

**BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
**December 15, 2009**  
**Alameda High Little Theater**  
**Oak and Walnut**  
**Alameda, CA**

**ADOPTED MINUTES**

**REGULAR MEETING:** The regular meeting of the Board of Education was held on the date and place mentioned above.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by President Mooney at 5:00 PM.

**PRESENT:** Jensen, Mc Mahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

**ABSENT:** None

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None at this time.

**ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION:** By President Mooney at 5:10 PM to discuss: Student Discipline/Expulsion/Re-admit (2 cases); Public Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release; Conference with Labor Negotiator Laurie McLachlan-Fry: AEA, CSEA, ACSA; Conference with Legal Counsel Regarding Existing Litigation – Pursuant to Subdivision (a) of Section 54956.9 – Beery vs. AUSD, Case #RG 08-405984; Balde, *et. al.* v. AUSD, *et. al.*, Case #RG 09-468037 (3 cases); Conference with Real Property Negotiator, Legal Counsel Danielle Houck and Superintendent Kirsten Vital: Property – Alameda Point; Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation – Significant Exposure to Litigation Pursuant to Subdivision (b) of Section 54956.9 (2 cases).

**RECONVENE TO PUBLIC SESSION:** By President Mooney at 6:36 PM.

**CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Led by President Mooney.

**INTRODUCTION OF BOARD MEMBERS AND STAFF:** Board members and staff present introduced themselves.

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA/APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR:**

**MOTION: Member Jensen**

**SECONDED: Member Tam**

That the Board of Education adopt the agenda. Items E-2, E-6, and E-4, F-2 and F-6 were moved to the January 12, 2010 agenda. Item E-5 was moved to the public agenda.

**AYES:** Jensen, McMahan, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

**NOES:** None

**MOTION CARRIED**

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** The Board of Education approved the following consent items (such items are identified by a plus (+) mark in the body of the minutes):

**+Approval of Bill Warrants and Payroll Registers:** The Board approved warrants numbered 949387-959397, 959402-959501, 959502-959506, 959507-959513.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** There are no minutes for consideration at this meeting.

**COMMUNICATIONS:**

**Written correspondence:** None at this time.

**Superintendent's Report:** Superintendent Vital clarified the vote from the December 8 meeting regarding Anti-Bullying curriculum, noting the approved recommendation for 2009/10 was to continue teaching Caring Schools Community K-5 and Lesson 9. For 2010/11, the approved recommendation was to adopt Steps to Respect for grades 3-5 with Caring Schools Community taught in grade 2. Additionally, Links to Literature was adopted as a resource.

**Oral Communications:**

*Karen Keegan, CSEA 27 President*, addressed the Board and echoed Board Member Spencer's comment at the last meeting regarding the non-inclusion of CSEA 27 in negotiating furlough days. Ms. Keegan reiterated that yes, CSEA does have to negotiate and vote before furlough days can be implemented.

**Board Oral Communications:** None at this time.

**Student Board Member Comments:** A student provided the Alameda High School report on behalf of Student Board Member Koki Inlow: Last day of "We Share"; change drive; successful Winter Assembly; La Pinata fundraiser on Wednesday; Helping Hands project; dance at Eagles Hall on Saturday; Gingerbread house build off at lunch.

Student Board Member Gamalinda from Island provided the following information: Newly formed basketball team won last Thursday; next home game is Thursday against Village High at 2:00 PM; drama program is writing/producing a play on teen pregnancy.

Student Board Member Mooney from Encinal noted: Adopt-a-Family program ended today; leadership finished wrapping all gifts; leadership will be selling holiday grams as a fundraiser; auditions for West Side Story began today.

Student Board Member Datuin from ASTI reported: Journalism class has created a website that is up and running as of today – [astitalon.com](http://astitalon.com) and is working on a revamped version of the school website; students and staff are saddened to see Ms. Lorna Steel retire and held an appreciation event on Monday.

**Calendar Review:** President Mooney noted the dates for Winter Break.

**Closed Session Action Report:** No action was taken in Closed Session.

President Mooney acknowledged the donations received from the community.

**Resolution No. 09-0079 – Recommended Approval of the Academy of Alameda Middle School Charter Application**

On October 27, 2009, the district received a charter petition from the Academy of Alameda Middle School to open serving students in grades 6-8. This charter is a result of a restructuring process to address program improvement compliance based on federal legislation No Child Left Behind. In accordance with law, a Public Hearing was held on November 10, 2009. Based upon legal timelines, the Board must now make a decision to approve or deny the petition.

A team of district staff reviewed the charter petition based on the criteria set by Education Code 47605 and our Board Policy Administrative Regulations AR 0420.4 to determine a recommendation to the Board. After extensive review, we have determined that the AAMS charter petition meets the criteria and recommend approval.

Debbie Wong, Assistant Superintendent, recapped the process for AAMS thus far and noted the item is for Board decision tonight.

Ms. Wong reviewed the 5 criteria the Board must consider when deciding to approve or deny a charter application. After thorough review of the application, staff's recommendation is to grant the charter petition for the Academy of Alameda Middle School. The initial charter would be approved from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2015 and could be revoked by our authority if AAMS commits a material violation. With approval tonight, the Board authorizes AUSD to delay the opening of AAMS for up to 1 year if, along the way, we find they are not going to be able to meet the conditions to open. If the school does not open by 2012, the district could start revocation procedures.

Superintendent Vital thanked staff for their work in implementing the new Board Policy and Administrative Regulations regarding charters in order to make AUSD's process clear and consistent to all. Superintendent Vital thanked AAMS for looking at their diverse group of learners and how to support them in a strong and innovative way.

Member Jensen asked about the strategies that will be in place to support the students since Chipman is in PI Year 4. Why couldn't these positive changes have been made at Chipman previously? Ms. Wong replied that the charter will be applying different strategies than anything they've done in the past and thinking about the "whole child" versus just focusing on academics. The flexibility available to charters provides more opportunities to use these tools. The charter has the ability to do a different kind of schedule because they don't have to work around bargaining agreements, for example. They have more leeway.

Member Spencer asked about ethnic balance. Ms. Wong noted AAMS plans to – and has been doing – intensive outreach. They want to be a neighborhood school and their goal is to enroll the Chipman students and any other interested students from across the district. The goal is to match – at a minimum – the district's current ethnic/racial balance.

Member Spencer asked for those families who choose not to attend, where would they go? Ms. Wong noted they could attend either Lincoln or Wood. Although Lincoln is currently at capacity, part of staff's work immediately if the charter is approved would be to work on such possibilities. AAMS will submit preliminary enrollment projections so AUSD staff can get a feel as to how many students will attend. That will help staff with planning around enrollment and staffing.

Member Spencer asked if there is a sufficient number of families not interested in attending the charter, is it a possibility that they could keep Chipman open as a traditional public school? Superintendent Vital replied that these issues have been raised before and at the last meeting, as well. One commitment staff has made to the Board is we need to keep the charter separate from the effects of what happens. There is a timeline around the effects, and we will come back in February once we have a clear sense of enrollment if the Board approves the charter tonight. The Board's judgment must be based solely on the 5 criteria as stated by Ms. Wong previously.

Member Spencer reiterated it's important for families to know what possible impacts might be. There was a statement in a previous presentation regarding turning Chipman into a charter. This is a start-up charter, so this line of questioning is appropriate for clarity and transparency purposes.

Member Spencer asked about the 20% volunteer service hours. Ms. Wong stated right now, at Chipman, this is not instituted. Member Spencer added the reason she brings this up is that families need to be aware of what their obligations would be and how they would be enforced. Ms. Wong noted the 20 volunteer hours is not something we looked in regards to the 5 criteria and isn't part of the regulations. The application notes "may," and this is not something AAMS is making mandatory.

Member Jensen referred to language in the petition referring to anti-harassment and asked what the plan for AAMS is to ensure there is no harassment. Will they be held to state/federal guidelines only or to the AUSD's newly-adopted policy? Rob Siltanen, Director of Educational Options, noted that the reason for that specific change is because AAMS should set their own policies as they will be a separate entity from AUSD.

Member Jensen asked about potential special education encroachment costs. Ms. Wong noted the district would receive special ed monies. Hopefully, they would be offset, but AAMS would be in our SELPA and so therefore, one of "our" schools.

*Patricia Sanders, AEA President*, noted that there was a suggestion that maybe the AEA contract was in the way of negotiating or working through some issues that might have been discussed as Chipman was considering what they would do from year 4 to year 5 program improvement. Ms. Sanders clarified the contract was not in the way, and there as an article in the contract that specifically addresses restructuring. There is a waiver, and if both sides come together and it makes sound, educational sense, the waiver is approved by both sides. The members at the site brought forth that AEA was interested in talking and negotiating with them and looking at accommodations. At that time, Chipman was considering applying as a conversion charter and not a start up; a lot of AEA members were on board with that.

What signatures did AAMS gather? Is it just teachers or does it include administrators? At what point are those signatures looked at? Ms. Sanders added in her personal opinion, the educational piece looks wonderful but there are concerns from AEA about going this route when there are lots of other options, some with no adverse consequences.

*Roxanne Clement, BayFarm Media Teacher*, noted she was pleased to see so many site-adopted programs, strategies and best practices included in the charter application. What plan are we putting in place for those teachers and staff that don't go along with the new charter? Because of seniority/bumping rights, there is the potential to impact all of our schools in terms of placement.

*Sylvia Kahn and Lori McDonald, AAMS Charter Petitioners*, stated that writing this charter was and still is a hard decision. Staff wrestled a long time about going charter and did not come to the decision lightly. From the start, staff wasn't sure if going conversion or start-up would be the best, but made the decision based on what was best for the children and most fiscally responsible. Had they gone conversion, AAMS would not be able to open fiscally sound, which would have been very irresponsible.

Ms. Wong clarified the question regarding the signatures, noting the number of teachers who must sign must be equivalent to at least half of the number of teachers the charter anticipates employing. The 25 signatures AAMS provided is over the estimated necessary number.

Member Spencer stated she appreciates everyone's hard work and dedicated effort into making it happen. This school will provide another choice for parents and offers a different approach with different strategies for success. Member Spencer wished AAMS well in their endeavors to serve our students.

**MOTION: Member Spencer**

**SECONDED: Member McMahon**

That the Board of Education approve the charter application for the Academy of Alameda Middle School.

AYES: Jensen, McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

**MOTION CARRIED**

President Mooney stated a few years ago, he was among those sitting in the audience when Chipman first started talking about program improvement. At that point in time, the seriousness of what we need to do for our schools weighed in. The community worked hard on this proposal, and we hope it evolves into something spectacular.

**Approval of Adult School Proposal for Fee for Services and Programs**

In 2009, the State of California significantly reduced funding to Adult Education, cutting funding by 19.9% from its 2007/08 levels. The state also placed Adult Ed funding in Tier III of categorical flexibility. Across the state and county, adult schools are adjusting to these new, lower funding levels.

Staff recommends the Board adopt a fee for service program for adult education in Alameda. The

proposed fees are modest for adult learners and align with practices of other schools in the county and state.

Rob Siltanen, Director of Educational Options, noted that last week, this item was presented as information. As a reminder, the state cut funding by 20%. In the spirit of preserving the adult school programs, Principal Orput and the Advisory Team analyzed plans and came up with this proposal.

President Mooney reiterated that the Board is not approving specific fees, but the fee for service program.

Principal Orput briefly reviewed the process and recapped last week's presentation regarding this item.

Member Jensen stated many cities have eliminated adult programs altogether, so she is glad to see Alameda working to preserve our programs. Member Spencer asked about GED tests. Principal Orput replied that we charge \$30 for the GED prep course and are currently working on a blended model of instruction.

Member Spencer added it's important that we continue to support Mastick and offer opportunities to our adult learners.

Member Tam asked if the adult school still had a fund reserve. Fil Guzman, Chief Financial Officer, responded that the adult school has a 3-4% reserve of \$1M.

**MOTION: Member Spencer**

**SECONDED: Member Jensen**

That the Board of Education approve the Adult School Proposal for Fee for Services and Programs.

AYES: Jensen, McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Approval of Demographic Study**

Fil Guzman, Chief Financial Officer and Leland Noll, Director of Maintenance, Operations and Facilities introduced the item adding that a few weeks ago, the Board was presented with the demographic study and asked staff for more information to be included. There is a revised study in the Facilities Master Plan section 2 this evening. Three areas of additional information were requested: homeless population numbers, the impact from the student base housing, and information regarding charter schools.

The demographers could not measure the impact of homeless students because there is not enough collectible data to make the projection possible. With regards to the former base, Section E page 12 notes it was difficult to isolate. Historical numbers have been provided in figure E-9.

Since 2002, the number of students residing in the Coast Guard housing has dropped by 25% from 132 to 98, and accounts for less than 1% of AUSD's enrollment.

Section G addresses charter schools, whose enrollment has increased by 234% since 2001 and covers grades K-12. As charter enrollment increases, district enrollment declines.

Member McMahon noted the fact is it is our obligation as a district to all of those individuals that attend public schools, regardless of whether they are AUSD or charters. If you add the numbers together, student enrollment is flat moving forward. We have to continue to focus from a Facilities Master Plan perspective and realize we're responsible for providing facilities for all students, whether charter or not.

Member Tam addressed data for homeless students, noting it is difficult to measure transitional families. Is it possible to check with the Alameda Point Collaborative and the McKinney-Vento Program to pull some data together to show some kind of trend at least from the last 3-5 years? Also, the Coast Guard is able to pull data from their resources that may help with projecting numbers.

Member McMahon asked about Prop 39 requests and clarification about what the obligation of the district is as far as providing space for inter-district students from non-Alameda schools attending charter schools. If charters are experiencing the same problems as far as fiscal constraints, they would be wise to also recruit students from neighboring districts. What is our legal obligation?

Member Jensen noted this is the third Facilities Master Plan report. When reviewing the report from 2 years ago, that report suggested our enrollment would be declining by about 18 students per year. This report suggests a decline of 19 per year. What's different between these reports and what is it most useful for?

Superintendent Vital noted there are 2 pieces to this; with the high-leverage piece of doing the strategic plan, we needed to verify and check on these pieces. There were issues around what we looked at – elementary schools boundary-by-boundary in terms of housing. What we found is we had greater enrollment in some boundaries that was different than what the demographic report actually said. There was a chart that showed which schools are really becoming more and more overenrolled and declining. This level of specificity is critical in terms of looking at a possible parcel tax. If we are unable to pass a parcel tax, the district will be faced with the possibility of closing and/or consolidating schools. Thus, it is important for us to be clear boundary-to-boundary so the Board can look at different options if we get to that Plan B level of fiscal implosion.

The Facilities Master Plan gets us clear around our inventory of classrooms. Dr. Ruben Zepeda physically went out and looked at each and every space to verify reports we received. We really wanted to see what this would look like based on varying loading rates and validate this analysis and plan, which is not something that may have happened with the Facilities Master Plan from a couple years ago.

Member Jensen noted she appreciates the additional information in this report. While the Facilities Master Plan informs the Master Plan, unless we're getting this to revise our boundaries to effect enrollment on a site-by-site basis, it may just get put on a shelf again along with prior plans.

Superintendent Vital added her goal as Superintendent is that we bring forward a specific draft of the Master Plan and look at those kinds of items as we potentially have to consider a contingency plan around Plan B. We need to be cognizant of our plan if we cannot meet our fiscal responsibility. We are relying on this analysis to make recommendations in consolidating schools and changing boundaries if necessary. We're hoping we won't have to face that, but we may.

Member Spencer noted this plan was estimated at a cost of \$60K and asked approximately where we came in. Mr. Guzman added staff is still reviewing, but that is the amount that was set aside for both the Facilities Master Plan and the demographic study.

**MOTION: Member Spencer**

**SECONDED: Member Tam**

That the Board accept and approve the demographic study as revised.

AYES: Jensen, McMahan, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

**MOTION CARRIED**

### **Draft Facilities Master Plan Review**

Leland Noll, Director of Maintenance, Operations and Facilities introduced the item and thanked staff members Jeff Knoth and Ruben Zepeda for their efforts involved as well.

This plan is being provided for review and comment by the Board tonight for final approval on January 12.

President Mooney pointed out there is a difference in acreage numbers from slide to slide. Mr. Noll noted they should be consistent and they will be changed to reflect the correct number and agree.

LPA representative Steve Newsom noted nearly every site the district has falls short of the California Department of Education recommended site size. This is nothing to be alarmed about, as this is often the case. This could become a funding opportunity as you may qualify for overcrowding relief funds.

Mr. Newsom noted the classroom inventory piece is one of the biggest elements and reviewed information regarding recommended classroom size and the site assessment process as they relate to the 3 scenarios previously discussed.

Superintendent Vital asked that the chart showing all the different loading rations on one page be added to the Facilities Master Plan notebook as it provides a quick view of important data and



would allow the Board to walkthrough area-by-area so people can understand what it means in terms of additional classroom space depending on various loading factors.

Member Jensen asked for clarification – what are excess capacity rooms? Superintendent Vital clarified these rooms may not be used for classrooms but may be used for a variety of other things such as computer labs, math tech courses, music, media, etc.

Member Jensen asked about the wing of Historic Alameda High School where the library used to be. Mr. Noll noted this wing was not included as it is not Field Act compliance and cannot be used as classrooms. Superintendent Vital noted conversion of this wing would equal a cost of \$12M at his point.

Member McMahon asked staff to clarify SDC rooms as they are loaded differently. This makes it difficult to add up numbers across columns in tables.

Member Jensen noted when looking at AHS vs. EHS, it looks like there are 3 times the number of seats available at Encinal if we didn't have flex space, and asked if a consideration was made to close Alameda High instead, in the scenario of only one high school. President Mooney commented that while Encinal has more acreage, there are more classrooms at Alameda. Superintendent Vital responded that Encinal would have to add 15 classrooms and 2 portable restrooms at a cost of \$2.5M - \$3M.

*Roxanne Clement, BayFarm Media Teacher*, noted appreciation in trying to get this kind of detail, but expressed concern about addressing program needs site-by-site. We need to be clear about how sites are using what is referred to “flex space.” These flex spaces tie into the quality of programs sites deliver in order to support students.

Member Spencer noted we want to know how to push students into larger sites and consider closing smaller sites to save money. For instance, at the elementary school level, there are rooms available at Washington, Paden and Haight as opposed to Franklin and Edison. It seems like some schools are very crowded, yet we have capacity at other sites. The same can be said for the middle and high school level. Perhaps we should consider leaving both high schools open but at a reasonable capacity. We could consider adding 8<sup>th</sup> grades to their sites if more enrollment was needed.

Student Board Member Gamalinda from Island noted he attended AHS prior to Island. In the event that AHS closes and EHS becomes the only high school, this would create a transportation program as many AHS students live on BayFarm Island. Also, the facilities at AHS are better than EHS. AHS has a TV/Media Studio, Kofman and the Little Theater, etc. and offers facilities that EHS does not have. However, closing either high school would be bad.

Superintendent Vital asked staff to follow-up on the chart she referred to earlier and address all Board questions and comments.

Member Jensen also corrected G-19. ACLC is shown as a 7-12 school and it is actually 6-12. Please correct enrollment numbers. Member Jensen asked staff to include any key consideration if we were to move ACLC off of the Encinal campus.

Member Tam commended staff in putting this complex report together to make sense for the Board and the public. We need to go back to where our core values are when we start moving in this direction. We need to be wary of the hit the West End has taken in recent years – we closed 3 elementary schools and Ruby Bridges is at capacity. In addition, there has been an increase in the ELL population. How do we build program capacity to still address the needs of those students that we're mandated to serve and preserve core programs that work? We need to consider all possibilities.

Member McMahon asked staff for an analysis of a bond measure. Mr. Newsome added the bonding capacity information could be updated and verified. The district does have some new construction eligibility at the high school level.

Member Spencer asked that all documents be uploaded to the district website so the public can review them online. Member Spencer noted she has 2 students at Encinal currently, and didn't want people thinking poorly of their facilities. The Encinal campus is significantly larger and has a very nice track and field, their classrooms and facilities are very nice.

#### **Categorical Flexibility – Arts and Music Block Grant**

The 2008/09 California State Budget authorizes school districts to use funding received from the state for Tier III programs for any educational purpose, to the extent permitted by state law. The flexibility to transfer funds from these programs is authorized for five years from the current year through 2012/13 by Ed Code 42605.

Fil Guzman, Chief Financial Officer, presented the item and asked for a Public Hearing. President Mooney opened the Public Hearing at 9:31 PM.

*Kim Orzell, Music Teacher*, noted it took many years of grassroots lobbying to get these one-time monies and it was a lot of work. Ms. Orzell requested the Board prioritize some of the monies of the arts grants so they don't get fully usurped and added to the general fund.

Hearing no further public comment, President Mooney closed the Public Hearing at 9:32 PM.

#### **Joint Use Agreement with the Boys & Girls Club of Alameda**

A signed Joint Use Agreement between the Boys and Girls Club and the district is needed in order for the Boys and Girls Club to apply to the State Board of Education for a \$1,000,000 construction grant. This is supplemental to what is already in the current lease agreement yet necessary to apply to the SBE for the grant.

Mr. Guzman noted this agreement is being brought forward so that the Boys & Girls Club can apply for a construction grant. This is a requirement the Department of Education has. There were a couple changes made to make sure we have priority for use of the site during school hours.

and the indemnity clause was changed so the Boys & Girls Club becomes the primary organization for indemnity and additional improvements are clearly defined and addressed.

George Phillips, the Boys & Girls Club Executive Director, thanked General Counsel Danielle Houck for her assistance with this agreement which allows the club to go after some potential joint use building money from the state.

**MOTION: Member McMahon**

**SECONDED: Member Jensen**

That the Board approve the Joint Use Agreement with the Boys & Girls Club as presented.

AYES: Jensen, McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None.

**MOTION CARRIED**

### **Program Costs – School Site & Department Budgets**

It has been the desire of this administration to be transparent in its budget reporting. At the last Board meeting, action was taken to approve the 2090/10 First Interim Budget Report. This is the traditional state-adopted report that presents allocations by major spending categories.

Tonight, the district would like to introduce two other formats that give the same budget information but in different categories: by school site and centralized department, and by program/resource code.

Mr. Guzman introduced the item. Last week the Board approved the First Interim. This is another way of looking at funds and how they are being used.

Member Tam thanked Mr. Guzman for the comprehensive data and asked if schools will be allowed to have carryover for projects next year if funding is not spent. Mr. Guzman noted yes, they will be able to carryover funds.

Superintendent Vital further explained that what the Board categorically flexed has been at the district office. We have not flexed any funds that went out to school sites. At Second Interim, we will see where we are. We will be bringing back a trans as there is some concern about cash flow and we will have to be very prudent about how we spend money.

Member Jensen asked about the placement of the “Drug Free Department” and asked for clarification as it notes the second highest amount. Mr. Guzman added he will provide further detail to the Board and this may be an incorrect placement.

### **Approval of Single School Plans**

Robert Shemwell, Director of Curriculum, introduced the item.

The School and Library Improvement Block Grant (SLIBG) was established by Assembly Bill 825 and combines into one block grant funds from the former School Library Materials program and School Improvement Program. The Public School Accountability Act (PSAA), SB 374, requires each school to consolidate all school plans required by programs funded through the

Consolidated Application into a single plan, known as the “Single Plan for Student Achievement.”

In compliance with the above requirements, sites have developed plans to improve the teaching and learning process with the use of categorical funds. Included for the Board’s review are copies of each site’s reflection of prior year, theory of action, measureable goals, and work plan which includes the site’s major strategies this year along with the funding sources, timeline, and budget.

This is a follow-up to plans not submitted at the November 24, 2009 Board meeting which included Alameda High, Encinal, ASTI, Chipman and Washington Elementary.

Member Tam noted at the last Board meeting, he brought up the question regarding School Site Council membership. Many times it is difficult to find appropriate representation. How are schools addressing the requirement?

Mr. Shemwell added in speaking with Assistant Superintendent Wong, this year staff is working with Bayces around equity across school programs. Equity doesn’t stop at the classroom but also needs to be addressed in community interactions. We need to motivate our parents to work with us.

Member Spencer expressed concern for the lack of measurable goals for Chipman. Is there no state test that could be used as a benchmark? Mr. Shemwell responded that in earlier sections, the school takes a serious look at state testing data to determine decision-making around student needs. They are choosing specific multiple assessments to drive decision-making around adjustments to instructional programs to support student needs and not waiting for long-term state benchmark assessments.

**MOTION: Member Tam**

**SECONDED: Member McMahon**

That the Single School Plans be approved as presented.

AYES: Jensen, McMahon, Mooney, Tam

NOES: Spencer

**MOTION CARRIED**

### **Update on the AERIES Student Information System Project Plan**

The district has selected Eagle Software to provide AUSD with AERIES. This is the first of several reports updating the project plan and deliverables to a successful completion of the project.

Jess Stephens, Technology Director, introduced the item and provided a brief update on the AERIES project implementation, the new student information system which will be used over the next 5-10 years and will interface with almost every other system we have.

Member McMahon asked about training and how we roll out to the parent community in terms of the ability of students to interface with it. Mr. Stephens noted there is a student and parent

portion, similar to what we currently use with SchoolLoop. We will be keeping SchoolLoop for a minimum of 1 additional year while we work on getting the AERIES portion installed and available.

President Mooney asked about implications for registering students next year. Mr. Stephens noted he has worked closely with Student Services and AERIES has a component that will do centralized registration, although it is no small task. There are some significant staffing requirements in order to put this in place and to support it the first couple years until all students are migrated to the new system. With CalPADS and CalTIDES, we will be able to identify students with a common number and roll them up into the next grade. We are currently working on a common registration form – sites do it differently among all different grade levels so we are trying to standardize and make it available online.

Member Tam asked if there are limitations to AERIES. Mr. Stephens replied there are a few things it cannot do. AERIES is a California-only company, and an advantage is it has California content standards built into it, report cards built in, and meets or exceeds the current state and federal reporting requirements for California and interfaces with our school lunch program. It really will do 95-98% of everything we will need it to do.

**MOTION: Member McMahan**

That the meeting be extended beyond 10:30 PM.

**SECONDED: Member Jensen**

AYES: Jensen, McMahan, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Report on Master Plan Survey Results**

As part of the process of gathering feedback on possible strategies for the Master Plan, this fall AUSD conducted two surveys through the website and at school sites.

Rob Siltanen, Director of Educational Options, introduced the items and reviewed the results of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Master Plan survey collected between November 20 and December 7.

**Highlights:**

- The latest Master Plan survey was posted on November 20. We have collected and analyzed results received through December 7
- As of December 7 there were 447 complete respondents to the online survey
- Survey shows strong support for the first four goals to take advantage of new opportunities
- Survey shows low support for the possible bonds listed
- For the possible “structural changes to reduce costs” (Question #9), the top choice was increasing the number of inter-district students
- For the “program goals and priorities given challenge to reduce costs” for secondary, the spread among the choices was relatively narrow, but the top choice was to protect AP classes
- For the “program goals and priorities given challenge to reduce costs” for district-wide, the spread among the choices was also relatively narrow, but the top choice was to protect technology

Member Spencer noted the majority of the respondents were preschool parents with almost 60% from BayFarm, Earhart, Edison and Franklin, and we need to take this into consideration when reviewing the data.

*Patricia Sanders, AEA President*, reminded the Board that when you do a self-selecting survey, it tends to be one of the least reliable and most random. It's important that as you make important decisions that affect children, you keep that in mind.

### **California School Boards Association (CSBA) Annual Conference Report**

The Board of Education members and the Superintendent attended the CSBA 2009 Annual Education Conference and Trade Show held December 3 through 5, 2009 at the San Diego Convention Center.

The conference provided an opportunity for governance team members to gather the most relevant, up-to-date information, share ideas, network with peers, and access practical tools to make the best decisions for students and schools.

Member McMahon noted the biggest thing he came away with was the fact that the numbers shared as it relates to the current state budget situation are actually a problem that's going to exist for at least 5 more years.

Member Spencer agreed and added several sessions spoke to Race To The Top (RTTT) funds, although it didn't sound like California would be receiving any of those funds. Unfortunately, the majority of the classes discussed how to do more with less. We did learn what other districts are implementing and there were several sessions regarding charters.

Superintendent Vital stated she appreciated that the Board and Superintendent attended together and were able to attend many different sessions and debrief together. It was sad talking about the recession going into 2014; it was very disheartening, but we learned some new things about special ed and how non-public placement contracts can "be your friend". It was a great opportunity.

President Mooney noted he attended the conference from December 2 through December 5 and overall, found it very informative. CSBA will be returning to an alternating location format, so this conference may be held in Northern California in the future. President Mooney added he attended the Board President's Workshop and sessions about using Board policies as tools, achieving success with mail-in parcel tax elections, an update on the state funding lawsuit, advocating for the arts, and negotiations among other topics.

Member Tam added he found the workshops he attended to be very informative and hopes the Board will take the time to reflect on how we build community – inclusive of cultural differences – while addressing the needs of all our students. Member Tam noted he is interested in beginning the Masters in Governance workshop to delve deeper into understanding how a Board should run.

Member Jensen reiterated Member Spencer's comments about Race To The Top dollars and asked Superintendent Vital about AUSD's involvement in moving forward.

### **Resolution to Adopt Categorical Flexibility**

Member Spencer noted she pulled this item and clarified that we are taking \$300K from Adult Ed and using it for other things. Superintendent Vital noted that is correct. Member Spencer questioned the move since the Adult School just made a presentation about having to do fee for service.

Superintendent Vital clarified that Adult Education gets \$1.1M per year. This \$300K is from carryover funds and outside of that \$1.1M. As we look at the bottom line over the next couple years, these are the kinds of tradeoffs the board is going to have to make.

**MOTION: Member McMahon**

**SECONDED: Member Tam**

That the Board approve the Resolution to Adopt Categorical Flexibility.

AYES: Jensen, McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

**MOTION CARRIED**

### **Board Member Reports**

Member McMahon noted last week, he attended the ROP meeting for First Interim and discussed a reallocation of funds over the next 6 months.

Member Spencer stated she attended the EHS football game in the rain and commended the team for a game well played. Member Spencer commented on Songfest and thanked AP Teacher Brian Rodriguez for facilitating the event. She also attended the play at EHS, and as a cancer survivor, the story was difficult to watch but extremely important, and the drama department did an exemplary job.

Member Tam attended the CSEA Holiday Dinner and 2 community events. Member Tam announced that LEAPS is hosting a spelling bee at Ruby Bridges this Thursday from 5:00 PM – 8:00 PM with 4 schools participating: Paden, Haight, Washington, and Ruby Bridges.

President Mooney noted he also attended the EHS football game on Friday and commented on the host school's facility with an all purpose/all weather Astroturf field and a great snack shack. Councilmember Mattarrese continues to work on all weather fields for school district sites. President Mooney commended EHS student Anna Campbell on her portrayal of the main character in the drama production and noted he looks forward to the spring musical, West Side Story.

### **Adjournment**

President Mooney adjourned the meeting at 10:53 PM.