help students decide what they want to do now and in the future.

Recommendation 2: Student Support & Advisory:

Recommendation A: A credit-bearing advisory should be offered at every high school. Ms. Heath explained that the task force came forward with a credit bearing process where they receive support around social/emotional, academic goal setting. Using the teachers as supports in involving the counselors as well.

Recommendation B: Reduce the counselor load to the American School Counselor Association recommendation of one counselor to 250 students. The current ratio is 1:400.

Recommendation 3: Daily Schedule:

The committee reviewed a variety of schedules. There was a consideration for just letting schools pick the best schedule for their schools. All various schedules were considered and debated. Both groups landed on the 3x5 schedule, a five-period day on a trimester schedule. There were positives and negatives about each one. The 3x5 aligned with the guiding principles and gives students the opportunity to earn 30 credits over the four years. There are two school districts that use this.

Director Harris read that Eugene Oregon, is going to back out of the 3x5. Ms. Heath noted she was not aware of this. The next phase of the process will include a discussion of this.

Recommendation 4: Extended Learning:

Ms. Heath spoke about the recommendations for extended learning. There are some structures in place that allows for this recommendation, so students can earn credits outside of the school day.

Recommendation 5: Policies:

Mr. Tolley explained there are two School Board Policies that would need to be reviewed/revised – Policies 2415, High School Graduation Requirements, and 2420, High School Grade & Credit Marking Policy. Policy 2415 includes the number of credits to graduate, the requirements for 2.0 GPA and service learning. Two World Language credits will need to be added as well as clarification on other potential pathways.

The recommendation from the task force is that we align with the state requirements. Mr. Tolley asked Directors to take a moment to review the specific requirements.

Kris McBride has participated on the steering committee in the past and is very versed in the requirements. Ms. McBride provided examples of the 4 types of student GPA's (cumulative, core GPA, district cumulative and core).

Director Blanford asked if she can share the rationale behind the four different calculations. Who is negatively impacted by the different calculations? Ms. McBride explained there are a variety of GPA averages to keep students to higher standards. She is not able to speak as to why there are two different ones – Cumulative vs. Core. The only GPA released is the one located at the bottom of the transcript. Who is impacted is the student. If a student does not meet School Board Policy, they will not graduate. It will not impact the school except for the graduation rate. Ms. McBride did not bring the data on which students are more impacted; however, all students at her school who were not graduating were African American students.

Mr. Tolley spoke about the credit waiver process, which requires students to have letters of support from school staff as well as students writing a request to take into consideration certain circumstances. Ms. McBride explained that the process is inconsistent at various high schools.

Director Harris asked staff to talk about what the numbers look like for the appeal process. Ms. McBride explained there is information in a packet of the objected appeals broken down by region. She can only speak to the numbers from Garfield High School. Approximately 10 students will not graduate based on not meeting the graduation requirements.

Director Harris asked about the weighted GPA for kids who are lucky or who have worked hard to take advanced placement and Running Start, and if we have this disaggregated data. Mr. Tolley explained there is a sense of who is participating in advanced placement, etc. and that it is factored into determining class ranking.

Director Harris is concerned that we do not have the information to see and stark contrast (Who is participating where? Who is being left behind and what is working, so we can replicate this?). Mr. Tolley explained that if the School Board wants a more detailed discussion in college coursework, we can gather that information.

Director Peters asked about Core vs. Cumulative, and what would happen if we got rid of the core and say the GPA is based on the class. Ms. McBride explained that we will still have student with a GPA of 1.9 who may not graduate even though they did not fail a course. A student can pass all classes and still not graduate.

Director Peters feels there is some unfairness and double standards. You can pass a class, but not get a diploma. We have to help students cross the threshold, so they can have a diploma. Mr. Tolley explained there is a consideration of adjusting the policy around removing the 2.0 GPA requirements, but that should be taken into consideration along with Policy 2420.

Director Burke asked if students are better served walking away from class and taking it again. Do they get better education by retaking the class or better education by empowering them to raise that? How are we getting our students through the year? Policy should stimulate that. Ms. McBride explained that it depends on the students. It comes down to the number of

seniors who are supposed to graduate. It is too late during their senior year to address the situation.

Director Burke asked if this could have been initiated earlier before it was too late. Julie McCleery explained that in the current high school schedule where high schools only offers 6 periods a day, it would not be possible for students because there is not enough hours in a day to earn additional credit. We offer advisory to every student in every school. By the time a student realizes what boat they are in, unfortunately, it is too far out.

Director Harris asked if this is a good idea now with current requirements, so we can have an earlier heads up. Mr. Tolley explained that it would be beneficial for all students at all grade levels. This is the process of choices that the School Board makes.

Director Peters asked what if we did not switch to 24 credits. Linda Sebring explained students would not count as 1.0 student FTE.

Director Peters asked if we can agree that \$5 million will not cover the cost, can we say no? We are putting our students at risk. Ms. Sebring explained that \$14 million will be lost if we do not meet the requirements.

Director Geary asked if the 3x5 schedule requires more staff/teachers. Ms. McCleery explained that we will have to put together a budget for the recommendations. The estimate on the 3x5 is \$1.8 million. We can make it so implementation takes place over time. Anything outside 6 period days will be an additional cost.

Director Peters had a resource question. In the list of all of the different states and what they require, only eight states required 24 credits. Ms. McCleery explained the document was included based on resources. The state is counting different things as credit. It was a resource used to answer some of the questions.

Director Peters asked what was the research from the Board of Education, etc. that says it is a good direction to go? Ms. McCleery explained there is some occupational educations from the State Board of Education to prepare student for career and college. Some of the resources lean toward what they were thinking in 2014-2015.

Mr. Tolley spoke about rewriting Policy 2420 and the need to allow for two credits to be waived for students with unusual circumstances. There will be a need to develop a policy to support that. This policy illustrates that we have an 11 point grading scale. It defines what a credit is.

Director Harris spoke about the comments that she has been receiving as to why we are not going to a 7 period day. Ruth Medsker explained the idea of 3x5 is to provide students with more options. It creates long blocks of time as they would in a semester. We need to think differently on how we use time. It will benefit students who struggle and it will get built into the schedules which will provide an opportunity for all students to learn by building a class and giving them a try, so they will not hurt their chances of graduating.

Director Harris asked about the cost of a 7 period day and block scheduling. Ms. Medsker explained that teachers are excited to have longer periods of students and having fewer students. The cost is that teachers will see 120 students instead of 150. Ms. McCleery explained that 3x5 is splitting the difference between the shorter period and the block periods.

Data shows that having block time was effective.

Director Harris asked if we have done a program review for IB. How many students get credit for IB test? Is this a successful model? Mr. Tolley explained that we do not have this information. There are a number of programs that need to go through a program review. We have re-staffed the Research and Evaluation Department to do the research.

Director Harris asked if we are doing a pilot program. Concie Pedroza explained that we want to align practice, have common planning time and do what is best for students in terms of extended learning. This will address the majority of the issues. Professional development is a key component to this. Teachers will need to learn how to maximize teaching time, blended learning, etc.

Mr. Tolley would like to get direction from the School Board on the two policies.

Director Patu asked Mr. Tolley about his thought process a round this. Mr. Tolley explained the 2.0 GPA is considered to be a high bar for students. The way it is calculated gives a false perception that we are creating a high bar, but not recognizing all courses students are taking and failing. Mr. Tolley is recommending removing the 2.0 GPA requirements. There is consideration on what is failing. We want to receive guidance on the policies and grade ranges.

Director Blanford asked for clarification on what is meant by guidance and noted he does not feel he is prepared to give guidance at this point. Mr. Tolley explained that it may be appropriate to have a work session to discuss this topic and have the opportunity for all Directors to have a better understanding around the decisions.

Director Patu mentioned the need to know more about the thought process around the 2.0 GPA and how we move forward. Mr. Tolley will prepare for a work session to have this conversation.

Director Burke asked what are the indicators, interventions and processes that will get kids up and above this point. What is the theory of action or evidence that will impact those students in a positive way? He would like to have a better understanding.

Director Peters mentioned that if we tell a student that was good enough to pass, how we can say it is not good enough to graduate. She would like a rationale behind the “D” grades. Mr. Tolley explained this will be part of the School Board Work Session.

Director Peters asked about the recommendation for students to take 2 credits of World Language. How can we mandate that when we do not have the teachers? How many times does it seem to default to online learning? Ms. McCleery explained that online learning is around equity. Online learning during the school day is being recommended to address concerns around equity. We need to make sure that all students have access.

Director Pinkham asked about the grade scale (the difference between a minus and plus grade). Ms. Pedroza explained it is a scale that is attached to a numeric equivalent. An “A” is different from an “A” minus.

Director Patu knows there are a lot of questions and recommends doing a work session to get

insight on what needs to be done to help the process.

Mr. Tolley spoke about the next steps – Implementation plan, feasibility study, budget analysis and prioritization and bargaining.

Director Harris asked if we have a timeline for the next steps. Mr. Tolley explained that bargaining impacts implementation of the 24 credits and additional instructional time which ties into transportation standards.

Meeting adjourned at 6:05 PM. Director Patu called for a 5-10 minutes recess

Work Session: Budget

This meeting reconvened at 6:14pm.

Director Peters noted that Deputy Superintendent Stephen Nielsen would be taking the lead on this session.

Mr. Nielsen informed the Board of changes made to the PowerPoint between posting and the session and noted staff is still working through the budget, indicating more changes were forthcoming. He further noted the one-time spend opportunities available. He asked the Board what they suggest the District do with the one time funds. He provided insight on how expenditures are not keeping up with the funding. He provided information on Kindergarten funding and cost recuperation and staffing enhancements. Mr. Nielsen noted the extra costs due to mandated compliance needs. Directors asked for clarification on what compliance means and what the funds are going toward in order to meet compliance. Mr. Nielsen discussed the costs associated with maintaining compliance with various Board Policies and legal mandates. He noted the costs associated with the community engagement portion of compliance. He further highlighted the financial obligations of programs already in existence, such as those funding athletic participation costs. Staff and Directors discussed the additional transportation cost due to the changes to Bell Times. Directors asked for information on the grant that is covering the *Play to Play* costs. Linda Sebring provided further detail and clarification on the grant used to cover the extra costs associated with student participation in athletics. Directors noted the understanding that the Bell Times change was supposed to be cost neutral. Pegi McEvoy confirmed that Principals have requested that buses be provided for athletic events which, due to the later release time, requires more busses on duty later in the afternoon.

Michael Tolley noted funding allocated to meet prevention and intervention needs as a result of truancy reduction programs. He further discussed the proactive approach of adding case managers across the District. Mr. Tolley noted the additional costs associated with translation services. Erinn Bennett noted the Board Policies on translation services and budgeting allocations to meet the needs of constituents. She further noted the Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA) policy on translation services and noted that an update is due in June. Stephen Nielsen noted the estimated costs associated with translation of documents and student services. He further noted the District would be absorbing these new costs as regulated by law and policies. Directors asked about the equity around allowing for athletic cost coverage when parents are being asked to cover school supply costs. Directors asked for further information and understanding on the policies around translation services for Board meetings. Ms. Bennett noted the Board budget allocations for translation services. Director

Harris asked for further information on the legislation on providing translation services support to families. Ms. Bennet noted the current understanding of the policies and procedures in place to meet translation requests.

Stephen Nielsen provided a breakdown of potential costs associated with the draft 2016-17 Superintendent SMART Goals. Directors and staff discussed the evaluation of the programs put in place to achieve these goals and noted the length and time commitment required in obtaining these assessments. Michael Tolley noted the resources requested by the various schools and the total estimated costs associated with these request. He further noted the budgeted amount put aside for schools that may not meet enrollment projections. He noted the challenges to mitigating the costs associated with reduction in enrollment and increased legal requirements while receiving lower state and federal funds. Mr. Tolley noted the prioritization process that occurs when trying to meet the needs of the schools' funding wish lists. Directors noted the equity concerns when funding programs and the need to be as detailed as possible when deciding which items to fund to insure an equitable divvying up of funds. Directors asked to review the prioritization list. They further addressed the perception of funding in the community and the need to abide by a thoughtful process of distribution of funds and meeting the needs of individual school requests. Directors noted they would like to know what programs are successful prior to making decisions on program funding so that these decisions can be informed. Staff noted the correlation between these requests and SMART Goals. Mr. Nielsen noted the timeline of when the final budget will be available and ready for approval. He further noted that staff is requesting guidance from the Board to address the allocation of the \$11 million in one-time funds. Directors asked about the option of not spending the money at all and saving it for potential use down the road. Mr. Nielsen provided more information around that option and provided additional options. Directors noted that they do not want to allocate funds to long term programs that cannot also be promised long term. Directors further addressed concerns about moving forward on making decisions on a Budget without knowing all the details on how the money will be spent. Directors asked for a more detailed breakdown of the budget. Directors addressed the concerns regarding the uncertain financial landscape. Mr. Nielsen noted that programs which are funded through these one-time funds will not have program funding in the following year which will be portrayed as a cut school resources. He addressed the concerns around legislative funding and levy cliffs. He provided more detail on what the levy cliff is and what pitfalls it can create. Directors noted the hesitation of saving tax payer money when the perception is that the tax payer is providing financial support for program and curriculum funding.

Directors noted they would like to look at the overall budget and would like to have a deeper understanding of where the funds are going and a better assessment of the programs that are being funded. Directors expressed concern about allocating funds without assurance of long term funding and would like to analyze what is working and what is needed. Directors noted the positive cycle of investing in schools in a way that will perpetuate future funding. They further discussed the results of removing critical elements from schools and the effect on enrollment. Directors noted the positive and negatives to program mitigation. Directors discussed the use of the equity tool in funding and noted they would like to see what fiscal promises have already been made, what high impact investments are in place and what investments can be made to increase or maintain student success. Directors requested an assessment of which investments will stimulate other investments and reduce costs in the future. They further requested more information and understanding on the evaluation of the list of wants from the schools and the potential in funding these requests. Directors noted their concerns with funding FTE's with one-time dollars and the potential long term effect of having

to terminate those positions at the end of the year. Directors and staff discussed the funding of items that would focus on attendance and enrollment. Directors discussed the need to identify urgent funding requests and those that could be put off a little longer. Mr. Nielsen noted the feedback from Dr. Nyland's participation in training and events in Washington, D.C. and noted the increased pressures to focus on funding support programs for student attendance. Mr. Nielsen noted that more detail on the budget would be provided before the regular Board meeting and that staff would be working on providing answers to questions asked at this session. Directors noted the desire to fund curriculum adoption and the hesitation to spend all the money without some guarantee of future funding. Directors also noted the need to be compliant with policies and legally set standards and the sensible funding of SMART Goals. Directors shared feedback on where they thought money would best serve the students and provide support for staff.

Oversight Work Session: Communications

This session was staffed by Chief Engagement Officer Carri Campbell, Deputy Superintendent Stephen Nielsen; Communications Specialists Tom Redman, Luke Duecy, and Casey Henry, and Web Content Editor, Pauline Amell-Nash.

Carri Campbell began the meeting by introducing herself and noted her new role as Chief Engagement Officer.

Ms. Campbell reviewed Slide 3, the functions of the Communications Department, including internal and external communications, as well as support to SPS leadership and the Board, such as talking points, media & stakeholder responses, and public engagement. She provided an example of the State of the District presentation in the fall.

Ms. Campbell reviewed Slide 4, the tools the Communications Department uses to communicate. She noted that School Messenger phone calls were used only for emergencies this year due to new federal regulations, and noted the anticipation that the newly developed opt-out system will allow the calls to be used more frequently next year as an informational tool for reaching families.

Ms. Campbell reviewed Slide 5, the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT analysis) for the Communications Department. She noted that an important strength is a strong team with deep experience in traditional communications. Directors asked what a "traditional communications" background was. Ms. Campbell asked each team member to come to the table to discuss their experience. Luke Duecy noted his 16 years of experience in print, radio and TV news, which he noted provides insight into traditional media. Pauline Amell-Nash noted her 12 years of experience in public relations and communications, including graphic design, media relations, and more. Tom Redman discussed his 34 years of experience in communications and related fields, including diverse experiences with the Sonics, Merrill Lynch, community fundraising, and more; 8 years with the District. Casey Henry noted her first 8 years of career as print journalist, primarily with the Associated Press, and 12 years of experience as a high school English, journalism and media teacher. Ms. Campbell noted the absence of Communications Specialists, Janae Frisch.

Ms. Campbell continued with a review of the department Weaknesses, emphasizing that the frequent churn of leadership and staff positions impacts the work. She noted the need to create clearer processes and protocols that have eroded in recent years, which would allow

for more strategic work. She discussed opportunities that include the Board's interests in community engagement, as well as new technological ways to distribute information. Ms. Campbell noted a primary threat is that the work is complex. Because of the small size of the team, it must make daily trade-offs, which means less opportunity to be strategic and to tell those complex stories. She noted the lack of strong branding and messaging across the District, made more challenging by leadership churn in District administration.

Ms. Campbell reviewed overall accomplishments, which she noted are significant given that the majority of the team has been with the District for two years or less. She reviewed web, social media, video and principal communications accomplishments from Slide 6.

Directors asked how the Communications team will ensure the web design is mobile-friendly. Web Content Editor, Pauline Amell-Nash, noted that the site should now be responsive, and noted the difficulty with a few older pages using tables, which have turned out to not be responsive. She noted the new breadcrumb and left-hand menus and that more work will be done when the Refresh project happens next year.

Ms. Campbell reviewed Slide 7, the team organizational chart. She noted that Communications has completed interviews for an executive administrative assistant, whose work should help release the team to focus on more strategic planning. The team is planning to meet later in June to map out a multi-year vision and strategy, at which point the team will determine how a new media relations specialist could fit into that scope.

Ms. Campbell reviewed the data contained in Slide 8, Objectives and Key Performance Indicators. She noted that not only do these KPIs support the Strategic Plan but also Superintendent SMART Goal 7.

Directors asked what the industry average for e-newsletter open rates were and if the numbers referred to school Districts, professional organizations, or both. Luke Duecy explained that this refers primarily to the private market but also school districts. He added that the model leverages the e-newsletter and social media to drive users to one centralized spot, our website. The gains are indicative of this process.

Directors asked if there was an appropriate measure for the increase in volume of social media posts year over year. Mr. Duecy explained that the team hasn't talked about the overall volume yet, but noted they could review these numbers in the future.

Directors asked if staff could define what is meant by the visitors' exit and open rates. Ms. Amell-Nash explained that in analytics, the exit rate indicates the homepage was the last thing they looked at before leaving the site and noted the Districts goal to get visitors to further engage after they get to the homepage.

Ms. Campbell pointed out that while principal satisfaction rate is high, family surveys indicate room for growth around our family outreach satisfaction rate, with those numbers trending down the last few years.

Directors asked if this may be a point to discuss at a later date, and asked if this was the highest value question to the community that the District reaches out to them and noted that some parents might not consider that focus a high priority or valuable use of time. Ms. Campbell thanked Directors for that the input.

Ms. Campbell discussed the Budget, Slide 9, briefly. She noted that setting aside staffing costs, just \$32,000 remains in the Communications budget. She stated that, as the largest District in the state, these numbers are pretty striking. She further discussed the large portion of the leftover funds for this year is within the \$10,000 for translations, which had primarily gone unused with School Messenger underutilized for automated calling under the new FCC regulations. She noted the department does not anticipate an underspending of the budget once the automated calling is back on track.

Ms. Campbell noted the Board and District's emphasized commitment to SMART Goal 7, community engagement, will require an enhanced level of funding for not only the Communications team but for other departments as well.

Ms. Campbell reviewed Slide 10, Benchmarking, and noted that in many cases, there is not a way to properly compare the results with other Districts since staffing and funding different vastly different functions. She noted that even if the comparisons accounted for these differences, District Communications is modestly staffed to meet these high needs.

Ms. Campbell reviewed the Policy slide, Slide 11. She noted that the wall calendar is low on sponsorships this year and might not break even; she noted the department is moving toward electronic distribution of flyers to streamline the process and are addressing the accessibility concerns for families without online access.

Directors asked for more information on the advertising policy and how it impacts the schools themselves and asked if it caused competition for those schools who try to sell advertisements in their own material. Stephen Nielsen noted that the policies apply to schools. Ms. Campbell offered to research the effects of these policies and stated she would provide further information in a Friday Memo.

Ms. Campbell reviewed Slide 12, Internal and External Controls and Slide 13, Major Contracts. Directors asked if the Communications team had gone through the FEMA training yet. Ms. Campbell noted the training was canceled and is going to be rescheduled.

Director Blanford left at 7:49 p.m.

Ms. Campbell covered the Information Technology, Slide 14, and reiterated that the new opt-out option will allow more families to receive automated information calls through School Messenger, and noted that next year families will be able to choose to receive text messages instead of a call.

Ms. Campbell reviewed the Looking Forward/Next Steps slide, Slide 15. She provided feedback that the department is excited about supporting community engagement projects; and noted that Ms. Amell-Nash has been actively engaging the community in the web refresh project, which is scheduled to roll out in the spring.

Directors noted that the previous Communications Chief stated the website would roll out in December 2015 and asked for clarification on the delay. Ms. Campbell noted the delay was needed to make time for survey translations to ensure the successful outreach to the Districts' marginalized communities. She further noted the delay helped ensure the new interface would not conflict with the enrollment timeline.

Ms. Campbell noted that the team would engage in strategic planning later in June to align processes, improve two-way family outreach, and more.

Directors asked for reassurance that the automated calls would resume in the fall with the opt-out forms in place. Ms. Campbell confirmed the timeline.

Directors asked for further information on the process alignment and the potential demands on staff and District resources. Ms. Campbell noted that time was still needed to determine the processes that need to be addressed.

Directors asked if the Communications department had developed a crisis and incident response quick sheets for families and staff. Ms. Campbell noted that the outgoing media relations specialist developed clear flow sheets for crisis situations that can be provided to the Board.

Directors asked for more information on the role of the department in helping the Board with our institutional memory. Ms. Campbell noted that Aaren Purcell, the Districts' Archivist, keeps historical records that can be used as a resource. She also noted that historical information would be useful when on-boarding new staff, and while that's not Communications' focus now, it could be considered in the future.

The meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m.