



## Ad hoc High School schedule committee

3:30-5 p.m., Thursday, Jan. 8, 2026

District Office, Room 103

Present: Katie Jones, Stephenie Burgess, Ari Feeney, Laurel Peak, Meghan Dunham, Bethany Barrett, Sam Haley, Matt Whitten, Heather Steele, Kate Manthey, Kristen O'Malley, Ben Goodwin, Scott Smartt, Marty Atkins, Bennet Vis, Dana Smith, Sonya Morrison, Sonia Cole, Mike Copland, Kathryn Weilage, Kay Reilly

### Opening:

Mike opened the meeting and updated the group regarding the state and local budget outlook, which is not positive. He shared that this added urgency to the work of budget reductions, including savings that could be realized from changing the high school schedule.

### Dr. Baker:

Dr. Baker joined the group to share his assessment of the budget situation. He first shared his appreciation for the work the group has done, and stated that, although changing the high school schedule is not desirable, it is one of the many difficult choices BPS is considering regarding budget reductions.

He then shared the current landscape from the governor's budget, OSPI's recent statement regarding education funding, and the legislative priorities that educators are advocating for.

He noted that, unlike other cost saving decisions that can happen later in the school year, the high school schedule must be decided soon because of the constraints of student registration timing. He reflected on a variety of factors that could affect budgets but also shared that many of those factors are not in our control. The high school schedule is something that is under our control.

He asked the group to re-discuss the options and to try to come to a consensus if possible. He stated that this group coming to a consensus is a better option for the system, if it can.

Group members asked Dr. Baker questions, which he answered.

## Small group activity:

Mike asked the group to break into small groups with the following tasks:

- reconsider the six period, seven period and seven of eight period ideas and come to a small group consensus if possible,
- capture any new feedback about each option,
- consider the ramifications of Options High School having a different schedule than the three comprehensive high schools.

The groups worked on the tasks, then reconvened and shared out.

## Small group results and notes:

- Six period – no groups preferred this option and most stated they discounted it because of its detrimental effect on programs like fine arts and CTE.
- Seven period – this option received a qualified yes from the majority of groups
  - o A main concern is planning time.
  - o One group noted that advisory could possibly be used to support reduced planning time.
  - o One group advocated to have planning at least 4 days a week.
  - o One group shared concerns about seven period schedule affecting students who are athletes, students with executive functioning challenges, and others.
- Seven of eight periods – no groups preferred this option and all stated they discounted it due to the lack of planning time and increased course and student load.

As they shared out, group members asked the following questions and/or noted the following items:

- Bell schedule for seven period remains to be landed.
- At least two block days are needed for curricular reasons, such as science labs and other instructional activities that require a longer class period to facilitate.
- There are continued questions about the 1080 instructional hours (“seat time”) requirement from state and/or average seat time across system. A group member wondered if possibly MS or ES could pick up approx. 15 mins additional instructional time to increase the average across the system. The group recommended that seat time should be a point of discussion.
- The group advocated to prioritize reducing current high school class sizes / adding additional staffing if savings resulted from the change.

- Professional development would be needed for teachers to teach 48-minute classes. Many teachers in BPS may not have taught this length of classes.
- If Options has a different amount of planning time because it would be on a different bell schedule, how would that be accounted for with the contract?
- One group member shared their belief that vocal dissent from the community regarding 5-period quarters or 5-period trimesters may have colored the district and/or committee's view of that option, believing there were those who were interested in the idea but did not speak up.

### Post-share out consensus activity:

Mike then asked the group to visually indicate through a show of hands whether the group had reached consensus for or against a variety of options.

For the comprehensive high schools:

- There was clear consensus against three options: No one in the group wished to continue considering the seven of eight option, the six period option or the “straight seven” option (i.e., seven periods every day with no block periods).
- A majority of the group wished to continue considering a variety of seven-period options, provided the bell schedule includes block days each week to meet curricular needs.
- The group recommends planning time to be considered essential to a block day, and any seven-period bell schedule needs to consider how planning could be provided.
- Some group members wished to continue considering five-period options.

For Options High School: Options staff and Mike noted that Options' schedule would be “landed” after the decision for the three comprehensive high schools.