# Reynolds School District Advisory \& Stewarding Body Meeting 

March 19, 2024, 4:00-6:00 pm

Attendees: Rutila, Frank, Cayle, Wei-Wei, Karen, Chelsea, Gustavo, Allie

## 1. Welcome \& Connection

a. Land Acknowledgment
b. Community Agreements
c. Agenda Check \& Framing

## 2. Recommendations: Consensus Protocol

a. Consensus Protocol
i. The consensus model helps us to have deep discourse about recommendations that are taking place
ii. Round 1 of the protocol allows us to see where everyone is at. If needed Round 2 will occur.
iii. If moving to round 2, the goal will be to gain clarity on the recommendation with an opportunity to focus on wonders and curiosities
b. FTE Shifts- FYI (this does not need to be approved by the body)
i. DOME TOSAs Revised proposal

1. Retain 4 sheltered instruction DOME TOSAs - shift from being district based to school-based. One at the high school and one at each middle school with the goal to increase traction with relationship building, coaching, and in-classroom support. The greatest need for sheltering instruction is at the middle school and high school, however, they will be able to provide consults at the feeder schools.
2. Clarifying Questions:
a. If TOSAs went into schools, who do they report to? They will be evaluated by the building principals with work being overseen by the EL Director.
3. Feedback
a. Appreciate the move to the building in order to build relationships
b. This will help the work to be relational rather than transactional
c. FTE Additions
i. Cosmetology Teacher (0.5 FTE)
4. Clarifying Questions:
a. Why is there a change from . 5 FTE to . 6 FTE? There is a change from . 5 (year 1) to . 6 FTE (year 2). The addition would be based on interest as well as measure 98 funding which could lead to a potential expansion of the role.
5. Consensus Round 1:
a. 13
b. $34^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$
c. 25's
6. Additional Questions:
a. Will we be able to sustain this role without the Intensive program grant in aid? Elective programs are based on student interest. Each year there is a process and there is currently strong support for this program. As the program grows, there will be an opportunity to look at other funds to sustain the program e.g. measure 98.
7. Recommendation was approved!
ii. Social Workers (4 FTE)
8. Clarifying Questions:
a. The need across the district is high - would it have been helpful to increase this number e.g. having 5 for each elementary school based on the need at each school? This was taken into account. Prior to COVID there were two social workers in the district and now there are 19 across the district. Paring it back to 4 at the elementary, 2 at the middle school, 1 at RLA, and 1 at the high school this would still be an increase from pre-COVID. When looking at other similar sized districts, this is still a larger number than other districts. Additionally, there are other sources of support in the counselors and community partners.
9. Consensus Round 1:
a. 65's
10. Recommendation was approved!
d. Paused: Family Engagement Partnership
i. Update: Collective decision to pause this recommendation for several reasons - most importantly is the impact that the work of community and family engagement has. After the meeting with the Scholastic Partners it was clear that it was more professional development for teachers rather than community engagement. This is another task for teachers and administrators to do. Gustavo, Justin, and Rutila will come together to rethink, revise, and recalibrate to ensure that this recommendation benefits the community and the district.
11. Clarifying Questions:
a. When will the work with the small group convene? The work will continue along with Scholastic. The work will continue with regard to mapping family engagement and building strong relationships.

## 3. Open Space/Questions/Needs

## 4. Next Steps

a. Stewarding Body Meeting: April 16, 2024
b. Advising \& Stewarding Body Meeting: May 14, 2024

