Regular (Business Only) Meeting

AGENDA

August 3, 2020
5:30 p.m.

Due to Governor Inslee’s proclamation, there will not be a site for the public to attend this meeting other than electronically

Special Board Meeting – 5:40-6:45 p.m. Adoption of Resolution 2020-13: Approval of Reopening Plan
Study Session – 6:45-7:45 p.m. 2020-2021 Budget Review

Login:
https://zoom.us/j/93887732592?pwd=b3VvRVJmaFlF6TkdDN1IKQTBBYlhTQT09
Password (required): 504586
Call-in numbers: 253-215-8782 or 669-900-6833
Meeting ID: 938 8773 2592

See August 3 Special Board Meeting for Public Comments
Submitted Online

1. Call to Order - 5:30 p.m.
2. Land Acknowledgement
3. Flag Salute
4. Approval of Minutes of the June 15, June 23 and June 30 Study Sessions and June 15 Regular Board Meeting

   4-June 15, 2020 Study Session Minutes-REV.pdf (p. 3)
   4-June 23, 2020 St Sess minutes.pdf (p. 8)
   4-June 30, 2020 St Sess minutes.pdf (p. 10)
   4-June 15, 2020 regular minutes.pdf (p. 12)
5. Adoption of Consent Agenda
   
a. Approval of 2020-2021 Application for the State Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program (TBIP)
      
      5a-Bkgrd-TBIP 20-21.pdf (p. 25)
      5a-TBIP iGrant 2020_21.pdf (p. 26)
   
b. Approval of Payroll and Vouchers
      
      5b-Payroll and Vouchers.pdf (p. 60)

6. Executive Session (if needed)

7. Adjournment: 5:40 p.m.

PENDING
Study Session Schedule is subject to amendment

Special Education Visioning Statement
Legislative Session Wrap-up and Impacts to Shoreline
Dual Language and Moving Up of Students
Counseling Recommendations
Graduation Requirements Update

August 17 Regular Meeting, 7:00 p.m.

Adoption of 2020-2021 Budget
Call to Order

President Fralick called the Study Session of the Shoreline Board of Directors to order via Zoom at 5:00 p.m. on June 15, 2020. Rebecca Miner, Superintendent; Curtis Campbell, Public Information Officer; and Kathie Schindler, Executive Assistant, attended this meeting at the Administrative Offices at the Shoreline Center. President Fralick announced that the meeting was being recorded and also asked for consensus that this meeting would conclude at 6:30 p.m. in order to provide a break between meetings.

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.)

Facilitator: Mary Fertakis, Washington State School Directors Association (WSSDA)

Summary of Last Meeting

President Fralick announced that at the last workshop on June 1, there was consensus among board members to move forward with some form of community listening sessions. As a first step, Superintendent Miner would work with one or two board members on the components of implementation. As a result of that direction, President Fralick and Superintendent Miner met with Mary Fertakis and Tanisha Brandon-Felder, Director of Equity and Family Engagement to determine how the community listening sessions would fit into the race and equity work already underway.

Topic: Consideration of Board Community Listening Sessions

Superintendent Miner asked for confirmation that the goal of this meeting was to develop a framework for moving forward with the community listening sessions. The board members nodded in agreement. Ms. Fertakis and Dr. Brandon-Felder had been asked to re-ground everyone on the work that has already been done on race and equity. The intent was to center the community conversations in the context of that work.

The agenda for this meeting included the following questions:

1) What work has been done in the district regarding race and equity?
2) How do we use that work as a foundation for our board work?
3) What is the goal for outcomes of the community conversation in the district?
4) What would a structure or framework look like to build toward that goal? What are some best practices that others have used? How do we avoid creating harm?

“Big Picture” – Mary Fertakis

Ms. Fertakis outlined the process involved in school boards implementing community listening sessions/town halls and acknowledged the need to view this through the lens of the Board’s governance role, which includes the following:

1) There was consensus at the last workshop on June 1 to do this as a board
2) Superintendent was tasked with providing some groundwork in the interim
3) The Board set the objective—to gain insight from the community in order to inform policy
4) Develop a structure (by staff with board input)
5) Staff brings recommendations back to the Board
6) Board participates in listening sessions
7) Staff compiles data from the listening sessions
8) Board incorporates data into policy review, creation and revision process
The emphasis needs to be on honoring the work of staff, the voices of students, the voices of the historically marginalized populations and the community whose tax dollars support the schools. Ms. Fertakis shared that when she spoke to colleagues and contacts on this topic, the very first thing everyone recommended was to start with student voices. “They are the first customers and the policies that are developed will have a direct impact on them.” They also suggested strongly that since school district personnel have been classified as “essential,” boards should take a close look at the guidance right now as there are potentially some exceptions that can be tapped into in regard to “in-person versus virtual” opportunities, and that there were some opportunities available right now for combining virtual with in-person meetings. It was preferred to get the people who are the focus of the listening session in the same space if at all possible, along with any staff needed to facilitate. There were specific recommendations about table setups, 6-foot social distancing and translators, if necessary. On the virtual side this would include board members and others who are interested in listening. It was also recommended that the targeted groups not be mixed, whether it be students, ELL population, historically marginalized populations—they should all be separate groups. Consideration should be given to allowing panelists to turn off their cameras if that provides an additional layer of comfort in speaking on difficult topics.

Another recommendation involved restricting the number of staff on the virtual call. In some cases, staff have recorded the sessions and used them later as professional development opportunities. Superintendent Miner asked for clarification on restricting staff from participating given OPMA rules and guidelines. Ms. Fertakis responded that this would depend on the level of participation by board members; it may be that there wouldn’t be a quorum to make it an open public meeting.

**Equity Work in Shoreline – Dr. Tanisha Brandon-Felder**

So far this year, two community opportunities had been offered. In the fall, Pulling Back the Curtain, focused on building awareness regarding what has been happening in Shoreline over the past four years. This spring, Spotlight on Equity, focused on what has been happening since COVID-19 began but occurred prior to the more recent tragic killings in our nation. Both videos have been made available for viewing.

Dr. Brandon-Felder highlighted the importance of listening to student voices as that has been a large part of what her department has continued to do and was a significant contributor to the implementation of the Race and Equity policy. Initially, students were invited to join the District Equity Committee; however it was difficult to match schedules with students for committee meetings due to their classes and activities, so student forums were held at the secondary schools and Cascade K-8 (7th and 8th graders). There were 40-60 students in each forum; over 2200 students participated in total. Going along with what Ms. Fertakis spoke about, they limited the number of adults in the room. Typically, it was Dr. Brandon-Felder and her assistant (Kim Darcy) and one other adult (not a classroom teacher or principal) from the individual buildings. This way, students felt safer in sharing their information. The work over the last 2-1/2 years has involved charting specific responses to very intentional questions and back and forth Q&As in open forum. This has been instrumental in getting feedback to principals and teachers and in creating professional development, which aligns with the policy work that was put in place. Dr. Brandon-Felder told the Board she would be happy to share that information at a later time if they were interested. Other opportunities have included going into classrooms to meet with students and most recently, Dr. Brandon-Felder met virtually with some students to hear their thoughts on curriculum.

Director Jernigan asked if the student participation in the policy work in 2017 is ongoing. Yes, once a year Dr. Brandon-Felder visits the schools for this specific purpose. The students self-select and receive release time to participate. It is a very wide variety of students that are a part of this
conversation and provide feedback—includes English learners, medically fragile, low income, LGBTQA, and students of color.

Director Betnel asked about how those conversations have evolved over the past few years. The first year focused on finding out what was happening on the student side and defining equity. If they were to create a law or policy, what would that involve, what would they like to see included. During the first session, questions were asked about what students were experiencing—positive and negative—and what types of things they saw in the system for which adults could be held accountable. In the second year, focus was on the policy and asking students if they were aware of its existence and whether or not they had observed any changes (better or worse) since its adoption. Most recently, the focus was on micro-aggressions and where they might be experienced, from students or staff. The sharing of the results on what they say has been fairly widespread. One of the questions asked this year was: “What is something you want adults to know about your everyday experience as a student?”

Director Jernigan mentioned that she had the impression from one of the Q&As that Dr. Brandon-Felder’s hiring and the establishment of her department was the result of an equity audit. She asked for clarifying information on that topic. Since this specific work occurred before Dr. Brandon-Felder was hired, Superintendent Miner fielded this question. She explained that when she first came to Shoreline in 2014, questions around equity frequently came up in her superintendent entry plan work. That first year, the District contracted with the Puget Sound Educational Service District, which is a very strong anti-racism organization. A district-wide committee was formed, on which she and the board president served in order to endorse the work. That committee worked for approximately a year and came up with the recommendation to form an equity department. She and the board president stepped back and allowed the committee to make their recommendation.

**Board Discussion**

The goal for the community listening sessions, as stated at the June 1 meeting, was to use the information gathered from the community sessions to inform policy. President Fralick added that she would also like to see individual goals for each session. The Board discussed, in depth, ideas as to how best to implement, facilitate, co-create with community, and evaluate these sessions. Ms. Miner offered to take notes on screen so all could see, follow along and amend as desired. Some of the bullet points included:

- Co-creation with the community group involved with the topic
  - Have them help us find the stakeholders
  - Co-creation of the questions
- Community members who are knowledgeable about this work and the community help create the questions
- Common essential questions informed by some of the decision-making before the Board
  - Do you feel welcome?
  - What is the district doing well?
  - What barriers is the district putting up?
- When the Equity and Family Engagement Department asked questions they asked three questions.
- **What do we do with the information after we have it?** When Dr. Brandon-Felder does it, she looks for professional development opportunities, builds systems so that it looks different in the future. How do we activate the information and center on the voices? This will look different for the Board than for staff.
• Good resource: Equity Advisory Team - stakeholder group could be a resource: 20 stakeholders who continue the work of equity. This was a continuation of the first 50 people who were on the initial District Equity Committee. They do an open call for this group but they need to have some background or knowledge in equity and in pushing the work forward. They make room for childcare and food at these meetings.
• Encourage us to use this as a planning tool for next year and for consideration of moving forward.
• Structural questions:
  - Don’t want to ignore/lose families and family member perspectives
  - Who is designing this? Don’t have the people working on this to be the “easy” people to find and get to this
  - Assign one or two board members to each community conversation?
  - Number of listening sessions?
  - How does the co-creation work?
  - How does this work in the context of COVID-19?
  - Do we try to have a minimum number like four per year and if we can do more, we do more?
  - How do we decide what communities to invite?
  - Strong feelings about starting with communities of color; what other communities would we think about talking to?
  - What role does the wider community have in bringing up ideas of who we would talk to?
• We’ve circled around three themes:
  - Start with communities of color
  - Start with students
  - Include topic of pandemic/COVID-19 challenges/learnings, etc.
• Make groups as similar as possible and this might be more than one meeting
• Who is attending?
• What are we getting out of the sessions to make sure we are incorporating what we’ve heard?
• Avoid misinterpretations of expectations
• Brainstormed list:
  - special needs students and families
• Would we do this in such a way that all board members could listen and all attend and all hear the information?
• Interest in having all five board members attend the meeting with community rather than breaking it out and sharing a report.
• What are the decisions coming before the Board in the next few months that might be informed by this work? Two key things: (1) What does the return to school look like in the fall and (2) the budget.
• There is a clear need in the community to be heard.
• Possible Proposal (act of putting this together will create new opportunities)
  - Start with communities of color – starting with students is fine
    - Hear about their experiences
    - Learn what they want to share with us
    - Learn what their needs are overall and in going back to school
    - Be curious about how students are spending their time while out of school
    - Think about racial justice
    - How can we transform relations between education and families
  - Directors Jernigan and Rivera to work with Superintendent Miner and Dr. Brandon-Felder
    - Create a plan to move these listening sessions forward
  - Implement the plan after co-creating this with community
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- After doing one listening session, choose another one for moving forward with a next conversation
- What do we share that can happen, continue, change as a result of this conversation? We don’t want to ask student to keep sharing and not make changes. Co-create how students would like us to follow up and ensure this is a two-way communication
- Counter a deficit model
- When we connect with students, start with questions that start with what kind of learning are they doing at home

Next steps:
1) Ms. Miner will work with Dr. Brandon-Felder, Director Jernigan and Director Rivera to co-create the community listening session with students and deliver to the Board in the next eight weeks
2) Dr. Brandon-Felder would like to include the CEE survey results in the work but not sure how quickly those will be delivered; includes very good questions that are focused on families and students separately
3) Consider the intersectional representation (students of color, Gay Straight Alliance, special education community, English Language Learners) – intentionally reach out to groups that can help to ensure that representation is present for this conversation

Adjournment: 6:31 p.m.

Heather Fralick, School Board President

Attest: August 3, 2020

Rebecca L. Miner, Secretary to Board of Directors
Call to Order

President Fralick called the Study Session of the Shoreline Board of Directors to order via Zoom at 4:00 p.m. on June 23, 2020. Rebecca Miner, Superintendent; Curtis Campbell, Public Information Officer; and Kathie Schindler, 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.)

Facilitator: Mary Fertakis, Washington State School Directors Association (WSSDA)

The Board participated in a WSSDA facilitated workshop for the purpose of reviewing and using the recently performed WSSDA self-assessments by individual board members in the development of school board goals for the 2020-2021 school year. Eight goals were considered with priority given to those listed below in bold—#1, #2, and #6. However, there was consensus by the Board that more work was needed in order to fine-tune the possible goals listed below. The Board agreed to schedule an additional one-hour meeting to refine and complete this work before moving forward. It was decided that Ms. Fertakis would also share information on an individual board policy governance model at that meeting. [The Board reconvened on June 30 from 4:00-5:00 p.m.]

Possible Goals for 2020-2021:

1) We will develop processes and measures for accountability towards racial equity in terms of learning outcomes

   Be more intentional about tracking demographic data (distance learning) including race, socio-economic, mental health, homelessness

   Monitor virus impacts on learning (point in time tracking)

2) Identify the information, accountability measures and outcomes that can help us focus our learning and decision-making with an equity perspective and a particular eye towards racial equity

3) How do we make sure we maintain support for what is working for our students and their growth?

4) What opportunity do we have to support our students in their own personal goals, self leadership, self recognition?

5) How are we tracking our progress in eliminating racism?

6) Fiscal guidance given the shortfalls on the horizon statewide (mandatory)
   How are we approaching what we are cutting? With an equity lens/perspective?

7) Support the superintendent in carrying out what has been approved by the Board (mandatory)

8) Develop processes for proactive, clear and understandable ongoing communication around board roles and responsibilities, board activities, decision-making and opportunities for input and feedback/engagement; create one-page summary of the Board’s roles and activities (share on website)
Adjournment:  7:08 p.m.

Heather Fralick, School Board President

Attest:  August 3, 2020

Rebecca L. Miner, Secretary to Board of Directors
Call to Order

President Fralick called the Study Session of the Shoreline Board of Directors to order via Zoom at 4:00 p.m. on June 30, 2020. Rebecca Miner, Superintendent; Curtis Campbell, Public Information Officer; and Kathie Schindler, 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.)

Facilitator: Mary Fertakis, Washington State School Directors Association (WSSDA)

The Board met to discuss the following topic:

Board Self-Evaluation and Goal Setting

Ms. Miner began by thanking the Board for the work already completed on setting goals for 2020-2021. The Board ran out of time at the previous meeting on June 23 so this meeting was scheduled in order to complete the work.

Ms. Fertakis briefly reviewed the “Possible Goals for 2020-2021,” specifically those in bold as the ones the Board discussed the most during the June 23 Study Session. It was also clarified for board members that these goals are separate from the Board/Superintendent/District Priorities that are developed and approved by the Board every year. These are specific goals for the Board’s work but does require the partnership with the Superintendent and her staff to complete them.

Possible Goals for 2020-2021:

1) We will develop processes and measures for accountability towards racial equity in terms of learning outcomes

   Be more intentional about tracking demographic data (distance learning) including race, socio-economic, mental health, homelessness

   Monitor virus impacts on learning (point in time tracking)

2) Identify the information, accountability measures and outcomes that can help us focus our learning and decision-making with an equity perspective and a particular eye towards racial equity

3) How do we make sure we maintain support for what is working for our students and their growth?

4) What opportunity do we have to support our students in their own personal goals, self leadership, self recognition?

5) How are we tracking our progress in eliminating racism?

6) Fiscal guidance given the shortfalls on the horizon statewide (mandatory)

   How are we approaching what we are cutting? With an equity lens/perspective?

7) Support the superintendent in carrying out what has been approved by the Board (mandatory)
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8) Develop processes for proactive, clear and understandable ongoing communication around board roles and responsibilities, board activities, decision-making and opportunities for input and feedback/engagement; create one-page summary of the Board’s roles and activities (share on website)

The Board spent the remainder of their time refining the goals. Listed below is the final product.

Completed 2020-2021 Goals:

1. We will develop processes for the Board’s regular and ongoing examination of measures for accountability with an intentional focus on racial equity.

   Consider as part of the “how”: towards racial equity in terms of impact on learning and learning outcomes, patterns of access to opportunities in the district, and eliminating the predictability of outcomes.

2. We will develop processes for proactive, clear, and ongoing Board communication with the community.

   Consider as part of the “how”: understandable, predictable around board roles and responsibilities, board activities, decision-making and opportunities for input and feedback/engagement; create one-page summary of the Board’s roles and activities (share on website)

Ms. Fertakis stated, in conclusion, that she would send information to Ms. Miner on the topic of policy governance as a board structure. Additionally, there were several presentations at last year’s WSSDA annual conference (November 2019) that are still available online.

President Fralick announced that next steps in this process include she and Ms. Miner collecting their thoughts and coming up with a plan and a timeline for continuing the conversation about the components for implementing the goals. Given the number of things coming up in the next few weeks regarding budget and the reopening of schools, continuation of this conversation with the Board would most likely occur after the July 20 regular meeting. Ms. Miner stated she would send out the notes from this meeting to the board members.

Adjournment: 4:56 p.m.

Heather Fralick, School Board President

Attest: August 3, 2020

Rebecca L. Miner, Secretary to Board of Directors
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 June 15, 2020. Rebecca Miner, Superintendent; Curtis Campbell, Public Information Officer; and Kathie Schindler, Executive Assistant, were attending 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. (President Fralick announced that she had visual confirmation that all board members were present.) Congratulations were extended to student representatives Cynthia Ruelas (Shorewood) and Michael Crosson (Shorecrest) who just graduated, as well as all members of the Class of 2020 from Shorecrest and Shorewood.

Land Acknowledgement

Director Jernigan was asked to provide this meeting’s land acknowledgement: “Thank you for the opportunity of this land acknowledgment to recognize our status as guests on these lands. I’m incredibly grateful for the chance at each board meeting to recognize not just the first people of this land, Coast Salish, but the educational philosophy, thought systems and cultural framework that best embody contemporary Indigenous life. That connection is critical. So it occurred to me, as I was listening to the student speeches from the June 6 march, just how busy our students have been during the physical closure of our schools. I saw last Saturday just how much learning has been taking place. I saw our students dismantling racist ideology. I saw the centering of family in family life. I saw students doing community service; I saw advocacy; I saw civic engagement, leadership and generosity. So as we acknowledge the first people of this land, let us too acknowledge that it’s time to think beyond the learning loss narratives of these past few months and make room for the Indigenous educational framework that recognizes kids learn at home and in community and from their elders, their peers, and this learning has value. Yakoke Director Fralick for the opportunity to share this today.”

Flag Salute

Comments

President Fralick began by stating: “Please let the record reflect, that once again, given our unique circumstances of being in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, we are meeting via Zoom and joined by members of the community who may be joining remotely or telephonically. Due to an update on June 1 to the Governor’s orders regarding public meetings, we are moving forward again with district business that had been temporarily suspended. She then asked Ms. Miner to share a few words about the updates to the Governor’s order.

Ms. Miner announced that there had been some modifications to the Open Public Meetings Act resolution that the Governor had published which allowed us to begin to conduct things that were beyond normal and routine, so we were able to begin that work. The current proclamation expires as it stands now on June 17, 2020, so perhaps soon we will be able to return to in-person meetings, but we will await and see if there is future guidance on that topic.

For the record, 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 June 15. There were a total of 17 pages of comments submitted. Those comments were received by the Board via email earlier in the afternoon (June 15). They were also placed on the district website at the following URL:
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https://www.shorelineschools.org/Page/1235 (School Board agenda for June 15). In order to make these comments more accessible, they have been posted in two locations (at the top before the agenda items begin and immediately following the consent agenda) within the board agenda packet. As with past meetings, President Fralick announced that there would also be a link to those public comments within the meeting minutes once the minutes are transcribed and approved by the Board (see link above). Several of the comments received addressed the District’s consideration for the fall opening and distance learning. She took the opportunity to encourage everyone to share their feedback and experiences with the distance learning in the upcoming community survey. The Board sincerely wants to thank the students, parents, teachers and community members who took the time to submit their comments in advance of the meeting. President Fralick announced at the last meeting that there would be a presentation at this meeting on school governance rules; however, due to time constraints, that has been postponed to the July 20 regular 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.

MOTION NO. 48: 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 May 18 Regular Board Meeting were approved as submitted.

Adoption of Consent Agenda
The following consent agenda was presented for approval:

a. Acceptance of Gifts, Grants, Donations
   1) Kellogg Middle School - $5,800.00 – Kellogg PTSA – Hang Time Club and snacks for testing
   2) Shorewood High School - $15,134.70 – Shorewood Boosters 2019-2020 Auction proceeds to benefit various ASB sports and clubs
   3) Elementary Summer School - $19,000.00 – Shoreline Public Schools Foundation
b. Adoption of Resolution 2020-10, Interdistrict Cooperative Programs for Students with Disabilities
c. Adoption of Resolution 2020-11, Purchase of Educational Services for Students with Disabilities
d. Approval of 2020-2021 Administrative Personnel Contract with Deputy Superintendent Marla Miller
e. Approval of 2020-2021 Administrative Personnel Contract with Assistant Superintendent Brian Schultz
f. Approval of 2020-2021 Meet and Confer Agreement with Shoreline Principals Association (SPA) and Shoreline Center Administrators (SCA)
g. Approval of Initial 2020-2021 Salary Addendum with Shoreline Principals Association
h. Approval of Initial 2020-2021 Salary Addendum with Shoreline Center Administrators
i. Approval of Initial 2020-2021 Salary Addendum with Shoreline Professional-Technical Association
j. Approval of 2020-2023 Meet and Confer Agreement and Initial 2020-2021 Salary Addendum with Shoreline Confidential Employee Association
k. Aldercrest Campus Modernization Project, Phase 2 – Approval of Change Order #14 – Kassel and Associates, Inc.
l. Cedarbrook Elementary – Abatement and Demolition Project – Approval of Final Acceptance
m. Einstein Middle School Replacement Project – Approval of Change Order #02 – Hoffman Construction, Inc.
n. Kellogg Middle School Replacement Project – Approval of Change Order #02 – Hoffman Construction, Inc.
o. Approval of Personnel
President Fralick asked each director if there were any agenda items they wanted pulled for discussion or a separate vote. There were none.

MOTION NO. 49: Director Rivera moved that the Board adopt the consent agenda, items 5a through 5q, which is attached hereto and becomes a part hereof. The motion was seconded by Director Jernigan and carried unanimously.

As of June 15, 2020, the Board, by a unanimous vote, approved for payment, those vouchers described as follows: May 2020 Payroll Warrants #447011-447039 and Electronic Transfers in the amount of $11,770,780.13; Reconciliation of Warrants Issued between May 29 and June 5, 2020 - General Fund Warrants #85556-85557, 85558-85607, 85608-85863, 192001121 and 192001159, totaling $527,027.86; Capital Projects Fund Warrants #85864-85878, totaling $1,162,255.74; and Student Bond Fund Warrants #85879-85933 and 192001160-192001163, totaling $33,317.20; for a grand total of $13,493,380.93.

President Fralick took the opportunity to express gratitude for the generous donations listed under agenda item 5a from the Kellogg PTSA ($5,800.00), Shorewood Boosters ($15,134.70) and the Shoreline Public Schools Foundation ($19,000).

Reports and Presentations
First Reading: Proposed New Policy 3424, Opioid Related Overdose Reversal
Amy Vujovich, Director of Student Services, presented.

In 2019, the Washington State Legislature passed Substitute Senate Bill 5380 in response to an increase in overdoses in the state. Governor Inslee signed the bill into law on May 13, 2019. This law required school districts with 2,000 students or more to obtain and maintain at least one set of opioid overdose reversal medication doses at each of its high schools.

This proposed new policy is based on the Washington State School Directors’ Association (WSSDA) model policy. There was a question from a board member earlier in the day as to whether or not Shoreline had any overdoses at any of our schools or sites and the answer was none, to Ms. Vujovich’s knowledge.

Alpha-Pharm is the expected provider for this medication. The District can work with ICHS or other partners in the community. The District will seek donations or use budget through the standing order for the medication; the cost per dose is approximately $120. The District will also identify designated trained responders who can distribute and administer opioid overdose reversal medication in each school. Each school has a school nurse and there will be at least one other designated trained school staff member. Nurses can train administrators; however, that would occur during the regular day so there wouldn’t be any additional associated costs.

In response to a question earlier in the day regarding “under what circumstances would we not be able to obtain the medication,” Ms. Vujovich stated that she didn’t anticipate any challenges in obtaining the medication, but she thought it was critical to have that statement in the policy; however, she doesn’t see that changing. In response to another question regarding “in the event the school does not have a full-time nurse,” Ms. Vujovich stated this wasn’t applicable because there is a nurse in every building.
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Director Rivera asked if the language in the first sentence of the second paragraph of the policy could be changed to reflect that even if the medication could not be obtained through donations, it could be purchased. Ms. Vujovich stated that she would bring back an amended policy for the second reading.

Director Wilson asked if there was a shelf life on this medication. Typically, it’s one year, so a new dose would need to be obtained, either through donation or purchase, every year. Occasionally, medications are good for two years; Ms. Vujovich indicated she would check with the nurses. Ms. Miner added that it is much like defibrillators and the annual monitoring that occurs for those machines.

Director Betnel asked if this medication would be kept in the nurse’s office and if so, what access exists in relation to before and after school activities. Ms. Vujovich explained that the accompanying procedure will state that it needs to be in an unlocked location that is labeled because it isn’t always known when it will be needed and who will administer it. It is an interesting medication in that it does not create a danger or a negative impact if it is administered to someone not experiencing an opioid overdose. There are no issues with leaving it in an easily accessible cabinet.

This new policy was presented for a first reading and would be back for recommended adoption on July 20, 2020.

Shoreline Children’s Center Program Update and Financial Information

Presenters:

Marla S. Miller, Deputy Superintendent
Hillery Clark, Director of Early Learning
Mark Spangenberg, Director of Finance and Business Services

The Shoreline Children’s Center is an optional, tuition-based preschool/childcare and extended care program offered by Shoreline School District to families in Shoreline and Lake Forest Park. The preschool/childcare services are available at elementary schools in the District.

Ms. Clark reviewed the vision and mission of the Shoreline Early Learning program, which was created by a committee of parents and staff about three years ago. Vision: Our vision is to eliminate the opportunity gap by optimizing the foundational early learning years in an inclusive, equitable community where every child belongs and is supported in developing friendships and becoming a lifelong learner. Mission: Our mission is to provide high quality early learning experiences to all Shoreline and Lake Forest Park preschool aged children. Our mission prioritizes underserved populations, inclusive learning, culturally responsive teaching and working together with all families.

A number of services are provided by the Shoreline Children’s Center. The only mandated program at the Edwin Pratt Early Learning Center is the special education preschool program.

Elementary Extended Care:
• Before, after, partial release and break care options
• 870 enrolled in 2019-2020 school year
• Snacks included
• Offering healthy and safe positive care for students in grades K-5

Preschool:
• Half-day, full day and extended day options
• 276 enrolled in 2019-2020 school year
• Meals included and eaten family style
• Prepares students for kindergarten through social emotional (Second Step Curriculum) and kindergarten readiness (Creative Curriculum) instruction
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- Fully inclusive
- Awarded two grants from OSPI ($30,000): Pyramid Model and Inclusionary Practices

There are some changes that will be required due to COVID-19 and CDC health and safety guidelines and these will create some logistical and financial challenges. These include:

- Increased staffing to meet maximum of 10 people in a classroom
- More space due to social distancing
- Required health checks
- Family style meals discontinued
- Increased safety procedures
- PPE, safety and cleaning/sanitizing purchases
- Equipment/supplies for individual use, e.g. containers for crayons, markers, scissors, etc.

Mr. Spangenberg reviewed a current and projected financial information document that covered actual revenue and expenses for the period of 2014-2015 through 2018-2019 and budgeted for 2019-2020. The largest projected costs for 2019-2020 are timesheet-based pay of $357,464. The incoming revenues stopped at $3,796,399. The projected expenses for 2019-2020 are $4,565,166 (including indirect costs of $415,015) for a net loss of ($651,368). As could be seen on the chart, in prior years when there is a negative balance, the full amount becomes the beginning balance for the next year and when there is a positive balance, half of it is carried over to the next year. This goes back to the difficult recovery days of 2006 and 2007 when there were some substantial write-offs of uncollectible tuition and bills from those years. For a number of years, there wasn’t any carryover. The current carryover process has been in place since about 2011.

Ms. Miller referred to one of the questions asked earlier in the day by a board member regarding how the above-mentioned balance is covered and why does this particular program impact the General Fund budget. When there is a negative balance, the General Fund covers the deficit. It can be likened to a short-term loan from the reserves in order to keep the program going. Typically, at this point the Board would be given a tuition rate for consideration that would keep the program in line with other programs and put it on the road to recovery. A positive ending fund balance was expected. Credit was given to Kelly Davidson and Hillery Clark for coming up with program choices and a tuition rate recommendation for 2019-2020 that was right on track. And then the pandemic hit. Staff continued to be paid through this time but now there is a deficit as reflected on the report.

Ms. Miller reported that the purpose of this presentation was to make the Board aware of the situation prior to staff bringing forward a recommendation for the fall. She also noted that the communities of Shoreline and Lake Forest Park are very proud of the programs at Edwin Pratt Early Learning Center. It is very much desired that the program open in the fall with District staff.

Ms. Clark presented three very general, possible programming scenarios for the 2020-2021 school year. She made clear that at this point, they don’t have definite ideas as to what will happen in the fall. They hope to have more information by the next meeting.

**Scenario 1: Suspended programming for Preschool and suspended programming for Extended Care**

- Program budget would stay stagnant
- Tuition cost to safely staff would be significantly higher
- Families may not be interested in enrolling due to health/safety concerns or in accessing a modified schedule
- Staff may not be able to work due to health/safety concerns or be available for a different schedule than they were hired for
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**Elementary Extended Care**
- Spaces that meet social distancing requirements may be unavailable at elementary schools

**Preschool**
- Prioritizes space and staff for Head Start and special education programming

**Scenario 2: Modified programming for Preschool and suspended programming for Extended Care**

**Elementary Extended Care**
- Spaces that meet social distancing requirements may be unavailable at elementary schools
- Staff may not be able to work due to health/safety concerns or be available for a different schedule than they were hired for
- Families may not be interested in enrolling due to health/safety concerns or in accessing a modified schedule
- Tuition cost to safely staff would be significantly higher

**Preschool**
- Prioritizing returning four-year-olds the year before kindergarten
- Supports social emotional learning
- Continues with blending model for the three preschool programs
- Community need for care
- More staff are retained

**Scenario 3: Modified programming for Preschool and modified programming for Extended Care**

**Elementary Extended Care**
- Community need for care
- More staff are retained

*Also relevant to Preschool:*
- Prioritizes returning four-year-olds the year before kindergarten
- Supports social emotional learning
- Continues with blended model for the three preschool programs

Ms. Miller reviewed the next steps, which are as follows:
- Provide additional information as requested by the Board
- Recommend approval of 2020-2021 tuition models and rates at the Board’s July 20 meeting, to support:
  - Enrollment of students for 2020-2021 for care and preschool
  - Projected revenues for budget preparation (impacts Children’s Center budget as well as District fund balance and cash flow)

Ms. Miller referenced a previous question by a board member in a conversation regarding why the District looks at the Children’s Center as having to make up the deficit fund balance as opposed to the Food Service program. Ms. Miller explained that the Food Service program isn’t optional—it needs to be available for students, but technically, the Children’s Center program is an optional service in which parents can choose to participate or not. It’s important to ensure that the District’s General Fund is not subsidizing an optional preschool on a continuous basis. Caution is needed in order to not delude the resources available for the primary mission of the District, which is the K-12 program.

Director Jernigan shared her family’s personal experience; both her children have been part of the Edwin Pratt family for several years and her youngest son graduates this year from the preschool. “It is monumentally important to our district and it is unique and it breaks my heart to see necessary changes being discussed or potentially on the horizon.” She stated to Ms. Clark how much the programs are appreciated and how much they want to support the success because it is so critical to kindergarten preparation.
Director Rivera echoed Director Jernigan’s comments above and expressed her desire to support the success of the program. In terms of scenario building, she asked what the feasibility would be of opening up again if the programs were suspended and also asked about the cost of running the building. Ms. Miller responded that the building supports both the mandatory early childhood special education program and the grant-funded Head Start program. So if the District were to open for school, those programs would be operating under some fashion. Given that the District just built this new center, she couldn’t imagine a scenario where they stepped away and ceased operations of the program.

Director Betnel also echoed her fellow directors’ support and admiration for the program and stated that her family has also benefited from it. She asked Ms. Clark for clarification regarding the 10 people in a classroom—does that refer to students or people. Ms. Clark responded that it was a total of 10 people and typically that is two staff and eight students. She also asked how it would look if there were eight students in a room with two teachers and the preschool houses 276 students (as mentioned earlier). Ms. Clark stated that they were looking at different models, possibly students coming for half days, but at this point, they were still working on it and waiting for more guidelines from the state. Ms. Miner added that currently, there are so many things that we just don’t know, including Department of Heath and CDC information, and it would only be speculation. Director Betnel also asked what happens to the other half of the carryover in those years with a positive ending fund balance for the program. Ms. Miller explained that those funds go into the general reserve and are used towards funding other K-12 programs.

**Preliminary Update on Development of 2020-2021 Budget Recommendations**

*Presenters:*

- Marla S. Miller, Deputy Superintendent
- Mark Spangenberg, Director of Finance and Business Services

Ms. Miller reported that typically at this time of year, a preliminary budget would be presented to the Board. However, due to the uniqueness of these times, that is not yet the case. Staff would like to schedule a study session immediately following the regular “business only” meeting on June 29. Ms. Miner added that the Board had not yet been surveyed on that but would be in the very near future.

Mr. Spangenberg reviewed the summer timeline for the budget development process.

- Preliminary Budget Review – July 20
- First publication of public hearing notice – Week of July 29
- Second publication of public hearing notice – Week of August 6 (cannot be closer than one week before the public hearing)
- Public hearing/final adoption – August 17

**GENERAL FUND**

The work on the budget begins with the working assumptions for budget development, which for 2020-2021 are as follows:

- 2019-2020 budget allocations are built into the 2020-2021 budget, unless specific decisions are made or information from the state becomes available to inform revisions
- Our usual detailed budget development work must proceed to be able to prepare a complete and balanced budget recommendation
- Staffing budgets represent over 88% of the General Fund and require the most time to prepare
- Pending adjustments: Highly Capable enrollment, Food Service prices, Children’s Center tuition, any local share of CARES funding, additional state reductions

**Levy Collections:**

1. Due to the pandemic, non-escrowed property tax payments have been deferred by the County to June 1
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2. Usually collect 39.4% of expected tax revenue by April 30; instead we collected 33.8% resulting in $1.3M less than usual
3. By approximately July 10 we will know how much revenue was collected through June 30

Classroom Staffing Ratios
- K – 3rd grade classrooms allocated at 1 teacher per 20 students – plus music and PE
- 4th grade classrooms allocated at 1 teacher per 27 students – plus music and PE
- 5th grade classrooms allocated at 1 teacher per 28 students - plus music and PE
- 6th – 12th grade classrooms allocated at 1 teacher per 26.10 students (includes electives)

Curriculum Adoption (provided by the levy)
- Math Adoption estimate $473,000

Cost of living increase vs. reduction in state funding due to drop in regionalization factor
- Cost of Living increases by 1.6%
- Funding due to regionalization factor drops by 2.0%

Ms. Miller made some clarifying comments regarding the regionalization factor. When the state responded to the McCleary Decision several years ago and increased basic education funding, they also took over a greater share of funding compensation. They set some minimums and maximums in their funding formula and recognized that districts, particularly in the Puget Sound region, already were funding salaries (primarily teachers) at a higher level than the state’s new funding model. So the legislature built into their funding formula regionalization factors based on property values. Shoreline was one of a small group of districts that received the highest regionalization factor because of being completely surrounded by districts that qualified as “high property value” districts.

Beginning in the 2018-2019 school year, the state’s funding model for compensation added 24% to the base funding formula for teachers. Beginning in 2020-2021, that formula will drop down to 22% and then in each of the following years, 2021-2022 and 2022-2023, it drops another 2%. Knowing that the regionalization factor would be dropping, the District, when bargaining the various employee agreements (especially with SEA), granted large increases for the first year but then capped to the cost of living adjustment (COLA) for the remaining two years of the agreement. The state’s assumption was that state and local revenues would begin to grow and that there would be an opportunity for districts to bring their compensation levels along without having to ask staff to take a reduction. If the state had not implemented the regionalization factor and they funded compensation for teachers as they did for everyone else, we literally would have had to ask our teachers to take a cut in pay. So, in essence, the regionalization factor was a mechanism for recognizing the high cost areas and for having additional funding available to begin the implementation process before dropping off. We are now seeing the first drop down (2%) which is enhanced by the 1.6% COLA. This regionalization factor ripples through all the state-funded programs, not just basic education, e.g. categorical programs (ELL, LAP, transportation, special education, etc.)

Other anticipated financial impacts:
- Children’s Center deficit 2019-20: $556,400
- Food Service deficit 2019-20: $292,025 plus unreimbursed cost of community meals program $466,000
- Comprehensive Early Intervening Services (CEIS): $315,000
- Career & Technical Education Recapture by OSPI: $226,000
  - (under spend of revenue and carryover)
  - (difficult to spend with distance learning/CTE)
- State’s adjustment to address State’s error in 2019-2020 transportation funding: unknown at this time

Ms. Miller explained that when the budget is being built, there is much reliance on data received from
OSPI that calculates what kinds of revenue should be expected in all the different programs. The budget for 2019-2020 included (unbeknownst to all) an error in OSPI’s calculation for funding transportation for a number of districts across the state. When that error was identified by OSPI, they sent out a notice stating that they would hold districts harmless that built their budget based on those state calculations. They also announced that they were going to cover that error as they planned calculations for revenue for the coming year. However, as a result of the pandemic losses, the Governor vetoed that in an effort to balance the budget. So what we know now is that the state will not be providing additional funding to backfill the calculation error going forward. For 2019-2020, they are not allowing our transportation revenue drop down to what it should have been, but they will be adjusting their distribution of funds across the state, which results in less funds. Just how that will be done has not yet been established and conveyed to districts.

Mr. Spangenberg shared a document reflecting revenues as of June 9, 2020 (prior to reductions currently in process. Detailed information from the state is very limited and not yet adjusted for certain known reductions, such as funding for a third day of professional development for teaching staff vetoed by the Governor. In answer to a question by Director Betnel regarding whether or not the dollar change on the first line of $2,773,093 included money coming out due to the veto, Mr. Spangenberg responded that there was still money to come out due to that veto and he estimated it to be about $300,000. Ms. Miller added that for years Shoreline has had more professional days for teachers than what the state has funded. It was anticipated that the state would be picking up that slack next year but if that doesn’t happen, the result will be more funds from the reserves to cover that expense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>19-20 Budget</th>
<th>20-21 Budget</th>
<th>$ Change</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3100-Apportionment</td>
<td>$92,314,173</td>
<td>$95,087,266</td>
<td>$2,773,093</td>
<td>Includes 3rd Prof Day - Vetoed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3121-Apportionment-Sped</td>
<td>2,569,644</td>
<td>2,697,851</td>
<td>128,207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4121-Special Ed-State</td>
<td>11,122,951</td>
<td>12,141,632</td>
<td>1,018,681</td>
<td>New tiered formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4121-Safety Net</td>
<td>419,000</td>
<td>419,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>District estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4122-Special Ed-Birth to 2</td>
<td>1,157,163</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>($1,157,163)</td>
<td>Moved to DCYF in 2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4155-Learning Assistance (LAP)</td>
<td>1,846,403</td>
<td>1,826,653</td>
<td>($19,750)</td>
<td>Reduced poverty &amp; regionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4165-TransitionalBilingual</td>
<td>1,512,259</td>
<td>1,552,525</td>
<td>$40,266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4174-Highly Capable-State</td>
<td>318,636</td>
<td>325,897</td>
<td>$7,261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4199-Transportation Operations</td>
<td>5,175,652</td>
<td>3,657,791</td>
<td>($1,517,861)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6124-Special Ed-Federal</td>
<td>2,376,910</td>
<td>2,098,250</td>
<td>($278,660)</td>
<td>State formula error 2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6151-Title I-Federal</td>
<td>989,417</td>
<td>979,717</td>
<td>($9,700)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREs</td>
<td>810,900</td>
<td>810,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>OSPI may absorb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND
There are three major areas that need to be covered in the budget:
• Complete the middle schools, estimate expenditures for 2020-2021
• Refine the projects list for 2020-2021 funded from the 2006 Bond Authorization
• Refine technology purchase plans – technology levy collections are also affected by the delay in the local tax collection

DEBT SERVICE FUND
• Revenues affected by the slower local levy collections
• June’s tax collections (available around July 10) are necessary to calculate anticipated debt service funding
  ▪ Sufficient funds must be collected in time for the December 1, 2020 payments and the June 1, 2021 payments
  ▪ Required to target a minimum fund balance of about $2.8 million (1/12th of annual payments) to occur sometime during 2021
• 2020-2021 principal payments $16,920,000 (-$1,110,000 less than 2019-2020)
• 2020-2021 interest payments $16,777,322 (-$813,650 less than 2019-2020)

ASSOCIATED STUDENT BODY FUND
• ASB planning for 2020-2021 will be significantly influenced by the plans for opening schools in the fall
• Budget preparation at this time assumes a status quo fiscal year
• ASB budgets are being adjusted to reflect the change of 6th grade from elementary to middle school

TRANSPORTATION VEHICLE FUND
• Final year of two-year grant to replace four older diesel buses with four newer diesel buses
• First year of a two-year grant to replace two diesel buses with two electric buses
• Confirming expected timing for bus deliveries and managing the cash flow
• Confirming plans for upgrades of the infrastructure support necessary to support electric buses (the grant includes a portion to cover the costs of these changes)

Ms. Miller addressed questions from the Board regarding when the Board provides input on the budget development. Typically, the priorities for the 2019-2020 school year would help set up what the Board would want staff to be thinking about for program changes in the 2020-2021 school year. However, as three board members were sworn in during December, the turnaround time for making significant changes to the budget is difficult right now but staff certainly want to hear what the Board wants to be included and staff want to make space for conversations and decisions the Board would like to see made. In reality, so much of the budget is tied up in staffing (88%) and of the remaining 12%, much of it is utilities and other costs that are continuous regardless of the program. We don’t have a lot of discretionary funds so typically if we are going to start a new program, we need to decide if we’re going to stop doing something else in order to create the capacity to do it. Years in which new revenue is expected are good times for adding something different.

Ms. Miller provided some recent examples of board-directed initiatives. One was the implementation of all day kindergarten for all students before it was fully funded by the state. Another involved adding new positions such as elementary counselors, instructional coaches, family advocates, elementary deans, high school graduation success coordinators, and the equity and family engagement department. These position changes came through a combination of board priorities, recommendations from staff that were presented and adopted by the Board, and some were a result of the bargaining process. The implementation of early release Wednesdays was a two-year process that ended with adoption by the Board after a substantial period of community and staff input. Once adopted it was built into the budget. Reducing K-3 class sizes came through several routes—it came through the state saying funds were
available but only if implemented; it came through bargaining where all agreed on wanting smaller class sizes; and it came through a phased-in approach once the SEA contract was approved by the Board. Ms. Miner elaborated on the equity department piece mentioned above. It came about because the Board established it as a priority, that equity needs would be reviewed and established through a committee process. She gave the directive to the committee and the committee came up with recommendations, one of which was to have an equity department. That recommendation was then built into the following year’s budget by the Board.

As an example of a “big ticket item” that is coming up in the 2020-2021 school year is the implementation of a decision that was made three years ago to move sixth graders from the elementary level to the middle school level. This contributed greatly to the design and construction of the middle schools as well as to the staffing of those schools. This, of course, was all approved by the Board. The intent for sharing these examples was to provide a picture of how the school board input and board prioritization process does change the budget but usually with a little bit more of a runway prior to the point of staff presenting the Board with a recommended balanced budget for the coming year.

Ms. Miller again reviewed the budget process that was presented earlier in this presentation and added the study session that has now been requested for June 29:

- Preliminary Budget Review – July 20 – will include all of the information that the budget team knows for certain at that point in time (revenue changes from the state, labor cost differences, utility differences)—things that are pretty well quantifiable and clear; there will still be unknowns particularly if the legislature decides to have a special session. Part of the reserves most likely will be needed to balance the budget and that will be part of the July 20 presentation as well.
- First publication of public hearing notice – Week of July 29
- Second publication of public hearing notice – Week of August 6 (cannot be closer than one week before the public hearing)
- Public hearing/final adoption – August 17 (state requires this be done by August 31)

Director Betnel asked if the July 20 presentation could also include a summary of all the budget impacts specific to this current school year, e.g. change in tax collections due to homeowners deferring tax payments, additional costs due to school closure. This would help the Board to discern what items are potentially one-time costs and which are ongoing.

**Board Requested Discussion**

Director Jernigan stated that over the last few weeks, the Board had heard from a large number of community members, staff and students about the importance of ethnic studies curriculum in meeting many of the District’s goals in terms of equity and beyond. She also recognized that there was a petition circulating with a few thousand signatures. Ms. Miner is scheduled to meet with students later in the week and she knows that conversation will inform next steps and assist in grounding and guiding this work. Over the last week, Directors Jernigan and Rivera have been meeting and collaborating and making contacts with colleagues in surrounding districts in order to get a clear picture of the status of ethnic studies around the state. For example, Seattle School District passed a resolution that has the implementation of the Since Time Immemorial (STI) and Black Lives Matter curriculum imbedded into the resolution. Directors Jernigan and Rivera have co-authored a resolution calling for ethnic studies and they will be meeting with Ms. Miner, Tanisha Brandon-Felder and Maria Stevens in the near future. It is Director Jernigan’s hope that after that meeting, they will be able to finalize the resolution and bring it forward for adoption by the Board at the July 20 regular meeting. She was “inspired by the petition because the harm of not having the STI curriculum fully implemented is not abstract or theoretical to me so I want to offer that I see this work as urgent, both as a woman of color but also as a parent raising two Native boys in the district.” Director
Rivera added that Since Time Immemorial and Ethnic Studies have also been adopted for inclusion in the schools at the state level.

Director Betnel voiced her wholehearted support for Directors Jernigan and Rivera for their work and offered gratitude to the students leading the petition process as well as the students who led the march in the community the previous week. In response to Director Jernigan’s request for future discussion and in an understanding of the critical role that instructional coaches, TOSAs and the entire Instruction Department play in being equity leads and in developing and delivering new curriculum and being a resource for our teaching staff, Director Betnel asked about having a conversation in an upcoming meeting regarding the strategies for restoring that instructional layer at our elementary and high schools (it remains at middle school level) and the budgetary options that might be available for enabling that initiative, particularly in view of the resolution for new curriculum.

**Action Items**

**Approval of 2020-2021 Food Services Fully-Paid Meal Prices**

*Presenters:*

  Marla S. Miller, Deputy Superintendent  
  Mark Spangenberg, Director of Finance and Business Services  
  Jessica Finger, Director of Food and Nutrition Services

Each year the School Board is asked to adopt meal prices for the food service program for the coming school year. At the June 1, 2020 regular board meeting, Board members received an update on Food Service operations and current and projected finances. As a part of that presentation, staff presented three scenarios for prices for fully paid meals for the 2020-2021 school year. It is to be noted that the price of fully-paid meals has no impact on access to food for students who qualify for free breakfast and lunch through the federal School Meals program.

Of the three scenarios presented to the Board at its last meeting, District staff now recommend Board approval of Scenario 2, which increases prices for elementary and middle school fully-paid meals by a nickel and increases high school meal prices by a quarter. It projects an increase to the deficit of $258,023. It is felt that filling the deficit and breaking even would require an increase that would not be met with participation on the part of students; it would most likely cause a loss in participation and revenue as well. The alternative scenarios either significantly contribute to the deficit (the “no increase” Scenario 1) or increase prices to an extent we believe would be a hardship for families and potentially reduce participation in the purchase of meals (the “break even” Scenario 3).

President Fralick asked the reason for the difference in the increase between elementary and middle schools ($.05) and high school ($.25). Ms. Finger responded that in looking at ways to increase revenue, they were interested in something that would have the least impact on the greater number of students. One of the things involved creating a third tier of pricing. Secondary prices (middle and high schools) have had the same pricing for many years. The District’s meal pattern for high school requires much more food, more calories and it costs more money. It made sense to add to the price of the meals that are actually costing more to produce, which is high school.

Director Jernigan asked if there would be enough PPE (personal protection equipment) to continue to operate the program safely. Ms. Miller stated that the District would be procuring a district-wide allocation of PPE as part of a monitoring of COVID-related expenses and the costs would not be coming out of the individual building and department budgets. Ms. Miller shared an experience in another school district where prices were increased by $.25 and participation decreased significantly.
Director Betnel asked at what threshold of price increase does the District see a large drop in families discontinuing the purchase of school meals. Given current conditions due to the pandemic, it is anticipated that families will experience pressure and stress to be able to afford increases. Even the $.25 that occurred during a time when there was no recession, could be worse now due to what families are experiencing and the significant unemployment in our area. In creating the scenarios, staff got up to an approximate $.80 increase in order to break even; that was simply too much as it would impact revenues significantly as well as impact students in terms of getting good nutrition. Ms. Finger added that the last time prices were increased by $.25, it was accompanied by a 20% drop in participation. There could have been other factors as there were budget shortfalls that year; it’s hard to know if that was the entire story for the drop in participation.

It was the recommendation of the Superintendent that the Board approve an increase in full-paid meal prices of $.05 at the elementary and middle level and $.25 at the high school level per fully-paid breakfast and lunch, as presented.

MOTION NO. 50: Director Rivera moved that the Board approve an increase in full-paid meal prices of $.05 at the elementary and middle level and $.25 at the high school level per fully-paid breakfast and lunch. The motion was seconded by Director Jernigan and carried unanimously.

President Fralick thanked those who electronically attended this meeting.

Adjournment: 8:57 p.m.

Attest: July 20, 2020

Heather Fralick, Board President

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.
SHORELINE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

REGULAR (BUSINESS ONLY) BOARD MEETING

August 3, 2020

TO: Members, Shoreline Board of Directors

ISSUE: X ACTION Approval of 2020-2021 Application for the State Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program (TBIP)--attached

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program (TBIP) funds provide supplemental resources and professional development for service of students identified as English Language Learners (ELLs). TBIP funds also support students that exited the ELL program in 2019 and 2020. In Shoreline, state TBIP funds partially pay for ELL teachers and paraeducator support at the elementary level, supplemented by basic education and levy funding sources. As required by law, TBIP funds are used to supplement already existing programs for ELL students, so salaries for certificated ELL teachers at our secondary sites come from basic education and levy funding sources.

To support current and exited ELLs, teams of classroom teachers and ELL staff regularly review data to determine how to best support students as needed in academic areas. In addition, TBIP funds will be used in 2020-2021, along with other district funds, to support implementation of the Dual Language bilingual program at Briarcrest Elementary.

TBIP funds are determined by the state using a per pupil allocation, calculated based on monthly counts of ELL students and recently exited English learners.

FISCAL IMPACT:

- **CURRENT REVENUE SOURCE:** Predicted TBIP funds for 2020-2021 will be $1,552,524.
- **FUTURE REVENUE SOURCE:**

RECOMMENDED DECISION:

It is the recommendation of the Superintendent that the Board approve the attached application for the State Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program (TBIP) for 2020-2021, as presented.

Report prepared by: Ellen Kaje, Ph.D., Director of Categorical Programs and Academic Support
Recommendations and TBIP Eligible Exited Students

Professional Learning Report (Form 972)

☑ Professional development has been reported. Professional learning must be reported in Form 972 before the TBIP or Title III grant can be approved.

Program Evaluation

Please complete this section with qualitative program features in your evaluation in lieu of the data elements this year. Some examples of qualitative program elements are community outreach, parent engagement, Social Emotional Learning, literacy in the home, multicultural engagement, graduation progress monitoring, language support in mathematics, language support in science, professional development with Since Time Immemorial curriculum, etc.

Do not complete this section if your district is applying for Title III funding independently with FP 232.

- EL Toolkit Ch. 9 - Evaluating the Effectiveness of a District’s EL Program
- Graduation Rates for English Learners / OSPI Report Card

1. What observations did the district make and what trends did the district identify when reviewing the Program components?

   N/A (applying for Title III through FP 232)

2. Based on the district’s most recent program evaluation, what is the district’s plan for continuous improvement of its programs to serve English learners? Describe the modifications that the district will make to its program.

   N/A (applying for Title III through FP 232)
**Exited TBIP Students**

*Section 514 of the Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6052* added funding to provide support to reach grade-level performance in academic subjects for students who transitioned from the TBIP by reaching the proficient level on the state English language proficiency assessment within the two previous years.

1. Describe the **TBIP-funded academic services** that will be provided to students who exited TBIP based on the 2019-20 ELPA21 Annual Assessment and require additional academic support. What information did the district learn from a review of the progress of its exited English learners?

   We were forced to use older data for our annual program review this year, due to the pandemic, which caused a cancellation of state testing, including the ELPA 21 and the SBA. While some of our students were able to participate in the ELPA 21 before the school closure, we have been advised by OSPI not to use the data as an aggregate, while we can still use the data at an individual student level.

   Since our review, as described above, was largely focused on last year’s data, our team came to many of the same conclusions as we did during last year’s review. Based on this review, we see strengths in Math for our exited ELs based on their SBA scores, students in Shoreline out-perform the state at all EL levels.

   In ELA, results are mixed. We see more of our Progressing ELs (14.1%) meeting standard on the SBA than at the state level (8.1%). But 39.3% of our ELs who score Proficient met standard on the SBA, compared with 46.1% at the state level.

   Our transition rate has remained stable over the past three years, 21%, 20% and 19.7% respectively. The state average for exits reported 2018-19 is 14.2%. Our data suggest that we are exiting students at a robust rate, and students are acquiring English.

   We use TBIP funds to conduct ELL data meetings between classroom teachers and ELL teachers for students in grades K-12. These meetings create the opportunity 1) for teachers to look deeply and holistically at the needs of our current and exited ELs students and 2) to make plans to meet these student needs.

   A growth area we identified for our program is our graduation rate for ELs. In 2019, 91.9% of our non-English learners graduated and only 4.7% of non-ELLs dropped out of school. By contrast, in 2019 only 64.6% of English learners graduated and 22.9% of our English learners dropped out. We had seen steady increases in our ELL grad rate from 2015 to 2018 from 59.6% in 2015 to 79.5% in 2018. We are disappointed with that number going down in 2019. Our high school ELL teams will take this into account as they develop their building plans to serve English learners in 2020-21. However, since we have had anywhere between 17 and 34 seniors district wide in any given year, some of this variation is also due to the different needs and circumstances of the particular students in each cohort.

2. What academic supports will the district provide based upon its review?

   As part of our review with parents, we identified the need to support students in their use of native language wherever possible. While we have been intentionally developing biliteracy with
our students in the dual language program, we have not made systematic efforts to support students' use of translanguaging and accessing all their linguistic resources in their learning outside of that program. As a result of this review, we will be focusing our professional development for our EL teachers in 2020-21 in supporting students with translanguaging and their active use of L1.

At the elementary level our ELL teachers implement a collaborative co-teaching model, where they work with teachers to support the language development of ELs in the academic setting to help students succeed.

At middle school, each building team describes their continuum of services for ELs and exited ELs and identifies how these students will have access to rigorous content in a plan annually submitted to the ELL Director.

At high school we implement an ELL cluster model, where we have clusters of about 5-10 English learners and exited ELLs in a general education content area class taught by a highly-qualified teacher with ELL background and/or an ELL endorsement. We continue to see academic gains for these students. We also provide each middle and high school a pot of funds to support ongoing professional development and data sharing among these staff.

Students that speak Spanish are our largest ELL population, as well as the population most likely to be experiencing an achievement gap based on our data even after they exit ELL. To support these students, we use TBIP funds to provide a Spanish-speaking ELL academic coach at each high school, to provide these students ongoing support in meeting graduation requirements.

We will also be continuing to link our professional development efforts around equity, AVID, GLAD and SIOP to support teachers with best instructional practices that support current and former English learners in their academic success.
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District Instructional Program: Bilingual Programs

Two-Way Dual Language Program:

Two-way Dual Language Programs provide literacy and academic instruction in two languages in classrooms with balanced numbers of English learners and native speakers of English. The goals are for students to become bilingual and biliterate in both languages of instruction, attaining high academic achievement in both languages, and sociocultural competence.

Dual Language Programs begin in Kindergarten and continue through 12th grade. Models vary by the percentage of instruction in each language, e.g., 90-10 or 50-50. Students continue in the program for at least 9 years and preferably through high school graduation to develop proficient biliteracy skills.

This is a basic education program. TBIP funds can be used to:

- provide supplemental English language development services and supports to English learners in this program;
- offset additional costs associated with providing more effective programming for English learners;
- provide professional development pertaining to language development for English learners.

NOTE: Current schedules of TBIP eligible students (English learners) must be kept on file indicating the type and amount of English language development services being provided to each student.

1. How many students are served through this model? Students eligible for TBIP are English learners (ELs).

   Number of ELs 46  Number of Non-ELs 65

2. Which schools are implementing this model?

   Briarcrest Elementary School

3. Describe the implementation of the dual language program. Include information on:

   - Languages of instruction;
   - Percentage of time spent teaching in each language by grade level;
How language of instruction time is divided by grade level (e.g. by content area, unit of study, time of day, other?);

Describe biliteracy development, e.g., time allocation for literacy in each language, progress monitoring process and plan for interventions in each language of instruction.

At kindergarten and first grade, we implement an 80/20 instructional model, with all content except for Social/Emotional skills being taught in Spanish. At second, third and fourth grades, we implement a 50/50 instructional model, where half of the content instruction takes place in Spanish and half of the content instruction takes place in English. Specialists will take place in English, because we do not yet have staff available to provide this support in Spanish.

Kindergarten: 80/20
Spanish - 80% of instructional time
Literacy, Math, Science, Social Studies

English – 20% of instructional time
Social/Emotional Skills

First Grade: 80/20
Spanish - 80% of instructional time
Literacy, Math, Science, Social Studies

English – 20% of instructional time
Social/Emotional Skills

Second Grade: 50/50
Spanish - 50% of instructional time
Literacy, Math

English – 50% of instructional time
Literacy, Science, Social Studies

Third Grade: 50/50
Spanish - 50% of instructional time
Literacy, Science, Social Studies

English – 50% of instructional time
Literacy, Math

Fourth Grade: 50/50
Spanish - 50% of instructional time
Literacy, Math

English – 50% of instructional time
Literacy, Science, Social Studies

Biliteracy is developed through literacy instruction in both languages every year. We also include a bridging module within each content area unit to help students see the connections between the languages. Spanish literacy is monitored with Estrellita (K) and the EDL. English literacy is monitored with the DRA.
4. How are TBIP funds used within this program model?

TBIP funds are used for the following components of our Dual Language Program:
- .5 Dual Language Coach
- Additional paraeducator support
- Professional development (along with other funding sources) to support staff in meeting the needs of ELLs in the Dual Language setting
- Supplemental materials (e.g., Spanish library books)

5. Describe the English language development services for eligible ELs and how instruction varies based on the student’s English proficiency level.

English learners receive English language development services through additional para support. Teachers and the ELL para-educator use English language data from the ELPA 21 to inform the ELD services in reading, writing, listening and speaking that will be provided to each student.

One-Way Dual Language Education:

One-way Dual Language Education provides literacy and academic instruction in two languages in classrooms with only English learners. The goals are for students to become bilingual and biliterate in both languages of instruction, attaining high academic achievement in both languages, and sociocultural competence.

Dual Language Education begins in Kindergarten and continues through 12th grade. Models vary by the percentage of instruction in each language, e.g., 90-10 or 50-50. Students continue in the program for at least 9 years and preferably through high school graduation to develop proficient biliteracy skills.

This is a basic education program. TBIP funds can be used to:

- provide supplemental English language development services and supports to English learners in this program
- offset additional costs associated with providing more effective programming for English learners
- provide professional development pertaining to language development for English learners.

**NOTE:** Current schedules of TBIP eligible students (English learners) must be kept on file indicating the type and amount of English language development services being provided to each student.

1. How many students are served through this model? Students eligible for TBIP are English learners (ELs).

| Number of ELs | Number of Exited ELs |

2. Which schools are implementing this model?
3. Describe the implementation of the dual language program. Include information on:

- Languages of instruction;
- Percentage of time spent teaching in each language by grade level;
- How language of instruction time is divided by grade level (e.g. by content area, unit of study, time of day, other?);
- Describe biliteracy development, e.g., time allocation for literacy in each language, progress monitoring process and plan for interventions in each language of instruction.

4. How are TBIP funds used within this program model?

5. Describe the English language development services for eligible ELs and how instruction varies based on the student’s English proficiency level.
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Developmental Bilingual Education (Late-Exit):  

Developmental Bilingual Education Late-Exit Bilingual programs are programs in which instruction is carried out in both English and the student’s native language. All students entering the program are English learners who speak the target language as their primary language. Typically, Late-Exit programs begin in kindergarten or first grade with 90% of instruction occurring in the native language and 10% in English. Instruction in English incrementally increases, while instruction using the native language gradually decreases until there is an equal balance of instruction occurring in both languages. The 50/50 division of instructional time continues through the completion of the program, which is usually in the 6th grade. Students then transition into classrooms in which the instruction is in English.

Developmental Bilingual Programs typically divide native language (L1) and English language (L2) instruction by means of content areas, unit of study, or by instructional time such as class period or day. As with Dual Language programs, students may continue in the Late-Exit program after they exit TBIP on the annual English language proficiency test.
This is a basic education program. TBIP funds can be used to:

- provide supplemental supports to English learners in this program;
- offset additional costs associated with providing more effective programming for eligible English learners;
- provide professional development pertaining to language development for English learners.

**NOTE:** Current schedules of TBIP eligible students (English learners) must be kept on file indicating the type and amount of English language development services being provided to each student.

1. How many students are served through this model? Students eligible for TBIP are English learners (ELs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of ELs</th>
<th>Number of Non-ELs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Which schools are implementing this model?

3. Describe the implementation of the late-exit program. Include information on:

   - Languages of instruction;
   - Percentage of time spent teaching in each language by grade level;
   - How language of instruction time is divided by grade level (e.g., by content area, unit of study, time of day, other?).

4. How are TBIP funds used within this program model?

5. Describe the English language development services for eligible ELs and how instruction varies based on the student’s English proficiency level.

---
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Transitional Bilingual Education (Early-Exit): (WAC 392-160-028) Sec. 2

The purpose of an Early-Exit model is to use the student’s native language as a foundation to support English language development.

Early-Exit models generally begin by initially providing 90% of instruction in the native language and 10% in English, increasing English instruction systematically until all instruction is provided in English. Early-Exit models differ from Late-Exit models in that students move to English-only instruction more quickly, with students generally moving into general education English-only classes within four years.

Early-Exit is the least effective of the bilingual program models and should only be implemented when the district is not able to provide a dual language or late exit model. Students in this model do not receive native language instruction for long enough to achieve biliteracy.

This is a basic education program. TBIP funds can be used to:

- provide supplemental supports to English learners in this program;
- offset additional costs associated with providing more effective programming for eligible English learners;
- provide professional development pertaining to language development for English learners.

NOTE: Current schedules of TBIP eligible students (English learners) must be kept on file indicating the type and amount of English language development services being provided to each student.

1. How many students are served through this model? Students eligible for TBIP are English learners (ELs).

   | Number of ELs | Number of Non-ELs |

2. Which schools are implementing this model?

3. Describe the implementation of the Early-Exit program. Include information on:
   - Languages of instruction;
   - Percentage of time spent teaching in each language by grade level;
   - How language of instruction time is divided by grade level (e.g., by content area, unit of study, time of day, other?).

4. Research has shown that the dual language and late exit program models are more effective than the early exit program model. What factors have prevented the district from implementing a dual language or late exit model?
5. How are TBIP funds used within this program model?

6. Describe the English language development services for eligible ELs and how instruction varies based on the student’s English proficiency level.
District Instructional Program, continued

☑ Alternative Instructional Program (AIP)
   (This section MUST be completed if the district is using the Content-Based/Sheltered Instruction program model or a Pull-out/Push-in program model, or Newcomer program model.)

TBIP’s Legislation on Alternative Instructional Programs

WAC 392-160-006 – An "alternative instructional program" means a program of instruction which may include English as a second language and is designed to enable the student to achieve competency in English. Alternative instructional programs are support systems provided in English-only or English with primary language support.

WAC 392-160-040 – School districts under one or more of the following conditions may elect to provide an alternative instructional program. Which of the following conditions support the district’s decision to provide an alternative instructional program?

☐ Necessary instructional materials in the student’s primary language are unavailable and the district has made reasonable efforts to obtain necessary materials without success. Please explain:

☐ The capacity of the district’s bilingual instructional program is temporarily exceeded by an unexpected increase in the enrollment of eligible students. Please explain:

☐ Bilingual instruction cannot be provide to students without substantially impairing their basic education because of their distribution throughout many grade levels or schools, or both. Please explain:

   Shoreline is providing a Dual Language program in Spanish and English, since Spanish is by far the most common language of our ELL population.

   Shoreline values bilingualism and encourages students to continue to develop literacy in their native languages. For students who speak languages other than Spanish, we do provide an alternative instructional program in English because we do not have enough speakers in any other language to provide a bilingual program.

☐ Teachers who are trained in bilingual education methods and sufficiently skilled in the non-English primary language(s) are unavailable, and the district has made reasonable attempts to obtain the services of such teachers.
Describe the process that the district used to determine that trained bilingual teachers are unavailable. Explain what reasonable attempts the district has made to recruit trained bilingual teachers.

☑️ Content-Based Instruction (CBI) or Sheltered Instruction (SI):

The content-based instruction and sheltered instruction programs are considered to be alternative instruction programs. Please ensure that the preceding Alternative Instructional Program section is completed.

Content-Based Instruction (CBI) integrates English language development with academic content learning using English as the language of instruction. The CBI model is used in classes comprised predominantly of English Language Learners with instruction delivered by teachers specifically trained in the field of second language acquisition and instructional strategies to support both English language development and academic grade-level content. CBI classes can be designed to meet core content credit requirements and/or to serve as language development support classes. District must follow State Certification Requirements for both English language development and content teachers when assigning teachers to provide content-based instruction.

NOTE: Current schedules of TBIP eligible students must be kept on file indicating the type and amount of English language support services being provided to each student.

Describe the district’s implementation of the content-based instruction or sheltered instruction program as it applies to the district.

Elementary Content-Based/Sheltered Instructional Program

1. Estimated number of students to be served:

2. Describe the implementation of the content-based/sheltered instructional program for the 2020-21 school year.

3. Indicate the amount and frequency of service by language proficiency level. Include how this amount and frequency is determined.

4. How does the district ensure that students have meaningful access to academic content in their mainstream classroom? (e.g., placement with EL trained teachers, supplemental materials, etc.)
5. How are TBIP funds used within this program model?

Middle School Content-Based/Sheltered Instruction Program

1. Estimated number of students to be served: 181

2. Describe the implementation of the content-based/sheltered instructional program for the 2020-21 school year.

Middle school in Shoreline will shift from grades 7-8 to grades 6-8 in the 2020-21 school year. ESL/ELL endorsed ELL teachers teach 1-2 ELL classes daily at each of our two middle schools, Einstein and Kellogg. These schools also offer ELL cluster content area classes. The ELL cluster classes have a heterogenous mix of English speakers and ELL students. These courses are taught by content area teachers who are trained in sheltered instruction. An ELA cluster class is co-taught with the ELA teacher and the ELL teacher to provide additional language development support for lower Progressing students. These classes each follow the same syllabus as the mainstream classes, with language development support for ELL students. Cluster content area classes are funded entirely from general education funds. In addition, each middle school also has .2 FTE for an ELL-endorsed Coordinator to support ELLs and recently exited ELLs in content classes.

3. Indicate the amount and frequency of service by language proficiency level. Include how this amount and frequency is determined.

All English learners receive language and content instruction from teachers on the ELL Team who have ELL training and who are supported by the ELL Coordinator, Instructional Coach and the ELL Team to use research-based techniques and strategies to best support rigor with scaffolded support for English learners. In addition ELs at the Emergent level and/or with more intensive language needs receive additional targeted language development support as needed.

ELL students at the Emerging level meet in their ELL class daily. Students at the Progressing level may have ELL support daily or every other day, depending on their schedule.

4. How does the district ensure that students have meaningful access to academic content in their mainstream classroom? (e.g., placement with EL trained teachers, supplemental materials, etc.)

Our two middle schools offer cluster content area classes that are taught by content area teachers who are trained in sheltered instruction. These cluster classes follow the same syllabus as the mainstream classes, with some accommodations for ELL students.

Our district ELL Specialist provides teachers with ongoing professional development in second language acquisition and instructional strategies for ELs.

Classroom teachers also use a built-in intervention time during the school day to provide English learners with additional content support as needed.
5. How are TBIP funds used within this program model?

TBIP funds are used to support ELL teachers, professional development for teachers in strategies to support working with English learners, as well as and planning time for teacher teams to examine data for English learners and exited students and plan for instruction to support language acquisition.

**High School Content-Based/Sheltered Instructional Program**

1. Estimated number of students to be served: 156

2. Describe the implementation of the content-based/sheltered instructional program for the 2020-21 school year.

   In high school, ELL students may be in one or two ELL classes in addition to a variety of ELL cluster classes, such as U.S. History, World History, Biology, Integrated Physical Science, English Language Arts 10 and English Language Arts 11. ELL courses are taught by ELL/ESL endorsed teachers. The ELL cluster classes have a heterogeneous mix of English speakers and ELL students and are taught by content area teachers who are trained in sheltered instruction. Cluster content area classes are funded entirely from general education funds and credit in subject area classes is awarded as earned.

   In addition, each high school also has .2 FTE for an ELL-endorsed Coordinator to support ELLs and recently exited ELLs in content classes.

3. Indicate the amount and frequency of service by language proficiency level. Include how this amount and frequency is determined.

   Emerging English learners receive EL support in a double period that meets daily that develops basic English skills in a language arts context. Emerging English learners also receive academic language development in blended content classes with clusters of English learners (within a heterogeneous class) taught by teachers with expertise in working with ELs. These students are clustered in advisories in which they will be with native language speakers to continue their language development.

   Progressing English learners receive dedicated instructional minutes in academic language development through one or more content classes taught by a teacher with EL expertise in a blended cluster model for ELs and Native English speakers. As needed, progressing English learners receive extra additional language development in reading and writing during advisory in which they are clustered with native language speakers to continue their language development.

4. How does the district ensure that students have meaningful access to academic content in their mainstream classroom? (e.g., placement with EL trained teachers, supplemental materials, etc.)

All ELL students are taught by teachers highly qualified in their academic area. In addition, teachers that teach in ELL cluster classes are also trained in SIOP, GLAD, and/or AVID strategies to support ELL students' access to the content.
Our district ELL Specialist provides teachers with ongoing professional development in second language acquisition and sheltering strategies.

5. How are TBIP funds used within this program model?

TBIP funds are used to support professional development for teachers in strategies to support working with English learners, as well as planning time for teacher teams to examine data for English learners and exited students and plan for instruction to support language acquisition.

6. How does the district ensure that high school students served through this model graduate from high school college-and-career-ready? Resource: High-Leverage Principles of Effective Instruction for English Learners.

Meeting the needs of all English learners starts with our ELL intake process. When a new middle or high school English learner arrives, we not only test each student using ELPA21 screener for English proficiency, we also test each student’s math and literacy abilities to help ensure we get each student what s/he needs. We conduct an interview with an interpreter with each new English learner and his/her family upon entry to help us learn about his/her school history, journey to the US, academic goals, and personal interests. Our goal is to identify a non-academic activity (sport, club, music, etc.) that we can connect each new English learner with as well as creating an appropriate and rigorous academic schedule.

Each middle and high school develops a plan annually to support the linguistic and academic progression of their English learners as well as making plans to support students through graduation. These plans are developed by administrators and teachers and submitted to the ELL director. Below each school has articulated how they will ensure the graduation of their upcoming seniors. Both schools will have one counselor designated to work with English learners to streamline communication with students and families.

Shorecrest High School: Students will have at least quarterly check in’s with the ELL Support team and ELL Academic Coach. Students will be the focus of our monthly “KidTalks”.

Shorewood High School:
* ELL Counselor coordinates with College and Career Coordinator to support ELL students’ post-high school planning and preparation
* All seniors have one to three 1-1 meeting/s with counselor
* Involve interpreters in counselor/parent meetings
* Use info from ELL intake process to help establish ongoing relationships with students

Alternative School or Digital Learning Program Content-Based/Sheltered Instruction

1. Estimated number of students to be served:

2. Describe the implementation of the content-based/sheltered instructional program for the 2020-21 school year.
3. Indicate the amount and frequency of service by language proficiency level. Include how this amount and frequency is determined.

4. How does the district ensure that students have meaningful access to academic content in their mainstream classroom? (e.g., placement with EL trained teachers, supplemental materials, etc.)

5. List supplemental instructional supports (FTE) and language development materials that are funded through TBIP in this program model. These supports must be provided exclusively to TBIP-eligible students. (If no TBIP funds are used, enter NA.)

6. How does the district ensure that high school students served through this model graduate from high school college-and-career-ready? Resource: [High-Leverage Principles of Effective Instruction for English Learners](#).

---

**Open Doors [1418] Youth Reengagement Program**

1. Does your district have an Open Doors program?

2. Describe the implementation of the content-based/sheltered instructional program for the 2020-21 school year.

3. Indicate the amount and frequency of service by language proficiency level. Include how this amount and frequency is determined.

4. How does the district ensure that students have meaningful access to academic content in their mainstream classroom? (e.g., placement with EL trained teachers, supplemental materials, etc.)
5. List supplemental instructional supports (FTE) and language development materials that are funded through TBIP in this program model. These supports must be provided exclusively to TBIP-eligible students. (If no TBIP funds are used, enter NA.)

6. What strategies does the district ensure that high school students served through this model graduate from high school college-and-career-ready? Resource: High-Leverage Principles of Effective Instruction for English Learners.

**Juvenile Rehabilitation Center, Juvenile Detention Facility, or Institutional Education Facility**

1. Does your district have an institutional education facility? If so, please respond to the prompts below:

2. Describe the implementation of the content-based/sheltered instructional program for the 2020-21 school year.

3. Indicate the amount and frequency of service by language proficiency level. Include how this amount and frequency is determined.

4. How does the district ensure that students have meaningful access to academic content in their mainstream classroom? (e.g., placement with EL trained teachers, supplemental materials, etc.)

5. List supplemental instructional supports (FTE) and language development materials that are funded through TBIP in this program model. These supports must be provided exclusively to TBIP-eligible students. (If no TBIP funds are used, enter NA.)

6. What strategies does the district ensure that high school students served through this model graduate from high school college-and-career-ready? Resource: High-Leverage Principles of Effective Instruction for English Learners.
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District Instructional Program, continued

☑ Supportive Mainstream:

This is an alternative instructional program. Please ensure that the Alternative Instructional Program section is completed.

Consistent, focused, and effective language development instruction is provided through ELL pull-out/push-in instruction or through small group work with the classroom teacher. Language instruction is delivered in English by teachers who have been specifically trained in the field of second language acquisition and strategies. Instruction may occur either individually or in small groups within the mainstream classroom (Push-in) or separate from the mainstream classroom (Pull-out) with the focus of supporting English language development.

Students in this model access grade-level academic content through participation in their mainstream classrooms. It is therefore imperative that districts employing this model ensure that sufficient time and resources are allocated for professional development of classroom teachers who will be responsible for providing access to grade-level curriculum for the English language learners in their classrooms.

**NOTE:** Current schedules of TBIP eligible students must be kept on file indicating the type and amount of English language support services being provided to each student.

**Supportive Mainstream: Elementary**

1. Estimated number of students to be served: 499

2. Describe the instructional support for the 2020-21 school year.

   Shoreline’s Collaborative ELL model is implemented by ELL-endorsed certificated teachers, with support from ELL paraeducators at buildings with higher numbers of English learners. Collaboration and communication between classroom teachers and ELL teachers is paramount to the English language development of our English learners. Each building submits an ELL building plan to the program director, which articulates regular opportunities when ELL and classroom teachers examine data for ELL students (oral language, literacy, and academic language) and discuss appropriate instruction and professional development needs. Research based instructional practices (including GLAD strategies) are used, with ELL teachers collaborating and co-teaching with classroom teachers to support ELLs, as well as embedded professional development as needed.

3. Indicate the amount and frequency of elementary supportive mainstream instruction by language proficiency level.
Eligible ELL students receive support through the collaborative and co-teaching model, which may include academic language development and vocabulary support delivered by either the classroom teacher or the ELL teacher.

The minimum amount of English Language Development instruction is an average of 50 minutes per week, though the distribution of this time will vary by classroom.

Based on assessment data, students may also receive additional pullout or push-in language support and/or support through Imagine Language and Literacy (ILL) as needed.

4. How does the district ensure that students have meaningful access to academic content in their mainstream classroom? (e.g., placement with EL trained teachers, supplemental materials, etc.)

ELL students have access to the same content as all students, through both in-class and limited pullout instructional support as needed. Materials are age appropriate and address the various proficiency levels, including Text Talk and Frames for Fluency. Supplemental materials for ELL students also include Imagine Language and Literacy, a computer-adaptive language and literacy program.

We have more than 150 of the elementary classroom teachers in Shoreline who have completed Tier I GLAD training. We also have 4 in-district GLAD trainers to support GLAD strategies. Classroom teachers use these strategies as a key part of our collaborative ELL model, in conjunction with the support of the ELL staff. In addition, one of the three Science Kits for each grade, K-6, comes to teachers with GLAD materials included.

5. How are TBIP funds used within this program model?

TBIP funds are used to support supplementary materials, elementary ELL teachers and para-educators, as well as professional development of teaching staff in meeting the needs of English learners.

Supportive Mainstream: Middle School

1. Estimated number of students to be served:

2. Describe the instructional support for the 2020-21 school year.

3. Indicate the amount and frequency of middle school supportive mainstream instruction by language proficiency level.

4. How does the district ensure that students have meaningful access to academic content in their mainstream classroom? (e.g., placement with EL trained teachers, supplemental materials, etc.)
5. How are TBIP funds used within this program model?

**Supportive Mainstream: High School**

1. Estimated number of students to be served:

2. Describe the instructional support for the 2020-21 school year.

3. Indicate the amount and frequency of high school supportive mainstream instruction by language proficiency level.

4. How does the district ensure that students have meaningful access to academic content in their mainstream classroom? (e.g., placement with EL trained teachers, supplemental materials, etc.)

5. How are TBIP funds used within this program model?

6. How does the district ensure that high school students served through this model graduate from high school college-and-career-ready? Resource: [High-Leverage Principles of Effective Instruction for English Learners](#).

**Supportive Mainstream: Alternative School or Digital Learning Program**

1. Estimated number of students to be served:

2. Describe the instructional support for the 2020-21 school year.

3. Indicate the amount and frequency of supportive mainstream instruction by language proficiency level.
4. How does the district ensure that students have meaningful access to academic content in their mainstream classroom? (e.g., placement with EL trained teachers, supplemental materials, etc.)

5. How are TBIP funds used within this program model?

6. How does the district ensure that high school students served through this model graduate from high school college-and-career-ready? Resource: High-Leverage Principles of Effective Instruction for English Learners.

Open Doors [1418] Youth Reengagement Program

1. Does your district have an Open Doors Program? If so, please respond to the prompts below:

2. Describe the implementation of the instructional program for the 2020-21 school year.

3. Indicate the amount and frequency of service by language proficiency level. Include how this amount and frequency is determined.

4. How does the district ensure that students have meaningful access to academic content in their mainstream classroom? (e.g., placement with EL trained teachers, supplemental materials, etc.)

5. List supplemental instructional supports (FTE) and language development materials that are funded through TBIP in this program model. These supports must be provided exclusively to TBIP-eligible students. (If no TBIP funds are used, enter NA.)
6. What strategies does the district ensure that high school students served through this model graduate from high school college-and-career-ready? Resource: High-Leverage Principles of Effective Instruction for English Learners.

Juvenile Rehabilitation Center, Juvenile Detention Facility, or Institutional Education Facility

1. Estimated number of students to be served:

2. Describe the implementation of the instructional program for the 2020-21 school year.

3. Indicate the amount and frequency of service by language proficiency level. Include how this amount and frequency is determined.

4. How does the district ensure that students have meaningful access to academic content in their mainstream classroom? (e.g., placement with EL trained teachers, supplemental materials, etc.)

5. List supplemental instructional supports (FTE) and language development materials that are funded through TBIP in this program model. These supports must be provided exclusively to TBIP-eligible students. (If no TBIP funds are used, enter NA.)

6. What strategies does the district ensure that high school students served through this model graduate from high school college-and-career-ready? Resource: High-Leverage Principles of Effective Instruction for English Learners.

FOR OSPI USE ONLY

Section approved: Select

Comments:
Program Model

**Newcomer Program:**  (WAC 392-160-028 Sec. 2)

Newcomer Programs are considered a separate group and are not required to meet the criteria for an alternative instructional program (AIP).

Newcomer Programs provide specialized instruction to beginning level English language learners who have newly immigrated to the United States and are especially useful for districts with large numbers of students with limited or interrupted formal education who may have low literacy in their native language. Districts must establish clear criteria for when students are to move out of the Newcomer Program and into the regular TBIP program offered by the district. Such criteria should be based on a combination of English language ability and length of time in the Newcomer Program. Individual student factors should also be considered regarding a student’s preparedness to receive services through another program model. Program length is typically one semester to one year for most students.

The amount of time that students spend in a Newcomer Program varies both in daily schedule and program length depending on the particular district model. Districts must establish clear criteria for when students are to move out of the Newcomer Program and into the regular English language development program. Such criteria should be based on a combination of English language ability and length of time in the Newcomer Program. Individual student factors should also be considered regarding a student’s preparedness to receive services through another program model. Program length is typically one semester to one year, but may be more or less time depending on individual student needs.

**Resource:** Newcomer Tool Kit

**NOTE:** Newcomer Programs should never constitute the entire English language development (ELD) program for any district, but should serve only as a foundation for students to move into the regular district TBIP program.

Current schedules of TBIP eligible students must be kept on file indicating the type and amount of English language support services being provided to each student.

1. Estimated number of students to be served

2. Entry Criteria:

3. Location:
4. Grade Levels:

5. Describe how the Newcomer program will be implemented. Include the number of hours per day.

6. Describe the criteria used to determine when students move from the Newcomer Program to another TBIP program model in the district.

7. How are TBIP funds used with this program model?

FOR OSPI USE ONLY

Program Model Section approved: 
Comments:
Teacher/Trainer/Coach Qualifications

☑ Staff Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate of staff funded through TBIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraeducators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Trainor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL Coach(es)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For "Other" indicate job titles and description of duties funded through TBIP:

Certificated Teaching Staff

1. How is the district recruiting educators with Bilingual Education or English Language Learner endorsements to serve English learners?

   All ELL teachers have ELL/ESL endorsements.

2. How is the district meeting the endorsement requirement for TBIP funding as outlined in RCW 28A.180.040 and effective September 1, 2019?

   We are continuing to hire only teachers endorsed in ELL and/or Bilingual Education for positions funded out of TBIP.

Staff hired as Professional Development Trainers and/or EL Coaches must have the experience and qualifications in the following areas:

- Instructional Strategies for EL;
• Second Language Acquisition;
• Understanding and implementing ELP standards;
• Alignment of curriculum to ELP standards

(Do not include outside consultants in this section.)

1. Describe Professional Development Trainer's qualifications, experience, and areas of training that will be provided. Fill this out ONLY if the position is funded through TBIP.

QUALIFICATIONS (Dual Language Coach):
• Current/valid WA State Teaching Certification.
• ELL/ESL and/or Bilingual Endorsement.
• Fluency in Spanish.
• Successful teaching experience in a Spanish Dual Language Program.
• Possesses instructional expertise in second language acquisition, curriculum.

2. Describe EL Coach’s qualifications, experience, and support that will be provided to teachers ONLY if funded through this grant.

JOB QUALIFICATIONS - District ELL Specialist
• Currently contracted Shoreline teacher
• ELL/ESL endorsement
• Three, or more, years of teaching experience
• Ability to articulate and implement the Common Core State Standards and English Language Proficiency Standards
• Leadership in establishing and implementing curriculum, assessment, and intervention systems
• Skill in setting high standards for all students and modifying curriculum for English language learners
• Clear understanding of current national, state, and local education initiatives (including RtI, GLAD and SIOP)
• Knowledge of current research related to effective instructional strategies, assessments, and interventions
• Ability to organize tasks, structure time, and manage multiple priorities
• Skill in group facilitation and providing professional development for peers
• Understand the role of central district leadership in relation to site-based system of schools
• Ability to work cooperatively and creatively as a member of the instructional leadership team
• Effective written and oral communication skills
• Skill in collaborative consultation and problem solving
• Awareness and sensitivity to diversity issues and concerns
• Ability to model lessons and coach teachers

FOR OSPI USE ONLY

Section approved:

Comments:
District’s Professional Development Plan to address the needs of ELs: Professional development specific to addressing the language acquisition needs of ELs is a requirement for TBIP funding.  (WAC 392-160-028, Sec. 3)

3. Describe the professional development plan for staff responsible for providing the English language development services indicated in this application.

   In order to prepare staff responsible for providing services to ELL students, our professional development for the 2020-21 school year will focus on:
   - Continued implementation of co-teaching at the elementary and middle school levels,
   - Ongoing training of ELL staff in use of the English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards,
   - Supporting elementary ELLs within the content areas (GLAD),
   - Support for ELLs at the secondary level (SIOP/AVID),
   - ELL assessment (ELPA 21 training),
   - K-12 ELL training in translanguaging and use of first language in English-speaking classrooms,
   - Conference attendance and professional development in implementation of an effective Dual Language Program

4. Describe the district’s plan to build the capacity of general education staff to provide meaningful access to content instruction to English learners.

   In order to support general education staff in their work with English learners, our professional development for these staff will focus on:
   - Co-teaching (elementary and middle school),
   - Supporting elementary ELLs within the content areas (GLAD),
   - Support for ELLs at the secondary level (AVID/SIOP),
   - K-12 ELL training in translanguaging and use of first language in English-speaking classrooms,
   - Conference attendance and professional development in implementation of an effective Dual Language Program

---

**FOR OSPI USE ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section approved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Professional Development Activities:

☑ All of the district’s professional development activities listed in this application funded through TBIP/Title III funding comply with the following requirements:

   The district’s professional development plan will prepare teachers, administrators, counselors, and others involved in language instruction educational programs to:

   - Improve the English language development instruction, meaningful access to content
instruction, and assessment of English learners; and

- Enhance educators’ ability to understand and use curricula, assessment measures, and instructional strategies specific to English learners.

**Professional development will be:**

- Evidence-based and specific to the instructional needs of English learners.

- Of sufficient intensity and duration to have a positive and lasting impact on teachers’ performance in the classroom.

- One-day or short-term workshops and conferences, must be a component of an established comprehensive professional development program for teachers.

**Professional Learning Trainings**

Complete this table for each training listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Title</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELPA 21 Training</td>
<td>Melissa Sargent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Training Description**
Annual training for all staff administering the ELPA 21 test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Funding Source &amp; Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream/content teachers</td>
<td>□ Instructional Strategies for EL</td>
<td>TBIP: 100.00 % OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL certificated staff</td>
<td>□ Understanding and implementing EL assessments</td>
<td>Amt:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>□ Understanding and implementing ELP standards - Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL program director</td>
<td>□ Alignment of curriculum to ELP standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrators</td>
<td>□ Content area understanding for bilingual/ESL teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraeducators</td>
<td>□ Other (must be specific to ELD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other School Personnel/Non-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participants**  
- Mainstream/content teachers
- EL certificated staff
- Principals
- EL program director
- Other Administrators
- Paraeducators
- Counselors
- Community-based Organization Personnel
- Other School Personnel/Non-administrative
- Support Staff
- Other

**Focus**
- Instructional Strategies for EL
- Understanding and implementing EL assessments
- Understanding and implementing ELP standards - Required
- Alignment of curriculum to ELP standards
- Content area understanding for bilingual/ESL teachers
- Other (must be specific to ELD)

**Funding Source & Amount**
- TBIP: 100.00 % OR
- Amt:
- Title III: % OR
- Amt:

**REMEMBER:** Allow SAVE to complete before hitting the **NEW** button again.
### Use of ELPs for ELs

**Presenter:** Melissa Sargent

**Training Description:**
Training for ELL staff in using the ELPs to plan for instruction and assessment of learning for ELL students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Funding Source &amp; Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream/content teachers</td>
<td>✔ Instructional Strategies for EL</td>
<td>TBIP: 50.00% OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ EL certificated staff</td>
<td>✔ Understanding and implementing EL assessments</td>
<td>Amt:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>✔ Understanding and implementing ELP standards - Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL program director</td>
<td>✔ Alignment of curriculum to ELP standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrators</td>
<td>✔ Content area understanding for bilingual/ESL teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraeducators</td>
<td>✔ Other (must be specific to ELD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based Organization Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other School Personnel/Non-administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Source & Amount:**
- TBIP: 50.00% OR
- Title III: 50.00% OR

**Schedule:** Ongoing

**Participants:**
- Mainstream/content teachers
- EL certificated staff
- Principals
- EL program director
- Other Administrators
- Paraeducators
- Counselors
- Community-based Organization Personnel
- Other School Personnel/Non-administrative
- Support Staff
- Other

**Focus:**
- Instructional Strategies for EL
- Understanding and implementing EL assessments
- Understanding and implementing ELP standards - Required
- Alignment of curriculum to ELP standards
- Content area understanding for bilingual/ESL teachers
- Other (must be specific to ELD)

### Dual Language and Biliteracy Development

**Presenter:** TBD

**Training Description:**
Ongoing training with dual language teachers in the key components implementation of a research-based Dual Language program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Funding Source &amp; Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ Mainstream/content teachers</td>
<td>✔ Instructional Strategies for EL</td>
<td>TBIP: 100.00% OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ EL certificated staff</td>
<td>✔ Understanding and implementing EL assessments</td>
<td>Amt:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>✔ Understanding and implementing ELP standards - Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL program director</td>
<td>✔ Alignment of curriculum to ELP standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrators</td>
<td>✔ Content area understanding for bilingual/ESL teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraeducators</td>
<td>✔ Other (must be specific to ELD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based Organization Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other School Personnel/Non-administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Source & Amount:**
- TBIP: 100.00% OR
- Title III: % OR
- Amt:
### GLAD Refresher Training

**Presenter:** Melissa Sargent, Sally Thomas, Sheryl Lundahl

**Training Description:**
Refresher training for GLAD-trained staff to hone their skills and further apply GLAD strategies to their classroom instruction for multilingual learners.

**Schedule:** 2020-21 TBD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Funding Source &amp; Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Mainstream/content teachers</td>
<td>- Instructional Strategies for EL</td>
<td>- TBIP: 75.00 % OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EL certificated staff</td>
<td>- Understanding and implementing EL assessments</td>
<td>Amt:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Principals</td>
<td>- Understanding and implementing ELP standards - Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EL program director</td>
<td>- Alignment of curriculum to ELP standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other Administrators</td>
<td>- Content area understanding for bilingual/ESL teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Paraeducators</td>
<td>- Other (must be specific to ELD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community-based Organization Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other School Personnel/Non-administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Workshop: Pathways for SIFE Reading and Writing

**Presenter:** Annie Smith

**Training Description:**
Training for middle and high school ELL teachers in working with multilingual learners with limited formal education.

**Schedule:** August-October 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Funding Source &amp; Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Title III: 25.00 % OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amt:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**REMEMBER:** Allow SAVE to complete before hitting the NEW button again.
### Training Title
Teaching for Biliteracy

### Training Description
Training for dual language staff around the development of biliteracy and dual language curriculum design based on standards.

### Participants
- Mainstream/content teachers
- EL certificated staff
- Principals
- EL program director
- Other Administrators
- Paraeducators
- Counselors
- Community-based Organization Personnel
- Other School Personnel/Non-administrative
- Support Staff
- Other

### Focus
- Instructional Strategies for EL
- Understanding and implementing EL assessments
- Understanding and implementing ELP standards - Required
- Alignment of curriculum to ELP standards
- Content area understanding for bilingual/ESL teachers
- Other (must be specific to ELD)

### Funding Source & Amount
- TBIP: 100.00% OR
  - Amt:
- Title III: % OR
  - Amt:

**REMEMBER:** Allow SAVE to complete before hitting the NEW button again.

---

### Conferences
Complete this table for each conference listed.

Press "NEW" button to create each new conference listing. Press SAVE after completing each record. Allow SAVE to complete before clicking the "NEW" button again.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Title</th>
<th>Number to Attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WABE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe connection to district EL PD Plan
Access for ELL staff to support in implementation of co-teaching, ELL instructional strategies (GLAD and SIOP) ELP standards, and bilingual program implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Funding Source &amp; Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✅ Mainstream/content teachers</td>
<td>✅ Instructional Strategies for EL</td>
<td>☑ TBIP: 50.00 % OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ EL certificated staff</td>
<td>✅ Understanding and implementing EL assessments</td>
<td>Amt:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Principals</td>
<td>✅ Understanding and implementing ELP standards - Required</td>
<td>☑ Title III: 50.00 % OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ EL program director</td>
<td>☑ Alignment of curriculum to ELP standards</td>
<td>Amt:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Other Administrators</td>
<td>☑ Content area understanding for bilingual/ESL teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Paraeducators</td>
<td>✅ Other (must be specific to ELD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Community-based Organization Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Other School Personnel/Non-administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REMEMBER: Allow SAVE to complete before hitting the NEW button again.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Title</th>
<th>Number to Attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Cosecha</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe connection to district EL PD Plan
Administrators, teachers, and coaches will learn about how to design and implement an effective Dual language program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Funding Source &amp; Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✅ Mainstream/content teachers</td>
<td>✅ Instructional Strategies for EL</td>
<td>☑ TBIP: 50.00 % OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ EL certificated staff</td>
<td>✅ Understanding and implementing EL assessments</td>
<td>Amt:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Principals</td>
<td>✅ Understanding and implementing ELP standards - Required</td>
<td>☑ Title III: 50.00 % OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ EL program director</td>
<td>☑ Alignment of curriculum to ELP standards</td>
<td>Amt:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Other Administrators</td>
<td>☑ Content area understanding for bilingual/ESL teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Paraeducators</td>
<td>✅ Other (must be specific to ELD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Community-based Organization Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Other School Personnel/Non-administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. How does the district ensure professional learning provided through TBIP and Title III is implemented? Describe the follow-up support provided to teachers.

At the district level, our ELL Specialist is 1.0 FTE (.5 TBIP and .5 Title III), so she can provide ongoing support to general ed and ELL paraeducators, teachers, and administrators district wide. In addition, the district ELL program director provides ongoing support for administrators and teachers in ELL pedagogy and best practice.

Each spring our Title III advisory reviews the professional development that has been offered alongside ELL student outcome data, including ELPA21, SBA and local district assessments. In May 2019, our Title III/ELL advisory identified a gap in math performance at the secondary level between students who have exited the ELL program and native English speakers. The advisory recommended a district professional development focus around math discourse to be embedded within training new math adoption to increase academic language development for both our current and exited English learners.
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Section approved:

Comments:
# RECONCILIATION OF WARRANTS ISSUED
## FOR THE PERIOD OF July 1, 2020 - July 31, 2020
### GENERAL FUND - PAYROLL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Warrants 447069 - 447102</td>
<td>July 31, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Transfers</td>
<td>July 31, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PR/AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,872,973.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DD/Tax/Ret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11,376,857.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PAYROLL</strong></td>
<td>$13,249,831.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of August 3, 2020, the Board, by a ________________ vote, does approve for payment the monthly payroll as listed above.

Secretary __________________________ Board Member __________________________

Board Member ________________________ Board Member ________________________

Board Member ________________________ Board Member ________________________

Signature of Auditing Officer __________________________ Date ___________
Management Voucher Review __________________________ Date ___________
RECONCILIATION OF WARRANTS ISSUED
JULY 24, 2020

GENERAL FUND
Warrant Numbers: 86456-86558
192001273-192001309

ACCOUNTS PAYABLE
July 24, 2020 $414,509.02
July 24, 2020 $4,952.98 ACH Reimb

GENERAL FUND TOTAL $419,462.00

CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND
Warrant Numbers: 86559-86577

ACCOUNTS PAYABLE
July 24, 2020 $807,258.22

CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND TOTAL $807,258.22

STUDENT BODY FUND
Warrant Numbers: 86578-86584

ACCOUNTS PAYABLE
July 24, 2020 $4,153.51

STUDENT BODY FUND TOTAL $4,153.51

TOTAL WARRANTS ISSUED $1,230,873.73
WARRANT REGISTER – CLAIMS

CERTIFICATION

I, the undersigned do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the materials have been furnished, the services rendered or the labor performed as described herein, and that the claims are just, due and unpaid obligations against the Shoreline School District, and that I am authorized to authenticate and certify to said claims.

General Fund $414,509.02 Check Number 86456-86558
$4,952.98 ACH 192001273-192001309

Capital Projects $807,258.22 Check Number 86559-86577

ASB Fund $4,153.51 Check Number 86578-86584

Check Date: July 24, 2020

Signature of Auditing Officer ___________________________ 7/23/2020 Date
The following vouchers, as audited and certified by the Auditing Officer as required by RCW 42.24.080, and those expense reimbursement claims certified as required by RCW 42.24.090, are approved for payment. Those payments have been recorded on this listing which has been made available to the board.

As of August 3, 2020, the board, by a __________________________ vote, approves payments, totaling $1,225,920.75. The payments are further identified in this document.

Total by Payment Type for Cash Account, U.S. Bank Warrants: Warrant Numbers 86456 through 86584, totaling $1,225,920.75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secretary</th>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Board Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Board Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check Nbr</th>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Check Date</th>
<th>Check Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86456</td>
<td>#SHORELINE-REVOLVING FUND LLC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>2,316.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86457</td>
<td>A-ONE MEDICAL SERVICES</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>4,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86458</td>
<td>AIRGAS USA, LLC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86459</td>
<td>Alattal, Areen</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86460</td>
<td>ALEXANDER, DEVON</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86461</td>
<td>AMERICAN PRINTING</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>694.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86462</td>
<td>Ammerman, Marie</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86463</td>
<td>APPLE COMPUTER INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>3,863.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86464</td>
<td>ARTIST &amp; CRAFTSMAN SUPPLY</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>199.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86465</td>
<td>B&amp;H PHOTO-VIDEO</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>28,278.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86466</td>
<td>BANK OF AMERICA</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>11,232.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86467</td>
<td>BOUND TO STAY BOUND BOOKS INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>762.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86468</td>
<td>BSN SPORTS</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>2,389.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86469</td>
<td>CDW GOVERNMENT INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>283.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86470</td>
<td>CITY OF SEATTLE</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>10,646.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86471</td>
<td>CITY WIDE FENCE CO</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>71.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86472</td>
<td>COLE INDUSTRIAL INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>747.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86473</td>
<td>COLLEGE BOARD</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>258.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86474</td>
<td>Cross, Michael</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86475</td>
<td>DYNAMIC LANGUAGE CENTER INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>311.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86476</td>
<td>EB BRADLEY CO</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>1,234.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86477</td>
<td>EDMONDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>20,640.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86478</td>
<td>EDMONDS SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>100,376.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86479</td>
<td>EPS LITERACY &amp; INTERVENTION</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86480</td>
<td>EVERETT COMM COLL CASHIER A/R</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>9,753.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86481</td>
<td>FASTSIGNS</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>277.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86482</td>
<td>FEDERAL EXPRESS CORPORATION</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>24.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86483</td>
<td>FIRE MOUNTAIN GEMS &amp; BEADS</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>499.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86484</td>
<td>FIRST CHOICE HEALTH NETWORK IN</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>2,538.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86485</td>
<td>FLINN SCIENTIFIC INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>2,407.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86486</td>
<td>FOLLETT SCHOOL SOLUTIONS, INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>3,916.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86487</td>
<td>GLAZERS CAMERA SUPPLY-ATTN A/R</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>1,913.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86488</td>
<td>Gleason, Jessica</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Nbr</td>
<td>Vendor Name</td>
<td>Check Date</td>
<td>Check Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86489</td>
<td>GOLDEN BOW GIFTS &amp; FLOWERS</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>707.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86490</td>
<td>Gray, Indre</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86491</td>
<td>GRIFFIN COMMERCIAL PARTS INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>168.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86492</td>
<td>Hafiz, Tracey</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86493</td>
<td>Ham, Young-Ji</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86494</td>
<td>Harrington, Peter</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>185.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86495</td>
<td>Herberg, Michael</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86496</td>
<td>Hoang, Nicole</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>18.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86497</td>
<td>Jacobs, Martie</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86498</td>
<td>KAISER PERMANENETE</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86499</td>
<td>KCDA</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>10,172.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86500</td>
<td>KELLEY CONNECT</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>1,441.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86501</td>
<td>KING COUNTY FINANCE</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>53.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86502</td>
<td>Ku, Jinyoung</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>92.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86503</td>
<td>LANGUAGE LINE SERVICES INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>1,053.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86504</td>
<td>LES SCHWAB TIRES</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>1,045.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86505</td>
<td>Lorck, Anne Marie</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>185.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86506</td>
<td>MacKenzie, Karen</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>42.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86507</td>
<td>Mahler, Steven</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86508</td>
<td>Mahoskey, Jr., Bill</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86509</td>
<td>Mathias, Natasha</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>185.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86510</td>
<td>MICHIGAN BRAILLE TRANSCRIBING</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>297.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86511</td>
<td>MICRO COMPUTER SYSTEMS INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>307.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86512</td>
<td>MITCHELL, MAK</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>1,816.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86513</td>
<td>MORNINGSIDE ACADEMY</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>7,424.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86514</td>
<td>MY BINDING</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86515</td>
<td>Nakayama, Keiko</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>86.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86516</td>
<td>NORTHWEST TECHNICAL PRODUCTS I</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>6,264.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86517</td>
<td>NW EDUCATIONAL SERVICE DISTRIC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>37,197.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86518</td>
<td>NW SCHOOL DEAF and HARD-of-HEA</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>4,135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86519</td>
<td>NW TEXTBOOK</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>3,042.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86520</td>
<td>OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH CENTERS OF</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>6,264.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86521</td>
<td>OFFICE DEPOT BUS SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>779.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86522</td>
<td>OGDEN RESOURCE CENTER</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>1,718.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86523</td>
<td>OREILLY AUTO PARTS</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>675.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86524</td>
<td>OVERLAKE SPECIALITY SCHOOL</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>45,220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86525</td>
<td>PACIFIC LEARNING CENTER NW</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86526</td>
<td>PACIFIC OFFICE AUTOMATION INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>1,102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86527</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>1,253.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86528</td>
<td>PREPARESMART LLC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>352.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86529</td>
<td>PUBLIC CONSULTING GROUP, INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>24.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86530</td>
<td>Vendor Continued Check</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86531</td>
<td>RECOLOGY CLEANSCAPES</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>8,622.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86532</td>
<td>REHABMART LLC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>1,228.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86533</td>
<td>REPUBLIC SERVICES</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>490.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86534</td>
<td>RIDDELL ALL AMERICAN</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>11,865.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86535</td>
<td>RIO GRANDE</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>1,814.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86536</td>
<td>RONALD WASTEWATER DISTRICT</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>6,802.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86537</td>
<td>ROSEN PUBLISHING GROUP INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>2,380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86538</td>
<td>Russakoff, Wyndi</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>93.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Nbr</td>
<td>Vendor Name</td>
<td>Check Date</td>
<td>Check Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86539</td>
<td>RWC GROUP</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>462.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86540</td>
<td>SAGE PUBLICATIONS INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>923.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86541</td>
<td>SCHOLASTIC BOOK FAIRS-8</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>3,123.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86542</td>
<td>SCHOLASTIC INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>9,994.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86543</td>
<td>SEATTLE CITY LIGHT</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>246.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86544</td>
<td>SEATTLE WATER DEPT</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>324.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86545</td>
<td>SHORELINE-ASB FUND</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86546</td>
<td>SOUND MUSIC PUBLICATIONS</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>224.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86547</td>
<td>THE HOME DEPOT PRO</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>2,505.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86548</td>
<td>THE READING LEAGUE INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>115.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86549</td>
<td>US FOODS</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>4,426.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86550</td>
<td>VERNIER SOFTWARE AND TECHNOLOG</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>7,800.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86551</td>
<td>WA ST DEPT OF REV LEASEHOLD TA</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>418.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86552</td>
<td>WA-ACTE</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86553</td>
<td>WASBO</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86554</td>
<td>WASTE MANAGEMENT OF WA HEALTHC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>24.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86555</td>
<td>WESCO DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>1,260.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86556</td>
<td>Wolfe, Lauren</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86557</td>
<td>WSIPC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>994.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86558</td>
<td>YELLOW WOOD ACADEMY</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>2,123.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86559</td>
<td>AMAZON CAPITAL SERVICES</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>279.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86560</td>
<td>APPLE COMPUTER INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>13,735.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86561</td>
<td>ASSOCIATED EARTH SCIENCES INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>5,684.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86562</td>
<td>BNBUILDERS INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>592,911.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86563</td>
<td>BUILDERS EXCHANGE</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>68.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86564</td>
<td>CDW GOVERNMENT INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>8,713.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86565</td>
<td>DLR GROUP INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>16,236.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86566</td>
<td>FLINN SCIENTIFIC INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>3,159.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86567</td>
<td>KCDA</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>29,901.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86568</td>
<td>LONG BUILDING TECHNOLOGIES INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>112,847.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86569</td>
<td>MAHLUM ARCHITECTS INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>437.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86570</td>
<td>MAYES TESTING ENGINEERING INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>2,185.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86571</td>
<td>MICRO COMPUTER SYSTEMS INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>1,961.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86572</td>
<td>MONOPRICE INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>3,417.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86573</td>
<td>MURRAYSMITH INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>3,614.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86574</td>
<td>PBS ENGINEERING &amp; ENV INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>3,725.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86575</td>
<td>WA ST DEPT OF REV LEASEHOLD TA</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>1,621.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86576</td>
<td>WELSH COMMISSIONING GROUP INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>3,619.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86577</td>
<td>WETHERHOLT &amp; ASSOCIATES INC</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>3,141.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86578</td>
<td>BANK OF AMERICA</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86579</td>
<td>Bayless, Carrie</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86580</td>
<td>Bradford, Diane</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86581</td>
<td>DISPLAY &amp; COSTUME SUPPLY</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>106.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86582</td>
<td>Goracke, Marya</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86583</td>
<td>Hovland, Jocelyn</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86584</td>
<td>RISAN ATHLETICS</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>3,886.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

129 Computer Check(s) For a Total of 1,225,920.75
The following vouchers, as audited and certified by the Auditing Officer as required by RCW 42.24.080, and those expense reimbursement claims certified as required by RCW 42.24.090, are approved for payment. Those payments have been recorded on this listing which has been made available to the board.

As of August 3, 2020, the board, by a ______________ vote, approves payments, totaling $4,952.98. The payments are further identified in this document.

Total by Payment Type for Cash Account, AP Employee Reimbursement:
ACH Numbers 192001273 through 192001309, totaling $4,952.98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secretary</th>
<th>Board Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check Nbr</th>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Check Date</th>
<th>Check Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>192001273</td>
<td>Allen, Shereen Marie</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>52.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001274</td>
<td>Arce-Brones, Donald Alberto</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>95.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001275</td>
<td>Brown, April E</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>52.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001276</td>
<td>Bugai, Julie A</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>32.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001277</td>
<td>Darcy, Kim Hasegawa</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>157.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001278</td>
<td>Due, Wayne Paul</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001279</td>
<td>Dwinell, Jin Xu</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001280</td>
<td>Felder, Tanisha Danyette</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>262.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001281</td>
<td>Finger, Jessica Erin</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>110.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001282</td>
<td>Francesculti, Christina Simons</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>157.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001283</td>
<td>Frisk, Rebecca Sue</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>42.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001284</td>
<td>Goglia, Bridget Link</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>283.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001285</td>
<td>Grabow, Amy Michelle</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>97.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001286</td>
<td>Griffin, Fredric Davison</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>429.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001287</td>
<td>Guzman, Susana E</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>52.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001288</td>
<td>Harris, Britt A</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>118.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001289</td>
<td>Hayes, Tamara Leigh</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>52.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001290</td>
<td>Helseth, Karen Lynne</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001291</td>
<td>Johnson, Amelia Ruth</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>52.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001292</td>
<td>Khan, Ayesha</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001293</td>
<td>Koenig, Robert Carl</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>15.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001294</td>
<td>Lohman, Andrew Edward</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>15.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001295</td>
<td>Martin, Nicole Marie</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001296</td>
<td>Mazur, Hanna</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001297</td>
<td>Mower, Trudy Corrine</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001298</td>
<td>Nunes, Elizabeth Anne</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>311.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001299</td>
<td>Pamparo, Fidel R</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>77.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001300</td>
<td>Phillips, Hannah Susan</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>71.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001301</td>
<td>Pilkey, Christopher C</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>77.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001302</td>
<td>Simard, John R</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>40.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001303</td>
<td>Steyaert, Kathleen A</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001304</td>
<td>Stoker, Amanda M</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>370.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001305</td>
<td>Stone, Melyssa Raye</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>99.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Nbr</td>
<td>Vendor Name</td>
<td>Check Date</td>
<td>Check Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001306</td>
<td>Thorne, Allen Michael</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>58.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001307</td>
<td>Thurman, Amy Emrich</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>187.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001308</td>
<td>Tran, Khue Thi</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>279.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192001309</td>
<td>Yousuf, Nasreen</td>
<td>07/24/2020</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 ACH Check(s) For a Total of 4,952.98