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MEETING PURPOSE AND OVERVIEW
The Bethel School District Long Range Facilities Task Force met for their sixth meeting on January 10th at the Pierce County Skills Center. The meeting’s key objectives were:

- How do options score when measured against phase 1 criteria?
- What are the pros and cons of the remaining options based on their criteria scores?
- What options should the Task Force continue to consider?
• What opportunities are there to combine options?
• Is there additional information still needed?

**Phase 1 Criteria Ratings:**

Penny explained that the first task for the evening would be to look at the nine remaining options and discuss how they scored against phase 1 criteria. After reviewing criteria scores the Task Force would then work to narrow down the list of options. Penny reminded the group that phase 1 criteria were developed during the November and December meetings and included:

- Duration of solution
- Capacity gained
- Equity
- Impacts to after-school/extra-curricular activities
- Cost
- Additional resources needed

Penny noted she had received an email from a Task Force member who was concerned that “educational impact” was not included as part of the phase 1 criteria. The member expressed that justifying the Task Force’s concern for students could be difficult if educational impact wasn’t included. In response, Penny noted that the Task Force had agreed to include educational impact as part of phase 2 criteria. She added that the research conducted on all the options under consideration did not show negative impacts to educational outcomes. Therefore, as a measurement, educational outcomes would not be a major differentiator for the Task Force and would not be of great help in narrowing remaining options.

Penny asked the Task Force if the decision to keep educational impacts as a phase 2 criterion was still their choice. She also noted that, to ensure community members knew the importance of the criterion to the Task Force, the recommendations report would include a discussion of why it was not included as part of the first phase. This approach was deemed acceptable by the group.

The Task Force then discussed narrowing down the options list using phase 1 criteria. The nine options they considered were:

- Year-Round Multi-Track (select schools only)
- Double Shifting (select schools only)
- Change 1 middle school to an elementary school
- Change 1 middle school to a high school
- Use parts of middle schools for elementary schools
- Turn all middle schools and elementary schools into K-8
- Turn all middle schools to 5-8 and all elementary schools to K-4
- Close Elk Plain School of Choice K-8 and change to elementary school
- Distance learning

Penny noted that the district advised Task Force members to evaluate Year-Round Multi-Track and Double Shifting options as applied at “select schools only” and not the entire district due to feasibility, cost and financial resources and staff. A suggestion was made to consider using a method identified during the research phase, used by one of the school district’s interviewed, to select schools where these options would be used. The method sets a threshold capacity level, and when a school reaches that capacity, it then transitions into the proposed option (Year-Round Multi-Track or Double Shifting).
Options Narrowing:
Penny asked everyone, as small table groups, to discuss the options using the Criteria Rating Definitions and the Options Data Sheet handouts to understand how the options compared to each other and the pros and cons of each option. After the discussion, Penny had Task Force members use their cell phones to participate in a poll to determine which options to leave behind and which to carry forward into the phase 2 evaluation.

After discussions, polling resulted in the following outcome (strike-through means the option was to be left behind)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Year-Round Multi-Track at select schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Double-Shifting at select schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Change 1 middle school to an elementary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Change 1 middle school to a high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Use parts of middle schools for elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Change all middle and elementary schools to K-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Change all middle schools to 5-8 grades and all elementary schools to K-4 grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Close Elk Plain School of Choice and change it to an elementary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Distance-learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developing combinations:
Penny noted to the Task Force that none of the remaining options fully addressed the district’s capacity problems at both the high school and elementary school levels. She asked each table group to consider the information for each remaining option (e.g. options data sheet, poll results) and develop combinations that would address all Bethel School District’s capacity needs. Penny also asked the superintendent, assistant superintendents and Cathie, Director of Construction and Planning, to form their own table group and develop combinations as well.

Each group reported out on their results. During their table discussions, Task Force table groups came up with six different combinations. Several of them were identified by more than one group. The district table group came up with three options, one of which was also suggested by the Task Force table groups. The district veered from the instructions and used one option that the Task Force had already said they were leaving behind (Double Shifting).

All combinations Suggested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of groups who suggested</th>
<th>Suggested by: Task Force (TF) Or District Leadership</th>
<th>Combination Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Year-Round Multi-Track high school + change 1 middle school to elementary school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF + District</td>
<td>Year-Round Multi-Track elementary school + change 1 middle school to high school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of groups who suggested</td>
<td>Suggested by: Task Force (TF) Or District Leadership</td>
<td>Combination Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Year-Round Multi-Track high school + change to 5-8 grade middle school + K-4 elementary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Change 1 middle school to high school + change to 5-8 grade middle school + K-4 elementary school</td>
<td>District noted that losing a middle school plus adding a grade to all middle school would result in an over-capacity situation at the middle school level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Change 1 middle school to high school + change Elk Plain SOC to elementary + change to 5-8 middle school and K-4 elementary school</td>
<td>District noted that losing a middle school plus adding a grade to all middle schools would result in an over-capacity situation at the middle school level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Year-Round Multi-Track high school + change to 5-8 middle school and K-4 elementary school + change Elk Plain SOC to elementary</td>
<td>One group suggested the same combination but added that Elk Plain remains a school of choice for K-4 grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Double Shifting high school (2 sessions per day) + change 1 middle school to elementary</td>
<td>District noted they “broke the rules” because Double Shifting works better than Year-Round Multi-Track for high school due to after school impacts, curriculum impacts, staffing of single teacher programs, resources necessary to run school year-round, and student preferences for late or early shifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Double Shifting high school (2 sessions per day) + change to 5-8 middle and K-4 elementary</td>
<td>District noted they “broke the rules” because Double Shifting works better than Year-Round Multi-Track for high school due to after school impacts, curriculum impacts, staffing of single teacher programs, resources necessary to run school year-round, and student preferences for late or early shifts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, after all the combinations were reviewed, the district explained why they selected Double Shifting instead of Year-Round Multi-Track at the high school level. Their reasoning was that Year-Round Multi-Track would be complicated to implement at high schools where they need to consider Running Start schedules, academic programs, graduations, college applications, SAT Testing, etc. The district also needs to consider their resources, as some single-teacher programs would require additional staff to cover year-round school. The district also noted that many high school students would like to start and end their day later. For these reasons, the district said they believe that Double Shifting would be more beneficial than Year-Round Multi-Track to students and families at Bethel high schools.

A Task Force member asked why the group didn't have this information prior to voting on the options, or why they didn't know about the problems with Year-Round Multi-Track for high schools. Penny reminded the Task Force that in discussing all the options in previous meetings, most of this information was presented and/or provided in hand-outs. The Task Force briefly discussed the district’s thinking and then concurred on recommending the following combinations for further analysis by the district and discussion at the January 31 Task Force meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combinations to carry forward for further analysis</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Year-Round Multi-Track Double Shifting high school + change 1 middle school to elementary school</td>
<td>Task Force agreed to change Year-Round Multi-Track to Double Shifting after listening to district’s rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Year-Round Multi-Track elementary school + change 1 middle school to high school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Year-Round Multi-Track Double Shifting high school + change to 5-8 middle school and K-4 elementary school + change Elk Plain SOC to elementary</td>
<td>Task Force agreed to change Year-Round Multi-Track to Double Shifting after listening to district rationale. One group suggested Elk Plain remain a school of choice for grades K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Double Shifting high school (2 sessions per day) + change to 5-8 middle school and K-4 elementary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next steps:
- Penny will update criteria and develop a selection process for the second phase of options evaluation for the next meeting
- The next meeting is Thursday, January 31st

The meeting was adjourned at 7:26pm.