

Bethel School District

Long Range Facilities Task Force



Meeting #7 Summary

Bethel School District Long Range Facilities Task Force Meeting #7
Thursday, January 31, 2019
5:30-7:30PM
Pierce County Skills Center, 16117 Canyon Rd E, Puyallup, WA 98375

Task Force members in attendance

Althea Clark
Ashlee Walker
Audra Brown
Bill Taylor
Brian Streleski
Carie Ann Lathom
Charis Storrs
Debby Morgan
Dennis Leingang
Jennifer Van Gieson
Kathleen Jones

Kim Price
Paul Marquardt
Porsche Appleman
Rebecca Sok
Rick Knutsen
Sandy Williamson
Terry Hurd
Tina Lee
Todd Mitchell
Tracy Hennessy

Members absent

Amy Briggs
Bernadette Patton
Dan Ferreira
David Knight
Demetrius Forte
Denise Clark
Dick Thurston
Jay McIsaac
Jeffrey Johnson
Joe Hoge

Marilyn Wood
Melanie Thomas
Mike Christianson
Mujaahidah Sayfullah
Peggy Brayton
Robert Crewse
Robert Stanley
Scott Martin
Shannon Zimmerly
Thomas Munoz

Meeting observers

Penny Mabie
Cathie Carlson
Leigh Ann Dryer
Doug Boyles
Karen Campbell
Joel Stutheit
David Wells

Tom Seigel
Jennifer Bethman
Lori Haugen
Chad Honig
Brian Grassi

MEETING PURPOSE AND OVERVIEW

The Bethel School District Long Range Facilities Task Force met for their seventh meeting on January 31st at the Pierce County Skills Center. The meeting's key objectives were:

- How do combinations score when measured against phase 2 criteria?
- What are the pros and cons of the combinations based on their criteria scores?

- What options should the Task Force recommend to the school board?
- Is there additional information still needed?

MEETING #6 REVIEW

Penny received an email after meeting #6 from a Task Force member regarding the process used to determine combinations to consider. Specifically, the issue was that the Task Force had agreed to eliminate double shifting as an option, and then agreed to bring it back when it was proposed for high school by the district rather than the year-round multi-track option agreed to earlier in the meeting by the Task Force. Penny noted for the Task Force that the decision had been made very quickly. She inquired if all Task Force members understood the discussion and the reasons that year-round multi-track school was replaced by double shifting. Several Task Force members noted that when they originally chose year-round instead of double-shifting, it was with the assumption that the double-shifting was an all-or-nothing option, that is, it had to be agreed to for both high school and elementary school. They said if they had realized it could be selected for high school only, they would have kept it, as they voted it down because they thought having elementary students on double shift schedules was out of the question. Penny asked the Task Force if they all understood the district's reasoning behind the switch, and they all agreed that they did understand and that double shifting should replace year-round multi-track school in Combinations A, B & D.

DISCUSSING PHASE 2 CRITERIA RATINGS

Penny asked Task Force members to talk amongst their tables and, using the Criteria Ratings Definitions sheet and the Criteria Ratings sheet, make sure they understand the phase 2 criteria and how each combination option measures against the criteria:

- Capacity gained
- Cost
- Impacts to special programs
- Feasibility of transportation
- Impacts to academics
- Staff impacts
- Use of common area space
- Home life impacts
- Before/after school impacts
- Impacts to curriculum
- Contract/negotiation impacts
- Impacts to district reputation
- Ease of implementation
- Timing of implementation

In evaluating each combination option, Penny asked Task Force members to use the criteria definitions and ratings tables to understand information for each option combination. She noted that criteria that impacts different types of schools (e.g. high school, middle school, elementary school) are shown as split cells; footnotes show the number of portables needed at middle schools when there's a capacity deficiency; and the impacts for each criterion were color-coded as follows:

- White = Low impact or most capacity gained
- Light green = Medium impact or medium capacity gained
- Dark green = High impact or least capacity gained

RECOMMENDATION DISCUSSION

Penny consolidated Task Force members into larger groups (4-6) and asked each group to consider the information currently at hand with the combinations options data sheet and the previous discussion regarding phase 2 criteria and determine which combination the group would recommend. She provided a worksheet that also asked the group to identify any caveats or conditions that should accompany their recommendation as well as the rationale for how they selected their recommendation. Each group reported out on their recommendation, conditions and rationale.

THE OUTCOME

The discussion began with five combinations under consideration:

Title	Description
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Double Shifting (select schools only) at high school • Change one middle school to elementary
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year Round Multi Track (select schools only) at the elementary level • Change one middle School to high school
C.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Double Shifting (select schools only) at high school • Change middle school to grades 5-8 • Elementary schools to K-4 • Change Elk Plain SOC to an elementary school
C.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Double Shifting (select schools only) at high school • Change middle school to grade 5-8 • Elementary schools to K-4 • Keep Elk Plain as a K-4 SOC elementary school
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Double Shifting (select schools only) at high school • Change middle school to grades 5-8 • Elementary to K-4

Table group (four groups) discussions resulted in the following recommendations, removing B, and C.1 (see strikeout above):

Identified by three groups	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Double Shifting (select schools only) at high school • Change one middle school to an elementary school
Identified by one group	C.2/D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Double Shifting (select schools only) at high school • Change middle school to grade 5-8 • Elementary schools to K-4 • Keep Elk Plain as a K-4 SOC elementary school. The group recommended keeping Elk Plain as a K-8 SOC, since that reduced the middle school capacity deficit by 200 students.

Penny led the group in a discussion of the two recommendations. She then summed up the results of the discussion and identified additional work needed.

High School: The Task Force recommends double shifting (at select schools) to address capacity needs at the high school.

Caveats:

- Would like to see a potential schedule split to have a better idea how it would work
- Need very clear criteria and transparency about how the decision is made for what school(s) to change double shifting
- One group would like to see either a) all high schools go to double shifting or b) the high school that double shifts becomes a school of choice. Addresses equity across the high schools.
- Need clear criteria for determining who is put on A (early) shift or B (late shift)
- Access to gym for athletics will be challenging. Suggest double shifting a high school that is adjacent to a middle school, so the B shift could use the gym at the middle school to create more access during the late session when sports teams also need gym access.

Elementary School: There are two options still under consideration:

Scenario 1:

- Change middle school to grade 5-8
- Change elementary schools to K-4
- Keep Elk Plain as a K-8 SOC elementary school

Rational for Scenario 1:

- This scenario creates the most capacity at the elementary level, where the need is the greatest.
- Changing one middle school to elementary is a short-term solution. This is a longer-term solution.
- Saves the School of Choice
- Has the least negative impacts

Scenario 2:

- Change one middle school to elementary

Rational for Proposal 2:

- Avoids putting 5th graders at middle schools
- Leaves Elk Plain School of Choice as is
- Easiest to implement
- Scenario 1 results in a capacity deficit at the middle school level

NEXT STEPS

- Penny will work with district to provide a bit more specific information about capacity impacts from the two elementary school scenarios still under consideration
- Penny and her team will document this work in a draft report
- The Task Force can continue to discuss this over email and with constituents and associates. At Task Force meeting #8, on February 21, the group will finalize how the recommendation for elementary will go forward, recognizing there may not be consensus, (which is acceptable) and that outcome will be reflected in the recommendations to the School Board.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:36pm.