

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

June 1, 2020

Call to Order

President Heather Fralick called the Regular Board Meeting of the Shoreline Board of Directors to order via Zoom at 7:00 p.m. on June 1, 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; Rebeca Rivera, Member; and Michael Closson, Shorecrest Student Representative. *(Since this meeting was being conducted on Zoom, President Fralick had a visual that all board members were in attendance.)*

Absent and Excused: Cynthia Ruelas, Shorewood Student Representative.

Land Acknowledgement

Director Jernigan stated that native spaces don't just happen in Shoreline, Washington. They have to be intentionally created, institutionally upheld, maintained and cultivated with care. "In a time of great trauma in our country, with the drumbeat of racism at our front doors, I want to offer this carefully cultivated native space to George Floyd. I'd like to offer 60 seconds of silence for George Floyd, starting now."

Flag Salute

Comments

President Fralick began by stating: "Please let the record reflect, 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 are listening remotely. Due to an update to the Governor's orders regarding public meetings, we are moving forward with district business that had been temporarily suspended. Aside from the new visual format for our board members and panelists, this is the same process we've been following for the last several meetings due to the Governor's order regarding public meetings. She then asked Superintendent Miner to share a few words about the updates to the Governor's order.

Superintendent Miner announced that there had been some conflicting information when the new information first came out over the weekend. As one individual stated, the proclamation was not a model of clarity. A clarification came later from the Assistant Attorney General for Open Government, which indicated one change from the previous proclamation. It no longer restricts what action a governing body may take at a meeting; the prior proclamation restricted actions to matters that were necessary and routine or matters necessary to respond to the COVID-19 outbreak and the current public health emergency. The District will now be able to get back to more normal programming.

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 1. There were approximately 50 pages of comments submitted. Those comments were received by the Board via email earlier in the afternoon (June 1). They were also placed on the district website at the following URL: <https://www.shorelineschools.org/Page/1235> (School Board agenda for June 1). In order to make these comments more accessible, they are 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 minutes once the minutes are transcribed and approved by the Board (see link above).

Regarding the comments as well as the many emails received by the Board, President Fralick reported that currently it is the responsibility of the Board President to respond to emails on behalf of the Board. However, she has personally been unable to consistently manage responses to the recent volume of messages received. She wanted the public to know that she as well as the other board members read what they are sent and truly appreciate the feedback from staff and the community. Additionally, there appears to be some confusion regarding the rules of governance around superintendents and school board members. During the Board's first retreat in January, Director Jernigan suggested producing a one-page explanation. Since then, Directors Betnel and Rivera have separately reiterated that request. There will be a presentation on school board governance roles at the June 15 regular board meeting. Again, she thanked everyone who submitted comments for this meeting.

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

MOTION NO. 45: 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 4 Regular Board Meeting were approved as submitted. Director Betnel then asked for clarification as to the process if one of the board members proposed an edit or revision at this point in the meeting in response to President's Fralick's question. Superintendent Miner responded that it would depend on the nature of the revision and if it required going back and listening to the recording of the meeting in order to make a determination as to whether or not the adjustment could be made. Generally, the minutes would be tabled until such time that the recording could be reviewed and brought back at a later date. The minutes process involves someone listening to the meeting several times in order to get as accurate a summary as possible.

Adoption of Consent Agenda

The following consent agenda was presented for approval:

- a. Adoption of Resolution 2020-9, Delegating Authority to WIAA for 2020-2021
- b. District-wide Safety and Security Systems Project – Elementary Vestibules – Award of Contract – Moon Construction Company
- c. District-wide Safety and Security Systems Project – Einstein Middle School – Approval of Change Order #02 – Long Technologies, Inc.
- d. District-wide Safety and Security Systems Project – Kellogg Middle School – Approval of Change Order #01 – Long Technologies, Inc.
- e. Parkwood Elementary Replacement Project – Approval of Settlement Agreement – Allied Construction Associates, Inc.
- f. Approval of the 2020-2021 Addendum to the Employment Agreement with Superintendent Rebecca Miner
- g. Approval of Personnel – Certificated
- h. Approval of Vouchers

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. 46: Director Betnel moved that the Board adopt the consent agenda, items 5a through 5h, which is attached hereto and becomes a part hereof. The motion was seconded by Director Rivera and carried unanimously.

As of June 1, 2020, the Board, by a unanimous vote, approved for payment, those vouchers described as follows: Reconciliation of Warrants Issued between May 15 and May 22, 2020 - General Fund Warrants #85421-85430, 85431-85449, 85452-85509, and 192001101-192001113, totaling \$910,401.92; Capital Projects Fund Warrants #85510-85528, totaling \$11,341,419.44; Student Bond Fund Warrants #85450-85451, 85529-85553, and 192001114-192001120, totaling \$41,668.16; and Private Purpose Trust Fund #70 Warrants #85554-85555 totaling \$787.00; for a grand total of \$12,294,276.52.

Reports and Presentations

Summer School Information

Ellen Kaje, Ph.D., Director of Categorical Programs and Academic Support, presented.

This presentation provided an overview of the Summer School program offerings, as well as a comparison of this year's summer programming to last year's program, due to the pandemic.

The Summer School Program for grades K-8 will focus on literacy intervention for students in grades K-4 and math intervention for students in grades 5-8. All programming will take place remotely, including the Summer Reading Program and online instruction.

The High School Summer School Program will include initial credit and credit retrieval options, both of which will be administered online, as in previous years. Math support classes will be offered online in Algebra I and Geometry. Students who received a grade of "Incomplete" in a high school course during the school closure will be supported in completing coursework as needed.

Dr. Kaje reviewed the goals for the 2020 Summer School Program, which include:

- To close gaps by providing an enriching learning experience for students most impacted by the school closure
- To provide intervention for students performing below standard and/or needing credit completion
- To provide academic and social/emotional supports for participating students

Typically, the District provides in-person support at both a K-8 site and a high school site. Last year, the sites were Meridian Park and Shorecrest; transportation was provided as well as free lunches on site. This year, there will be a Summer Reading Program for grades K-4 with generous support from the Shoreline Foundation (last year the program served only grade 1) and online instruction for grades K-8 and high school. Due to the impacts of COVID-19, there will be some additional training for staff in the area of social/emotional learning to better meet the needs of our students during this situation. Free lunches will be provided at Aldercrest, Meridian Park, Shorecrest and Shorewood.

Highlights of the 2019 K-8 program that served 266 students:

- K-3 Literacy Program – 108 students; 62% made growth; teacher and paraeducator in each classroom, 5:1 ratio
- 4-6 STEM Program – 105 students; 100% increased in confidence, two-week windows with hands-on projects, e.g. golf courses and forecasting for a disease outbreak
- 2-4 Language Acquisition (ELL) – 18 students; 100% made growth
- 7-8 Literacy Program – 15 students; 69% made growth
- 7-8 STEM Program – 20 students; 100% increased in confidence

Highlights of the 2019 Summer Reading Program (funded by Shoreline Foundation and foundry10):

- 36 first graders who had made gains in literacy
- Teachers selected high interest texts at each student's reading level
- Teachers mailed letters and books to students throughout the summer (Foundation funds only)
- Goal: Students maintain their reading gains

Minutes – June 1, 2020

94% maintained or made gains
39% reading at grade level

Highlights of the 2019 high school program that served 350 students:

- Credits recovered – math (91%), English language arts (78%) and Apex (33%)
- Support – reading/ELL (100% made gains)
- Initial credit earned – art, PE, Shoreline Virtual Learning (97%+)

Dr. Kaje reviewed the plans for the 2020 Summer School Program.

- K-4 Literacy
 - ❖ Expand Summer Reading Program (Foundation/foundry10)
 - ❖ Imagine Learning (with teacher support for eligible students)
- Grades 5-8 Math
 - ❖ Students scoring at strategic level on winter assessment
 - ❖ Develop online model with teacher support
- High School Program
 - ❖ Initial credit – SVL
 - ❖ Credit retrieval – Apex
 - ❖ Math courses – Algebra I and Geometry (the parts that were previously in person will now be on Zoom with the teachers)
 - ❖ Support for students with 'Incompletes'

K-8 Program

- K-4 Literacy – students 2+ years behind
 - ❖ Summer Reading Program – Mail books and letters home (3 times--early, mid and late July); Jacqueline Estephan currently working with principals to identify students
 - ❖ Expand to focus on students well below standard with low/no engagement* (students who have not regularly engaged during school closure)
- Online – Imagine Learning
 - ❖ Available for all students K-5 through end of August
 - ❖ Eligible students – teacher check-ins weekly
- Grades 5-8 Math – students approximately one year behind
 - ❖ Grades 5-6 online class and 7-8 class
 - ❖ Math TOSAs developing remote curriculum

High School Program

- Online initial credit – various course options through Shoreline Virtual Learning (SVL) curriculum
- Online credit recovery – various course options – Apex curriculum and paraeducator check-ins regularly
- Online math courses – Algebra 1 and Geometry (modified hybrid courses)
 - ❖ Schools generate lists of students to invite (received F grade in the fall)
 - ❖ Also available for grade replacement, skill development
- Support students with 'Incompletes'
 - ❖ Implement teacher plans through home learning

Prior to the start of Summer School 2020 (July 6-31), the District will continue to hire staff, invite students to participate, finalize programming and provide social-emotional learning to Summer School staff. In the fall, a summary report will be presented to the Board by Dr. Kaje and the two Summer School principals, Jacqueline Estephan (K-8) and Jennifer Zadow (high school).

Director Wilson asked if the families of the students in the Summer Reading Program are made aware of how much is involved in prompting their children to read books during the day. Dr. Kaje explained that with this program, the books are mailed to the homes and it doesn't include an online component. The program includes an orientation for families. In past years, students have mailed letters to their teachers and shared their thoughts about what they were reading. With different circumstances this year, they might be asked to keep a journal and share in the fall. Some of those details are still being worked out. Director Wilson also asked if phone calls would be made to the families of Summer School students. Dr. Kaje responded that she liked that idea and it would probably be more of a possibility this year. Typically, there is a principal and an office manager at each site but they are kept quite busy managing students and activities during the day. However, not being on site this year likely will allow more time for check-ins with families.

Director Wilson and Director Jernigan asked about the Apex program. Apex is an online curriculum tool that the District subscribes to for students who have attempted credits unsuccessfully. It has a broad suite of offerings: world language, US history, English, health, P.E., etc. This is a tool that has been used in the District for years.

Regarding the Summer Reading Program, Director Rivera asked about the impact on the interest of students if teachers are not able to handpick the books this year, and whether or not it would be possible to return to that format next year. Dr. Kaje responded that this was very hard to let go of this year but unfortunately very necessary to comply with social distancing. If at all possible, it will absolutely return next year.

Mr. Crosson asked about advertising of the programs. As a student, he wasn't aware of the Summer School opportunities until the end of his freshman year, particularly around taking initial credit courses in order to get them out of the way and make room for other classes. Initial credit courses are usually taken through Shoreline Virtual Learning, which students can access in the fall and spring, as well as the summer. There is information on the website but Dr. Kaje wasn't sure how broadly it was advertised at the buildings. She appreciated the question and stated they would be working further with the buildings to get the message out.

Director Betnel expressed gratitude to the Shoreline Foundation for their generous support of the Summer Reading Program. She asked if the 266 students (K-8) who attended last year versus the 1,000 students invited was a standard invite to attendance ratio for Summer School. She also inquired about why the Summer Reading Program would quadruple this year but some of the other courses would have less capacity. Dr. Kaje reported that 25% has been a pretty typical ratio of students invited to students who participate, particularly for the in-person instruction. Each year, staff usually tries to get invitations out by spring break, if not earlier, so that families can make their summer plans. The expectations for attendance are stringent in that with only a 20-day program, if a student misses five days, it's difficult to get the full experience. The attendance policy limits student absences to two or three. Some families may view that as an obstacle and some may just want the summer as a break from school to enjoy family time. Staff members are hopeful, however, that this year there may be more interest and participation due to the online only and shorter day format.

Director Wilson asked if any of the students pay for Summer School. The fee for Shoreline Virtual Learning is \$185 per class and Apex has a fee of \$100 for credit retrieval. Typically, elementary classes are \$20 and high school classes are \$25 to provide more incentive to attend. The Algebra 1 and Geometry classes are free in order to help high school students stay on target to graduate. Through the Shoreline Foundation, there are scholarships available for all of the above and they have been in place for years. The middle and high school counseling teams work with families to determine what assistance can be provided.

Director Jernigan thanked Director Wilson for asking that question as the response assisted her in understanding the structure. She asked if the scholarship pathways were advertised for students. Yes, they are and families are encouraged to access through their counselors. This summer, none of the elementary offerings will carry a fee as there is no in-person option.

First Reading: District Instructional Materials Committee (DIMC) Recommendation for Middle School Math
Presenters:

Maria Stevens, Director of Teaching and Learning

Nathan Lee, Math TOSA for Grades 6-12 (.6 FTE) and Shorewood Math Teacher (.4 FTE)

This material was presented to DIMC following the completion and recommendation of the Middle School Math Adoption Committee. Nathan Lee presented on behalf of that adoption committee and Maria Stevens presented on behalf of DIMC. **The recommendation for grades 6-8 core instruction in mathematics is LearnZillion Illustrative Mathematics.**

Ms. Stevens stated that the Middle School Math Adoption Committee began its work in April 2019. They worked through the remainder of 2019 and into 2020. In May of this year, they began the recommendation process.

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| May 6, 2020 | Middle School Math Adoption Committee – Unanimous vote to recommend to DIMC |
| May 19, 2020 | District Instructional Materials Committee (DIMC) – Unanimous vote to recommend to Board |
| June 1, 2020 | First reading at this regularly scheduled board meeting |
| June 15, 2020 | Recommendation to approve at regularly scheduled board meeting |

Mr. Lee reviewed the goals and the tools involved in arriving at this recommendation.

The Goals

Common Core Alignment

- *Focus* on major work of grade
- *Coherence* across units and levels
- *Rigor* – balance of procedures, concepts, and application

Research-based Best Practice – curriculum that heavily focuses on the following and assists students in becoming mathematicians:

- Student mathematical practices
- NCTM (National Council for the Teachers of Mathematics) Equity Statement – leading organization in terms of research-based practice

Shoreline Instructional Strategic Plan

- Strategic Direction #5: Teach in ways that are relevant, engaging, innovative, student-driven and rigorous

The Tools

- Guidance from OSPI; Mr. Lee attended training in Spokane on curriculum adoption process
- EdReports – an organization that rates mathematical curriculum according to Common Core (more to follow on their scores)
- NCTM
- Talked to other districts to see what they were using and why and how they chose their curriculum
- Shoreline grades 6-8 teacher survey
- Shoreline middle school math priorities list

Minutes – June 1, 2020

Ms. Stevens spoke about the volunteers that served on the Middle School Math Adoption Committee. The members included the following classroom teachers from multiple buildings and grade levels:

6th Grade Teachers: Shereen Allen (CK8), Trisha Massot (Briarcrest), Elizabeth Thompson (Syre)

7th and 8th Grade Teachers: Andie Holsten (Einstein), Garth Riley (Einstein), Jacob Dove (Kellogg), Jennifer Payne (Kellogg)

Committee members also included the following administrators/special programs staff and one parent:

- Principal: Chrisy Francescutti (Cascade K-8)
- Equity Lead: Rosie Moore (Ridgecrest)
- Special Education TOSA: Jenn Zadow
- Secondary Math TOSA: Nathan Lee
- Director of Teaching and Learning: Maria Stevens
- HiCap Specialist and Parent: Heather Stroh

Other than Heather Stroh, Ms. Stevens reported that they were unable to get any other parents who were comfortable with serving on a secondary math curriculum adoption.

The middle school math priorities list included the following priorities, which was pared down from the original 20:

- Meet the needs of all academic learners
- Meet special needs
- Culture of collaboration and group tasks
- Student-centered instruction
- Authentic and real-world problems
- Spiraling – an idea that says we don't learn something with one lesson; once we learn a lesson we might be used to it but we tend not to master it in one session; math concepts come back over time so they can display growth over time

Mr. Lee reviewed the four phases of the “big picture timeline” and what occurred during each phase:

Phase 1: Learning and Develop Rubric (Spring 2019)

- Provide professional development for committee members
 - ❖ Common Core Content Standards and Philosophy
 - ❖ Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice
 - ❖ NCTM's Equity Statement
- Survey grades 6-8 teachers
- Create a draft of priorities list

Director Betnel asked if the District's equity toolkit was used in addition to the NCTM Equity Statement. Ms. Stevens responded that students are included in the curriculum adoption process although it can be difficult to keep students for the entire length of the committee, particularly when the duration is 12-18 months. However, they are engaged in other ways, e.g. piloting and survey feedback in order to ascertain student experience with the materials.

Phase 2: Review Materials (Fall 2019)

- Finalized priorities list
- Used EdReports and other districts to narrow down to 8 highly rated curricula
- Shallow dive: 8 narrowed down to 3 curricula
- Deep dive: 3 narrowed down to 2 curricula

Phase 3: Field Testing (Winter 2020)

- Vendor presentations from top 2 curricula
- Field Testing:
 - ❖ 13 test teachers
 - ❖ Provided training on both curricula
 - ❖ Collected teacher and student feedback
 - ❖ Debrief meetings for both

Phase 4: Recommendation and Implementation

- Final recommendation (May 6)
 - ❖ Processed field test data and feedback
 - ❖ Scored each curricula using the priorities list
 - ❖ Unanimous recommendation for LearnZillion Illustrative Mathematics
- Community Review
 - ❖ Materials available to the public via Shoreline website and the curricula is free to access during this school closure time

Mr. Lee shared some of the reasons that LearnZillion is the recommended curriculum. EdReports gives three scores:

- Focus and coherence (Common Core alignment) – 14/14 – 6th, 7th, 8th
- Rigor and mathematical practices (Common Core alignment) – 18/18 – 6th, 7th, 8th
- Usability (is it usable for our students and teachers?) – 37/38 – 6th, 7th, 8th

At the time and possibly even currently, this was the highest rated curriculum.

LearnZillion includes:

- Digital lessons
- Family access to support materials
- Support for ELL and students with disabilities
- Extensions for students who are ready to go deeper
- Student workbooks
- Digital assessments
- Teacher professional implementation and ongoing training

Ms. Stevens added that often with a curriculum adoption, the support for ELL and students with disabilities is an entirely different area that educators have to seek out and pull in to the curriculum. That is not the case with LearnZillion as those supports are embedded into the core lessons.

Mr. Lee reviewed how LearnZillion addresses each of the six priorities mentioned earlier.

- Meets the needs of all academic learners
- Meets special needs
 - ❖ Highly engaging tasks and problems
 - ❖ Embedded supports for ELL and students with disabilities
 - ❖ Extensions for students who are ready to go deeper
- Culture of collaboration and group tasks
 - ❖ Open-ended problems that invite discussion and multiple perspectives
 - ❖ Balance of individual and collaborative problem solving
- Student-centered instruction
 - ❖ Problem-based curriculum: Intriguing and authentic problems at the center of every lesson
 - ❖ Open-ended problems/multiple strategies

- Authentic and real-world problems
 - ❖ Many problems include visuals/image revolving around a real-world situation
- Spiraling
 - ❖ Homework/practice includes topics covered in previous units

Ms. Stevens added that this is the last math curriculum adoption as the elementary and high school curricula were adopted over the last several years. The committee was very thoughtful in making sure that they properly bridged the middle school curriculum with the two previous curricula.

Director Betnel asked if there would be opportunities for this math curriculum to intersect with the courses previously presented in the PACT approval, e.g. Build It, Design It, etc. Ms. Stevens responded that there will be some overlap in how students are taught to problem solve. One of the differences will be that math tends to not be as “hands on” in finding solutions as the “It” classes are hoped to be. As teachers become more aware of what is happening in the “It” classes versus the math classes, there can be some crosswalks to the core content classes of math. The intent is to provide the same vocabulary in both areas so that students realize that teachers are asking for the same things, even though it’s coming from a different class and a different teacher.

Mr. Lee reported that one last thing that was considered was our current reality and realization of the fact that we may not be back to a full in-person model of school in the fall. There may be some sort of a hybrid model between an in-person and a distance learning model. Of the two curriculum that were studied, LearningZillion addressed that current reality more fully, particularly in terms of a digital curriculum, consumable workbooks, embedded routines, and pre-assessments (check-ins on student progress) and common assessments. Routines and safety around learning are very important.

This recommendation was presented for first reading and would be brought back for a recommended adoption at the Board’s June 15 regular meeting.

In regard to the embedded supports for ELL and students with disabilities, Director Betnel inquired if this curriculum would prevent pullouts of students. Is it integrated in such a way that students could remain with mixed groups of peers for a more inclusive learning environment? Mr. Lee responded that yes, these are integrated supports for inclusive class instruction and not pullout models. Ms. Stevens added that depending on a student’s IEP and whatever gap that may exist, there might be some class supports outside of the class that will still be needed.

Food Service Program Financial Information

Presenters:

Marla S. Miller, Deputy Superintendent

Jessica Finger, Director of Nutrition Services and District Warehouse

Mark Spangenberg, Director of Finance and Business Services

Ms. Miller began by saying no action was being recommended at this time. She just wanted to present some information for the Board’s awareness regarding some upcoming issues that will need to be addressed.

The mission of the Food and Nutrition Services Department is to alleviate childhood hunger within our community and increase student success by providing and promoting a nutritionally balanced diet in a warm and friendly environment. The Food and Nutrition Services Department is an enterprise program, which means that it must make enough in revenue to cover the costs of labor, food and overhead from the prices charged to paying students and reimbursements from claims for free and reduced priced meals served. The goal of the program is to break even and be entirely self-supporting.

Minutes – June 1, 2020

The services provided by the Food and Nutrition Services Department are divided into two categories: ongoing and extraordinary. The ongoing services include school breakfast and lunch, snacks for child care and preschool, catering for district-related events and programs, summer community meals and staff meals. The extraordinary services include kitchen construction consultation, opening new sites, and supporting students while in transition sites.

Mr. Spangenberg reviewed the financial information associated with the program for school years 2016-2017, 2017-2018, 2018-2019 and through April 30 of the 2019-2020 school year. The budgeted revenue for 2019-2020 was \$2.8 million but when schools closed in March, all revenues stopped for a YTD number of \$2,005,755. After expenditures and encumbrances of \$2,107,410 and indirect costs (a formula calculated by OSPI and negotiated with the federal government) of \$190,369, the net difference is (\$292,025).

Mr. Spangenberg noted that of the 291 districts with food service programs last year, only 12 covered both the direct costs and the indirect costs together. The statewide loss was approximately \$61 million. Director Rivera asked if any of these costs were being covered by the COVID-19 federal funds. Ms. Miller responded that those were being covered separately under the community meals program. With federal reimbursements included, current estimates put the District at a deficit of approximately \$446,000. The community meals program is not embedded in the numbers shared in this presentation. Director Betnel asked if the student debt was embedded in these numbers and Ms. Miller said that they were but our student debt is relatively low, at about \$13,000, most of which is collected through “angel funds” or through the end-of-year collections from parents. On the spreadsheet, this is reflected in the local revenues, which includes payments for meals from families who are not eligible for free and reduced price meals. Local revenues stopped after the last day of school lunches, which was March 11.

Ms. Miller reviewed three possible scenarios with the Board as reflected below. The problem with increasing prices in order to cover costs is the possibility of losing participation. Ms. Miller stated that she wanted the Board to consider the three options prior to taking action at the June 15 regular meeting.

Food Service 2020-2021 Price Change Scenarios
6/1/2020 Board Meeting

	Scenario 1 No Price Change	Scenario 2 Elem & Middle +\$0.05 High Schools +\$0.25	Scenario 3 Breakeven All Prices+\$0.85
Revenues			
Local Revenues	\$1,409,081	\$1,447,773	\$1,705,796
State Revenues	\$42,507	\$42,507	\$42,507
Federal Meal Reimbursements	\$1,367,383	\$1,367,383	\$1,367,383
Federal Commodities	\$182,519	\$182,519	\$182,519
Other Revenues	\$7,600	\$7,600	\$7,600
	<u>\$3,009,090</u>	<u>\$3,047,782</u>	<u>\$3,305,805</u>
Expenditures			
Office & Supervision Salaries	\$446,492	\$446,492	\$446,492
Office & Supervision Supplies & Services	\$17,678	\$17,678	\$17,678
Food	\$1,032,610	\$1,032,610	\$1,032,610
Operations Salaries & Benefits	\$1,834,489	\$1,834,489	\$1,834,489
Operations Supplies, & Services	\$125,926	\$125,926	\$125,926
	<u>\$3,457,195</u>	<u>\$3,457,195</u>	<u>\$3,457,195</u>
Catering, Edwin Pratt Transfers	(\$151,390)	(\$151,390)	(\$151,390)
Projected Net Change	<u>(\$296,715)</u>	<u>(\$258,023)</u>	<u>(\$0)</u>
2019-2020 Projected Ending Fund Balance	\$ (292,025)	\$ (292,025)	\$ (292,025)
2020-2021 Projected Net Difference	(\$296,715)	(\$258,023)	(\$0)
2020-2021 Projected Ending Fund Balance	\$ (588,740)	\$ (550,048)	\$ (292,025)

NOTE: These scenarios do not include projected 2020-2021 indirect costs of \$234,623.

Director Rivera asked why these scenarios do not include the indirect costs of \$234,623. Ms. Miller responded that it is included in the financial reporting to the state but not typically when looking at how the direct program revenue covers direct expenditures. Typically, these are dollars that would help fund the overall budget of the school district. Pulling indirect costs out of the revenue that is funding part of a program helps pay the costs of everything else. Additionally, not including indirects here is partly because

we haven't covered indirect costs in this program for several years and we don't want to make the situation worse by suddenly covering them. The note was added in the interest of transparency.

Next steps include:

- Provide additional information as requested by the Board
- Recommend approval of 2020-2021 full meal prices at the June 15, 2020 board meeting, to support:
 - ❖ Summer preparation and printing of Food Service information for distribution to families in August
 - ❖ Projected revenues for budget preparation (impacts Food Services budget as well as District fund balance and cash flow)

Director Rivera asked if there would be a mechanism available to potentially ask for donations, should we not be in an in-school model in the fall. Ms. Miller stated that we could look for those opportunities. The community and the county, state, etc. view the providing of food as an essential support. This program cost is often a surprise to most people in that they don't realize the size of a school district food service program and the associated significant revenues and expenditures.

Director Jernigan reported that she had heard in the past that the District was operating the food service program under a waiver and that the waiver had been extended. She asked what that was and how it impacts this budget. Ms. Finger responded that the emergency feeding program, which is somewhat of an alternative to the summer food service program with fewer regulations, is operating with waivers. There is a waiver for congregate dining; a waiver of the specific amount of time between serving breakfast and lunch; a waiver that allows parents/guardians to pick up meals even though their students aren't in the car, as well as a handful of others that allow districts to operate under the current model. She indicated that there would probably be additional waivers put in place for the fall. Another loosening of the federal restrictions that are normally in place has to do with providing food that goes away from one of our sites and is consumed somewhere else.

In answer to a question from Director Jernigan about free meal eligibility for families, Ms. Finger spoke about the area eligibility option, which allows districts to serve meals to anyone in the geographic area that qualifies for the summer feeding program. Currently, there is a temporary waiver in place until June 30 that allows school districts to run these food service operations without having area eligibility. This is a federal waiver for which states can apply. The state applied for it again but as of now the feds have not approved it. Fortunately, Shoreline has several areas that do qualify and that is where the summer feeding programs are located—Aldercrest Campus, Shorecrest, Shorewood, and Meridian Park. City partners are operating programs at North City, Paramount Park, Dale Turner YMCA, and the Shoreline Library. The area eligibility for summer feeding programs is based on census tracts.

In answer to a question from Director Rivera regarding students needing a parent with them to get a meal, Ms. Finger stated that students who walk to school are allowed to pick up a meal without the parent. As mentioned above, there is a waiver in place that allows adults to pick up meals without the student in the car.

Director Betnel asked about the broadness and constraints of the area eligibility guidelines. Ms. Finger responded that it is very specific; an address is entered online on a map and the color coding indicates if an address does or does not qualify. Ms. Finger offered to provide a link for more information. Director Betnel also thanked Ms. Finger for serving on the upcoming national training panel.

Board Requested Discussion

Director Rivera suggested having paired study sessions in order to dive into racial equity and discuss how the equity toolkit is being used along with its impact and possible limitations. On another topic, she would

like to discuss how the District reaches out to students and families in regard to serving on specific committees—how representative are those committees and how can we make them more representative.

Director Betnel requested “a Board discussion on the race and equity policy as to how it relates to combating racism; review related policies for potential updating to explicitly name and codify how they address equity and anti-racism in the District; and how the Board will hold the Superintendent accountable for the items, as noted we are to do, in the Race and Equity policy as well as whether there are any other elements of accountability we feel are necessary in the District to combat racism in our schools and community.”

Director Betnel asked if the loosening of the restrictions for school board agendas (as of this date) would now allow for the District to proceed with the resolution for the Since Time Immemorial curriculum. Superintendent Miner stated that the proclamation would allow for that at this time.

President Fralick announced that this was the last official board meeting before graduation for our student representatives, Cynthia Ruelas (Shorewood) and Michael Crosson (Shorecrest). She extended congratulations to both students and expressed how much the Board appreciated their voices at board meetings during this particularly challenging school year. Michael announced that he had committed to the University of Texas at Austin and that he would be attending the McCombs School of Business, studying MIS with either a double major or a minor in computer science.

Action Items

Approval of Ridgecrest Elementary Highly Capable Magnet Program Placement Beginning with the 2020-2021 School Year

Presenters:

Marla S. Miller, Deputy Superintendent

Brian Schultz, Assistant Superintendent

Mr. Schultz began by saying that this presentation was originally scheduled for March 16, 2020 but was removed from that agenda due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent proclamation from Governor Inslee regarding what types of business could be considered at school board meetings.

Knowing that the North City Elementary Campus was going to be used as a kindergarten site for the 2019-2020 school year, Mr. Schultz and Ms. Miller convened the Elementary Boundaries, Capacity and Program Placement Stakeholder Advisory Committee, to review the future uses of the North City Campus, possible boundary changes, and increasing from nine to ten traditional elementary schools plus Cascade K-8. Imbedded in this work was program placement. The committee’s recommendations were presented to the Board on October 7 and 21, 2019.

At the Board’s November 4, 2019 meeting, the Board accepted the recommendation of the Elementary Boundaries, Capacity and Program Placement Stakeholder Advisory Committee to consolidate the Ridgecrest Elementary Highly Capable Magnet Program and the Meridian Park Elementary Highly Capable Magnet Program, beginning with the 2020-2021 school year. The program would be placed at Meridian Park.

Unfortunately, the data considered by the committee and presented at the November meeting had incorrect information about the projected number of students at Ridgecrest Elementary School. The Board has reviewed the original recommendation, the underlying background information considered by the Committee and the prior Board, additional data requested by the Board, and is considering the program placement options.

As a reminder of recent history, Mr. Schultz stated that in the fall of 2018, Shoreline as well as many other school districts in the region, experienced a substantial enrollment shortfall. Then again in the fall of 2019, enrollment came in below projections. Mindful that the cost of running an elementary school is about \$1.5 million, the committee struggled as to whether or not it was an appropriate time to consider opening up another elementary school. The decision was made to push the pause button on the North City portion of the work and house students and programs within the current elementary buildings.

The 2020 review of placement of the Ridgecrest Highly Capable Magnet Program included the following presentations:

- January 27 Regular Board Meeting – Board direction to review previous decision
- March 2 Board Study Session
- March 2 Regular Board Meeting
- March 9 Virtual Public Forum
- March 16 Request for Board Action (tabled due to COVID-19 pandemic)

The November recommendation to the Board and subsequent decision, in its totality, was as follows:

- Consolidate the Ridgecrest Highly Capable Magnet Program with the Meridian Park Highly Capable Magnet Program and co-locate at Meridian Park Elementary.
 - ❖ Enrollment in the Ridgecrest Highly Capable Magnet Program has declined significantly since HiCap services have been offered at neighborhood schools
 - ❖ Consolidation will reduce the need for split classrooms
 - ❖ Highly Capable classrooms at Ridgecrest will be available to house kindergartners and Ridgecrest can offer kindergarten for the first time since 2015-2016.

Ms. Miller reviewed the program placement options that were presented to the Board during the March 2, 2020 study session and regular meeting.

- Option 1 Consolidate the two programs at Meridian Park as approved November 4, 2019
- Option 2A Grandfather 5th grade only at Ridgecrest Elementary
- Option 2B Grandfather 4th and 5th grades only at Ridgecrest Elementary
- Option 3 Return to two separate eastside/westside magnet programs
- Option 4 Other options determined by the Board

Additional options that were identified for consideration included:

Option 2C

Offer the option for 2nd and 3rd grade HiCap students from the 2019-2020 school year to stay at Ridgecrest as boundary exceptions, receiving HiCap services in regular education classrooms with singly-eligible HiCap students

Option 2D

“Balance” the size of grandfathered HiCap Magnet Program classes at Ridgecrest, if necessary, by filling classes with students who are singly eligible for HiCap Math

A significant change that occurred between the Board’s approval of the recommendation in November and the March 2 presentations was that staff found there was capacity/classrooms at Ridgecrest to house the projected incoming kindergartners and maintain some classrooms of highly capable students. This was a big shift in data that brought staff to this reexamination.

Ms. Miller reviewed a large spreadsheet entitled “HiCap Staffing and Classroom Analysis” and an enlarged portion of the spreadsheet, “Summary of 2020-2021 HiCap Models”. These were added to the presentation just prior to the meeting. This is the best projection, based on assumptions, of what staff believes the needs to be for the fall for both Ridgecrest and Meridian Park. These projections include the new dual-eligible (English language arts and math) students whom were not known at the time of the original projections due to the fact that the testing for next year had not yet occurred. The enrollment projections, grade level by grade level, for each of the two sites were shown independently and then combined and the proposal that was accepted in November combines those two programs. Today’s program going forward if not changed would be represented by the column entitled, “MPHC & RCHC Combined”. The purpose of the chart was to reflect how much staffing is generated for each grade level if the programs are combined and how much is generated if they are separated.

Ms. Miller reviewed the summary document for each option and the associated costs, based on 2020-2021 magnet program enrollment based on trend data.

	Enrollment	Staffing by Regular Ratio	Staffing Rounded	Number of Split Classrooms	Additional Staffing for Splits	Total Staffing	Staffing Cost Compared to One Location
2020-2021 Model One, Location: MP	197	8.17	8	1	0.3	8.3	\$--
2020-2021 Model Two, Locations: MP & RC							
Meridian Park	131	5.5	6	1	0.3	6.3	
Ridgecrest	66	2.67	3	1	0.3	3.3	
TOTAL	197	8.17	9	2	0.6	9.6	\$182,000
Primary Location MP & Grandfathered RC 5th Grade							
Meridian Park	170	7.2	7	2	0.6	7.6	
Ridgecrest	27	0.96	1	0	0	1	
TOTAL	197	8.16	8	2	0.6	8.6	\$42,000
Primary Location MP & Grandfathered RC 4th & 5th Grade							
Meridian Park	151	6.5	7	2	0.6	7.6	
Ridgecrest	46	1.67	2	0	0	2	
TOTAL	197	8.17	9	2	0.6	9.6	\$182,000

Ms. Miller stated that one of the highly capable parents asked that she mention that this assumes that under each scenario we would have the same total number of students participating. However, it was also noted that if two separate programs were not maintained, there was a possibility of losing some of that enrollment. She also reported that she had estimated transportation costs from the Director of Transportation of \$26,500 if the highly capable magnet programs were housed at two locations. Every year, the cost of transportation is determined, in part, by where the buses are running and how much capacity they have, so at this point, this is an estimate.

In answer to a question by Director Rivera regarding the total estimated cost (\$140,000) of a teacher, Ms. Miller explained how the previous spreadsheet provided arrived at the \$140,000 per FTE estimate. The

District reports actual data on teachers to the state. The average actual cost for a teacher, including benefits, payroll taxes, base salary plus additional days, etc. and the estimated cost of living adjustment for the 2020-2021 school year comes out to \$140,000.

Director Betnel asked for clarification regarding the potential grandfathering of the 4th and 5th graders scenario—would the two splits identified at Meridian Park be the grades 2/3 split moved over from Ridgecrest and the grades 3/4 split that would already be at Meridian Park? Ms. Miller responded that when you combine the enrollment for each grade level, you have new totals and you may or may not need to have a split class. So it isn't that you move a split class intact over from Ridgecrest. There would be new combined totals for which the staffing formula for each particular grade would be applied. Ms. Miller also addressed a perceived contradiction or change in information by again reviewing the above costing and FTE chart. This included a discussion of the SEA collective bargaining agreement regarding compensation versus additional support in the classroom when enrollment is above a targeted staffing ratio. Split classrooms automatically get an additional .3 FTE of teaching support.

Director Jernigan asked if Options 2C and 2D listed on page 7 the PowerPoint presentation were reflected in the spreadsheet in terms of staffing costs compared to one location. No they were not and part of the reason for that was because they would be mixing highly capable students into other classrooms. So whether or not there are additional costs depends on this combined size of classrooms.

Director Rivera acknowledged the hardship of moving programs. One of the major obligations of the Board is to ensure a balanced budget. This is especially true this year and that due to the leadership of the superintendent and the stewardship by the District's administrators, the District is in a good financial condition. However, that cannot be said for next year given the uncertainty of current circumstances and the impact. That being said, she didn't want to choose the first option where the programs are located at Meridian Park. She would like to ensure that at least the fifth graders stay at Ridgecrest (Option 2A).

Director Jernigan encouraged Director Rivera to revisit that preference in view of the cost (\$42,000) as well as in terms of using the equity tool. We cannot have austerity for some programs and not for others.

In reflecting on the results of the COVID pandemic and the impact on board meetings and discussions that would have taken place over the past few months, Director Betnel acknowledged that to some in the community it may appear that only numbers and dollars are being considered rather than the children who are impacted. She stated that the Board was indeed looking at all the children, not just those in the Highly Capable Program, but also those who are not represented in these spreadsheets who are in adjoining classrooms or in different schools down the street. When looking at class size ratios and dollars, the Board is looking at equity and how best to allocate resources. Upon coming on the Board last fall, members were asked (by the community) to immediately overturn the previous Board's decision, even before an error in the data had been found. The board members agreed that they weren't going to overturn a previous board's decision. However, when the error was found, the Board was asked to review the data because there was a change in the information, and that was the right thing to do. It is also the right thing to solicit input and to review the entire landscape of this decision, both in terms of how it will impact the students in the Ridgecrest Highly Capable magnet program but also the rest of the Ridgecrest community; the students in the Meridian Park Highly Capable magnet program but also the rest of the Meridian Park community as well as teachers and staff. In making her decision, she sees two issues at hand that she wants to ensure she doesn't conflate—care of our current students and their needs (the ones who may have to move to a different school) and secondly, the long-term vision and life of the highly capable programs.

President Fralick thanked Director Betnel for her very eloquent and articulate summary of this process as well as the difficulty of it for everyone involved. She also thanked Directors Jernigan and Rivera for their

emphasis on fiscal responsibility as board members. She asked Director Wilson for his thoughts. He also thanked Director Betnel for her expressions and appreciated the emphasis on the human element.

As a member of the Highly Capable Program and a member of the Board, Director Jernigan stated that she certainly has interest in making sure that the program is maintained, inclusive and supported and that diversity is cultivated within the program. She expressed a leaning towards Option 2C, which offers families the possibility of staying within their neighborhood school. In reading all of the comments that were submitted to the Board, she saw the culture of Ridgecrest and the community connection associated with that neighborhood school as a common theme that she saw emerge in many of those comments. She likes the idea of “offering folks who are invested in that network school a chance to stay in that network school as long as those highly capable services can be provided within a general education classroom.” She thought that was an option that allows her to uphold both of the responsibilities mentioned by Director Betnel; however, it is not an option that is fiscally detailed. Superintendent Miner clarified this as a slight modification of Option 2C in that Director Jernigan was referring to 2019-2020 second through fifth grade HiCap students at Ridgecrest rather than just second and third grade HiCap students continuing to stay at Ridgecrest as boundary exceptions and receiving HiCap services in regular education classrooms with singly-eligible HiCap students.

Director Rivera expressed that she was under the impression that the offer for Ridgecrest HiCap students to continue as boundary exceptions was already a part of the original decision. Superintendent Miner responded that she wasn't sure if that had formally been decided but that they were hoping to accommodate those students. Mr. Schultz added that he felt that accommodation at Ridgecrest could indeed be made. Director Rivera asked if there were any additional costs associated with students opting to stay at Ridgecrest. Mr. Schultz responded that would be difficult to say without knowing how many students would stay. What is known is that the smaller the sample size, the more challenging the staffing costs become. However, from an accommodation standpoint, space wise, moving of the sixth graders to the middle schools has freed up space in most of our elementary schools.

President Fralick asked if there would be any additional transportation costs through allowing second through fifth graders the opportunity to opt into highly capable services in the general education classrooms. Ms. Miller responded that typically, a student attending a school as a boundary exception has responsibility for their own transportation. However, the district practice has been to allow students to ride a bus if there's room on buses that are going from the student's neighborhood school to the boundary exception school. It is not guaranteed and is not a district planning obligation. This is different from a district program that is placed at a site different from the neighborhood school. In those cases, transportation is provided from the neighborhood school to the school hosting the program.

Director Jernigan asked for clarification around Option 2C, which speaks of “receiving HiCap services in regular education classrooms with singly-eligible HiCap students”. Does this mean they would be in a general education classroom or in a classroom with students who haven't quite qualified for highly capable but have qualified in one single subject area? Mr. Schultz responded that not knowing the exact number of students who would be in the classroom with single eligibility, it would just be speculation at this point. Superintendent Miner summarized Option 2C by saying that a third grade HiCap student could choose to continue in a magnet program by moving to Meridian Park, OR could choose to return to home school if it wasn't Ridgecrest, e.g. Brookside, OR could stay at Ridgecrest as a boundary exception and receive HiCap services in the same way as students who choose their neighborhood school over a magnet school.

Maria Stevens, Director of Teaching and Learning, was asked to step in and address whether or not there was any educational rationale for having fifth graders remain at Ridgecrest. She began by saying that even now under COVID-19, instruction encompasses quite a bit, including social-emotional instruction as

well as academic instruction. She felt that there would absolutely be an impact to moving fifth graders from Ridgecrest to Meridian Park, but in terms of whether or not that would be so detrimental that a student wouldn't recover would have to be examined on a student-by-student basis because students respond to situations differently. "There are good teachers at both sites; I think there are a lot of things that are positive about both schools but I don't know that I could say other than what you would already anticipate being impactful upon students in their last year of being at a school to be served in a cohort. The math instruction will be similar; it's a year ahead, but in terms of being able to collaborate with peers who 'get them' both academically and in other ways, that doesn't necessarily occur in the general education setting, so families would have to make the choice if that's a need for their student to go to Meridian Park." She also stated that she was trying to be very careful because she herself has a son in the Ridgecrest HiCap program who will be a fifth grader next year. She also spoke about her experience in teaching special education and the various categories of needs for students.

The Board engaged in a discussion regarding student needs, the options, comments from community members, and fiscal responsibilities.

Superintendent Miner asked if Ms. Miller could explain the additional highly capable funding that is received from the state as well as the possibility of restoring programs at some future date. Currently, 100% of the \$320,000 received from the state for 2019-2020 is used in support of the program—training teachers (professional development) and materials. There is a TOSA (teacher on special assignment) position specifically assigned to the Highly Capable program (K-12), which is not funded by those additional state dollars. That certificated position focuses on assisting teachers with their instructional methods, etc. In answer to Director Jernigan's question about the Highly Capable Specialist, Ms. Miller explained that this is a classified position at the central office that supports the Highly Capable Office in the administration of testing and reporting data to the state. The position is divided between Assessment (.5 FTE) and HiCap (.5 FTE).

In answer to a question by Director Rivera regarding whether or not the District was trying to cluster all the students who are either single or dual eligible for HiCap into one classroom, Ms. Stevens explained that in a magnet or cohort, the class consists entirely of students who have been determined eligible for HiCap. A cluster is typically nine students or less as is the case with ELL and special education, but can be higher. Principals are tasked with balancing all special programs in their class configurations. This is more of a building decision rather than a district decision.

Superintendent Miner shared a document to be put on the screen (through Curtis Campbell) that summarizes the Board's conversation regarding a modified Option 2C. After slight tweaks, it read as follows as a possible option to be voted on:

The elementary Highly Capable magnet program will be located at Meridian Park. Current (2019-2020) Ridgecrest magnet program students may:

- *Attend Meridian Park in the magnet program*
- *Attend their neighborhood school and receive services in a general education classroom*
- *Attend Ridgecrest as a boundary exception student and receive services in a general education*

Newly identified students will attend Meridian Park or their home school.

Director Jernigan asked if the original data regarding decreasing enrollment in the HiCap program at Ridgecrest still stands as correct.

Director Betnel asked to review a budget question from the large spreadsheet (HiCap Staffing and Classroom Analysis—Trend Data). In referring to the salmon colored section for MPHC & RCHC Combined, the projected class sizes for fifth grade are listed as 34 and 33, which would push them both into overload. She asked if there were associated costs for the overload as was reflected in the other chart for keeping the fifth graders at Ridgecrest (\$42,000). Ms. Miller responded that there would be associated costs and that this is something that happens fairly regularly where classes in the highly capable program get to that size. Ms. Miller reported that she did not include overload costs in any of the scenarios as those are costs derived from class size triggers where the teacher has a choice of pay or additional help in the classroom. Instead, she used fixed costs such as the .3 FTE, which is automatically added for split classes, but this was not a perfect analysis. There could also be overload costs associated with HiCap students remaining at Ridgecrest if fifth grade classes reached those trigger points.

Given that we know more about our fiscal constraints now than we did in March, Director Jernigan asked if President Fralick might want to propose a vote on Option 1, which has no additional associated costs. Superintendent Miner interjected that she didn't know if that was necessarily different from what was proposed as a modified Option 2C. The proposal is basically an extension of Option 1, whereby the magnet program is located at Meridian Park. The extension is that Ridgecrest HiCap students would definitely have a place at Ridgecrest until they age out of elementary school. It could either be called modified Option 1 or modified Option 2C.

Director Rivera asked to slightly revise the earlier proposal as follows **(shown in bold)**:

Option 2E (see below where this title was added)

The Elementary Highly Capable magnet program will be located at Meridian Park. Current (2019-2020) Ridgecrest magnet program students may:

- 1) Attend Meridian Park in the magnet program*
- 2) Attend their neighborhood school and receive services in a general education classroom*
- 3) Attend Ridgecrest as a boundary exception student and receive services in a general education classroom, **but they may need to provide their own transportation***

Newly identified students will attend Meridian Park or neighborhood school.

President Fralick asked if anyone would like to propose a motion.

Director Betnel announced that she was now calling the above proposal Option 2E but that she was in support of what she was now calling Option 2F, which is grandfathering the 27 fifth graders at Ridgecrest at an anticipated cost of \$42,000. She felt that was justifiable in order to avoid that class from changing schools twice in two years. Mr. Schultz asked if doing this would take away the option for Ridgecrest fifth graders to attend Meridian Park because as he reads the above proposal, this essentially grandfatheres all of those magnet students onto the Ridgecrest campus if they choose that option.

Director Rivera once again asked to modify the proposal above to be titled Option 2E and then add Option 2F below to read: Grandfather second thru fourth graders as stated above and maintain a fifth grade magnet class. Superintendent Miner asked Curtis to copy the above Option 2E in order to create a new Option 2F, which says:

Option 2F

The elementary Highly Capable magnet program will be located at Meridian Park. 2nd-4th current (2019-2020) Ridgecrest magnet program students may:

- 1) Attend Meridian Park in the magnet program*

- 2) *Attend their neighborhood school and receive services in a general education classroom*
- 3) *Attend Ridgecrest as a boundary exception student and receive services in a general education classroom, **but may need to provide their own transportation***

*Newly identified students will attend Meridian Park or neighborhood school.
Maintain a 5th grade magnet classroom at Ridgecrest for the 2020-2021 school year.”*

Director Jernigan expressed some concern about making this decision at such a late hour without knowing all the relevant fiscal costs. As she understood the two options, there would not be additional costs with Option 2E; however, there would be additional costs of \$42,000 for staffing with Option 2F as well as transportation costs, possibly \$26,500. She asked if she was articulating and understanding that correctly. Ms. Miller said that she was but the transportation costs in this instance would likely be less than the \$26,500. The Director of Transportation had estimated that having one consolidated program, rather than two programs at two different sites, would save approximately \$26,500.

Director Rivera asked if it would be appropriate to start a discussion to determine which direction individual board members were leaning in their decisions. President Fralick responded that she felt there had been a robust discussion and that typically, parliamentary procedures were followed. Superintendent Miner added that rather than doing a straw poll, often someone makes a motion and if there isn't a second or the motion doesn't carry, a different motion is put forward.

President Fralick asked if there was a motion any board member would like to bring forward.

MOTION NO. 47: Due to the way it addresses the socio-emotional connection to Ridgecrest, Director Jernigan moved that Option 2E be considered for adoption by the Board, in order to address the program placement issue for the Ridgecrest Highly Capable cohort. Director Rivera stated she could go either way but seconded this motion. The motion carried with four yes votes and one no vote. Director Betnel stated that she preferred Option 2F so that fifth graders would not be asked to change schools twice in two years and particularly amid a pandemic. Director Jernigan clarified that Option 2E does not ask fifth graders to change schools.

President Fralick thanked those who electronically attended this meeting, particularly the 52 who continued until the very end.

Adjournment: 11:25 p.m.

Heather Fralick, Board President

Attest: July 20, 2020

Rebecca L. Miner, Secretary
Shoreline Board of Directors

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