

## **BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

May 4, 2020

### **Call to Order**

President Heather Fralick called the Regular Board Meeting of the Shoreline Board of Directors to order via conference phone and Zoom at 7:00 p.m. on May 4, 2020. Rebecca Miner, Superintendent; Curtis Campbell, Public Information Officer; and Kathie Schindler, Executive Assistant, were attending this meeting from Room D105 of 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 Crosson, Shorecrest Student Representative. *(Since this meeting was being conducted telephonically among the board members, President Fralick had each director state they were present. Superintendent Miner had the presenters, Maria Stevens and Marla Miller, state they were present as well.)*

Absent and Excused: Cynthia Ruelas, Shorewood Student Representative.

### **Land Acknowledgement**

Director Jernigan expressed that she was immensely grateful for the gift of beginning these meetings with the land acknowledgement. She feels an enormous responsibility with each of these opportunities. Over the weekend, her sister had reminded her of their teachings, specifically that “our gift and our responsibility are one and the same, two sides of the same coin.” This responsibility is really an opportunity to center the fundamental teachings of our Coast Salish ancestors, which are aligned with those of her tribe, the Choctaw Nation. Those fundamental teachings involve the centering of family and of family life, which also includes our elders, whom we would never sacrifice for the benefit of our economy. We all have the opportunity to incorporate those teachings into how we live our lives today, to examine our daily rituals and daily schedules and determine what is of most importance--our families, our family life and our elders.

### **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 telephone and joined by members of the community who may be listening remotely.” She then asked Superintendent Miner to share a few words about these unique circumstances.

Superintendent Miner reiterated that on March 24, Governor Jay Inslee issued a proclamation, which in part, referred to the Open Public Meetings Act and the Public Records Act. This order was set to expire on April 23, 2020 but it has now been extended to May 31, 2020. Governor Inslee prohibited school districts from conducting open public meetings in person as a result of the novel coronavirus pandemic, and required districts, at a minimum, to provide telephonic access to meetings. It also prevented districts from taking action as defined in RCW 42.30.020, unless those matters are necessary and routine or are matters necessary to respond to the COVID-19 outbreak and the current public health emergency.

For the record, President Fralick noted that community members were given notice of the change to the meeting format. They were also notified by email of the opportunity to join the meeting electronically or telephonically and to submit written comments until noon on May 4. Those comments were received by the Board via email earlier in the afternoon (May 4). She thanked the community members for taking the time to submit their comments. *(The comments were also posted to the electronic board packet for May 4 under “agenda” on the District’s website at: [www.shorelineschools.org/page/1235](http://www.shorelineschools.org/page/1235).)*

Minutes – May 4, 2020

President Fralick moved to suspend the provision of Board Procedure 1441P allowing for community members to address the Board during this meeting.

MOTION NO. 34: 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 Mr. Wilson. A roll call vote followed and the motion carried unanimously.

### **Approval of Minutes**

President Fralick announced that the minutes of the April 13 Study Session, April 13 Regular Board Meeting and April 17 and April 24 Special Board Meetings were pulled from the agenda and would be brought back for consideration on May 18.

### **Adoption of Consent Agenda**

The following consent agenda was presented for approval:

- a. Approval of Personnel - Certificated
- b. Approval of Vouchers

President Fralick asked each director individually if there were any agenda items they wanted pulled for discussion or a separate vote. There were none.

MOTION NO. 35: Ms. Betnel moved that the Board adopt the consent agenda, items 5a and 5b, which is attached hereto and becomes a part hereof. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wilson. A roll call vote followed and the motion carried unanimously.

As of May 4, 2020, the Board, by a unanimous vote, approved for payment, those vouchers described as follows: Reconciliation of Warrants Issued Between April 10 and April 24, 2020 - General Fund Warrants #83229-84008, 84009-84068, 192001063, 84093-84838, and 84845-84922, totaling \$764,933.68; Capital Projects Fund Warrants #84069-84086, 84091-84092 and 84923-84949, totaling \$12,410,617.60; and Student Bond Fund Warrants #84087-84090, 192001064, 84839-84844 and 84950-84957, totaling \$20,961.00; for a grand total of \$13,196,512.28.

### **Board Requested Discussion**

All board members were asked individually if they wanted to propose any items for future discussion. There were no topics proposed at this time.

### **Action Items**

#### **Adoption of New Policy 2418, Waiver of High School Graduation Credits**

*Maria Stevens, Director of Teaching and Learning, presented.*

The proposed new policy for waiving up to 2 high school credits reflects recent updates by the State Board of Education in supporting the Washington State 24-credit graduation requirements. District staff and legal counsel have reviewed the recommended policy and procedures from the Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA).

Districts are authorized to waive up to two credits of the 24-credit graduation requirements (WAC 180-51-068), according to written district policies. Students with the waiver may graduate with 22, rather than 24 total credits, although students must earn the 17 foundational (core) subject area credits. Credits that may be waived are the seven elective credits (four electives and three Personalized Pathway requirements— one of two arts credits and both world language credits).

Student circumstances that districts could identify as considerations for the waiver could include: homelessness, limited English proficiency, medical conditions, disabilities, inability to retake classes or enroll in remedial classes free of charge or any other individual student circumstance that directly compromises a student's ability to learn.

Ms. Stevens reviewed the process for accessing the waiver:

- Students/guardians must file the District's Application for Waiver of High School Graduation Credits;
- The Application for Waiver of High School Graduation Credits must be submitted 30 school days prior to the scheduled graduation date.

President Fralick asked each board member individually if they had any questions on this presentation; there were none.

It was the recommendation of the Superintendent that the Board adopt new Policy 2418, Waiver of High School Graduation Credits, to be effective May 4, 2020.

MOTION NO. 36: Mr. Wilson moved that the Board adopt new Policy 2418, Waiver of High School Graduation Credits, as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jernigan. A roll call vote followed and the motion carried unanimously.

Adoption of Resolution 2020-5, Emergency Waiver of High School Graduation Credits  
*Rebecca L. Miner, Superintendent, presented.*

As part of the Graduation Toolkit, the Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA) has issued several recommended resolutions. The first of these, Resolution 2020-4, Authorizing the Superintendent to Act in the Present Emergency as Designee, was adopted by the Board on March 30, 2020.

Resolution 2020-5 reinforces the authority of the District to apply for a waiver from the State Board of Education (SBE) for Waiver of High School Graduation Credits. The District applied for and was approved for that waiver at the first opportunity to do so at the SBE meeting on April 21, 2020. This resolution sunsets on July 31, 2020.

Superintendent Miner announced that a third resolution was scheduled to be brought to the Board for consideration and possible adoption at the May 18 regular meeting.

President Fralick asked each board member individually if they had any questions on this presentation; there were none.

It was the recommendation of the Superintendent that the Board adopt Resolution 2020-5, Emergency Waiver of High School Graduation Credits, as presented.

MOTION NO. 37: Ms. Rivera moved that the Board adopt Resolution 2020-5, Emergency Waiver of High School Graduation Credits, as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Betnel. A roll call vote followed and the motion carried unanimously.

Adoption of Resolution 2020-6, Non-Supervisory Certificated Employee Reduction Authorization for the 2020-2021 Contract Year and Resolution 2020-7, Supervisory Certificated Employee Reduction Authorization for the 2020-2021 Contract Year  
*Marla S. Miller, Deputy Superintendent, presented.*

*(These were two separate action items on the agenda but were covered by one presentation.)*

Ms. Miller began with a review of the school district budget development process that was shared in its entirety with the Board at their study session on January 22 (rescheduled from January 13 due to snow). At that time, staff was not aware that there would be a COVID-19 pandemic that would significantly impact the budget process. The items and activities listed for January and March have all taken place. We now find ourselves in May. By state law, before May 15, school districts must do the following:

- Determine surplus/RIF (reduction in force)
- Develop overall staffing impacts at district level
- Request board approval of any RIF notices

The actual revenues for the 2018-2019 fiscal year reflect that the largest portion of revenue comes from the state—60% in “State-General” (apportionment) and 15% in “State-Special” (categorical, e.g. ELL, special education, etc.). “Federal-Special” revenues amount to 4% of the total, “Local Taxes” (enhancement levy) amount to 15% and “Local-Non Tax” is 5% (primarily Children’s Center tuition).

The actual expenditures for the 2018-2019 fiscal year reflect 80% to schools, district-wide support 8% (Teaching and Learning Department, Maintenance Department and supervisors at district-wide level but services based at schools); school-based support 7% (e.g. food service staff and custodians); public activities 3% (Children’s Center); and central administration 2% (Payroll, Human Resources, Business Office, Superintendent’s Office).

Ms. Miller also reviewed a chart reflecting the actual ending fund balances for 2014-2015 through 2018-2019, along with the projected ending fund balance (adopted in August 2019) for 2019-2020.

The 2019-2020 budgeted General Fund expenditures can be broken down as follows:

Compensation/Benefits – 87.8%

- All certs (wages only) – 45.8%
- All classified (wages only) – 17.9%
- Payroll taxes and health insurance – 24.1%

Remaining – 12.2%

- Utilities
- Insurance
- Audit/compliance
- Legal costs
- Contracted special education instructional services
- Curriculum/instructional materials
- Supplies

What has changed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic?

- Potential drop in enrollment (as advised by demographer to school districts in Puget Sound; possibly 1.5% to 2% of projected enrollment may not be able to stay in area due to high cost of living, unemployment, etc.)
- Anticipated loss of revenue (could be significant loss of sales tax revenue)
- Unknown ability to re-open school buildings in 2020-2021

In terms of budget planning for 2020-2021, Ms. Miller reviewed the “knowns” and “unknowns”:

Knowns:

1. Closure of Meridian Park Kindergarten and North City Kindergarten sites
2. Reconfiguration of middle schools to include 6<sup>th</sup> graders
3. Logistical and financial impacts of pandemic in spring of 2020:
  - a. Distributed technology from schools to homes

Unknowns:

1. Impacts of pandemic
  - a. Enrollment
  - b. Revenue
  - c. Ability to open school buildings
  - d. Changes to legal requirements and guidelines (e.g. K-3 compliance, special education, other)

Knowns (continued):

- b. Distributed supplemental instructional materials from schools to homes
- c. Need to replenish donated emergency supplies

At this time, the recommendations include:

- Approve resolution to allow District to meet mandatory deadline for notification of reduction in force (RIF)
- Continue monitoring leaves, resignations, and retirements to reduce potential need for RIFs and ability to recall staff
- Identify additional reductions in other areas to balance the impacts of budget reductions
- Continue monitoring enrollment and revenue impacts

In the event that the District does need to reduce expenditures in order to balance revenues, the District “would not in any way, shape or form say that the only reductions recommended would have to do with certificated staff.” The problem is that’s the only part of the budget where there is a fixed deadline by the state for notification of staff. If a resolution is not adopted by the Board, once May 15 passes, that is no longer an option. This meeting’s recommendations are in response to the deadline in the state statute.

Ms. Miller explained how the RIF process works:

- District must follow very clear legal parameters established through state law and our local collective bargaining agreement (CBA) with the Shoreline Education Association (SEA)
- Board adopts resolution to allow RIF process to be implemented no later than May 15
- District administrators identify positions (not people) to be reduced for 2020-2021
  - ❖ Program reductions
  - ❖ Increased staffing ratios
- Human Resources follows the contractual procedures in the CBA with SEA to identify individuals to receive RIF notifications - determining individuals who are impacted takes some time. The following was provided earlier in the day in response to a question from a board member: *“The District first identifies the positions or portion of positions that will be reduced, by job description, subject area and grade level. The SEA contract then directs the District to determine which individuals are least senior within those specific positions. If an employee’s contract would be reduced based on their current job assignment but they have the qualifications (as documented in their certificate) and more seniority than another person in a position that is not being reduced, the more senior person is allowed to “bump” into that other position for which they are qualified. The contract for the least senior person is then reduced. This process is iterative, so it is difficult to say exactly which individuals will have reduced contracts until the entire process is run.”*
- By May 15, individuals received RIF notifications
- If positions are reinstated after RIF, the recall process in the CBA is implemented and individuals are offered contracts for 2020-2021

Ms. Miller then explained how the RIF process works for certificated administrators:

- District must follow very clear legal parameters established through state law; the agreement with administrators is silent on the RIF process
- Board adopts resolution to allow RIF process to be implemented no later than May 15
- District administrators identify positions (not people) to be reduced for 2020-2021
  - ❖ Program reductions
- Human Resources follows legal procedures to identify individuals to receive RIF notifications
- By May 15, individuals receive RIF notifications
- If positions are reinstated after RIF, the recall process in the CBA is implemented and individuals are offered contracts for 2020-2021

In summary of what was presented:

- District recommendation for board adoption of Resolution 2020-6 to authorize RIF of no more than 25 non-supervisory certificated FTE and Resolution 2020-7 to authorize RIF of no more than 3 supervisory certificated FTE
- District will minimize actual RIF to the extent possible
- District will continue to monitor enrollment and revenue to reduce RIF and maintain programs as fiscally possible and sustainable

The General Fund is comprised of three categories or buckets of expenditures (as indicated on slide 7 of the presentation): certificated contracts, classified employees costs and non-employee related costs. The resolutions on this agenda only pertain to the certificated contracts, due again, to the deadline of May 15 for notification to staff.

Ms. Miller reviewed a couple of the questions that had come in earlier in the day in regard to this process. A question was asked regarding how the number of RIFs included in these resolutions was determined. In very preliminary reviews of what has been taking place in the economy, it was thought that possibly a target of 3-5% of the budget would be a good place to be as of May 4, without any definitive information from the state. The total of the 25 non-supervisory FTE and 3 supervisory FTE is just over \$3.5 million, or 3% of the state revenue. It is felt that there would also be an impact in local funds but not immediately since most people have already paid their taxes and the April collection appears to be about where it should be. However, eventually there may be a delay as people become unable to pay their mortgages and taxes.

Another question inquired about the possibility of using fund balance. The targeted fund balance is in board policy (between 4 and 5% of total General Fund budgeted expenditures). The budgeted reserve for 2019-2020 is \$8.1 million. To put this in context, this amount is less than one month's payroll for Shoreline, which runs at approximately \$12 million. During this pandemic and school closure, most of Shoreline's employees have been kept in paid status. The reason this is possible is due to the state continuing payment of apportionment for the 2019-2020 school year. Again, if we didn't have that continuation of state funding, the fund balance would not be enough to cover one month of payroll costs.

President Fralick opened the meeting up for questions on this presentation by asking directors by director district. Director Jernigan asked for clarification regarding whether the Board was being asked to approve the resolutions authorizing 28 FTE without touching the reserves. Ms. Miller responded that as of May 4, the Board was being asked for approval to issue notices in order to preserve the ability to make those reductions if necessary. Unfortunately, school districts don't yet have information from the state as to what formulas to use in preparing budgets for next year. If the District didn't present and adopt these resolutions at this time, it would be necessary to find \$3.5 to \$5 million in other reductions, NOT in the certificated staff category. This would most likely mean cutting into classified staff at a much deeper level as well as dipping into reserves. President Fralick added that earlier in the day, one of the responses to board questions noted that there was a recommended spending down of the reserves for 2020-2021 of \$170,000 [as part of the four-year projection included in the adopted 2019-2020 budget] and was it correct that the \$8.1 million was in line with meeting the 4-5% board policy minimum. Ms. Miller responded that was correct but what we don't know right now is the extent to which the District will be reimbursed for costs related to COVID-19. It is likely that some reserve will be needed to cover unanticipated costs for this fiscal year. On the other hand, there will probably be lowered costs for utilities given that there are no students in the buildings.

Director Jernigan also asked for more clarity on how RIF positions are identified in the district. There will possibly be some reductions due to the closing of the two overflow kindergarten programs, which were already planned. Positions that are currently part of those two sites that might not be needed in other buildings could be potential candidates for RIF. Another possibility might be building in an expectation of

where an enrollment shortfall may appear. Typically, not all of the kindergarten positions are filled until we actually have the registrations that support the enrollment projection. For the first time since kindergarten registration began in February, there recently was a drop in the number of registrations. Spring break was included in that time period, so it could be that or it could be due to the current circumstances mentioned by the demographer. If the enrollment drops, there won't be a need for as many teaching positions.

Director Jernigan also asked if the RIF recommendations were based on the demographer's projections of a possible 1.5% to 2% decline in enrollment. Ms. Miller responded not entirely, because when there are fewer students, there is also less revenue from the state. Typically, the cost of staffing is approximately 80+%, not 100%, so the number of teachers would be reduced but this would also require that costs in other areas be reduced as well.

In response to another question by Director Jernigan as to whether or not there was any additional board action required after adoption of these resolutions, Ms. Miller responded that the Board's role is to authorize the potential RIF action. It is then up to district administration to develop a proposal for the implementation—if the RIFs are needed and where they would occur. Their responsibility is also to continue to balance the budget and there is a good possibility that other areas would also be affected. But again, tonight's action items in regard to certificated positions are due to the state-required deadline of May 15. Superintendent Miner reiterated that this action is in large part due to not having all the information needed to make decisions. It's a clear case of timelines not lining up and there weren't any provisions made by the state for extending the May 15 deadline. The state also is in a position of not having all the information. There are no indicators that districts will have any additional information prior to the deadline; otherwise, Superintendent Miner stated she would have suggested another board meeting prior to May 15.

Director Jernigan asked if every school district in Washington was bound by the May 15 deadline. Yes, the deadline is the same for all; however, not every district is in the same exact situation so they may respond differently. For example, if a district has a large reserve, they may be better able to weather a reduction. If a district is growing, they will likely have new revenue coming in as a result of the increased enrollment.

Director Wilson cautioned against using reserves and also against too many teachers and not enough students. In his recent memory, he noted that typically there were much fewer RIFs (3.0, 4.0, 6.0) and usually all were recalled. This is a much deeper cut; circumstances are very different now but it's important to back the system.

Director Rivera asked Director Wilson if he remembered the circumstances of 2007 and 2008 in terms of how many RIFs were authorized and if there were specific budget issues. Superintendent Miner related that at that time, the District was in the midst of closing two schools, North City and Sunset, which would have eliminated most of the overhead costs associated with those buildings. Teachers were likely moved to other schools (with the students); however, principal, custodial and office positions would have likely been eliminated.

Director Rivera asked if she was correct in calculating that the board-directed reserve was currently at 5%, the upper part of the board-directed range of 4-5%; dropping down to 4% would amount to approximately a savings of \$1.5 million. Ms. Miller explained that as the total expenditures grow, so does the required reserve. Currently, the District is committed to the state increase in salaries for staff for next year. Also, when building the budget, funds are sometimes moved to the reserves in order to remain at a specified level, e.g. when the revenues don't grow at the same rate. During the recession of 2008, school districts across the country adopted a similar target (4-5%) for their reserves, in part, to demonstrate that public institutions could withstand a drop in revenue. This becomes a part of the annual reporting associated with issuing bonds. When the books are closed for a fiscal year, the District is required to submit those end-of-year financial statements to the bond holders, and if the ending fund balance dips too low, this negatively

impacts the bond ratings and results in the District paying a higher yield rate. Additionally, with the adoption of the annual budget, districts are now required to include a four-year projection of the district's finances (also put in place after the recession) in order to provide the community with a sense of the soundness of the district's finances. Both of these factors contribute to the need for a stable ending fund balance. If districts use reserves, they have a one-time ability to use those funds and then in order to make it up, it becomes a much steeper curve to fill the hole and then get back to the original percentage of reserves.

Director Rivera asked what the basis was for the estimated 3% loss of total revenue. Ms. Miller responded that she follows the state's quarterly economic report for planning. It was already known that we were losing 2% in state funding for compensation in 2020-2021 based on the regionalization factors for our district. It was anticipated that would be made up by closing the two kindergarten programs (Meridian Park and North City). However, now with the loss of additional revenue, it seemed prudent to assume a 3-5% loss. This is based on more of an experience factor rather than from any solid data coming from the state.

Director Rivera asked if there were any legislative changes coming in June. Ms. Miller responded that they anticipate having more information in June in preparation for the 2020-2021 budget. President Fralick added that in the weekly WSSDA call, mention was made of three possibilities for the state legislature: potential special session in the summer or a potential special session in the fall or a potential special session after the regular session that begins in January 2021.

Director Betnel asked if procedurally, the RIF resolution is typically a one meeting process. Ms. Miller responded that yes, usually the RIF resolution is a one reading action item.

Director Betnel asked if there was any anticipation that the financial impacts of the pandemic mentioned in the presentation would be covered by either the state or federal government. The information available right now is that the District may be eligible for reimbursement of approximately \$270,000, but that is very much a preliminary amount.

Director Betnel said she was of the understanding that the Title I formula would be applied to the distribution of the Washington CARES Act funds to school districts; how much does that mean for Shoreline? When funds are distributed using a Title I formula, Shoreline is not one of the more prominent recipients because we don't have the demographic that Title I particularly tries to support, which is a much higher free and reduced meal population. Since there has been no guidance whatsoever as to what the distribution of those funds might look like, Ms. Miller stated that she didn't feel comfortable putting out a number. Upon hearing about the Title I formula, she was less optimistic about what Shoreline's allocation would be.

Director Rivera reported that she had learned earlier in the day that there was going to be a push at the federal level to assist schools financially. Ms. Miller responded that because the State of Washington maintained payment of apportionment throughout the closure, we know that we will not be eligible for funding costs that we would have incurred if we had remained open. We are using state funding to maintain, for example, the payment to all of our teachers and the transportation costs of the food distribution program. The fact that the state maintained the apportionment payments would prohibit us from submitting a claim for these costs under the Emergency Funding Act. We are however looking at claiming costs that are extraordinary and not covered with the state funding formula. Food service staff is typically paid with local and federal funds. There is probably some portion of our food service meals that are extraordinary, especially during spring break, and could be submitted for reimbursement.

Director Betnel asked how much of our anticipated overall reduction in expenses is the RIF. Ms. Miller responded that we don't know the total amount as yet but based on experience, she is hoping it wouldn't be

more than a \$3.5 to \$5.0 million total reduction that would be necessary, but this is just an educated guess at this point. If the amount was \$3.5 to \$5.0 million, it would be a shared reduction between the three “buckets” of district expenditures (certificated, classified, materials/supplies); it would not all come from certificated salaries.

Director Betnel asked if the legislature would revisit the K-3 class size as a part of looking at budgetary impacts and is there anything in place in Shoreline that would encourage maintaining that priority? Ms. Miller responded that would come under the category of priorities and board decisions on how to balance the budget. If the state no longer funded K-3 class size reduction and all of our costs for those positions needed to come out of the reserves or the levy, we would probably need to make deeper cuts in order to maintain the smaller K-3 class sizes. Currently, the state is funding it and if they stopped funding it, the District would have to decide to maintain it by cutting somewhere else or by taking more of the reserves.

Director Betnel asked when elementary boundaries might be revisited. Prior to COVID-19 and the subsequent school closure, the overarching plan had been to be doing the research this spring and then presenting a proposal to the Board in possibly November for implementation in 2021-2022.

Director Betnel asked if the reduction in force were to result in the elimination of a currently offered course, would that come before the Board for notice and/or a vote. Superintendent Miner stated, that assuming Director Betnel was talking about a high school course, a program reduction could happen during this process without additional approval from the Board. Ms. Miller added that normally staffing is associated with enrollment and registration in classes. If there is a very small number of students registering for a particular course, that means another course may possibly have a lot more students. There is a limited number of staff in any scenario, RIF or otherwise. Usually the question is, if there is a need to pull out FTE from the system, where will it result in the least amount of impact to students.

President Fralick asked if the Board were not to adopt the two resolutions, what impact would that have on the District. Ms. Miller stated that if a significant reduction is required, the District would not be able to cut any certificated staff. The reductions would have to come from the other “two buckets.”

Director Rivera asked if the state funding is based on a specific ratio, e.g. K-3 class size, if we don't have that number of teachers, do we not get funding? And does this apply to grades 4-6 and above? Ms. Miller responded that if the K-3 compliance requirements stay as they are currently set up, we probably would not reduce K-3 teachers to the point where we would lose funding, so that is one of the pieces of information the District is waiting on from the state. There is an overall compliance for the district as a whole, K-12, that we meet, but K-3 is the only grade band with a compliance requirement whereby funding comes specifically to address class sizes in that particular grade band.

Director Rivera stated that some certificated positions are not specifically tied to the classroom and asked if when determining cuts, if they would be made across the board, including positions that are not fulfilling classroom ratios. Ms. Miller responded that all positions would be reviewed with the caveat that K-3 may not be beneficial to cut. Of particular interest in planning for next year are program needs and requirements and determining which cuts would have the least impact on students. Nothing is really protected from that conversation but the key again is to review what specifically is needed for this coming fall. There isn't any one particular area where cuts would be made but rather it would be a range of areas.

Director Jernigan referenced Tam Osborne's presentation earlier in the year where he spoke about the progress that has been made in diversifying staff, particularly in the classified arena. She asked if there were any assurances that could be offered to the Board regarding ensuring that cuts won't disproportionately impact our teachers of color for whom the District has worked so hard to recruit and retain. The challenge with a reduction in force is that there are very clear statutory requirements that

seniority is included as the primary factor in determining which positions and individuals are reduced. The contract with the Shoreline Education Association echoes that same priority, so unfortunately there can be no guarantee that there wouldn't be a disproportionate impact on newer hires. It depends on the categories, qualifications and content areas in which they are employed and how many are in a particular area.

Director Jernigan offered her gratitude to Ms. Miller for being willing to respond to the depth of questions asked in this regular board meeting that are more typical for the open dialogues enjoyed in a study session atmosphere. Likewise, Ms. Miller acknowledged the difficulty of this topic for even seasoned board members, particularly with the lack of information available at this time in terms of budget development. It is a disheartening process and she expressed appreciation for everyone's sincerity and forbearance in trying to navigate where we are now and where we need to be.

It was the recommendation of the Superintendent that the Board adopt Resolution 2020-6, Non-Supervisory Certificated Employee Reduction Authorization for the 2020-2021 Contract Year, which authorizes the District to issue reduction in force notices to reduce a maximum of 25 FTE certificated employee contracts, as presented.

MOTION NO. 38: Mr. Wilson moved that the Board adopt Resolution 2020-6, Non-Supervisory Certificated Employee Reduction Authorization for the 2020-2021 Contract Year, as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Fralick. A roll call vote followed and the motion carried unanimously. It was noted, however, by President Fralick that this action was taken with heavy hearts and that board members as well as administration were not taking this decision lightly, but rather were acting in the interest of fiduciary responsibility. It was hoped that the full number authorized would not be realized.

It was the recommendation of the Superintendent that the Board adopt Resolution 2020-7, Supervisory Certificated Employee Reduction Authorization for the 2020-2021 Contract Year, which authorizes the District to issue reduction in force notices to reduce a maximum of 3 FTE supervisory certificated employee contracts, as presented.

MOTION NO. 39: Ms. Rivera moved that the Board adopt Resolution 2020-7, Supervisory Certificated Employee Reduction Authorization for the 2020-2021 Contract Year, as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wilson. A roll call vote followed and the motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment: 8:55 p.m.

---

Heather Fralick, Board President

Attest: June 1, 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.**