



Student Safety & Well-Being Committee

Mercer Island High School

April 7, 2026

Meeting Notes

Meeting notes taken by Michelle Mueller, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent

Opening Remarks

Frank Schott commenced the meeting at 5:33 p.m.

Superintendent Update and Announcements

Superintendent Rundle discussed some of the challenges students and families have faced recently and acknowledged the difficulty around budget reductions for the 2026-2027 school year. He shared that he worked with Facilitator Frank Schott, Board President Stephanie Burnett, and students on the Committee to produce a video to provide details of the Committee's work, which will be available to share soon. In response to some Committee members inquiring about measuring progress, Superintendent Rundle indicated that items such as education and training can be used as metrics to evaluate progress. He shared that the Committee's work helped him to navigate recent discussions around an MIFC coach's misconduct with children and noted that he will be starting a conversation with several athletic-affiliated local organizations to build relationships. Following up on a discussion held at the March 3 meeting, Superintendent Rundle offered further clarification on disclosure versus reporting, specifically that a report is made by a third party who has had someone disclose something to them. He noted that administrators will be attending an upcoming Praesidium training around student safety during travel and overnight events.

PSESD offered information on training, in collaboration with KCSARC, to be offered on-site to schools by community partners in 2026-2027 to review RCW and OSPI requirements on professional boundaries. Work is being done to develop additional training that will outline reporting requirements and recognizing signs of grooming/ sexual misconduct. It was noted that FLASH, sexual health education curriculum, is also available through King County and focuses primarily on training for teachers.

An update from the Reporting and Follow Up work group was shared, and it was noted that WSSDA has taken an interest in the subcommittee's suggested revisions to Policy 3205 and may wish to use it as a model policy.

Superintendent Rundle offered comments on the District's content monitoring system and provided an example of how it functions. He also announced that he nominated Frank Schott and Paulette Denman for the WASA Community Leadership Award and student members for the WASA Student Leadership Award.

Housekeeping

Mr. Schott presented the agenda. [Link here](#) for the March through June timeline. He requested that work groups provide their observations, recommendations and open questions by Monday, April 13 for him to share with Praesidium. At this point, subcommittee recommendations will not be altered; however, language will be made consistent when it comes time to present to Praesidium on April 29. Mr. Schott distributed a Back-to-the-Future exercise recap.

Breakout Group Report

Continued from March 3 meeting.

Student Learning and Educator/Staff Training - [Link to Presentation](#)

Committee members reported on their work to date with reference to the presentation linked above. They highlighted that, while health education is present in the District, reliance on teachings around boundaries, grooming and recognizing inappropriate relationships cannot solely be limited to health classes in order for change to occur. Some thoughts included supplementary curriculum in all grade levels to augment the core curriculum, thereby increasing the number of touch points. It was mentioned that not all children have access, or there may be several years between courses (e.g., students receiving special services). Some discussion occurred around the current practice of reteaching concepts at the middle school level as well as the need to develop relationships and build community for students before they enter high school. This foundation would aid in students feeling comfortable reporting. Additional discussion occurred around the District limiting health education options in summer school because the curriculum is not as robust as a full semester course.

To bring about meaningful change, staff training must go beyond compliance and education will need to extend to families. Some discussion occurred around opportunities for improvement and examples were shared (e.g., Safe Schools for Students; 9th, 10th and 11th grade assemblies; and mentorship/peer support). Additional discussion was held around peer mentorship and programs to foster relationships, which could aid in the transition from 8th to 9th grade. Further discussion occurred around the possibility of in-person staff training, which would provide the opportunity for conversation and deep dives. Staff need to understand their accountability and have what are acceptable boundaries with students clearly defined. The West Seattle High School Teal Ribbon Project was referenced, which is a program for which teachers can sign up and receive additional training on sexual violence prevention, supporting students and offering a safe space for students. It was noted that the biggest challenge will be changing the culture.

Initial Draft Recommendations for School Board

To be shared with Praesidium before their April 28-30 visit using the recommendation framework provided by Mr. Schott on March 25. Addendums may be attached.

Student Learning and Educator/Staff Training

Recommendations from the Student Learning and Educator/Staff Training Subcommittee, as outlined in [the presentation](#), were reviewed, specifically the need to establish a Student Safety Task Force. Some discussion occurred around how this might be formed.

Reporting and Follow Up

Recommendations from the Reporting and Follow Up Subcommittee were reviewed. It was noted that recommendations were considered through an equity lens.

- Create a clear, student-centered reporting system with consistent expectations, accessible (including anonymous) pathways, and a process that students can easily understand.
- Establish consistent documentation and follow-up expectations, including clear communication, coordinated response, and student safety and anti-retaliation protections.
- Standardize training and clarify roles, including mandatory reporting, professional boundaries, and consistent, accountable responses to student concerns.
- Revise Policy 3205, *Sexual Harassment of Students Prohibited*, for clarity, accessibility, and alignment with student experience while maintaining legal compliance.
- Incorporate ongoing updates to 3205 P to ensure alignment with policy, implementation, and day-to-day practice.
- Explore a Student Advocate role to provide student-centered, non-investigative follow-up support.

Professional Boundaries

The Professional Boundaries Subcommittee offered an update with reference to the presentation, accessible [here](#). The work group is focused on revising Policy/ Procedure 5253 A, *Maintaining Professional Staff/ Student Boundaries*, to provide a legal definition on what constitutes sexual harassment and to shift from general to more specific guidance, including examples, references to grooming, preventative language addressing the appearance of impropriety and corrective actions. Revisions also include consistent language applying to all adults working with kids (e.g., staff member, employee, volunteer), making it clear that everyone has the responsibility to observe, comply and report misconduct to the appropriate authorities and failure to do so can lead to disciplinary action. The policy outlines a process for staff to request preapproval if a situation could be perceived as improper (or to report immediately after the interaction) and offers clarity on appropriate forms of communication and prohibited behaviors (e.g., favoritism). Some examples were discussed and conversation around case-by-case circumstances occurred (e.g., when a hug might be acceptable). It was noted that the policy may not allow for addressing socializing outside of school. Staff training and mandatory reporting requirements are made clear rather than just referencing reporting in Policy 3205, and consequences for retaliation are articulated.

The subcommittee wishes to ask Praesidium about the following:

- Conflicts of interest (e.g., staff tutoring students).
- Concept of consent.
 - Some discussion occurred around the fact that consent may look different for different people (e.g., nonverbal), power differentials between staff and students, and how consent may be required by both staff to student and student to staff.

Some discussion occurred around whether a hug is ever appropriate, with it being noted that a student may have experienced boundary violations in the past of which a staff member is not aware that compromise their ability to consent. Additional discussion occurred around whether preferential treatment applies to participation grades and how appropriate interactions might differ depending on grade level, culture, staff position (e.g., counselor, nurse/health room aid) or context (e.g., at a funeral

versus at graduation). It was suggested that training on how to finesse unique situations might be helpful so that staff can act appropriately while still building connections and providing support.

Draft Questions to Praesidium (group exercise)

Due to time constraints, the Committee did not engage in a group exercise. Mr. Schott encouraged Committee members to email him any questions for Praesidium by Friday, April 10. He noted that additional questions can be posed at a later date due to the ongoing nature of the work.

The meeting concluded at 7:29 p.m.