

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

August 3, 2020

Call to Order

President Fralick called the Special Board Meeting of the Shoreline Board of Directors to order via Zoom at 5:35 p.m. on August 3, 2020. Rebecca Miner, Superintendent; Curtis Campbell, Public Information Officer; and Di Mikesell, Executive Assistant, attended this meeting at the Administrative Offices at the Shoreline Center.

Roll Call

Present: Heather Fralick, President; David Wilson, Vice President; Sara Betnel, Member; Meghan Jernigan, Member; and Rebeca Rivera, Member. *(Since this meeting was being conducted via Zoom, President Fralick had a visual that all board members were in attendance.)*

Action Item – Adoption of Resolution 2020-13, Approval of District Reopening Plan

*Presenters: Rebecca L. Miner, Superintendent
Marla S. Miller, Deputy Superintendent
Maria Stevens, Director of Teaching and Learning*

The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) requires that all school boards for districts in the State of Washington approve reopening plans for their districts. The plans must be approved by school boards, posted on the district websites and submitted to OSPI no later than two weeks prior to the start date of school for each district.

President Fralick announced that this meeting was a follow-up to the study session that was held on the evening of July 27, 2020 on the same topic of remote learning. In an effort to have as much planning time as possible, this meeting was being held on this date rather than waiting until August 17. It was being held in compliance with Governor Inslee's open public meeting order in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Since meetings cannot be held in person at this time, the opportunity for public written comment was provided up until 12:00 p.m. on August 3. Numerous comments were submitted and those were shared with the Board shortly after 12:00 p.m.

Based on this alternative community comment process, President Fralick moved to suspend the provision of Board Procedure 1441P allowing for community members to address the Board during this meeting.

MOTION NO. 58: President Fralick moved that the Board suspend the provision of Board Procedure 1441P allowing for community members to address the Board. The motion was seconded by Director Wilson and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Miner began with a review of the three committees that worked on the reopening plan:

- Operations – Technology, transportation, food services, health and safety (Marla Miller)
- Instruction – Student learning, equity of access, attendance and engagement (Dan Gallagher, Maria Stevens)
- Family and Community – communication, engagement, access to technology (Tanisha Brandon-Felder and Curtis Campbell)

Ms. Miner reviewed the current timeline:

June 17 – July 10 – Teams developed proposals and prepared for stakeholder input

July 13 – 22 – Stakeholder (students, staff and family) input

July 20 – Board update

July 24 – Teams finalized recommendation to Superintendent

July 31 – Superintendent finalized recommendations

August 3 – Bargaining continues; special board meeting with recommended resolution

Special Minutes – August 3, 2020

August 4 – Communication to community regarding Board decision

August 24 – Staff training begins

September 2 – School opens

Planning assumptions have included:

- There will still be active cases of COVID-19 in Shoreline at the time of school opening and throughout the 2020-2021 school year.
- There will not be a vaccine in time to impact the 2020-2021 school year.
- There may be multiple waves of virus outbreak and changing guidance from health officials.
- Schools will need to maintain operational flexibility for the 2020-2021 school year.
- We do not anticipate increased state or federal funding for schools.

Resources guiding documents have included:

- King County Health Department Guidance
- OSPI *Reopening Washington Schools 2020 District Planning Guide*
- Shoreline School District Race and Equity Decision-Making Tool
- Additional considerations

Ms. Stevens reviewed the definitions of the three instructional models:

Onsite: Students safely learn in school; safe access to in-person instruction and supports in accordance with public health requirements.

Hybrid: Students safely learn in school and away from school; student groups have access to in-person instruction and support using a rotating schedule and/or prioritization of certain grades, courses and/or programs. Onsite instruction is supplemented by remote learning in accordance with public health requirements.

Remote: Students safely learn away from school; students are engaged in learning through remote instruction with very limited exceptions for in-person supports.

As discussed at last week's study session, Ms. Miner stated that the recommendation is to open school in the remote model.

OSPI requirements for remote learning include:

- 1) Work with community partners to identify child care options for school-aged students whose families don't have the option to stay home with a child each day;
- 2) Address gaps in connectivity and technology access so each student has sufficient opportunity to continue their learning outside of the classroom;
- 3) Continue providing school meals to the students who rely on them; and
- 4) Utilize their local data to determine which of their students need additional intensive learning supports and provide those supports remotely if possible or in-person when that is the only effective delivery method.

It is anticipated that when students are able to come back to in-person learning, it will need to be a pivot to a hybrid model rather than coming back to school 100% due, in part, to the need for social distancing. We hope to pivot based on metrics from public health. The model below was the original recommendation prior to moving to the current remote model (shared at July 20 regular board meeting). Families could choose to stay with all remote. Additionally, there would be a group of students (D) that would be onsite for up to four days per week. Once the metrics for pivoting to a hybrid onsite model are met, the instructional model would be as follows:

Instructional Model – Pivot to Hybrid

| Group | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Student Group A | Onsite | Onsite | See below | Remote | Remote |
| Student Group B | Remote | Remote | | Onsite | Onsite |
| Student Group C | Remote | Remote | | Remote | Remote |
| Student Group D | Onsite | Onsite | | Onsite | Onsite |

Wednesday activities will include:

- Remote learning
- Intervention services
- Recovery services
- Staff planning
- Staff collaboration
- Staff professional learning
- Deep cleaning of buildings

Ms. Stevens reviewed some details regarding the remote model and how it differs from the spring remote model. Planning for students includes:

- Synchronous (live instruction via Zoom)
- Asynchronous (recorded or individual student work time)
- Small group synchronous (live instruction via Zoom)
- Grading and feedback (shared through Canvas at secondary level and through other means at elementary level)
- Attendance (daily/course)
- Streamlined regular communication
- Technology access for all students, including internet access
- Maintain music, PE, library services
- Continue to assess guidance for onsite instruction for some students

Planning for families includes:

- Streamlined regular communication from the school and teacher (will be using typical systems that have been used in the past)
- Family Academies (will begin right before school starts and will occur periodically over the first month of school; feedback will be collected in order to determine if families' needs are met)
- Technology access for all students, including internet access
- Meals
- Continuing regular feedback opportunities
- Maintain regular district updates

Planning for instructional staff includes:

- Developed priority standards
- Summer teacher teams developed units/lessons to align with priority standards
- Professional learning focused on: (held in August, September, October and throughout the year)
 - Effective use of LMS (Canvas, Seesaw, Google Classroom)
 - Remote and hybrid instructional strategies and tools
 - Social emotional learning strategies

Ms. Stevens shared some additional points regarding remote learning that set it apart from what occurred in the spring. Remote learning (Continuous Learning 2.0) will include:

- Standards-based instruction – moving students forward in their learning
- Regular assessments of student progress
- Meeting social emotional needs
- Basic education compliance

Ms. Miner summarized the recommendation:

- 1) Open with remote learning model
- 2) Prepare for pivot to hybrid learning model
- 3) Continuous monitoring of public health guidance

Questions from board members:

Director Jernigan announced that she had several questions (as follows):

Regarding the Family Academies, which staff members would be interacting with the families? Ms. Stevens replied that the academies are being designed by Dr. Tanisha Brandon-Felder and Curtis Campbell with a great amount of flexibility. Some trainings could be synchronous (live) and some could be asynchronous (recorded). The TOSAs could be involved, particularly the technology TOSAs; also counselors, family advocates, teacher leaders. It will be a matter of determining family needs and then matching those needs with the appropriate staff.

How does this recommendation mesh with OSPI models and is this “Shoreline thinking”? Ms. Miner responded that the initial 58-page recommendation from OSPI indicated an incredibly strong preference for on-site, in-person instruction. Since then, OSPI and Chris Reykdal have stated that we were in a very different place in June than we are today. They understand the situations in specific regions and the guidance from those health departments. The recommended model was developed here in Shoreline in compliance with the OSPI reopening guidelines.

Is the synchronous, small-group instruction for all students or just for students who are struggling with a larger group format? Ms. Stevens responded that the intention was to use this format for all students in addition to students who have intervention supports and needs.

How are we evaluating the impact of this service model on students? If we see a number of students falling behind, is there a mechanism in this model that allows the District to pause, re-evaluate, reassess, pivot? Ms. Stevens stated that there wasn’t something specific in the model but there have been discussions about creating timeframes in which feedback would be collected from students, staff and families. Engagement and participation rates can be reviewed as well as other data pieces. However, we don’t want to wait until a survey is taken. If a student is on a class list and not engaging, efforts will be made to track down the issues. The goal is to understand in order to improve practice and meet the needs of our students.

I don’t see a specific and formal evaluation tool included in the recommendation. Is that coming before the Board at a later date?

To Superintendent Miner: I don’t see a specific evaluation or formal process included with this instructional model. Is that something that will be coming before the Board or is that something the Board can request in order to ensure that we know we’re not expanding racial equity gaps in learning. Ms. Miner responded that possibly an outside contractor could be hired to assist in that process; however, depending on the length of time the District is in a remote model, there may not be sufficient assessment material available, e.g. grades, credit attainment. This wasn’t built into the

model; the intent was for a continuous loop of feedback with our families, students and staff. Director Jernigan further stated that she would want to have that included in the instructional model so that she has confidence that this model is not perpetuating and expanding racial equity gaps.

Director Rivera asked if there was an adaptive model to accommodate those students who can't participate in the synchronous model. Ms. Stevens stated that one of the things they have been considering is how to use the learning management system so that if a student misses a day, they can still connect to what happened in the prior class. Staff members are looking at what to do with students who have ongoing issues joining the synchronous learning so plans are being developed across the district to meet their needs and keep them from falling further behind. The planning and the work that the teachers have done this year has a great deal of emphasis on providing instruction in a more culturally responsive way and creating more tools and resources that broaden the perspective of the materials provided. Teachers are heavily leaning into practices and processes with a focus on students who have not traditionally been successful in school. All of the planning tools and resources start with thinking about how we can understand the learning needs of our kids from a positive perspective and not a deficit. The last thing she wants is for students to come to school and feel "crummy" because they weren't able to successfully access school last spring. We want them to know that their strengths are seen and acknowledged. Ms. Stevens told the Board that she was immensely proud of the work the teachers have done and she would be happy to share the tools they have used to create lessons in a thoughtful way for our students. There has been no sitting back since the spring; rather there has been an abundance of energy spent and thoughtful collaborative work performed with instructional coaches, equity leads and TOSAs regarding how to best meet the needs of our kids.

Director Rivera shared that one of her personal challenges in working online is the onset of fatigue. She asked if there was a plan to mitigate that for students and teachers. Ms. Stevens related how they are trying to incorporate age-appropriate and developmentally appropriate best practices into the online learning platform. For example, in traditional kindergarten classes, teachers continually transition students—maybe from a 10-minute learning exercise on the floor to a brain break session at their desks, and then on to another activity. Teachers don't want to have their students (especially the very young ones) turn off their screens and audio altogether because they might not get them back, but they do want to make sure the students get those much needed brain breaks, get water, get the wiggles out, etc. Teachers are mindful of what is developmentally appropriate for each grade level in order to keep students from disengaging. Also, how does a teacher read a student on a Friday versus on a Monday?

Director Wilson asked to revisit slide #10 of the presentation regarding the OSPI requirements for remote learning, specifically #1, which states: "Work with community partners to identify child care options for school-aged students whose families don't have the option to stay home with a child each day." Director Wilson asked the age of the children being referenced here. Ms. Miner responded that these are the OSPI requirements that came out once they realized that some districts would be going into full remote learning. We aren't mandated by this but there are certain best practices around what age children are expected to be able to stay home under the supervision of an older sibling or by themselves, etc. As a reminder, beyond the community partners Shoreline has a provision that other districts do not, which is the district-run before and after care. Those resources and the expertise of our staff could be tapped into; however, all of that is still yet to be determined in negotiations with our employee groups. We are currently in conversations with community partners but specifics around the various ways in which these partners may be able to assist are still in progress.

Director Betnel asked Ms. Miner if this meeting's vote would be authorizing the reopening of schools with the all-remote learning plan as well as authorizing the pivot to hybrid when possible. Yes it is. She also asked what the plan would be if we don't get a metric from the public health agencies. Ms. Miner responded that suggestion was very unlikely. At this point, it is far more likely that there indeed will be a metric and she believes that is in process. If there wasn't a metric, then we would have to decide through local control on parameters for reopening of school and that would need approval from the Board. Director Betnel again stated that they were being asked to vote on not only the reopening plan to all remote but also the pivot plan to hybrid without having the opportunity to ask questions about the hybrid plan. Ms. Miner stated that the hybrid plan was reviewed in detail at a meeting earlier in the summer and nothing had changed about that plan since then other than converting to all remote.

Director Betnel stated that she understood the District was still in negotiations with the unions. She asked if in approving the recommendation at this meeting, the board members should feel comfortable that the hybrid plans would be fully supported by the unions. Ms. Miller stepped in and stated that anytime the working conditions of staff are being modified, the District has the obligation and the responsibility to negotiate that with the different groups. The remote model is at the forefront of everyone's minds because of the shortness of time to make preparations before school starts but staff members are also having conversations about what the hybrid model entails. One of the key drivers of the hybrid plan revolves around the safety of students and staff. There are so many parameters around opening schools that staff have probably spent even more time, in some ways, on the hybrid model in terms of the operational issues related to bringing students on campus knowing the need to adhere to CDC and OSPI guidelines. Bargaining is underway with virtually all groups. The District would not be recommending anything with which our employee unions would not be in agreement. Ms. Miller shared that the Shoreline Education Association (SEA) had notified the District that they wanted to put the needs of students that were the furthest from educational justice at the top of the list of values that should be embedded in their thinking. This has been high on the District's list of priorities as well. Ms. Miller anticipates having most of the bargaining complete by the Board's August 17 regular meeting.

President Fralick reminded the board members that they are voting on framework and that the specific details are at the purview of the contract negotiations in addition to the leadership of our administrative team. The Board needs to stay at their governance level.

Director Betnel asked Ms. Stevens if they had considered having parent/teacher conferences conducted earlier in the school year in an effort to connect with students; also could ACES (Adverse Childhood Experiences Study) assessments be used to determine the trauma that some of our students might have experienced during this pandemic. Ms. Stevens responded that she believed everyone on both sides of bargaining as well as all in our district and in our community are interested in doing whatever it takes to support our families, and that this might mean doing things differently from how they were done in the past. Some of the training in SEL (social-emotional learning) is going to be specific around "trauma-informed" for all of our teaching staff because we believe that's a place where our students, staff and families are as a result, not only of this pandemic, but also as a result of watching the protests. We recognize that trauma-informed is going to be central as we think about supporting our students in this upcoming year. Teachers will get trained and some of those resources mentioned will be used to help staff understand the needs of our students as they enter our system. However, we don't want to singly focus on the negative and jump to a deficit model where it's all about filling the gap and not so much about recognizing strengths and maximizing them. It's a delicate balance between which assessments are used and how many.

Director Betnel asked Ms. Stevens what she wished could be done that policies and other constraints are preventing. Ms. Miner responded that she didn't feel at this time that there were any legal constraints. The State Board of Education and OSPI have done a great job in rulemaking to allow us to achieve the desired objectives during a difficult and challenging time. There are no easy answers but it doesn't need to be legislated at this point. Next year and possibly even later this year there may be additional funding constraints and at that time we will certainly look to our legislators for assistance.

Director Jernigan asked if there could be a separate process added for evaluation impact reporting to the Board at periodic intervals, which could take place throughout the delivery of the remote platform. Ms. Miner stated that as this was a special board meeting for a single agenda item, she could not add a separate action item to this meeting's agenda. A board member could either amend the motion or she could come back with a proposal for evaluation of our programming and response for the remote learning model at the August 17 regular meeting. Director Jernigan stated she would not want to see student withdrawals six weeks into the school year and not have any impact evaluation or actual data that would indicate trends in disengagement. It will be important for the Board to understand not just the delivery of remote learning but also the impacts on our students. Ms. Miner stated that we know students are withdrawing from school districts across the region. We know that independent schools are not being asked to stay closed and private schools are trying not to open in remote status in some cases. There is some speculation that districts across the region may lose up to 500 kindergartners over this next year.

Director Jernigan asked Ms. Miner if in her discussions with other superintendents in the region, are other districts including remote learning evaluations but Shoreline is not. Ms. Miner responded that she had not heard of any other district doing so. Ms. Miller added that it appeared that Director Jernigan was asking for qualitative data. On a different note, there will be quantitative data that will be reported to the Board following the fourth day of school. Enrollment and attendance numbers will be available and will be shared with the Board as is usual practice. Ms. Miner added that she would definitely encourage the Board to go with an outside entity for the proposed evaluation. Based on the tremendous amount of time that was invested by all during the recent perceptions and needs study, she didn't feel that given the complexity of what Director Jernigan was requesting, there would be the time nor the expertise necessary at the district level. Director Jernigan restated her request after saying she didn't feel it was that complex, as follows: "I want to know how we are going to know as a Board whether or not we're expanding racial inequities within our public school system. How are we going to know that? What existing mechanisms could we utilize?" Ms. Miner responded that she didn't think we have any existing mechanisms other than perception surveys that could be disaggregated by race to determine that within the period of time we may be looking at for remote learning. "We don't know how long it will last—it could be a semester, it could be a year, it could be six weeks. Would we expect to see really big progress monitoring results? Would we be able to see a statistically significant change in that short a period of time? Probably not if it was on the shorter end of time. I would not be able to say in a statistically significant way that our students of color did not achieve learning in the same manner with these two measures on this data point. The data points we are using are not that sensitive at this point."

Ms. Miller added that one thing that will be different from the spring is that we will be taking attendance on a daily basis. We will also be monitoring engagement of students. We've already had conversations about who might be involved in reaching out and engaging with families where students are not participating in the instructional model in the way they should. There should be early indicators when students are engaging. In the spring, attendance wasn't taken but it will be when school starts, which will provide more structure. There will be data available in real time.

President Fralick related what she understood Ms. Stevens to say earlier in the meeting, which was that the plan is to try to reach out and assist students before it becomes something that could be captured in a survey. If a student has missed three days of school, staff would want to contact the family to make sure there isn't something the District could do to help, e.g. maybe it's a broken hotspot that could be easily remedied. These proactive measures would assist in preventing barriers from multiplying before problems are revealed in statistical analysis. Ms. Stevens agreed and added that the District does have data on students and families who didn't fully engage last spring. "Let's not wait to see if that pattern continues; but rather, let's reach out to those students before school starts and see how they are doing and make sure they have a device as well as any other supports they might need. The goal is to be as proactive as possible." She stated that we do want to think about systems and ways to measure our effectiveness with engagement, but also in terms of students progressing towards standards and ensuring that students feel that they are seen and valued. This shows up in attendance data and whether or not they come to class but it could also show up in focus groups or surveys or some other types of mechanisms that reflect how their social-emotional needs are being met. Ms. Stevens shared that in talking with parents, some have expressed that the social-emotional needs of their children are at the center of their concerns, as much as the learning. "We are committed, like all of you, to narrowing the gap, to raising up our students from all families and communities and we need to figure out in this moment what the best tools are to help us understand how we're doing."

Ms. Miner stated that she didn't want any board members to be uncomfortable with the path we're taking. There was strong interest from families and staff in approving this recommendation, which was why this special meeting was added after talking about this the previous week during a study session (July 27). But if there is a lack of comfort, it can be tabled until August 17. However, this was not the superintendent's recommendation because she understands that families and staff are anxious to move forward. Individual board members could abstain from voting or a board member could amend the motion or recommendation. Ms. Miner also stated that the Board could take a vote at this meeting with the knowledge that she would bring forward a proposal for evaluation of effectiveness of the remote plan on August 17 (as discussed earlier in the meeting).

Director Betnel stated that Director Jernigan's question and the discussion that followed reminded her of Goal #1 that the Board identified for themselves at a workshop earlier in the summer with Mary Fertakis (WSSDA). The goal states: "Developing processes for regular and ongoing examination of measures for accountability with intentional focus on racial equity." So along those lines, the question is which processes and which measures will we have, as a board, to understand how this is going and see how it is impacting racial equity in the District.

Ms. Miner reiterated that it would not be possible to answer that question at this meeting. Again, it would be her recommendation and she believed it was also the preference of families and staff to put the issue of selecting the chosen model to rest. She said she would be happy to put together a proposal for gathering and assessing information to ensure that the District is not widening the gap and not harming those students who are furthest from educational justice, which would be presented at the next meeting on August 17. However, she felt it was in the best interest of families and staff to move forward with the recommendation so that all can continue planning and making preparations.

It was the recommendation of the Superintendent that the Board adopt Resolution 2020-13, Approval of District Reopening Plan, as presented.

MOTION NO. 59: Director Wilson moved that the Board adopt Resolution 2020-13, Approval of District Reopening Plan, as presented. The motion was seconded by Director

Special Minutes – August 3, 2020

Rivera and carried unanimously. Director Jernigan stated that she was voting in favor of this motion but with the promise that Superintendent Miner would come back with a formal evaluation plan.

Adjournment: 6:52 p.m.

Heather Fralick, School Board President

Attest: September 10, 2020

Rebecca L. Miner, Secretary to Board of Directors