

## **BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

August 17, 2020

### **Call to Order**

President Heather Fralick called the Regular Board Meeting of the Shoreline Board of Directors to order via Zoom at 7:00 p.m. on August 17, 2020. Rebecca Miner, Superintendent; Curtis Campbell, Public Information Officer; and Kathie Schindler, Executive Assistant, attended this meeting from 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. *(President Fralick announced that she had visual confirmation that all board members were present.)*

### **Land Acknowledgement**

Director Jernigan stated: "I welcome the opportunity to offer our land acknowledgement this evening as we are gathered virtually on the lands of the Coast Salish people. As described in the *Since Time Immemorial* curriculum, native people, Coast Salish people have rich histories and survival stories based on thousands of years of observing and understanding the lands and of prioritizing to our children where things come from and how we are connected to this land and to this space. Our Coast Salish elders say when the tide is out, the table is set, and this lays bare that the land is what sustains us as a people. I think this is a particularly helpful lesson because it illuminates that while knowing facts is important, usable knowledge is better. I hope that this is a reflection we can meaningfully connect to the work before us this evening and in the work beyond."

### **Flag Salute**

### **Comments**

President Fralick began by stating that she wanted the record to reflect that since we are still in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, we are meeting remotely via Zoom and joined by community members either electronically or telephonically. This is in compliance with Governor Inslee's Proclamation 20-28.8 regarding public meetings, updated on July 31, to extend the order until September 1, 2020.

President Fralick noted that community members were given notice last week regarding how to join this meeting. They were also notified by email of the opportunity to join the meeting electronically or telephonically and to submit written comments using an online form until noon on August 17. Those comments were received by the Board via email earlier in the afternoon (August 17). The Board sincerely appreciates the feedback and comments and wants to thank those who took the time to submit their comments in advance of this meeting.

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. However, she stated that this suspension does not apply to the public hearing on the 2020-2021 budget portion of this meeting. Public comment would be allowed at that time.

MOTION NO. 59: 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.

### **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the June 29 Study Session and August 3 Regular (Business Only) Meeting were approved as submitted.

### **Adoption of Consent Agenda**

The following consent agenda was presented for approval:

- a. Aldercrest Campus Modernization Project, Phase 2 – Approval of Change Order #16 – Kassel and Associates, Inc.
- b. Early Learning Center – New Building and Site Work – Approval of Final Acceptance
- c. Einstein Middle School Replacement Project – Approval of Change Order #04 – Hoffman Construction, Inc.
- d. Kellogg Middle School Replacement Project – Approval of Change Order #04 – Hoffman Construction, Inc.
- e. Approval of 2020-2024 Collective Bargaining Agreement with Maintenance Employees (Seattle Building Trades Council)
- f. Approval of 2020-2023 Collective Bargaining Agreement with Shoreline Athletics and Activities Association (SAAA)
- g. Approval of Personnel
  - 1) Certificated – Recommended for Election, Leaves of Absence, Retirements/Resignation
  - 2) Certificated – Out-of-Endorsement Assignment for 2020-2021
  - 3) Classified – New Hires, Retirements/Resignations, Layoffs
  - 4) Supplemental Pay – Activity Pay for 9/1/19 – 8/12/20
- h. Approval of Vouchers
- i. Acceptance of Board Member Resignation – David Wilson

President Fralick asked if there were any agenda items the Board wanted pulled for discussion or a separate vote. There were none.

MOTION NO. 60: Director Jernigan moved that the Board adopt the consent agenda, items 5a through 5i, which is attached hereto and becomes a part hereof. The motion was seconded by Director Rivera and carried unanimously.

As of August 17, 2020, the Board, by a unanimous vote, approved for payment, those vouchers described as follows: Reconciliation of Warrants Issued between July 31 and August 7, 2020 - General Fund Warrants #86587-86679, 192001310 and 192001313-192001319, totaling \$320,308.96; Capital Projects Fund Warrants #86585-86586, 86680-86696 and 192001311 totaling \$12,032,058.60; and Student Bond Fund Warrants #86697-86778 and 192001312, totaling \$59,743.36; for a grand total of \$12,412,110.92.

### **Reports and Presentations**

#### **Summary of Remote Learning Research Options**

*Presenters:*

*Dr. Tanisha Brandon-Felder, Director of Equity and Family Engagement*

*Curtis Campbell, Public Information Officer*

*Anzara Miller, Director of Assessment and Professional Practice*

*Rebecca L. Miner, Superintendent*

*Maria Stevens, Director of Teaching and Learning (unable to attend)*

Ms. Miner began by saying that at the August 3 special board meeting, as part of the approval of the remote learning plan, the Board had requested options for studying the effectiveness of the plan. This presentation was focused on two options:

Minutes – August 17, 2020

- Professional evaluation completed by a research organization
- Data collected and reported to the Board by district staff

Whichever of the above is chosen, the study will be bounded by information we currently have in our student information system (SIS):

- Gender (self reported at time of enrollment)
- Race (self reported at time of enrollment)
- Free and reduced lunch eligibility
- Special education/504 eligibility
- English Language Learner eligibility
- Highly Capable eligibility
- Learning Assistance Program eligibility
- Home language spoken (self reported at time of enrollment)
- McKinney-Vento (homeless) status

Our SIS does not distinguish single parent/guardian households. Students may be set up with two households but there could still be two parents/guardians in each household or one parent in one and two in another, etc. We can't sort students by any mental health issue they may be experiencing, e.g. we wouldn't be able to identify how many students currently being impacted by mental health issues received failing grades as ninth graders.

If we consider whether we are widening the gap through remote learning, that is a two-points-in-time analysis and we would need outside assistance. If we want to judge the efficacy of the plan we put into place, we can do that with existing staff and resources.

Hanover Research is a nationwide company that supports 350 K-12 members nationwide by providing research and insights. It employs more than 200 full-time analysts including statisticians, survey design experts, primary research/qualitative data analysts and content experts. Hanover considers what we would be requesting a "custom research proposal". The cost would be \$45,000 and could include any of the following options:

STRATEGIC PRIORITY	KEY RESEARCH QUESTIONS	APPROACH*
Evaluating Online And Hybrid Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are stakeholders' perceptions of Fall 2020 district operations and instruction?</li> <li>• What are areas of strength in the district's execution of Fall 2020 plans? Areas of concern?</li> <li>• What should the district prioritize as it continues to navigate the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on K-12 education?</li> </ul>	2020-21 District Operations Survey
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How well is the district meeting expectations with respect to remote/hybrid learning?</li> <li>• What factors impact stakeholders' engagement in remote/hybrid learning?</li> <li>• What are the primary challenges stakeholders encounter when working/learning remotely?</li> <li>• What priorities and unmet needs exist among stakeholders that the remote/hybrid learning program should address?</li> </ul>	Online Focus Groups* or In-Depth Interviews: Remote Learning Experiences
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How have stakeholders adjusted their expectations for learning for the 2020-2021 school year?</li> <li>• How are stakeholders conceptualizing student engagement and participation given changes to learning formats?</li> <li>• What are stakeholders' goals for the school year? What are they looking to achieve?</li> </ul>	Online Focus Groups* or In-Depth Interviews: Expectations for 2020-21 School Year

STRATEGIC PRIORITY	KEY RESEARCH QUESTIONS	APPROACH
Evaluating Online and Hybrid Learning	<p><i>Specific theme, [X], to be determined based on findings from stakeholder survey:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How are stakeholders defining [X]?</li> <li>• What impact is [X] having on stakeholders?</li> <li>• How can the district address challenges posted by [X]?</li> </ul> <p><i>(Sample size would need to be at least 10 so that data doesn't become personally identifiable.)</i></p>	Qualitative Pulse Interviews
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are students participating in virtual/hybrid learning?</li> <li>• What are differences in participation by student subgroup and learning model?</li> </ul>	Analysis of Student Participation in Learning
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How are online/hybrid learners performing during the 2020-21 school year?</li> <li>• What are differences in performance by student subgroup</li> </ul>	Analysis of Student Learning Outcomes

STRATEGIC PRIORITY	KEY RESEARCH QUESTIONS	APPROACH
Evaluating Online and Hybrid Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How are online learners performing on winter and spring benchmark assessment during the 2020-21 school year?</li> <li>• How are hybrid learners performing on these assessments during the 2020-21 school year?</li> <li>• What are differences in performance by student subgroup and learning model?</li> <li>• What are differences in performance by level of participation in remote/hybrid learning?</li> </ul>	Benchmark Assessment Differential Analysis
	<p>What high-quality, free resources are available to teachers to support online learning in the following areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English Language Arts</li> <li>• Math</li> <li>• Science</li> <li>• Social Studies</li> </ul>	Curated Resources for Online Learning
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on any individual evaluation project, how can the district support ongoing conversations among school and district leaders about how to improve the online and/or hybrid learning models?</li> </ul>	Discussion Guides

Hanover has already been very generous about sharing high quality free resources available to teachers. They have made the research more transparent in the age of pandemic.

Ms. Miller (Anzara) discussed the in-district option which would include:

- Common assessments tied to pacing guides and priority standards (year-long map of school year)
- Discipline Data\* - this is new for all districts doing remote learning
- Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) process – supports for students academically, behaviorally and social-emotionally, which ties in with the PBIS (positive behavioral interventions and supports) system; data from this process helps staff determine who needs additional support beyond core instruction
- SPED disproportionality data (considered in 98 categories = 14 areas x 7 ethnic groups as determined by the state)
- Attainment of credits\* - secondary
- Collect attendance data as required by OSPI\*

## Minutes – August 17, 2020

- Universal screening: WAKids, iReady\* - both will be done remotely
- Formative assessments to help us understand more deeply where students are at with their learning
- Grades at normal grading intervals – secondary\*

Dr. Brandon-Felder reviewed the following components of the in-district option:

- Setting up of family learning academies (Amharic, English, Spanish): family feedback to understand barriers and further needs; exploring what other languages may be added as time goes on
- Affinity group focus groups for implementation of remote learning (primarily racial affinity groups); sharing of experiences; already in existence for staff but expanding to include students based on clubs at secondary level and working through activity coordinators
- Focus groups by Department of Equity for students on specifically equity-focused questions (continuation of previous work)

Mr. Campbell reviewed the final areas:

- Focus groups for families, students and staff – very similar to the town halls that were conducted on the topic of school reopening plans; could seek volunteers or develop a system to randomly invite participants from different groups
- Survey for students, staff and families about implementation\*
- Annual CEE (Center for Educational Effectiveness) Survey\* - timing of survey and questions could be adjusted

\*Can be disaggregated by all categories in SIS

Director Wilson asked if contracting with Hanover would be a one-time proposal or ongoing. Also, if district staff were used to gather the data, what would be given up in terms of time? Ms. Miner responded that Hanover was a well-regarded research company that does quality work but comes with a high price tag. She would lean towards an ongoing relationship but would also recommend at least one more year with CEE, so initially that might mean contracts with both for one year. In terms of staff time, Hanover relies on the staff of school districts to obtain and provide the data, which is not directly accessible by Hanover. Staff would still need to be setting up groups of students and working closely with them. “The time continues to be borne by our staff.”

Director Rivera asked about the timeframe for Hanover providing the district with data. For example, issues might arise this fall that need to be mitigated but what if we don’t receive information until January? Ms. Miner responded that it wouldn’t be as far off as January but it also wouldn’t be as agile as we would be; it’s feasible for staff to provide monthly reports to the Board but with Hanover, it likely wouldn’t be with that frequency, given the complexity of their work. However, they know the goal is to be responsive in order to make course corrections and support our families; it is anticipated that they would do that in a timely enough manner.

Director Rivera recognized the value of the potential individual interviews that Hanover might conduct in terms of highlighting some of the issues that people might not feel comfortable discussing in a focus group. She wondered about the amount of time involved for qualitative analysis on the part of staff. Ms. Miner agreed but in making this a priority, the time would be allocated by staff to ensure meaningful data was collected and shared in order to impact our remote learning.

Director Rivera asked for clarification regarding all the data coming from the district. Ms. Miner clarified that there would be a couple of things that would come specifically from Hanover, e.g. survey.

Director Jernigan asked if the data available from the student information system was all going to be monitored across time regardless of whether or not the district contracted with Hanover. Ms. Miner

responded yes in terms of the final slides that spoke to available data, but the work could possibly be tapered back somewhat if we were also working with Hanover and providing information to them. We wouldn't double up on tasks. The items just listed and discussed were expanded slightly as a result of questions from board members; however, most of the items had already been determined by staff as necessary to judge the efficacy of the remote learning platform, the engagement by students and how to make any needed corrections.

Director Jernigan stated her preference for the district option, particularly given the cost of an outside contractor and especially at a time when programs and resources are being cut as a result of diminishing funding. She also asked if the student information system could be used to measure student engagement for the last portion of the 2019-2020 school year. It will be to a limited extent. Engagement looked very different; daily attendance was not taken so we won't have a point-to-point comparison to last year. As had been shared with the Board in earlier correspondence, we were not collecting the level of data while in the emergency learning mode that we will be collecting this school year, e.g. daily attendance. In answer to Director Jernigan's question regarding whether or not the Board could request daily attendance across race/ethnicity data via a monthly report, Ms. Miner responded yes.

Director Jernigan asked if the form she recently completed in registering her son for kindergarten was what is used to build the student information system. "Yes, exactly," replied Ms. Miner. Director Jernigan commented that the form asks about the number of adults in the household as well as how many households are associated with the student. Ms. Miner responded that the information isn't totally clear as to whether or not the two households include one or two guardians and who or how many work full time. Beyond the cost, Director Jernigan expressed concerns about sharing data with a for-profit company (although reputable)—all the more reason for leaning towards the in-district option.

Director Betnel expressed her desire to evaluate how well we are doing but also to "enable staff to proactively, flexibly, nimbly shift when needed in response to what we're seeing and what we're hearing back, etc." A monthly dialogue with the Board would be very helpful. Ms. Miner responded that the district can provide information about month-to-month attendance and other aspects but there may not be monthly focus groups with students and the students involved in focus groups may change from time to time. She didn't intend to suggest that all of the components listed in the presentation would have updates on a monthly basis.

Regarding the formative assessments, Ms. Miller added that these assessments would be done on a daily/weekly basis by teachers with their students; they can see what's working and what isn't and make adjustments. "Teachers will be nimble with those assessments as all good instructors are. Every day they will be able to shift and modify their lessons accordingly. Teachers will be the nimble folks out there adjusting and we [district level] will be the ones collecting the data district-wide. But the shifting and the connecting that needs to happen with students—that's really going to happen with the teacher at the classroom level." Ms. Miner added that the next level would be the school. It is very likely that the principal will also spot any issues and make adjustments before it gets to a board-level report, possibly through family advocates and paraeducators contacting families. Staff could include this information when reporting to the Board—here are trends we have spotted and here's what we are already doing to remedy these issues. Next steps may include additional focus groups or connections with families.

Director Betnel inquired about how the priority standards would be clearly communicated to families. Ms. Miller responded that because those are different in elementary at every grade level and in secondary at every content area, the teachers would be communicating the priority standards. To do a family engagement district-wide, it would have to be every grade level and every core content area. Teachers are really good at saying what they need their students to learn; students should be able to answer that question as well.

Director Betnel recognized that many things are still being sorted out for the landscape of discipline but asked if when the framework was complete, she would like to see that reported to the Board. She felt there would be data points that would highlight any disproportionality issues. Ms. Miller responded that the intent was to use the same methods for data collection; however, the classroom environment was going to be very different and we don't yet know how it will look in actual reality. We will be trying to figure it all out along with all the other school districts in the state.

Director Betnel inquired about an assessment that she learned about at the WSSDA conference but didn't see on the list in this presentation—a student mental health survey that happens at the state level. Ms. Miner responded that this is the Healthy Youth Survey that is administered by the state and is only done every other year. It is administered to cohorts of students in specific grades—not to all students. The distribution and the analysis are all done by the state and it is not known yet how the next round will be administered. The data gets significantly less reliable the smaller the sample gets. This is an amazing tool for the state to look at mental health, suicide ideations, feelings of worry and anxiety, etc. but again much less reliable in the smaller numbers. Director Betnel encouraged using whatever tools are available particularly in terms of global health and current conditions nationally around racial justice. Ms. Miner stated that Healthy Youth Survey is certainly a tool that the state can use in terms of thinking about resource allocation and educational programs and assessing trends, e.g. impacts of vaping and legalization of marijuana. This isn't as agile as some of the other things mentioned earlier where the district could make plans and change course based on information obtained.

Director Betnel asked if the Transition student data could be disaggregated. Ms. Miner responded that typically, we would not be able to disaggregate by race, lunch status, etc. as this would be such a small sample that it could become personally identifiable.

Director Rivera asked if Hanover would collect personally identifiable data or would the submitted data be aggregated and not personally identifiable. Ms. Miner replied that the data would be masked; they would get individual student data but not accompanied by names.

Director Rivera expressed interest in Hanover's ability to determine the impact of COVID on learning for different groups. She asked if it would be beneficial to the district and our students, possibly next year and/or following years, to have Hanover assist us in determining whether or not we are widening the gap through remote learning. Ms. Miner responded that this is certainly interesting data but it can become so large and then become less user friendly and more challenging to answer the "so what" question in order to positively impact students.

Ms. Miner stated that it appeared to be the Board's desire to go with the in-district option. The panel of presenters will prepare a timeline and some mock-ups of what might be useful to the Board and then present to the Board.

On behalf of the Board, President Fralick thanked all the presenters for taking the time to prepare and present this information to the Board.

#### School Board Governance Roles

*Rebecca L. Miner, Superintendent, presented.*

Ms. Miner began by sharing a listing of a document provided by the Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA) outlining the various school board and superintendent roles. The roles are as follows:

<b>School Board</b>	<b>Superintendent</b>
1. Sets the vision, direction and goals of the district	1. Manages the district according to the vision, direction and goals
2. Decides “what”	2. Decides “how”
3. Requests and considers information	3. Seeks and provides information
4. Considers issues	4. Provides recommendations
5. Creates, reviews and adopts policy	5. Recommends and implements policy
6. Reviews and approves plans	6. Implements and reports on plans
7. Monitors progress	7. Reports progress
8. Contracts with personnel	8. Hires, supervises and evaluates personnel
9. Reviews and approves budget	9. Formulates and recommends budget
10. Represents public’s interests	10. Acts in public’s interest
11. Advocates on behalf of students, staff and schools	11. Serves as the liaison between the staff and the board
12. Seeks and considers community input	12. Maintains a strong team of experts on the administrative team and considers their input

A unique opportunity is coming up in that the Board will be embarking on a process for selecting a replacement board member for David Wilson. Ms. Miner announced that she thought it would be very helpful to have WSSDA provide some specific training in this area, possibly on a Saturday or in the evening with the goal of using common language and developing common understandings. It might be best to wait until then to take a deeper dive into this information around governance roles; however, in the meantime, this information could certainly be placed on the website.

In response to Director Betnel’s question about a timeline for this process, Ms. Miner stated that districts are required to seat a replacement within 90 days from the date of the vacancy, which in the case of Director Wilson, would begin on September 12, 2020. If we didn’t have a replacement within 90 days of September 12, the Puget Sound ESD would step in and select a new board member. She doesn’t anticipate any problems with meeting that deadline.

Last year with the election of three new board members, a resolution was adopted to allow newly elected members to attend the WSSDA annual conference (which includes the new member boot camp) in mid-November, which takes place after the election but prior to being sworn in. Similarly, this year the Board will be asked to adopt a resolution on behalf of the replacement board member. Candidates will be asked to hold the dates of the conference [November 18-20, 2020].

Director Betnel stated that sharing this information on the website, sooner rather than later, would be beneficial for the community, particularly in terms of clearing up any confusion some may have regarding the roles of the superintendent and school board. Ms. Miner agreed in that the language is general enough so as to be confusing for community members so providing additional insights would be helpful. For example, someone may say that the gate to the playground at the school where we take our kids to play is broken. “It sounds like a ‘what’—the gate is broken, but really it’s much more. The Board decides that we’re going to make sure that we have adequate resources and funds to maintain our facilities—the ‘how’. The ‘what’ and ‘how’ in particular can be a little bit confusing. Certainly reading this [roles listed above] leaves many questions unanswered but it’s a good starting point and it’s a good broad definition. I would certainly encourage the community to listen in as we discuss with WSSDA.”

Director Jernigan agreed and even suggested that a third column with grounded specific examples would be helpful. She also mentioned that even though she appreciates WSSDA’s role in training and preparing new board members, she was a little disappointed because they ask individuals to integrate into a system that isn’t necessarily designed for people of color. This is a critique that many have identified as

problematic with WSSDA. Director Jernigan voiced additional disappointment in the participation fees for the upcoming all-virtual annual conference as being the same as when they were in person; she asked if any rationale had been provided on that decision. Ms. Miner responded that she would follow up on that question and added that she had voiced some concerns herself regarding WSSDA blurring the lines somewhat in the weekly conference calls as to the roles of superintendents and board members. However, both agreed that the calls have been valuable in sharing information and networking.

Director Jernigan noted that in particular she felt that #11 of the roles was one that could be easily blurred: “Advocates on behalf of students, staff and schools.” She stated that could be said of most of us, administrators in the district as well as board directors. Some impactful issues have come before the Board, e.g. the recent adoption on the new framework for learning. Director Jernigan provided an example that could be used (possibly in a third column) in bringing clarification to the community--the Board doesn't decide that children will be required to participate through Zoom for four hours per day, but rather they adopt the framework for online learning and staff follows through with the implementation.

Directors Rivera and Betnel voiced their agreement with Director Jernigan regarding the addition of a third column with clarifying examples for the website, even if the document is still a work in progress.

#### First Reading: District Instructional Materials Committee (DIMC) Recommendations

*Rebecca L. Miner, Superintendent, presented. (Maria Stevens, Director of Teaching and Learning was unable to attend.)*

The materials being submitted for first reading were reviewed by the DIMC at their meeting of April 14, 2020. Given the restrictions regarding what could be included on school board agendas, this first reading was postponed from last spring until now.

These books are brought to DIMC from staff who plan to use them in their instruction. The teachers who submit the books are selecting books based on their desire to have text from and inclusive of diverse/multiple perspectives of our students. All of these books are representative of student groups in our schools and provide both a window and mirror for students so they can see themselves in the writings.

A couple of the questions asked by a board member earlier in the day related to the race and ethnicity of the authors. Ms. Miner reported that a volunteer was working on gathering biographical information about the 28 works being proposed and the “own voice” of their authors. That information will be shared with the Board when it is received and certainly in sufficient time before the recommended adoption of these materials. Ms. Miner reported that if board members had questions she couldn't answer, she would be sure to get them to Maria Stevens for a response.

The materials were as follows:

- 1) *Sewing the Rainbow, 2018, grades K-6*
- 2) *Sparkle Boy, 2017, grades K-6*
- 3) *The Boy and the Bindi, 2017, grades K-6*
- 4) *The Proudest Blue, 2019, grades K-6*
- 5) *They She He Me: Free to Be, 2017, grades K-6*
- 6) *When Aiden Became a Brother, 2019, grades K-6*
- 7) *I am Jazz, 2014, grades K-6*
- 8) *Rainbow. A First Book of Pride, 2019, grades K-6*
- 9) *A Tale of Two Daddies, 2010, grades K-6*
- 10) *And Tango Makes Three, 2005, grades K-6*
- 11) *From the Stars in the Sky to the Fish in the Sea, 2017, grades K-6*
- 12) *Jacob's New Dress, 2014, grades K-6*

- 13) *Julian is a Mermaid, 2018, grades K-6*
- 14) *One of a Kind Like Me, 2016, grades K-6*
- 15) *Pink is for Boys, 2018, grades K-6*
- 16) *Blended, 2018, grades 5-6*
- 17) *George, 2017, grades 5-6*
- 18) *Merci Suarez Changes Gears, 2018, grades 5-6*
- 19) *Hurricane Child, 2019, grades 5-6*
- 20) *Planet Earth is Blue, 2019, grades 5-6*
- 21) *Planet Middle School, 2011, grades 5-6*
- 22) *Ghost, 2019, grades 6-8*
- 23) *Ghost Boys, 2019, grades 6-8*
- 24) *A Young People's History of the U.S., 2009, grade 8*
- 25) *Orientation: The School for Gifted Potential, 2012, grade 7 HiCap English*
- 26) *Internment, 2019, grade 8*
- 27) *Phonetic Awareness, 2020, grade 1 teacher resource*
- 28) *Brainpop and Brainpop Jr (online), grades K-6*

#### **Overview of titles #1-15**

- Materials/text: Collection of books in alignment to Health and Social Studies Standards
- Intended use: supplemental to Core, small and large group, K-6
- All of these books are about experiences of young people as they navigate life. Each book provides diverse perspectives.

#### DIMC review:

- These books align with our equity goals as a district to provide text that represents our diverse community
- Many libraries in Shoreline already have these books available
- 14 titles were unanimously recommended
- One title, *I am Jazz*, passed by a vote of 8 to 2

#### **Overview of titles #16-21**

- Materials/text: Collection of books in alignment to English & Health Standards
- Intended use: supplemental to Core, small large group, 5<sup>th</sup> grade and above
- All of these books are about experiences of young people as they navigate life. Each book provides diverse perspectives. Topics include: blended families, LGBT, Black female heroine, growing up after a hurricane, special needs, foster care, life as a middle school student.

#### DIMC review:

- These books align with our equity goals as a district to provide text that represents our diverse community
- Many libraries in Shoreline already have these books available
- Unanimously recommended

#### **Overview of titles #22-23**

- Materials/text: Collection of books in alignment to English standards
- Intended use: supplemental to Core, large and small group, 6<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> graders
- Award winning books. These books are about experiences of young people as they navigate life. Each book provides diverse backgrounds and personalities; rich and complex stories about Black boys.

#### DIMC review:

- These books align with our equity goals as a district to provide text that represents our diverse community
- Many libraries in Shoreline already have these books available
- These books are wildly popular
- Unanimously recommended

**Overview of title #24, *A Young People’s History of the U.S.***

Intended use:

- Supplemental to Core
- 8<sup>th</sup> grade
- Small and large groups
- To be used in Social Studies at the middle school level

*Summary:*

A text presenting a multi-faceted perspective of the U.S. It offers the perspective of people and groups who have been under-represented and oftentimes muted.

DIMC review:

- Appropriate
- Aligned with Social Studies Standards
- Provides diverse perspectives
- Unanimously approved by DIMC

**Overview of title #25, *Orientation: The School for Gifted Potentials***

Intended use:

- Supplemental to Core
- 7<sup>th</sup> grade
- Large and small groups
- To be used in English classes with cohort of Highly Capable students

*Summary:*

It is set in the future, in a world where gifted potentials are identified and removed from their families to attend a school that will meet the needs of the gifted student. While at the school he learns about Dawbroski’s Overexcitabilities (OE) and strategies for managing them.

DIMC review:

- Appropriate
- Aligned with English Standards
- Provides diverse perspective
- Unanimously approved by DIMC

**Overview of title #26, *Internment***

*Intended use:*

- Supplemental
- 8<sup>th</sup> grade and above
- Large and small group
- To be used in English classes

*Summary:*

- Set in near-future USA. 17-year old Layla and parents are forced into an internment camp for Muslim Americans
- Touches on many issues in today’s culture, ‘us vs. them’

DIMC review

- Appropriate
- Aligned with English Standards
- Provides diverse perspective
- Unanimously approved by DIMC

**Overview of title #27, *Phonetic Awareness***

*Intended use:*

- Supplemental to Core
- Kindergarten – 2<sup>nd</sup> grade

*Summary:*

- The book focuses on eight phonetic awareness skills, along with two additional activities to develop letter and sound recognition, and language awareness
- The lessons are designed to deliver Tier 1 phonetic awareness instruction in a whole group setting and only take 10 minutes. For students in need of extra support, portions of lesson could be used in a small group.

DIMC review:

- Appropriate
- Aligned with English Standards
- Provides diverse perspective
- Unanimously approved by DIMC

**Overview of recommendation #28, *Brainpop and Brainpop Jr. (online)***

*Intended use:*

- Supplemental to Core
- Teacher resource
- Kindergarten – 6<sup>th</sup> grade

*Summary:*

Interactive educational websites designed for K-3, 4-6 grade students. Each content area has a short animated video clip, with related practice quizzes, vocabulary flash cards and graphic organizers. Request is specific to PE.

DIMC review:

- Appropriate for elementary students
- Supportive of continuous remote learning
- Unanimously approved by DIMC

Director Wilson requested a list of any titles that were rejected by DIMC; he thought this would be helpful in moving forward in the process. Ms. Miner wasn't aware of any but she would research that question and respond in a Friday Briefing.

President Fralick expressed how impressed she was with the bulk of work involved in reviewing 28 submissions. She asked Ms. Miner to convey that gratitude and appreciation to Maria Stevens and the DIMC members; their work will be incredibly beneficial for our students. The committee is moving in the direction that community and board members have requested and it is much appreciated.

Director Jernigan also expressed gratitude and in particular, for the eighth graders having the opportunity to read Howard Zinn's, *A Young People's History of the United States*. "This is a real turning point for our district that will deepen the learning experience for our students."

Director Betnel gave a shout-out to Lara Drew, Highland Terrace Principal, and her team who submitted many of these titles. This is due, in part, to the equity and diversity work they have been doing over the last few years. She mentioned that she noticed a tabled topic on the DIMC agenda around a review the DIMC form. She asked if there could be questions on the DIMC form as to whether the author was a person of color or possibly a representative of a population that might be the subject of a particular submission, e.g. LGBTQ, special needs, etc. Director Betnel also asked why the book, *Orientation*, was intended only for the Highly Capable cohort. Is it not suitable for the general education population, recognizing that we have highly capable students in all our classrooms? Ms. Miner said she would forward those questions to Maria Stevens.

These submissions were presented for first reading and then later brought forward for the Board's adoption at their regular meeting on September 21.

**Board Requested Discussion**

In regard to the evaluation of remote learning as well as the Board’s goal around identifying measures to evaluate progress for serving our students furthest from educational justice, Director Betnel asked if conversations could include how we could translate the board-requested metrics and evaluation goals into an equity framework so that an equity-impact analysis is embedded into items brought before the Board.

Secondly, Director Betnel expressed concern about the violence against one of our students over the last several weeks and the varying levels of response by the police around this activity. Conversations have been occurring around the topic of SROs (School Resource Officer) in our schools. Director Betnel acknowledged the concerted efforts, the research and conversations with students of color the past few months by Superintendent Miner. Given that the public is asking for further information on this topic, she requested a board conversation about the roles of SROs in our public schools in order to hear what services the SRO contract supports, the terms of the contract, what Superintendent Miner has learned from her conversations with students, and what the SRO’s relationship is with campus safety and student discipline. The Board would like to invite community input and be able to provide direction as we move forward.

Director Rivera requested a study session to further conversations about communication. In particular, she is interested in having community discussions (possibly two board members at a time) to share what the Board does and what’s happening in the District.

President Fralick encouraged the Board to set some priorities out of consideration for staff time and what staff members are dealing with currently in regard to reopening school. These are all in-depth requests and there are new ones brought up at each meeting, which are in addition to the multitude of ongoing tasks. She indicated she would like to see a workload balance so that staff are not overworked and are not serving Board purposes exclusively resulting in shifting time away from the primary duties of educating our students. Ms. Miner expressed appreciation for President Fralick’s comments and added that a great deal of work around the ethnic studies resolution has been undertaken—we want to make sure we are implementing this initiative effectively. Pre-COVID, there was a prioritized list of scheduled study sessions that didn’t take place due to the pandemic, e.g. race and equity presentation and a number of others that were deemed as priorities and learning elements. This summer, the Board established a couple of goals. It would be appropriate to develop a work plan in a study session in order to prioritize the work that needs to be done so that the time together is spent respectfully and productively.

Director Rivera responded that she felt all three of the requests this evening fell within the Board’s two designated goals but appreciated that only so much could be done in a certain amount of time. Ms. Miner responded that an additional priority would involve appointment of a replacement board director, which will take a fair amount of time. She anticipates an upcoming study session to prepare for that work and then there will be interviews that will likely involve multiple evenings.

Director Betnel echoed what Director Rivera said above in that two of the three requests this evening were directly tied to the goal related to evaluating and measuring processes in order to determine impacts on our students. The other goal related to communication.

President Fralick stated it was important to recognize the pacing of being able to address the goals; meetings aren’t going to happen instantly and there are many demands on everyone’s time. While there may be priorities, the Board’s goals are yearlong endeavors which require pacing. This is all in addition to the other work that has to be done, e.g. adoption of a budget.

Director Betnel stated they weren't asking for instant responses on these requests but she agreed that it might be helpful, due to the impacts of the pandemic, to reprioritize, particularly given the three imminent large projects—adopting a budget, reopening school and finding a replacement for Director Wilson.

### **Action Items**

Public Hearing and Adoption of Resolution 2020-14, Adoption of 2020-2021 Budget – Fixing and Determining Fund Appropriations; Adopting the 2020-2021 Budget, the Four-Year Budget Plan Summary, the Four-Year Enrollment Projection, and Establishing Fees; and Providing for Related Matters

*Presenters:*

*Marla S. Miller, Deputy Superintendent*

*Mark Spangenberg, Director of Finance and Business Services*

On July 20, 2020, the Board reviewed preliminary draft budgets for all funds. The proposed final Debt Service Fund, ASB and Transportation Vehicle Fund budgets are unchanged since the prior presentation. The General Fund and Capital Projects Fund budgets have been revised to reflect additional analysis which was highlighted in the presentation.

Mr. Spangenberg reported that Puget Sound ESD had reviewed the District's budget the previous Friday and had no questions or concerns. This part of the budget process has been passed.

Expenditure Appropriations (no change from preliminary budget unless noted):

- General Fund: \$160,411,940 (-\$6,060,569 from July 20)
- Capital Projects Fund: \$46,561,710 (-\$2,745,000 from July 20)
- Debt Service Fund: \$33,718,000
- Associated Student Body Fund: \$2,878,000
- Transportation Vehicle Fund: \$1,157,000

Levy collections for calendar year 2021 remain the same as presented on July 20:

- General Fund/M & O Levy: \$25,032,669
- Capital Projects/Tech Levy: \$3,250,000
- Debt Service Fund: \$35,200,000

Operating transfers include Capital Projects (Tech Levy) to General Fund: \$1,537,926 (up \$50,000 from July 20.)

### **General Fund Recommended Budget**

- Beginning Fund Balance      **\$11,275,227**
- Plus Revenues                      **\$154,952,663** (-\$3,312,160 from July 20)  
*Reduced: Children's Center, Food Service, State Transportation, Federal Spec Ed*  
*Increased: Safety Net, CARES, Tech Levy Transfer*
- Minus Expenditures              **\$160,411,940** (-\$6,060,569 from July 20)  
*Reductions related to remote learning*  
*Increased Software Licenses (Tech Levy)*  
*Additional Budget Cleanup*
- Ending Fund Balance              **\$5,815,950** (+2,748,409 from July 20)  
--Board Minimum Fund Balance at 3.2% of Adjusted Expenditures  
    Board Resolution 2020-14 authorizes temporary suspension of Policy 7130, Fund Balance  
--2020-2021 Curriculum being received prior to September 1 = \$500,000

A four-year projection (including enrollment) was presented to the Board by Mr. Spangenberg. The enrollment in the budget has been decreased by 3% from original projections for 2020-2021. For the

remaining years, Mr. Spangenberg used the demographer's (Les Kendrick) number for kindergarten and then used the normal cohort factoring for rolling up the other grades moving forward. Assumptions include: Running Start would be the same percentage of 12<sup>th</sup> graders across the board and Home Education Exchange would remain flat across the four-year period. Staffing assumptions per student remain the same as what was used for the 2020-2021 budget. It is a statistically based roll-up for the coming four years. Ms. Miller stated that that four-year projection was added as a requirement for school districts after the last recession so there would be something on paper that provided a forward look. However, there is no audit standard that states the projection needs to have a particular relevancy or statistical bearing on what we actually see. Past experience indicates that the best-laid plans can be completely modified by legislative action, unexpected occurrences in the health system, etc. There is no external measurement that the District or the Board needs to meet in terms of how realistic the projection is. It is more of a tool for identifying and raising issues for awareness.

Mr. Spangenberg noted that the plan is to return to a 4% ending fund balance by August of 2022 (by cutting down expenditures significantly); however, that will be the Board's decision.

Capital Projects Fund Recommended Budget

- Beginning Fund Balance     **\$19,685,519** (no change from July 20)
- Plus Revenues                 **\$57,984,800** (+\$18,000 from July 20)  
    --*Investment earnings*
- Minus Expenditures         **\$46,561,710** (-\$2,745,000 from July 20)  
    --*Pool, other project updates*
- Transfers Out:                **\$1,537,926** (+50,000 from July 20)  
    --*Software licenses (remote learning)*
- Ending Fund Balance         **\$29,570,683** (+\$2,713,000 from July 20)

The four-year projection for the CP Fund reflects completion of the major construction projects during 2020-2021. It also projects a continuation of spending 2006 bonds, which represents the last of our voter-approved bond projects.

Debt Service Fund Recommended Budget (no change from preliminary budget)

- Beginning Fund Balance     **\$11,468,000**
- Plus Revenues                **\$34,582,000**
- Minus Expenditures         **\$33,718,000**
- Ending Fund Balance         **\$12,332,000**  
    --*As required by accounting rules, includes only existing bonds*  
    --*Budget extension will be required if we sell bonds this year*

Ms. Miller made reference to a question from a board member earlier in the day regarding refinancing school bonds to a lower interest rate in order to save money for taxpayers. She has been in conversations with the financial adviser over the last couple of months on this topic. He has been watching the market on our behalf and at this point there is potential for refinancing bonds and saving interest. Staff will be delving into that further after the beginning of the new fiscal year. As noted in the presentation under the Debt Service Fund, the budget must be built for currently outstanding bonds only so we will need to ask the Board for a budget extension in the event we do refinance our bonds during the 2020-2021 school year.

ASB Fund Recommended Budget

There were no changes from what was presented on July 20.

• Beginning Fund Balance	<b>\$1,214,000</b>
• Revenues	<b>\$2,891,000</b>
• Expenditures	<b>\$2,878,000</b>
• Ending Fund Balance	<b>\$1,227,000</b>

The fund balance increased a bit due to a lack of opportunity to spend funds this past spring. The four-year projection is really a roll-up on a per student basis for the revenues and expenditures as we haven't yet asked the ASBs to project out for three additional years. ASB always has to balance and frequently they balance at the school level and in each particular activity.

Transportation Vehicle Fund Budget

There were no changes from what was presented on July 20.

• Beginning Fund Balance	<b>\$563,000</b>
• Revenues	<b>\$600,000</b>
• Expenditures	<b>\$1,157,800</b>
	<i>--Final year of two-year grant to replace 4 older diesel buses with 4 newer diesel buses</i>
	<i>--First year of a two-year grant to replace 2 diesel buses with 2 electric buses</i>
	<i>--Provides as much flexibility as possible to manage when the buses are received</i>
• Ending Fund Balance	<b>\$5,200</b>

Ms. Miller stated that at times, the state delays payments on the depreciation schedule. It is not known at this time if that will occur, but it is a possibility.

Ms. Miller also noted that the presentation of this budget tonight is due to the dedication of a large group of employees who want to ensure that people are safe, that students get the support they need, but who also recognize that this is a very different time. The reductions that are incorporated into this budget are not yet complete. What is known now but wasn't known a few months ago during the certificated RIF process, is that there will be a need for a quick transition from a remote learning model to a hybrid model. Instead of doing the reduction in force (RIF) with the classified staff, furloughs, for the most part, are being implemented. A furloughed employee is still employed by the District; they are temporarily not working their regular assignment and not being paid for their regular assignment, but they still are eligible to receive insurance benefits paid for by the District. Additionally, staff members are eligible for unemployment benefits. The furlough can be part-time or a full furlough compared to what they were doing last year. It was felt that keeping a relationship with staff and continuing insurance benefits was the right thing to do. The budget is not where we would want it to be financially and we wish we had a more robust reserve but that is simply just not the case. The efforts of so many caring staff members collaborating through this process are much appreciated.

Ms. Miller reviewed the General Fund notes, which included:

- Adjustments Due to Impacts of COVID-19 Pandemic
  - Anticipated reduction in enrollment
  - Anticipated reduction in state and federal funding
  - Remote learning model for opening of school year

- Staffing
  - Reductions in certificated, administrative and classified staffing
  - Continuation of support for equity and family engagement
- Compensation
  - Implementation of negotiated compensation (COLA, midpoint)
- Health Insurance
  - Significant increases in unfunded costs for health insurance coverage with required move to the State’s School Employees Benefits Board (SEBB)
- Supplies and Materials
  - Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)
  - Math curriculum and middle school instructional materials for 2020-2021 received prior to start of fiscal year so the costs shifted to the 2019-2020 fiscal year

The budget is a plan and it is expected that there will be changes over the next year. The plan establishes the upper level of expenditures; however, it is likely that the plan will need to be revisited and may result in a budget revision as the revenues may come in lower than expected. As a plan, the budget doesn’t compel us to do anything that is in the plan. What does compel us is the legal/contractual obligations—audit or mandatory costs, insurance, etc. In response to questions that came in earlier in the day from a board member, there is still flexibility to move funds from one line item to another. [Shoreline Board Policy 7141, Transfers Between Budget Classifications was shared as part of the earlier response.] The budget adopts the total budgeted expenditures in each fund, and the District administration has the flexibility to move funds from one area to another as needed as long as the total expenditure for the fund, e.g. General Fund is not exceeded.

Once the budget is adopted, staff spends a significant amount of time monitoring that budget. Ms. Miller and Mr. Spangenberg monitor enrollment every week until they shift to monthly monitoring around mid-October. Additionally, the Position Control team meets weekly to review and monitor hiring and staffing allocations that have been given out to schools and departments. Ms. Miller and Mr. Spangenberg meet monthly with the directors from the various departments in order to monitor their individual budgets and ensure they are staying within their allocations. On a regular basis, state and federal funding are monitored and reconciled. The adoption of the budget isn’t the end of the process—it’s the beginning.

Normally when a budget is built, it is expected there will be the same educational plan for the entire year. However, the fact that the District is planning on pivoting from a remote learning model to a hybrid model at some point greatly influenced the budget development process.

Ms. Miller reported that she had met with Children’s Center representatives the previous week. All agreed that staff members are interested, willing and able to work. If possible, the District wants to offer a robust child care model in the community, both at the preschool level and at the elementary level. As a result of that meeting, Hillery Clark and the Children’s Center staff will be reaching out to parents and asking them for a firm sense of whether or not they want to participate in the program. For the first time in quite some time, the Children’s Center was on track in 2019-2020 to have a robust program (not moving mid-year into a new facility) and then the coronavirus hit. The goal is to build that program back up but there are factors in play, e.g. public health guidelines that require half the number of students with the same number of staff that will make it challenging. A recommendation for a fee schedule will be brought back at a future board meeting.

- Levy
  - The 2020-2021 budget year reflects the full impact of the State’s limitation on General Fund Levy collections to \$2.50 per \$1,000 of assessed value or \$2,604 per student, whichever is less.

## Minutes – August 17, 2020

- Results in a likely roll-back of \$569,331 to \$25,032,669 from the voter-approved levy of \$25,602,000. The final levy limit will be recalculated by OSPI and published at the end of September 2020.
- The recommended 2020-2021 budget maintains the allocation of \$500,000 levy funds for curriculum adoption, however the materials will likely arrive before September 1<sup>st</sup> and therefore will be expensed in the 2019-2020 fiscal year.
- Operating Transfers
  - \$1,537,926 from the Capital Projects Fund (Tech Levy) to reimburse the General Fund for tech support staff and software license fees. This was increased by \$50,000 since July 20 to cover additional software licenses that may be needed due to remote learning.
- Schedule of Fees
  - Consistent with 2019-2020 fees, with the exception of:
    - Children’s Center: increases due to smaller class sizes required by public health guidelines
    - Food Service: reflects the price changes approved by the Board in June
    - Other fee changes are noted on the fee schedule
    - Field trips (based on preliminary calculations): increase in labor cost
      - 2020-2021: \$2.14 per mile + \$41.44/\$49.60 per hour (with and without additional health insurance, respectively)
      - We update the cost per mile after year-end close based on OSPI requirements
      - 2019-2020: \$2.14 per mile + \$38.57/\$47.35 per hour

### Public Hearing:

**President Fralick then stated:** “RCW 28A.505.060 specifies that the school district board of directors shall first hold a public hearing prior to the adoption of the budget for the ensuing school year. The Governor’s proclamation regarding public meetings does not remove the opportunity to speak at a public hearing specifically for the adoption of the budget. On Friday, the community was given instructions on how to be heard for or against the recommended 2020-2021 F-195 Proposed Budgets including the General Fund, Capital Projects Fund, Debt Service Fund, Associated Student Body Fund and Transportation Vehicle Fund. The options provided to the community include being called by district staff, or writing in to have their comments be read aloud, or receiving alternative instructions based on individual circumstances. All comments will be limited to two minutes each, and must relate to the budget. I will now open the public hearing. At this time are there any written comments that you need to read aloud Superintendent Miner? Superintendent Miner read the following comments that were submitted online on the District’s website:

- 1) Alicia Arnold, Staff Member and Parent – Please read into the official record. I am concerned that teachers will not have adequate support at the high school without an instructional coach this year. This will be an especially difficult year for teachers in balancing supporting student work and mental health while delivering content in a new online format. Our instructional coach was instrumental last year in helping teachers develop consistent lessons so that students received engaging and thoughtful lessons. Rethinking the way we grade and assess students will be paramount this coming year to ensure that we are equitably serving students. However, the time and energy it will take to research and develop these new practices will be extremely difficult without an instructional coach to help implement this in a consistent manner across multiple content areas.
- 2) Alexis Nast, Community Member – We should cut Police Department SRO funding from the schools as this makes learning environments unsafe for BIPOC students (and teachers). This money should be reallocated to support BIPOC students, particularly those who may need additional resources during covid such as technology support at home, free and reduced lunch access, and other support.

Mr. Campbell stated there were two individuals who wanted to submit their comments via telephone. He agreed to monitor the time of the comments.

- 1) Cathy Kennedy – Both my kids graduated from Shorecrest and I'm just speaking to the urgency of eliminating the funding in the budget for SROs as soon as possible. Ideally, it's late and I know that might not be possible. If you can't do it now, just to work towards that goal with all urgency. I'm sure some of you have seen some of the studies that have not found a direct link between the presence of SROs and school safety. On the other hand, the presence of SROs in schools has been shown to be highly problematic for our BIPOC students. Research indicates that referrals to SROs disproportionately affect BIPOC students who are found to be more than twice as likely than their White counterparts to receive discipline through law enforcement. The discipline has been found to contribute to the school to prison pipeline. So I would propose that any funding for SROs be discontinued and diverted to, for example, hiring BIPOC counselors who are familiar with the needs of the students and support them in their journey to adulthood. Thanks for hearing my comments.
- 2) Linnea Woldron – My comment is about the Home Education Exchange program and I'm wondering if there is a way to expand that program for this year to try to retain any students who might be un-enrolling because they don't yet know how remote learning will go for their young children especially. I know in some other districts, there are families who are working in contact with teachers without necessarily having the remote portion of learning.

President Fralick stated: "Mr. Campbell, are there any persons on the phone who would like to be heard? Mr. Campbell replied: No there were not. And are there any other persons to be heard using alternative means? Mr. Campbell replied: No there were not. Thank you for your comments. The public hearing is now closed."

**Superintendent Miner stated:** "The Superintendent recommends Board adoption of Resolution 2020-14, Adoption of 2020-2021 Budget – Fixing and Determining Fund Appropriations; Adopting the 2020-2021 Budget, the Four-Year Budget Plan Summary, the Four-Year Enrollment Projection, and Establishing Fees; and Providing for Related Matters, which authorizes the Secretary of the Board of Directors to certify the appropriated expenditure amounts, authorize interfund transfers, certify the collection of excess levies for the 2021 tax year and authorize the 2020-2021 fee schedule as presented. A draft of the resolution was provided in the board packets and previously made available to the public on the District's website. Do any members of the Board have any questions or comments?"

Director Jernigan asked for clarification about the timeline for a budget extension. Is this quarterly or just as needed? Ms. Miller responded that budget extensions take place as needed. It's not typical so there isn't a pattern but the process requires a conversation with and input from the Board. The process is not nearly as exhaustive as the process for adopting the budget but the details are outlined and shared in the regular board meeting process along with a public hearing. Once adopted, it goes to the state and becomes the new revised budget for the school district. It is technically needed if it appears that we will spend more than what's approved in this budget; it's not needed if we are going to receive less or spend less. However, as mentioned earlier, monies can be moved around administratively and cautiously without a budget extension, which is a normal part of the process.

Director Jernigan stated that Director Betnel had recently requested a study session on the topic of school resource officers (SROs) that had not yet occurred. It was Director Jernigan's understanding that the costs for the one non-full time SRO position were split between the District and the City of Shoreline. Ms. Miller responded that the current budget is approximately \$49,000 for our share of the cost of that position, which is employed through the City of Shoreline but contracted through King County. Director Jernigan asked if upon revisiting the funding of an SRO position, which has already been approved and adopted through this budget, it would be cause for a budget revision if the Board decides this isn't something they want to

support. No it would not. Ms. Miner reminded the Board that she had already facilitated one session with students and members of the City of Shoreline to specifically hear student thoughts as she is most interested in elevating student voices around this topic and getting the opinions of our students who are actually in our high schools every day (in a normal year). In the meeting, students asked thoughtful questions and asked for data. She is meeting again with this group on Thursday, August 20. Funding for the SRO position is in the budget but it is not unusual for things to change during the course of a budget year in such a way that funds are not used in their entirety for a specific purpose or they are redirected to something else. With the SRO question, it can be reconsidered by the Board without having to make any budget revisions/extensions.

Director Jernigan asked what the Board's role was in understanding trends that may occur during the school year, specifically when it comes to something like retaining a high school instructional coach in place of a TOSA (teacher on special assignment) for the Highly Capable program, when potentially it is demonstrated that one group of students is struggling and one group of students is performing well within the online model. Ms. Miller responded that the commitment to certificated staff occurred back on May 15 (board action on May 4). Having people in positions under contract, the decision to reduce those contracts in part or in full had to occur by May 15 by resolution as required by state law. This doesn't mean that if there was a vacancy, it couldn't be filled. Various options could be considered in addressing an issue. The budget creates the capacity but it's the contract that sets the legal obligation to carry it out. With those certificated positions, the contracts were established in May. In terms of the SRO, we have not yet signed a contract for the coming year so there is still time to gather information and make a decision on the contract. It's the difference between a plan (the budget) and the execution of the plan, which still has additional steps involved.

Director Jernigan asked if suspending the board policy of maintaining the 4-5% reserve had occurred before in Shoreline, and in terms of building it back up, could it also be suspended next year if necessary. Ms. Miller responded that when you're in the middle of a crisis (this pandemic) and have the impacts on the budget that weren't anticipated, it's difficult to take that time to rebuild. The Board could say they just want to monitor and see where we are next spring and review what the budget requirements appear to be for the coming year and decide on a target. She expressed that she and Mr. Spangenberg would both agree that being below 4% is a concern. She thought the last time this occurred was when the school district was in very dire straits financially. The Board at that time and the administration made difficult decisions in order to build the reserve back up. These are highly unusual times. It would be a difficult process, but it should be a deliberate process to decide what it would take in order to rebuild. Additionally, if we go out to the bond market in the near future, our fund balance will be scrutinized very carefully.

In regard to the four-year projections for the General Fund on page 5 of the presentation, Director Rivera asked why the amount for "regular expenditures" goes down from 2020-2021 to 2021-2022 while everything else goes up. Ms. Miller responded that as Mr. Spangenberg explained earlier when discussing the four-year projections, this was a forced entry in order to build the fund balance back to 4%. If this four-year plan was executed, with assumptions, it would take reducing expenditures even further in order to restore fund balance. Mr. Spangenberg added that the current budget assumes expenditures are ahead of revenues by \$5.5 million, which can only occur for so long before you get to zero. Ms. Miller added that we are there; we couldn't do it another year or we would be at zero. If the enrollment assumptions hold true and the revenue assumptions hold true, more cuts would be needed next year.

Director Jernigan asked if it was correct that this particular budget assumes that students would come back to in-person learning within this school year. Ms. Miller stated that was correct but that it is one thing to build a budget but it is something different to announce to the community when we think we're going back to a hybrid model. So we have built into the budget some assumptions about building capacity for that pivot based on projecting what the expenditures and revenues would look like. If we pivot to hybrid, we will

be able to restore many of the positions that we are currently looking at furloughing but we will also begin generating revenue to support those positions.

In regard to a public comment made earlier, Director Betnel asked if there was any opportunity during these highly unusual circumstances to scale key operations for the Home Education Exchange (HEE) program and what impact would that have on our enrollment should families choose either full-time or part-time enrollment in HEE. Ms. Miller responded that for students enrolled in the district, their basic education funding is essentially the same. But if they are enrolled in the alternative learning experience (ALE) program (HEE), we are obligated to make sure that program gets the majority portion of the revenue that gets generated by that student. It gets pulled out of the pool that funds everything and goes to fund the ALE. There are requirements from the state regarding how to support alternative learning programs. So there's a consequence, but financially it might mean that we have students attending HEE that might not be attending school in the district otherwise. Perhaps those students wouldn't stay in the district if they didn't have that choice. In response to the question about whether the program could grow, it could if we have space and staff, but does it help the district financially—not necessarily unless the students were to disenroll rather than go to HEE. There's a difference between homeschooling and HEE (alternative learning program). The district cannot count homeschoolers unless they are enrolled for part of their education somewhere in the district. An alternative learning program requires a fixed number of hours per week of certificated direction for students who are enrolled in HEE. They also need an individual learning plan for each student. Provided they meet those requirements, the district can count the enrollment.

Director Betnel reminded her fellow board members that the 2021-2022 fiscal year would be the first year of the new biennium state budget. So this coming January will be a budget year and we can expect a very active legislative session. It also means that Mr. Spangenberg and Ms. Miller will be in a position of waiting until the end of the session before fully knowing the impacts.

Regarding rebuilding the reserves, Director Betnel asked about what the impact might be of spreading those spending cuts out over two years versus one year—“it looks like a much harder year in a year where it feels like we are going to be rebounding from an already hard year.” Ms. Miller responded that spreading over two years would obviously be a more gradual process; however, she feels that this is something the Board will want to review next spring when more information from the legislature as well as district enrollment information will be available to assist in making those decisions. If enrollment holds steady and doesn't decline too much over the year, the Board will be in a stronger position for projecting what 2021-2022 will require. The Board can decide if they are comfortable with a slower rebuild of the reserve or if they would rather get it done through a quicker route. Ms. Miller reported that staff is not comfortable with the lower reserve. Both she and Mr. Spangenberg were in their positions in the past when the state and federal government literally reduced funding mid-year. In these uncertain times, having a lower reserve is not a good place to be. But at this point, we don't know all the variables to determine which makes more sense as to the rate of rebuilding the reserve.

**President Fralick stated:** “In accordance with the statutes of the State of Washington, it is recommended that the Board adopt the 2020-2021 proposed budgets as outlined in Resolution 2020-14 for the period of September 1, 2020 through August 31, 2021. Is there a motion?”

**MOTION NO. 61:** Director Wilson moved that the Board adopt Resolution 2020-14, Adoption of 2020-2021 Budget – Fixing and Determining Fund Appropriations; Adopting the 2020-2021 Budget, the Four-Year Budget Plan Summary, the Four-Year Enrollment Projection, and Establishing Fees; and Providing for Related Matters, as presented. The motion was seconded by Director Rivera and carried unanimously.

### **School Board Reports and Communications**

Director Rivera thanked Director Wilson for his service on this board. She appreciates the opportunity to work with him, his comments, his insight and goodwill. She wished him all the best.

President Fralick announced that after much thought and consideration, she had made the decision to resign her position as president of the Board and director of District #2, effective September 12, 2020. This time period will allow for an orderly transition. The text of her statement can be found below.

*I ran for office to make sure that the Shoreline School District remained one of the best districts in Washington State. We have an incredible and energetic Superintendent, a dedicated administrative team, and some of the best teachers and classified staff in the area. We also are very lucky to have a community that cares deeply about public education and tax ourselves to fund our schools.*

*It is an honor to serve our community as your Director and I appreciate the confidence my colleagues on the Board placed in me when they selected me as President.*

*Because of unanticipated circumstances, I must focus on taking care of my family. No one can take my place in my family, but there are many community members who are committed to public education and the best outcomes for our kids. After a lot of thought and consideration, I am resigning my position as President of the Board and Director Position 2, effective on September 12, 2020.*

*We have an amazing group of employees working in our district in a number of visible and unseen positions. Our certificated staff and teachers, our incredible administrators, our classified staff, including para-educators and office staff, maintenance and custodial staff, kitchen workers, bus drivers, and before- and after- care providers all contribute to the continued success of our district.*

*I do want to especially thank the two individuals with whom I have worked most closely with as a board member - Kathie Schindler for her incredibly instrumental work supporting the Board. I also have deep respect for the unwavering leadership, dedication, and experience of our Superintendent. I know that Dr. Miner has had many sleepless nights to make sure that our children are safe and receive the best education possible. She, along with her administrative team, have bent over backwards to help me and the Board understand how the district works and are spending long hours responding to the challenges of providing education in the middle of a pandemic.*

*I am reminded, time and again, how important it is to believe the best in people and that our district is continually working to create better learning opportunities for each student. It is a reality that public education in our State, and our country, remains underfunded. I will continue to advocate for the full funding of public education, especially funding for special education.*

*I know our district has made progress over the past few years. We've made equity a goal and there is ongoing work to create an ethnic studies curriculum. One of my proudest moments was voting to name the Early Learning Center after Shoreline resident and Seattle NAACP President Edwin Pratt. We've also seen the emergence of some tremendous student leaders who are challenging our community to address the concerns of Shoreline youth.*

*Our Board and our district succeeds with the support and input of the community. I benefitted from the comments from the community, and I am confident that our community will continue to participate and engage with the Board.*

*Thank you to my colleagues on the Board for their time, patience, guidance and collegiality: Mike Jacobs, Dick Nicholson, Dick Potter, Sara Betnel, Meghan Jernigan, Rebeca Rivera, and David Wilson.*

Adjournment: 10:01 p.m.

Minutes – August 17, 2020

---

Meghan Jernigan, Board President

Attest: October 19, 2020

---

Rebecca L. Miner, Secretary  
Shoreline Board of Directors

**All documents referenced in the minutes may be viewed in the Superintendent's Office during normal business hours.**