

Alameda Unified School District

Master Plan 2010-2015

February 23, 2010

Vision

We believe that our diverse community of students, given a rigorous academic program in an inclusive, safe and secure environment, will be prepared to be responsible citizens.

Mission

AUSD will effectively use our limited resources to ensure that every student succeeds.

Guiding Principles

1. All students have the ability to achieve academic and personal success.
2. Teachers will challenge and support all students to reach their highest academic and personal potential.
3. Administrators have the knowledge, leadership skills and ability to ensure student success.
4. Parental involvement and community engagement are integral to student success.
5. Accountability, transparency and trust are necessary at all levels of the organization.
6. Allocation of funds will support our vision, mission and guiding principles.

The learning organization

...organizations where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning to see the whole together.

Peter Senge, 1990

The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of Leading Organizations

Alameda Unified School District 2010-2015 Master Plan Executive Summary

Introduction

Like every other school district in the state, the Alameda Unified School District has been hard hit by cuts to the state education budget. In 2009-10, AUSD saw this year's revenues reduced by \$1,421 per student from \$6367 to \$4946. The 2010/11 proposed Governor's budget shows no meaningful restoration of public education funding for years to come. As a result, Alameda Unified School District must address this new fiscal reality.

The impending crisis confronting AUSD has reached a point where school district funding rates have dropped to 2004-05 levels. Even with after everything we have done to reduce non-essential services, moving towards a leaner organizational model, and making every tax dollar count towards greater efficiency, the millions of dollars in funding cuts the state has made to AUSD compels us to look for innovative solutions while calling upon the citizens of Alameda for additional support.

The severity of the impending deficit -- plus a growing achievement gap, uneven enrollment, and a need for more choice in the Alameda Unified School District - led Superintendent Kirsten Vital to propose creating a Master Plan for the next five years in the spring of 2009. Commissioned by AUSD's Board of Education -- and designed by Superintendent Vital and staff -- the goal of the Master Plan was to develop a blueprint for the district's decision-making on finances, staffing, programs and facilities over the next five school years.

The Master Plan Process

To develop the plan, Superintendent Vital formed an internal work group, as well as sought the assistance of several organizations with specialized expertise. In an unprecedented effort to engage the community stakeholders in the development of the district's future, the Board of Education and the central office staff also provided multiple opportunities for public education and comment, including: **eight community workshops**, hosted by the board and superintendent; **29 smaller meetings** hosted by independent, trained "Public Education Volunteers"; **30 school-site meetings** led by principals and other site leaders; **two community surveys** on the AUSD website; and **a teacher survey** developed by the Alameda Education Association (the teacher's union in the district).

At the same time, district staff gathered data on the district's capacity, performance, and resources, including: human resources; patterns of inter-district transfer students' enrollment, behavior, attendance and academic performance; district student attendance and academic performance; facility use and school-site demographics; and the role and function of the central office. As the Master Plan started to take shape, the superintendent continued to listen to the questions and ideas of parents, teachers, staff and the community at large.

The resulting Master Plan sets updated goals for the district; identifies concrete educational and fiscal strategies to reach those goals; and establishes an optimistic (but we believe sensible) timeline for implementation -- all with the goal of *enriching the educational experiences and improving the academic outcomes of all AUSD students despite the many challenges the district currently faces.*

The Two Scenarios

The 2010-2015 Master Plan lays out two potential scenarios for the district:

Under **Plan A**, AUSD will become a state-of-the-art, 21st century school district by implementing eight core strategies: 1) redesign the central office for efficiency and quality service; 2) raise the bar for academic achievement and equity; 3) create a system of attractive school options; 4) maintain a policy of neighborhood schools (including keeping both high schools open); 5) strengthen enrichment programs; 6) optimize enrollment; 7) build non-profit, business, and philanthropic partnerships; and 8) pass a parcel tax.

We believe that by enacting these strategies, AUSD will not only weather the challenges caused by the state's financial crisis, but create a thriving, vibrant school district that meets the needs of all its students and continues to be an asset to the entire city of Alameda.

Plan A depends both on the passage of a parcel tax to replace Measures A and H and the implementation of cost-cutting measures (including streamlining the district's central office and temporarily increasing class sizes to 24.5:1 for grades K-3 and 35:1 for 9th grade).

Under **Plan B**, the course that the district will take if voters reject a replacement parcel tax, the district will resolve the projected \$25 million deficit by enacting a series of dramatic, but necessary, budget cuts that may include some or all of the following:

- 1) Continue the redesign work in section 1, cutting central office to the bare minimum necessary for legal compliance;
- 2) Change elementary configuration to K-6;
- 3) Change middle school configuration to 7-9;
- 4) Change high school configuration to 10-12;
- 5) Increase class size to 32:1 or higher for all grades;
- 6) Reduce the inter-district transfer student program to the most minimal level and to only "even out" enrollment anomalies;
- 7) Close three or more elementary schools across the island;
- 8) Close one high school and consolidate all 10th, 11th and 12th grade students to a suitable campus;
- 9) Close one middle school and consolidate 7th, 8th and 9th grade students to a suitable campus;
- 10) Change enrollment boundaries to ensure that all existing schools (7 elementary schools; 1 traditional public middle school and 1 high school) are filled to capacity at the increased class size of 32:1 K-6 and 35:1 for grades 7-12;
- 11) Eliminate or reducing most/all programs funded by Measures A and H;
- 12) Provide only the most absolute minimum of classroom/instructional supplies;
- 13) Cut teacher positions due to the reduction of the inter-district transfer program and fewer classrooms with an increased class size;

- 14) Reduce salaries and benefits for teachers, administrators, and classified staff;
- 15) Cut up to five (5) instructional days;
- 16) Reduce or eliminating teacher work days;
- 17) Cut professional development/resources; and/or
- 18) Reduce the work year and corresponding salary for classified and administrative staff.

Plan B will severely undermine the quality of our district, the education our students receive, and the economy and culture of the Alameda community at large.

Next Steps

Assuming the Board of Education approves this final version of the Master Plan and a parcel tax strategy, an independent community group will run the parcel tax campaign because state law prevents the district from organizing and running the campaign.

If the parcel tax passes, the implementation timeline of the recommended Master Plan will go into effect immediately. If not, the district will begin the implementation of the alternate plan.

"The Alameda Unified School District has hard choices ahead of us. The entire Alameda community must work together toward solutions that will protect and maintain the quality of education our schools provide in the face of drastic state budget cuts. I look forward to working with everyone in our community to pull our schools through this difficult time and ensure our students receive the quality education they deserve."

Kirsten Vital, Superintendent.

Table of Contents

Section 1: Introduction

- 1) The Purpose of the Master Plan
- 2) The Impact of California's Fiscal Crisis on AUSD
- 3) History and Context of the Master Plan Process: Our Actions

Section 2: Challenges, Goals and Strategies

Introduction

- 1) Redesign Central Office
- 2) Raise the bar
- 3) Create a system of attractive school options
- 4) Maintain a policy of neighborhood elementary schools
- 5) Strengthen effective enrichment programs
- 6) Optimize enrollment
- 7) Build nonprofit, business and philanthropic partnerships
- 8) Pass a parcel tax

Section 3: Scenario B: The "No Parcel Tax Scenario"

- 1) Introduction
- 2) The Challenge and Goal
- 3) The Strategies to Overcome the Challenge
- 4) Implementation of the Strategies

Section 4: Conclusion

- 1) Introduction
- 2) Final Stages of the Master Plan Process
- 3) Next Steps
- 4) Endnotes
- 5) Appendices
 - A. Estimate of fiscal implications of each strategy
 - B. High level timeline (Gantt Chart)
 - C. ASTI enrollment

Section 1: Introduction

In this section:

- 1) The Purpose of the Master Plan**
- 2) The Impact of California's Fiscal Crisis on AUSD**
- 3) History and Context of the Master Plan Process: Our Actions**

The Purpose of the Master Plan

The Alameda Board of Education and Superintendent Kirsten Vital developed this Master Plan to ensure Alameda students receive a quality education in spite of unprecedented reductions in California state funding for public education totaling a projected state cut of an additional \$1.5 billion. For Alameda, this reduction would amount to \$2 million in the 2010-11 school year alone. Around the state other districts are making across-the-board, blind cuts and resigning themselves to the corresponding reductions in educational opportunity and negative impact on learning and achievement. The Alameda Unified School District believes that across-the-board, blind cuts are unacceptable for its community. Instead, this plan represents an entrepreneurial and bold approach to meet ambitious goals, addresses wide-ranging challenges, and carefully considers the fiscal implications of its proposed strategies.

This Master Plan continues the district's focus on raising overall achievement and accelerating the progress of students who are behind or not on track to graduate ready for college and careers. Additionally, AUSD must do more with less, reducing its fixed costs while ensuring effective services, high quality programs and fiscal integrity. To achieve this plan AUSD needs to continue to make significant upgrades to its management and program monitoring systems, using innovative technologies and a focus on efficiency and quality. Given the volatility and unreliability of state funding, this plan relies on a motivated community to lobby for and successfully pass a new replacement parcel tax. In doing so, Alameda will provide the district with the resources that will allow it to execute this plan successfully and achieve its goals for students, families and employees. The plan leverages every legal revenue source available to AUSD and incorporates developing philanthropic, business and other types of partnerships that will enable AUSD to become a "state of the art" district by 2015.

The Impact of California's Fiscal Crisis on AUSD

California has been hard hit by the recession of the past two years. The reductions to education are more severe here than in other states because of a series of state policy changes that began with the 1978 passage of Proposition 13, an amendment to the California State Constitution.

AUSD, which depends overwhelmingly on state funding (and receives little federal funding beyond one-time "stimulus" money), saw this year's allocation slashed by \$1,421 per student from \$6367 to \$4946, reducing funding to 2004-05 funding levels. Although Alameda citizens passed parcel taxes A and H to fund quality schools, the collapse in state funding means that the \$7.3 million in annual revenue from these parcel tax measures will be insufficient to cover a widening gap between what we receive from the state and what we need to maintain and improve our schools and programs. These continual cuts to education funding in California have completely eliminated the safety net provided to the AUSD through the community parcel tax.

History and Context of the Master Plan Process

Focused on the challenges and goals at hand, in March of 2009, the Board of Education directed Superintendent Vital to develop a Master Plan that will guide AUSD through the current crisis and chart a course for the future. Given the instability and unpredictability of California's fiscal outlook, Superintendent Vital focused on creating a five-year plan and a process for ongoing revision as the state's financial outlook changes.

Superintendent Vital formed an internal work group,ⁱ to initially guide the Master Plan process. In addition, the Superintendent secured external assistance from individuals and groups with specialized knowledge and experience.ⁱⁱ The district also contracted with an architectural, engineering and facilities planning firm, and an efficiency expert. The superintendent also used her executive cabinet, project teams and a focus group of secondary principals to give immediate feedback on secondary choice and other proposals that emerged from various internal studies to revise and further develop the master plan.

Complimenting the work of the internal and external teams, the Board of Education and the Superintendent engaged the broader community from May to December 2009 to ensure that all district stakeholders had multiple opportunities to inform the Master Plan. These included:

- 1) Eight Community Workshops hosted by AUSD Board of Education and the superintendent.
- 2) A *Listening Campaign* carried out by independent, community-based Public Education Volunteers (PEV) that reached an estimated 400 people through 29 meetings.
- 3) More than 30 school-site meetings led by principals and other site leaders.
- 4) Two community surveys on the AUSD website with a total of 676 respondents.

- 5) A survey of teachers created and analyzed by the Alameda Education Association (AEA) that was reported to the board in October, with a total of 392 respondents.

With ongoing input from these stakeholders the internal work group and project teams:

- 1) Gathered data across the central office and all school-sites to assess performance on a variety of indicators of student success and other operational aspects that influence student success, including:
 - a. aggregate and disaggregated student results from California State Content Standards Tests
 - b. attendance and academic performance of district and inter-district transfer students
 - c. budget/resource allocation
 - d. Human Resources deployment
 - e. facility-use and school demographics
 - f. central office roles and functions
- 2) Processed data reports produced by the external team to incorporate into the master plan.
- 3) Sought and obtained feedback from the many stakeholder groups in Alameda.
- 4) Revised and edited documents and presentations based on new data and feedback on community priorities.

The Master Plan

The eight goals proposed in this Master Plan are the result of extensive community engagement, a variety of information rendering processes including Board Workshops, PEV meetings, school meetings, community meetings, and web-based and paper surveys.

We believe this plan will bridge the looming financial chasm and transform AUSD into **a model "21st century district" by 2015**. The Master Plan will lead to an AUSD that strengthens accountability by focusing on improving outcomes and meeting proficiency targets for all students and subgroups. It will result in creating a system that will combine resource flexibility with greater accountability and encourage greater school autonomy. It will empower parents to help improve learning quality and give them real choices. It will provide teachers with quality professional development and look towards creating a teacher incentive plan that encourages all teachers to continually grow and improve. It will reshape district office work, establish systems that collect, analyze and utilize data, and capitalize on efficiencies gained from increased use of technology and Internet-based tools.

Our students will benefit from this Master Plan by graduating from our schools with the knowledge, skills, abilities and dispositions needed to succeed and thrive as adults. If our students are to succeed in today's complex economy, they need to have access to advanced levels of English, math, science, and history. Every student should have interesting, rigorous and relevant classes that prepare them for entrance to the California State University or University of California system. They also need a range of analytic and workplace skills. Our high schools need to prepare our young adults with the academic and technical knowledge and skills they will need to prepare for further education and for careers in current or emerging employment sectors. A well designed career technical education and Regional Occupational Program (ROP) includes competency-based applied learning that contributes to the academic knowledge, higher-order reasoning and problem-solving skills, work attitudes, general employability skills, technical skills, and occupation-specific skills. Greater cooperation and a stronger partnership with ROP and the Adult School can help AUSD provide a strategically sequenced set of courses that accomplish the above but also will lead to an associate degree or a certificate in a specific career field, and to high skill, high wage employment.

Section 2: Master Plan Challenges, Goals, and Core Strategies

In this section:

Introduction

- 1) Redesign Central Office
- 2) Raise the Bar
- 3) Create a system of attractive school options
- 4) Maintain a policy of neighborhood elementary schools
- 5) Strengthen effective enrichment programs
- 6) Optimize enrollment
- 7) Build nonprofit, business and philanthropic partnerships
- 8) Pass a parcel tax

Each goal is supported by core strategies that will require a set of implementation and change management plans. Progress towards meeting these goals will be assessed and adjusted continuously in three-year cycles. AUSD, students, teachers and staff and in fact all stakeholders will have to think and work differently as this plan evolves. Additionally, some of the proposed strategies may require that we draw upon the expertise of local, regional, statewide and national organizations to strengthen our work and provide additional resources to make these transformational changes a reality.

For each Master Plan goal in this section we address:

- 1) Challenges***
- 2) Goals***
- 3) Description of Core Strategies***
- 4) Assumptions and Tradeoffs***

An estimate of the fiscal implications of each strategy and a high level implementation timeline (Gantt chart) can be found at the end of the document in Appendices A and B

1. Redesign Central Office for efficiency and quality service; invest cost savings in learning; and decentralize many central functions with funding and accountability to school sites.

Challenges

In model 21st century school districts, central offices will be lean and will provide only the services that are essential to meet state and federal compliance responsibilities and as well as tasks and services that make sense to do from a central office rather than at a school site. The challenge for the central office is simply that it must accomplish more with fewer resources, so innovation is essential. The last seven years of central office budget cuts steadily reduced or eliminated central office staffing and overhead. Some cuts created benefits, as with the redirection in 2009-10 of approximately \$2 million in Title I, TIIG, SLIG and block grant funding to schools to help them meet their academic achievement goals. However, some cuts simply reduced or completely eliminated central office functions across the board. These types of cuts undermined the district's capacity to perform key responsibilities and meet reporting requirements to state and county officials.

Goals

1. Continue to decentralize and redirect 5-10% more of the total district budget to school sites along with greater flexibility and accountability for achieving results.
2. Redesign the central office to reflect 21st century management practices, tools and work processes.

Achieving the Goals

Over the past year, AUSD already has taken initial steps to make the central office much more efficient. Superintendent Vital has launched the redesign of central office departments and their functions. We have already in 2008-09 redistributed fiscal resources to the school-sites, giving schools greater responsibility and additional funding to increase the quality of academic programs to meet the educational needs of all students. In addition, in the fall of 2009, Superintendent Vital continued the redesign of central office departments and their functions. Going forward the redesign will be guided by the results of an "efficiency study" that assessed how departments can perform remaining central office functions more effectively which identified further opportunities to reduce fixed costs and redirect money to schools. Feedback from the Master Plan survey showed that the Alameda community overwhelmingly supported this strategy, with approximately 84% of the respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that we should redesign the central office to become more lean and efficient.

Preliminary analysis of the efficiency study suggests that some departments can streamline their current workload by eliminating unnecessary tasks, by shifting tasks that

can be better accomplished at school sites, and/or by taking advantage of opportunities for technology enhancements. The analysis uncovered numerous broken business processes and missed technology enhancement opportunities that need to be implemented if a true streamlining of the central office is to occur.

The efficiency study used a series of in-depth customer interviews with teachers, office managers and principals to focus the redesign effort on those areas and departments most often identified as problems or “pain points.” Although each group reported out various issues, there were a number of concerns common to one or more “customer” groups. For example, the work order system in Maintenance, Operations and Facilities was repeatedly mentioned as a broken system. Many customers reported a low responsiveness for day to day issues and stated that they could not understand why it took so long to get some things fixed while other things were never fixed at all. Customers summarized their experience as “random responsiveness.” School sites stated that prioritization of work orders was a mystery and noted an overall low response time. As a result of this information, the efficiency study and recommended redesign includes redistributing work among staff in the Maintenance, Operations and Facilities department to address the prioritization and processing of work orders and establish an online cueing system.

A number of other “pain points” were identified within the central office that resulted in wasted time, frustration, inaccurate work product and lost money. The efficiency study mapped and analyzed fourteen (14) cross-departmental processes:

- Hiring process
- Change of Status process
- Health and Welfare Benefits process
- Pay process (salaried)
- Pay process (hourly and ETOT)
- Pay process (substitute and other stipends)
- Personal Leave process
- Leave of Absence process
- Medical Leaves process
- Vacation Leave process
- Worker’s Compensation process
- Retirement Benefits process
- Purchasing process
- MOF Work Order process

For each of the fourteen processes and their respective department, the report provides specific recommendations on how central office departments can become both more efficient and more service and results oriented. The analysis recommends the redesign of several departments as well as the repair or redesign of the processes identified above. By using the analysis, recommendations and the implementation timeline of the efficiency study, the central office can accomplish more with fewer resources.

To bring the district up to 21st century business practices, staff will use technology enhancements and tools to work efficiently. Some examples include:

1. using Edjoin to accept and review job applications on-line thus eliminating paper processes
2. tracking work orders on-line and having staff in the field use hand held devices to close out orders once completed thus eliminating holding or losing paper copies that would have to be collected and entered into the computer by hand at a later time
3. using Subfinder for all substitute employees including paras, clerical and custodians which would result in the elimination of unsupported personal data bases; and
4. using APTA financial system to generate sign-in and sign-out sheets staff attendance

Unlike typical redesign efforts where reorganization is imposed on staff, this Master Plan ensures that central office staff will play a major role in the redesign process for their own departments. Before the end of the 2010 school year, central office departments will create departmental scorecards that will allow principals, office managers and eventually teachers, families and students, the opportunity to evaluate the work of each department. The evaluation data will help district departments set work priorities and develop strategies to improve. Specifically, departments will identify core business functions and start to collect performance data to gain baseline information from which to monitor improvement in the services they provide as well as their growth towards performance targets. Maintenance, Operations and Facilities has started to review the work order processing system to identify how it can better communicate to principals, office managers and school staff expected norms for completing work orders and activating technological tools that will notify site staff when work orders are completed. Currently the systems in MOF are not functioning in an effective manner leaving sites with little confidence that submitted work orders will be completed in a timely fashion.

In the next few years, AUSD will fully utilize these department scorecards by asking for department evaluations from all district stakeholders and integrating feedback into the move towards greater central office efficiency. Starting at the end of this school year -- and for the next several years -- the District will need to upgrade central office systems, including tools for financial management, reporting and cost modeling. Professional development will be provided to staff to better utilize internet-based tools and services to reduce fixed costs and significantly upgrade access to data and information, monitor progress and report results accurately to stakeholders.

Assumptions

- 1) The current central office structure, systems and processes cannot be cut much further — they must be redesigned to achieve cost savings and greater efficiencies.
- 2) In many cases schools can use redirected funds more efficiently than central management.
- 3) We can determine the best functions to decentralize and the ones that should be centrally managed.
- 4) School-sites are ready to learn the new skills and responsibilities that decentralization entails.
- 5) Core business strategies and developmental services standards will be implemented and will function well.
- 6) Many new, affordable tools now exist that can help AUSD better manage its resources, its money and its schools.
- 7) A phased approach will demand a new set of managerial skills --- that is, all leaders in District offices will be required to lead major process improvement efforts in order to deliver the best operational performance of their departments.
- 8) We will find the partners and resources we need.ⁱⁱⁱ

Trade-Offs

- 1) Relocating some central office services to school-sites may require greater staff development. Simply giving principals and site leadership teams more authority and funds without adequately preparing them would be inefficient and ineffective.
- 2) It takes time to adjust to the redistribution of district functions. The new roles and responsibilities may take a year or two to normalize and work smoothly. Although a phased in approach will take longer, we believe it will yield better results.
- 3) Site leadership must accept the accountability and responsibility assigned to them as a result of shifting funds directly to them.

2. Raise the Bar for academic achievement and equity through school-based continuous improvement initiatives led by site-based leadership teams.

Challenges

Alameda schools do well compared to other California schools. Our challenge is to build a "state of the art" public education system by 2015 that will prepare all students for graduation, post secondary study at a college, university or career technical education institution, and successful careers in the 21st century.

Although we are educating most students well, there is an unevenness throughout the school system AUSD's academic performance shows room for improvement overall—both for higher achieving students and for lower achieving students. Many of our students have requested access to more interesting, challenging coursework and unique opportunities. In addition to not providing our students with the highest quality system overall, the district is not sufficiently serving certain subgroups of AUSD students. AUSD did not make the federal government's "Adequate Yearly Progress" (AYP) in 08-09 because the district did not meet performance targets in English language arts and mathematics for African American students and Students with Disabilities and the district did not meet the target for mathematics for Hispanic students. Last year, AYP targets were set at 45% of students at or above proficient for English language arts and were set at 45.5% of students at or above proficient for mathematics. In AUSD last year, 41.3% percent of African American students were at or above proficient in English language arts and 38.3% were proficient in math. Students with Disabilities at or above proficient reached 36.5% and 34% respectively. Hispanic students met AYP targets in English language arts with 51.1% at or above proficient but missed the target for math with 43.6% proficient. With AYP targets increasing at approximately 10% each year, the challenge becomes increasingly difficult if we don't raise the bar for all students and if we don't empower site-based leadership teams to innovate and put in place improvement initiatives that will accelerate the learning and achievement for students not on track to graduate, and be ready for college, employment or adult life.

Efforts to address achievement gaps are beginning to show results. Last year we saw greater gains for African American and Hispanic students on their Academic Performance Index (API), as they increased 16 and 31 API point respectively. Gains in the percent of students at or above proficient grew by 10% for African American students and 6.5% for Hispanic students in English language arts. However, the 2008-09 API scores by subgroup show that while there was only a one point difference between white and Asian students, there was a one hundred seventy-eight point (178) gap between African American students and Asian students, one hundred twenty-five point (125) gap between Hispanic and Asian students and one hundred fifty-two point (152)

gap between Pacific Islanders and Asian students in the area of English language arts. The gap between these same groups is one point larger when compared to white students. The 2008 AUSD high school graduation data, disaggregated by ethnicity, shows that African American and Hispanic seniors completed all University of California/California State University A-G course requirement at approximately half the rate (36%), when compared to (72%) of their Asian peers. In 2007, the UC/CSU course completion rates for African American (25%) and Hispanic (23.3%) students were about one third the completion rate of Asian (77.4%) students. While the rates for UC/CSU completion went up by about 10% from 2007 to 2008, we must continue to accelerate their achievement and eliminate this achievement gap.

With the challenges of improving education overall and eliminating the achievement gap in mind, AUSD will need to both build new, higher quality educational systems and strengthen existing systems. School-sites will likely need:

1. Support, in the form of professional development and coaching.
2. Time to gather- process and analyze student and teacher data and then study and implement best practices in order to upgrade programs at AUSD schools.
3. Leadership, funding and time to learn how to best design and implement individualized education plans for all struggling students to accelerate achievement

All of these elements require time, money and expertise. One of our core challenges is that the fiscal crisis has forced AUSD to consider cutting the very resources we need to make progress. Overcoming the fiscal crisis is imperative if we want to raise the bar for achievement.

Goals

1. Build a "state of the art" public education system that will prepare all students for graduation, college and successful careers in the 21st century by 2015
2. Significantly reduce the achievement gap over the next three years by personalizing teaching and learning for each student, holding high expectations, and providing additional supports for students who require them

In order to improve overall achievement, AUSD plans to build a "state of the art" public education system to meet the demands for greater access to challenging work, preparing all students for college, career and life success.

In order to eliminate the achievement gap, AUSD intends to support each school to develop and implement more innovative instruction, targeting struggling students. The district needs to focus on what students are learning, how they are taught, and what

practices work best with them. AUSD is wholly committed and required to close the achievement gap.

Strategies

1) Develop Individual School Instructional Initiatives

A key component of this Master Plan is to develop local instructional initiatives. The district intends to assist schools as they build school-based systems to study school/student data, use the data to build and improve school-site initiatives; research and implement best teaching practices to shape the initiatives and provide professional development to ensure the highest quality implementation of the initiatives. Through these practices schools will be better positioned to personalize learning, raise student achievement for all students, close achievement gaps and increase the number of students graduating who will complete all A-G course requirements for UC/CSU admission.

2) Apply Best Practices Proven to Accelerate Learning – Support our employees to continually grow and improve

Currently, Educational Services coordinates professional development for teachers in key areas such as improving mathematics instruction, reading comprehension and writing strategies. One of the expected outcomes is that students will demonstrate proficiency on state and local assessments. Additionally, Educational Services coordinates the equity work to assist schools to develop strategies to close achievement gaps between white and Asian students on the one hand and African American and Hispanic and Latino students on the other. Specifically, the district is working directly and will continue to work directly with principals and teachers in the following programs:

Mathematics Initiative: In collaboration with the Alameda County Office of Education, this is a K-12 mathematics systemic approach to increase student achievement through strengthening teachers' content knowledge, deepening lesson design, utilizing ongoing assessment data to mitigate learning gaps, and teacher coaching by peer mathematics coaches.

California State University East Bay: AUSD is also forging new partnerships with institutions such as California State University, East Bay which is reaching out to school districts in Alameda County to provide enrichment opportunities in the area of math and science. Specifically CSUEB has a number of successful programs such as their summer Algebra Academy program that they want to extend to include Geometry and Algebra II with the goal of increasing the number of college-ready students interested in pursuing higher education in science, technology, engineering and math or becoming math/science teachers. CSUEB is also building out math support to students needing remediation through their innovative on-line math remediation program. To support high achieving students, CSUEB is in the early stages of creating an Early

College Program for high school seniors to enroll in at the East Bay campus during their last year of high school. The goal is to attract more college-ready seniors to CSUEB and to serve as a model of integrative learning for local districts with high schools. Superintendent Vital has been actively negotiating with CSUEB to participate in these programs and to encourage CSUEB to play a larger role in supporting AUSD students.

Strategic Instruction Model (SIM): The mission of this work is to dramatically improve the performance of adolescents (grades 6-high school), including those at-risk for failure, through the integration of research-based teacher and student strategies and tools across subject areas. Through this model, teachers help students become independent learners and thinkers through effective teaching of critical content and providing teachers with a breadth and depth of instructional procedures to address many of the challenges students face in the classroom. This model includes professional development for teachers, principal leadership development, and ongoing teacher/principal coaching.

Inquiry by Design: This is an inquiry-based, English language arts model currently piloted by Chipman Middle School, Lincoln Middle School, and Island High School. Teachers implement units of study and a trio of procedural studies designed to help establish key tools, rituals, and routines, including writer's notebooks and independent reading. This model complements the Strategic Instruction Model by increasing the capacity to deliver rigorous and coherent inquiry-based instruction to students via a professional development-driven project anchored by units, training, and on-site coaching. Teachers apprentice students to the work of reading and writing difficult texts.

21st Century Technology Standards: The district's Education Technology Plan presents clear curricular goals tied to academic content standards with a clear vision to close the predictable achievement gaps between various student groups. The plan also sets a goal of having all students acquiring and using the ISTE (International Society for Technology in Education) National Educational Technology Standards for Informational and Communication literacy skills needed in the 21st Century. These skills include:

- a. demonstrate creative thinking, construct knowledge, and develop innovative products and processes using technology.
- b. use digital media and environments to communicate and work collaboratively, including at a distance, to support individual learning and contribute to the learning of others.
- c. apply digital tools to gather, evaluate, and use information.
- d. use critical thinking skills to plan and conduct research, manage projects, solve problems, and make informed decisions using appropriate digital tools and resources.
- e. understand human, cultural, and societal issues related to technology and practice legal and ethical behavior.
- f. demonstrate a sound understanding of technology concepts, systems, and operations.

Teacher Incentive Plan: AUSD wants to explore with the AEA innovative ways of supporting teachers in improving professional practice and pedagogical knowledge in an incentivized manner. In short, the district wants to collaboratively look at teacher incentive models with the AEA that reward teachers for their efforts and effectiveness.

School Calendar and Collaboration: In addition we need to work with AEA to collaboratively create a long term calendar that supports children's educational needs and allows for adult learning time in the system. Teachers need time to share practices, observe each other and discuss students in professional learning communities.

3) Ensure School Principals are Instructional and Community Leaders

Educational Services coordinates the equity work to assist schools to develop strategies to close achievement gaps between white and Asian students on the one hand and African American and Hispanic and Latino students on the other (or for that matter any group where there are significant achievement gaps). This type of work is extremely difficult as old notions of how schools work and beliefs about academic expectations for certain types of student sometimes conflicts with our responsibility to educate all students to high levels of academic achievement. Principals have to lead this work at their school and have to have support to be successful. Our partner and support in this work is the Bay Area Coalition for Essential Schools (BayCES).

AUSD and BAYCES through their *Leading for Equity* program has embarked on building and developing transformational instructional leadership to ensure all students achieve to the highest levels. The program includes the examination of systemic inequity and achievement gap, facilitative instructional coaching conversations, and material on addressing and improving systems and programs for all students. The two strands of this professional development are for principals and school site teacher teams.

4) Develop a Tiered Intervention System for Schools

The district plans to build a tiered intervention system that will help school leaders develop local instructional initiatives to meet student achievement targets and to provide appropriate intervention. The district intends to assist schools as they build school-based systems to study school/student data-; use the data to build and improve school-site initiatives; research and implement best teaching practices to shape the initiatives and provide professional development practitioners to ensure the highest quality implementation of the initiatives. The system will be able to help schools gauge whether or not innovations are working for the student populations intended.

With more instructional funds and responsibilities moving to school sites over time, the central office assumes the exclusive role of monitoring and supporting achievement and equity at all schools. This year, the central office is developing a system to assess and support school-site academic improvement. The new system features include:

1. A comprehensive assessment for evaluating major criteria indicators of student success including API and AYP, attendance, Advanced Placement participation and performance, secondary graduation rates and the academic growth of cohorts of students over two or three year periods.^{iv}
2. A baseline analysis of current school performance and placement of schools on a particular tier based on a compilation of student achievement measures including growth and decline on all criteria indicators.
3. School developed targets for growth and a credible plan that ensures each school reaches its growth targets.
4. The tiering system rewards schools with greater autonomy in trade for greater accountability. In addition it allows the central office to differentiate and focus on its most challenged schools.

5) Redirect funds to schools from Central Office

Since January of 2008, AUSD has implemented a “zero based” budgeting process that annually reviews every district dollar to see how it is invested and whether it is getting results for children. The district staff reviews general fund expenditures, categorical expenditures by department and by school site budgets to see if the board needs to re-allocate resources based on the superintendent’s recommendation. This process has allowed the public full transparency of district resources and spending.

Assumptions for Improving Achievement for All Students

- 1) Status quo is not an option. Our responsibility is to provide the highest quality of education for each student, and we will relentlessly improve, celebrating our accomplishments along the way.
- 2) Transforming the current education system so that it serves each student and family well is a value we share with our community.
- 3) We must both try new things and implement proven programs.
- 4) Everyone is a learner — this applies to everyone from the classroom to the boardroom to the living room. A continuous improvement cycle necessitates that students, teachers, administrators and parents work together to learn with greater understanding what it is going to take to provide every student with a rigorous and relevant education.

Trade-Offs for Improving Achievement for All Students

- 1) Change isn’t easy. New, more comprehensive initiatives may involve new and different work from staff.
- 2) Resources are limited. There will be hard choices to make.
- 3) Developing initiatives that will prepare all students for success in school, college and life may involve both additional resources and reallocation of current resources.

Assumptions for Instructional Time

- 1) The district and the community value the time that students have to learn. Teachers and administrators and staff need time to learn too.
- 2) Instructional time is a valuable and limited resource and must be fully allocated and fully utilized.
- 3) The amount of instructional time and the strategic use of this time directly influence the success of students.
- 4) In most classrooms instructional time is used effectively.

Trade-Offs for Instructional Time

- 1) Time costs money.
- 2) If the district continues to struggle due to reduced funding, we may need to revisit our priorities, including the costs of instructional, development, and prep time.
- 3) Ensuring that all teachers have access to high quality professional development and effectively use collaboration and preparation time and that all students have well-prepared teachers, may require that extra resources, work and time be made available.

3. Create a system of attractive school options to provide desirable choices and deepen student, family and community engagement in the youths' lives and education.

Challenges

The usefulness of a one size fit all comprehensive high school that sifts and sorts students is long gone. No longer can secondary schools educate the top twenty percent well and leave the rest with merely an adequate education. Our information based economy requires all citizens to have the skills to learn new information and to think critically through a variety of problems. Educating all children well and to high levels is the challenge as is creating attractive school options that engage all students in their learning.

AUSD offers few educational options at the secondary level. While the current course offerings in comprehensive high schools seem to work for many students, for some they do not. Even some higher performing students have expressed a desire for more relevant subject matter and closer relationships with adults and peers on campus. Across the island we see marginal growth in statewide test results for secondary schools.

In addition, having few educational options at the elementary and middle school levels may limit opportunities for the current and future success of particular students. When given the opportunity to attend a school with specialized interests, such as a school with a developed language program, these particular students' interest and motivation to learn may strengthen, leading to higher academic achievement. Well prepared elementary and middle school students have a greater likelihood of success when they enter high school.

Goals

1. Research, design and fund educational program options designed to increase youth motivation to learn and family engagement by creating new programs and incorporating charter schools into a program of choices open to all students and families. Engage secondary students in rigorous academic study while motivating them to prepare for careers, college and/or post secondary studies.

The broad goal of the secondary school choice initiative is to create different educational pathways to careers and college in order to give students and families greater opportunity to align a school program with their interests. We believe that more personalized learning environments, aligned with student interest, and coupled with rigorous, relevant and interesting curricula can inspire young people (and their families) to become more engaged in and responsible for their learning.

Additionally, by teaching students in smaller cohorts, all students can better connect with teachers and administrators on a social and/or emotional level, giving them the supports necessary for success in school. The City of Alameda Child and Youth Development Survey 2009, published as *Alameda Health Is Not Just Healthcare* initiative and facilitated by Alice Lai-Bitker, highlights the research from the Search Institute, that the quality of caring relationships, high expectations, and meaningful opportunities to participate in a young persons life is strongly linked with quality of health, social and academic outcomes.

In addition, at all levels, magnet or other specialized programs should also help resolve the imbalance of enrollment across the District by creating programs throughout the system that appeal to students and families across Alameda due to their specialty, small size and improved student outcomes. Moreover there is strong support among teachers for magnets. Results from the AEA membership survey showed that 48% of the responding Alameda teachers have an interest in a magnet school program and 80% want alternative programs only if implementing such options (charters and/or magnets) would not hurt the District financially. In particular, some schools on the West End are experiencing declining enrollment, as is particularly the case at Encinal High School. Operating an under-enrolled campus is not efficient. However, we think that the strong affiliation with Encinal High that its current teachers, staff and students demonstrate, coupled with developing new magnet programs on site, and opening up enrollment to East Alameda students and students from outside Alameda, will allow the school to grow and prosper.

Achieving the Goals

AUSD currently offers one specialized program at the College of Alameda — ASTI or the Alameda Science and Technology Institute. However, through the *Listening Campaign*, Master Plan surveys, and the AEA survey we learned that there is a high level of interest for more magnet programs at the secondary school level. The Master Plan survey showed that a majority of respondents (354/525) or 67% strongly agreeing or agreeing with expanding educational options.

Therefore, our first priority is to expand options at the high school level, starting with Encinal High School and then expanding to Alameda High. To begin, these programs will most likely be "self contained" small learning communities featuring a particular, proven model for education (e.g., the International Baccalaureate, High Tech High, or Big Picture Learning Models). The district proposes to begin finding strategic funding partners to help expand offerings starting in March 2010.^v

At the elementary and middle school levels we propose developing a K-8 language immersion or arts magnet school (at a site to be determined) that would open in the

2011-2012 school year. The Master Plan survey revealed that community members and parents were most interested in dual language immersion, science/technology and an arts themed school. At the elementary level, a dual language immersion model was the most popular (64.73%). Science and technology were more popular at middle (66.81%) and high schools (73.8%). The teacher survey showed support for magnets with focus on performing art (43.2%), math/science (42.1%) and science/technology (41.7%). This February we will start the process of determining the location of the K-8 magnet school. The process will include a request for proposal (RFP) from site leadership and design teams who desire to create a magnet or themed school. Other elementary and middle school options will be explored in ensuing years. We will determine the models we might need after doing market research and further identifying community interests. We also will specifically encourage our other middle schools to begin discussions with their communities to determine whether magnets or small learning communities will help improve student learning and engagement in schoolwork. By “meeting students where they are” in more specialized learning communities (realized through magnet programs and/or academies), schools can better engage students in their learning by aligning study with interests.

Initial start up funding for magnet or other specialized programs will come from external nonprofit and philanthropic partnerships. Strategy 7 found later in the Master Plan outlines the goals and strategies for securing external funding so that teachers and administrators can design innovative school options. Organizations such as the Bill and Melinda Gate Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and others look for school districts and leaders to support and partner with to provide durable evidence and powerful examples of equitable, high-quality schooling for all students. Our strategy is to fully leverage our position as an emerging 21st century school district and establish partnerships that will help us reach our goals.

Charter schools also offer options for families. Like magnet schools, charter schools appeal to particular interests. The site-based governance and regulatory flexibility that charter schools enjoy provide an opportunity to involve students, parents, teachers and administrators more deeply in school program development. Charters offer an alternative way to align program with specific student needs, especially when effectively monitored by the district office. AUSD has developed open, solid relationships with three current District charter schools, Nea, BASE and ACLC, and is working collaboratively with the Academy of Alameda (Chipman Middle School) as they work towards opening their charter school for the 2010-2011 school year. Our approach going forward is to continue to collaborate and learn from our existing charter schools as part of our choice initiative.

Choice System Assumptions

- 1) Students and families want or will respond positively to more choices at the secondary and elementary levels.
- 2) Creating small learning communities within larger, traditional comprehensive high schools is feasible with funds from the parcel tax and/or from external funders for start up costs.
- 3) Developing new magnets and/or small learning communities will increase levels of social and emotional support for engaging students more deeply in learning.

Choice System Trade-Offs

- 1) Change isn't easy. Restructuring schools, designing new programs, hiring staff and aligning students, parents and staff to a new mission involves new and different work.
- 2) With limited resources, development of a new program may require a redistribution of resources from other programs.
- 3) Choice programs require that leaders listen to the priorities of communities, families and students. district leadership must be ready to learn, adjust and respond as needed.

Assumptions About Charter School Education Options

- 1) Charter schools are public schools and part of AUSD.
- 2) Charters are held to the same standards as other AUSD schools. They must provide the highest quality education for all students, including students from all subgroups requesting admission to the charter school.
- 3) Charters will request/purchase back-office support from AUSD if the quality warrants it and the costs are competitive.

Trade-Offs for Charter School Education Options

- 1) When charters do not buy services from AUSD, the central office loses revenue.
- 2) Charters require monitoring.
- 3) Charters that do not achieve district and state targets or that do not attract the enrollment they need to be viable, risk having their charter revoked.

4. *Maintain a policy of neighborhood elementary schools to strengthen school communities and facilitate close collaboration for the education of younger children. Keep the two comprehensive high school campuses open to house new options and leverage school affiliations.*

Challenges to Neighborhood Schools

Alameda families value their neighborhood elementary schools highly. Public input offered early in the process -- and then voiced throughout 2009 via the *Listening Campaign*, public workshops and survey responses -- reinforced how essential neighborhood schools were to the Alameda community. The Board of Education affirmed this value as a Master Plan priority in August 2009, citing their ability to support strong school communities and facilitate close collaboration for the education of younger children.

Given the reduction in state funding and the sunset of the current parcel tax two years from now, AUSD would have to secure considerable financial support to continue to maintain existing neighborhood elementary schools without disruption. Like other priorities named through the *Listening Campaign*, surveys and other forms of feedback, we have determined that the current system can be maintained and strengthened with a new parcel tax and by optimizing enrollment (See Strategy 6, "Optimizing Enrollment"). In the AEA survey, 31% of responding teachers indicated their preference that no schools be considered for consolidation 42% indicated that AUSD schools should be open to other Bay Area residents. Otherwise, operating under enrolled schools is fiscally unsustainable and consequently preserving neighborhood elementary schools would require cuts elsewhere. Even with funding from a parcel tax — AUSD's base fiscal resources could not preserve all current programs or program elements.

Based on feedback from the *Listening Campaign*, survey and other forms of feedback, the district and the community also value existing secondary school-sites. Not only have existing secondary schools developed traditions that evoke pride, a strong community and alumnae affiliation with the schools, but the sites' proximity to students helps reduce barriers for many students to attend core courses and participate in extracurricular activities. Proximity also allows some families to more easily participate in the school community. Despite these advantages AUSD cannot maintain two high school sites without optimizing enrollment (see Strategy 6) and without securing additional funding.

Goals

1. An excellent neighborhood elementary school for every family in Alameda with appropriate enrollment, preserving space and investment for specialized programs and resources
2. Continue to offer two (2) middle schools in AUSD and optimize their enrollments. Plan for a successful opening of the Academy of Alameda at the Chipman campus as it will most likely be the school of choice for neighborhood families.
3. Maintain two (2) comprehensive high school sites and optimize their enrollments.

The Superintendent is not recommending for the time being the “one high school” option pending passage of a parcel tax of the amount needed to bridge the gap between the funding that the state provides and the costs of priorities established in this Master Plan.

Achieving the Goals

In order to begin this process of strategy evaluation and election potential -- and to gain broad community participation-- the district has trained Public Education Volunteers (PEVs), who subsequently managed the *Listening Campaign*; held community workshops where district leadership shared fiscal and academic data about neighborhood elementary schools and existing secondary sites, and implemented on-line surveys to gauge community priorities for neighborhood elementary schools and existing secondary sites. Specifically, district leaders and PEVs engaged in many conversations with stakeholders on the trade-offs that the AUSD community may have to make in the near future, in order to preserve neighborhood elementary schools; existing secondary school sites and enrollment zones while also eliminating the deficit.

Assuming the parcel tax passes, the district proposes, based on feedback from the community and the decision of the Board of Education, to keep open all neighborhood elementary schools and keep their current enrollment zones for the next two years. Over the next few years, AUSD will continue to assess community support for the other strategies such as class size increases of 1-4 students per teacher at K-3, needed to maintain neighborhood elementary schools and current enrollment zones. AUSD will need some temporary flexibility in finding a workable solution to make small class size work. It is important to note that class size is a negotiated item with the Alameda Educational Association. The district will also continue to evaluate the costs of maintaining all existing neighborhood elementary schools and propose ways to make the neighborhood elementary schools more cost effective, e.g., increasing inter-district transfers to optimize facility-use. As we strive to build trust and cooperate with our employee groups, the district will sponsor continuous dialogue and involvement of bargaining units so that they can participate in setting priorities over time as conditions change.

Also based on the priorities established by the community, AUSD intends to preserve existing secondary school-sites and their current enrollment zones. Implementing these intentions depends heavily on passing a parcel tax and optimizing enrollment. The parcel tax must be large enough to provide the resources needed to sponsor the basic needs of four traditional public secondary schools within current enrollment zones and develop the special initiatives needed to improve academic achievement. Nonetheless, in the next few years, the district will continue to evaluate the viability of continued support of all secondary schools and enrollment zones. AUSD will analyze the costs of maintaining all secondary schools by both monitoring school-site enrollment to ensure that sites are sustainable and by tracking levels of resource-use, e.g. staffing, utilities and operating costs, at each site relative to enrollment. The district will also compare this resource data to each school-site's academic performance to ensure the most effective use of AUSD's limited funds. AUSD will also work to find ways to make the secondary schools in their current enrollment zones more cost efficient.

Assumptions for Preserving Neighborhood Elementary Schools

- 1) Neighborhood schools are a high priority.
- 2) Neighborhood schools provide a strong sense of community and access to full participation.
- 3) The current system of neighborhood schools serves most students well.
- 4) Under-enrolled schools will recruit and enroll transfer students from outside the district in order to maintain fiscal viability.

Trade-Offs for Preserving Neighborhood Elementary Schools

- 1) Preserving existing neighborhood schools will be impossible without a significant increase in revenue from parcel taxes or by cutting programs (and creating savings) elsewhere (like increasing class size, consolidating secondary schools, etc.).
- 2) K-3 class size increases and/or flex reductions may be considered to resolve facility capacity issues essential for preserving the enrollment zones.
- 3) While most students do well in current elementary programs, some students will need new and/or different methods to succeed. School-based initiatives will be required to accelerate learning for these students

Assumptions for Preserving Existing Secondary Sites

- 1) The district and its community members value preserving existing secondary school-sites.
- 2) Existing secondary school-sites have deep established roots in the community, and their students, families and staffs have developed close relationships in their

respective communities. This is an asset that can be leveraged on behalf of student learning.

- 3) Student and family proximity to schools allow easy access to school sites, facilitating greater investment there.
- 4) All secondary sites will be schools of choice that offer attractive programs designed to engage students in rigorous and relevant programs to prepare them for college, careers and citizenship.
- 5) Optimum enrollment at both sites is possible and necessary.

Trade-Offs for Preserving Existing Secondary Sites

- 1) Preserving existing secondary schools (even if student populations are rebalanced) takes significant resources and is not possible without a significant increase in funding from parcel taxes or by cutting programs (and creating savings) elsewhere (like increasing class size, consolidating neighborhood elementary schools, etc.).
- 2) Changes will need to be made to ensure that all secondary schools serve all students well and that secondary schools are run more efficiently.
- 3) These changes will require extra work, like designing and implementing intervention programs and recruiting inter-district transfer students to fill gaps at under-enrolled schools.

Assumptions for maintaining enrollment zones

- 1) Keeping current enrollment zones minimizes disruption to students, families and local businesses.
- 2) With predictable enrollment levels and by utilizing new technology such as the AERIES student information system, staff can access a complete personal, social and academic history of students to better plan for and monitor the academic/educational progress of their students. Staff will be able to design, initiate and continuously improve programs and also enroll students in programs that best fit students' needs.
- 3) Preserving neighborhood school enrollment zones and ensuring that current school enrollment requires a parcel tax.
- 4) Current enrollment patterns at neighborhood elementary schools are inefficient resulting in few if any seats existing in some schools where they are needed, while excess, unused seats exist in other schools.

Trade-Offs for Maintaining Enrollment Zones

- 1) Preserving existing school enrollment zones is not possible without a significant increase in funding from parcel taxes or by cutting other programs (and creating savings) elsewhere (like increasing class size, etc.).
- 2) Ensuring quality and equity within each zone will require extra planning and close monitoring of results and enrollment patterns.

5. Strengthen effective enrichment programs that inspire and motivate our children to learn and come to school.

Challenges

Specialized co-curricular and extracurricular programs give students the extra in-classroom (co-curricular) or out-of-classroom (extracurricular) enrichment that would not be possible within the limits of the core curriculum. For many students, enrichment activities provide the kinds of experiences that teach them important skills and knowledge that are not part of the explicit curriculum. School communities also value the flexible spaces that facilitate specialized enrichment activities. Without flexible space, enrichment programs that take place during the school day would likely be reduced or eliminated. However, the current menu of school programs, with reduced state funding and no additional external funding, would increase AUSD's structural deficit. While these programs all have value for some students, with no external funding, most would be cut or eliminated since all available funds would support the core curriculum only.^{vi}

Goal

1. Preserve all programs that are valued by the community and show results.
2. Craft a parcel tax to continue supporting these programs; add programs to continue this innovation/choice.

Achieving the Goal

This fall the district created, implemented and analyzed a survey allowing community members to prioritize district programs and flexible space. Respondents to the Master Plan survey at the elementary level strongly supported enrichment programs currently included in the schools' program. For example, respondents chose elementary P.E. (46.4%) as their first choice of programs to protect. A slightly smaller group (33.4%) preferred to protect elementary music as their first selection. Art is another program that is highly valued at the elementary level. All schools currently have some form of art to enrich the educational experience of students. The Art Docent program at all ten elementary sites is very popular and schools staff it with parent volunteers. Families would like to see art education expanded and supported. The Board of Education each year reviews the district's Arts Education Resolution, which recognizes a complete education must include:

- the arts as an integral subject of the curriculum in accordance with the state standards and framework,
- a strong sequential arts program taught by highly qualified visual and performing arts teachers,
- access to and practice in the visual and performing arts to ensure that every child will have the opportunity to practice critical thinking and leadership skills,

investigate creative ideas, and make new connections for themselves and others.

The district has a board approved Visual and Performing Arts Education (VAPA) Plan developed by teachers, parents, community members, and administrators that focuses on meeting the following goals:

1. Ensure equitable access to VAPA for all students in all schools everyday
2. Develop and implement a comprehensive K-12 standards-based VAPA curriculum that is cohesive and inclusive
3. Ensure highly qualified VAPA professionals who are passionate about teaching and passionate about the arts
4. Provide ongoing communication about the power of arts learning
5. Support and develop VAPA programming through community and school partnerships
6. Ensure that all schools have adequate supplies and equipment and dedicated, exemplary facilities to support VAPA programs
7. Fund a sustainable and equitable VAPA budget within AUSD
8. Ensure qualified leadership that advocates for the needs of the VAPA program

In addition, through a partnership with the Alameda County Office of Educational Arts Alliance, the District plans to offer elementary classroom teachers professional development on integrating arts in the classroom in order to expand arts learning in the classroom.

Community members who participated in the *Listening Campaign* led by Public Education Volunteers voiced support for flex space as a valuable resource they would like to see remain. In the AEA survey, teachers overwhelmingly responded favorably (79.6 %) to considering using common areas or "flex space" for extended hours, community-centered events like movie night or other similar events. AEA members also believed that on-site day care should be available for parents at every elementary school (72.2%). In the coming months, the district will more carefully evaluate all programs. An important future goal is to align the multiple art and music programs so that the pathways can be continued as students move from elementary, through middle school and on to high school. With adequate funding, music programs can be expanded to include other more specialized music ensembles.

At the middle school there is a great need to expand access to technology and media center services. Unlike the elementary school level where schools are staffed with a credentialed Media Specialist who meet weekly with students and assist teachers with technology integration, middle schools do not have credentialed Media Specialist support. The current state of education is becoming increasingly embedded with technology and 21st century students are now expected to have high levels of information and technological skills. Under current funding conditions it is extremely

difficult to purchase, maintain and replace computers and other such technology because a regular funding stream is simply not available. Access to current technology all of a sudden becomes very scarce at the middle school level, just when students really need access to a variety of resources to complete research projects or to take advantage of technological innovations to accelerate their learning.

After school programs play an important role in providing additional support for students who need the most help in core classes. The realignment of afterschool programs that took place in June, 2009 is an important structural change that should help close achievement gaps and better prepare students for higher level academic classes thus making them more competitive when they are ready to apply to college. Without the extra tutoring and small group instruction that is currently provided through our afterschool programs the district will most likely see an increase in dropout rates as student simply cannot keep up with their studies or will give up out of frustration.

At the high school level, Regional Occupation Programs and career technical education provide opportunities for students to develop their interest in high wage, high skill level careers. There will need to be a realignment of ROP and career technical education classes to provide students the opportunity to receive a certificate in concentrated field of student that they could use to gain employment or extend their studies beyond high school. ROP classes and building out the Adult School to provide career technical education classes will provide a valuable service for students who choose to move in a career pathway. Because of the current fiscal crisis in California, ROP programs are cutting classes that student need and desire. Finding an alternative funding source for ROP and career technical education classes is essential if we are to meet the educational needs of all students.

Assumptions to Preserve High-Quality Programs

- 1) Programs are accessible to all students or targeted to help accelerate learning for students who are not on grade level or on track to graduate.
- 2) Programs enrich student educational experience.
- 3) Core academic programs are a priority.
- 4) Investment in high quality intervention programs benefit all students by increasing all students' time on task and by raising academic rigor in core curriculum.
- 5) High quality programs also include programs for high achieving students such as GATE or Advanced Placement

Trade-Offs to Preserve High-Quality Programs

- 1) Some programs may require families to pay in order to participate.
- 2) Scarce resources may need to be reallocated from one program to fund much needed technology

Assumptions to Preserve Flexible Space

- 1) Flex space is important and gives schools the capacity to provide specialized extracurricular or co-curricular programs.
- 2) Specialized extracurricular or co-curricular programs improve learning and provide students with enrichment that they would likely not access in core classes.
- 3) Most flex spaces are used effectively and used in a manner that directly benefits students.

Trade-Offs to Preserve Flexible Space

- 1) Flex space may be reallocated house core programs to accommodate increased enrollment, even if program funding exists.
- 2) Schools will need to work to ensure that their current flex spaces are being used most effectively and in the cases, where the space is not used most effectively, make the changes necessary.

6. Optimize enrollment to reduce fix costs, stabilize programs, and create year-to-year consistency in program planning and delivery.

Challenges

Nearly 94% of the AUSD budget is allocated to staffing schools. Consequently, due to the magnitude of reductions in state funding, unless the AUSD can secure a significant amount of parcel tax revenue, external financial support or enrollment earned revenue, the district will have to implement staff cost reductions in order to remain solvent.

Optimizing enrollment to reduce fixed costs and for increasing the benefits from efficient scales of economy can limit some of the negative consequences caused by the state budget cuts to AUSD. Enrolling more students in AUSD from Alameda and surrounding communities fills empty classroom seats and increases general fund revenue.

Alternatively, most of the strategies related to reducing staff costs would have a negative impact on student learning (e.g., enforcing fewer instructional days) or would disrupt families (redrawing enrollment zones to consolidate enrollment). Some would have a negative impact on jobs, salaries and benefits and the ability to recruit and retain teachers and staff (i.e., implementing furlough days, salary rollbacks). Although increasing class size does produce some negative impacts on teachers and students, the relative cost is minimal compared to other potential strategies. We acknowledge the extra workload this entails for K-3 and some 9th grade teachers (and the fact that some of these measures would have to be negotiated with AEA). Even though increasing class size provides significant fiscal benefits, feedback received during the *Listening Campaign* (through PEV meetings, workshops and surveys), clearly indicates that many members of the AUSD community do not want an increase in class sizes. According to the AEA survey, members believe that small class size is integral to student success (over 90%). The majority of teachers indicated that the optimum class size is between 15-20 students. This preference appears to be fairly consistent across grade levels.

Generally speaking, when class size increases fewer classrooms are needed. In order to continue to employ current teachers, thereby saving jobs, and in order to maintain salary levels for existing teachers, the district must identify a pool of students to fill the vacant seats. Currently, the district admits a small number of inter-district transfer students. However, by admitting a larger number of inter-district transfer students, the district could fill all currently open seats and extra seats created by possible class size increases. The net result would generate new revenue for AUSD at a per pupil state revenue limit of \$4946 per additional student. With additional analysis this dollar amount could be factored by the number empty seats and/or empty classrooms to generate

additional revenue scenarios. These scenarios, in turn, could help project models for lowering the district's fixed costs, which support current teacher salaries and benefits.

Some community members voiced concern during the *Listening Campaign* and on surveys about the success of inter-district transfer students in AUSD. They reasoned that if inter-district students were not being successful, we may not want to admit additional students. Staff research has shown that inter-district transfer students perform well academically and behaviorally.^{vii} In fact, the longer these students attend school in Alameda the better they do (as compared to the rate of improvement by Alameda students). Data on behavior issues show they do not misbehave at rates higher than Alameda residents at the secondary level but that there is a marginal increase at the elementary level. District policy and practice revokes inter-district permits when students fail to behave or succeed in school. It is for these reasons that staff believes this is the best strategy to fill vacant seats, and thereby optimize enrollment.

Goal

1. Optimize facilities and make education more sustainable in AUSD with better economies of scale by increasing total enrollment in order to make best use of facilities.

AUSD understands that in the classroom, each additional student can make a difference. In particular, with each additional student, the teacher may have to spend more time preparing for lessons and assessing and managing the students. Taking fiscal challenges and education research^{viii} into consideration, we believe the evidence supports that increasing class size has less negative impact on students, families and teachers than other cost saving measures such as enforcing furloughs, reducing instructional days, reducing salaries or closing schools. AUSD realizes that any planned increases should be as small as possible and that they should be temporary. Consequently, if implemented, the district will set a goal of limited and controlled class size increases as negotiated with AEA.

Achieving the Goal

After thorough research of all potential staff, cost reducing strategies, the internal work group believes that increasing class 1-4 students per class at K-3 and increasing 9th grade to be consistent with other high school grade levels are the best options under the current fiscal circumstances. Such increases would save an estimated \$1 million. This strategy would also create a benefit by increasing the likelihood that families living in overenrolled school zones could attend their currently over-enrolled neighborhood schools.

By maintaining existing neighborhood elementary and secondary schools and their current enrollment zones, many schools will remain under-enrolled, and subsequently, under-utilized. By increasing class size, the gaps between the number of empty seats and the optimal number of student enrollment will expand further. With this fiscal reality in mind, we propose to leverage the attractiveness of an AUSD education to help stabilize enrollment and decrease the district's fixed costs by establishing optimum enrollment and admitting transfer students until the desired enrollment targets are achieved.

At the end of 2009-2010, the district will use the information from the Facility Master Plan, the demographic study, the enrollment and attendance reports, and the facility-use and inter-district transfer analysis to determine the level of class size increase and the total inter-district transfer population size target for 2010-2011 along with the individual school-site's inter-district transfer student target population sizes for 2010-2011.^{ix} Careful consideration needs to be taken given the changing student demographic projections identified in the Demographic Study^x. That study predicts that certain student/school populations are predicted to increase (Earhart, Edison, Franklin, Otis and Ruby Bridges) while others are predicted to decline (Bay Farm, Haight, Paden and Washington). The goal is to explore creating and using joint use partnerships with the city to maximize our facility space. Accordingly, it would be better to build out schools and provide more classroom space on campus if enrollment projections predict an increase in the local student population. This will need to be closely analyzed with individual school site solutions for Earhart, Edison, Franklin, Otis and Ruby Bridges. AUSD will also ensure that the population of inter-district transfer students extends across multiple school-sites to the extent possible starting in 2010-2011. Also, at the end of the 2009-2010 school year, AUSD will determine how to market the available spaces to inter-district transfer students to ensure that AUSD receives a higher number of quality applications in the inter-district transfer process in order to fill the new target. The district will need to ensure that the schools are equipped with materials, desks and other essential items to handle the increase in inter-district transfer students. The district will also need to implement some supportive measures to ensure that schools are both prepared to handle the increase in class size (if necessary) and the increase in the number of inter-district transfer students served.

Assumptions for Increasing Class Size

- 1) The district and the community value preserving small class size.
- 2) At current K-3 class sizes (20:1) the effect of raising class size 1-4 students per class on individual and class academic performance is minimal.
- 3) Raising class size will produce savings that will help realize other priorities during a turbulent fiscal time.

- 4) The district will forge an agreement with the Alameda Education Association (AEA) to temporarily raise school class size and then return to lower levels when adequate state funding allows.

Trade-Offs for Increasing Class Size

- 1) Increasing class size will increase the workload for teachers.
- 2) It may take more outreach to help the public understand and accept the rationale for this strategy.
- 3) Requires careful and explicit agreements about criteria for return to class size reduction in better fiscal times.

Assumptions for Rebalancing Enrollment with Inter-district Transfers

- 1) Keeping current school enrollment zones creates more stability.
- 2) Some schools are under-enrolled. This is inefficient. Operating at full capacity creates crucial economies of scale.
- 3) AUSD will be able to recruit the necessary target of inter-district transfer students to fill the gap.
- 4) In addition to enrolling inter-district transfer students, the district will implement a system of choice that will allow students and parents to choose to move to school-sites (mainly secondary) based on interest (with themed, small learning communities) or space available.
- 5) The quality and reputation of Alameda schools will attract inter-district students and families who value an excellent education.

Trade-Offs for Rebalancing Enrollment with Inter-district Transfers

- 1) If the district does not reach the necessary inter-district transfer target, the lack of efficiency especially without a significant increase in funding from parcel taxes, will force the district to consider cutting other programs (to create savings) elsewhere (like increasing class size, etc.).
- 2) Schools will have a vested interest in recruiting students if under-enrolled.
- 3) Under-enrollment means less funding for particular schools; eventually this could impact the decision to keep particular schools open.
- 4) Creating an effective system will take careful thought, planning and execution.

7. Build nonprofit, business and philanthropic partnerships to invest the time, money and expertise required for AUSD to become a model, 21st century school district by 2015.

Challenges

The strategies proposed here are as bold and ambitious as the fiscal crisis is severe. Consequently, AUSD needs increased revenue from philanthropic sources to cover the costs to carry out these strategies. It will take an effort by the whole community to be successful. Organizations that might support AUSD need to have dynamic leadership and the capacity to seek grants from regional, state and national sources. The organizations' missions and management would have to be aligned with the direction of AUSD and the needs of regional, state and national funding sources.

Goal

- 1) Raise \$1.2 million over the next three years to support district initiatives by securing our nonprofit partner, Alameda Education Foundation to raise money and manage programs.

Achieving the Goal

Currently, AUSD continues its valued partnership with the Alameda Education Foundation (AEF). AEF provides much needed support for many extracurricular and co-curricular programs. The district values this relationship, but will challenge AEF during the life of this Master Plan to take up the role of strategic development partner and help raise funds for the district's core initiatives. The magnitude of this responsibility cannot be overstated but there is great hope that AEF will have the capacity, skill and leadership to do the development work AUSD needs to fund our programs and to meet our goal of becoming a model 21st century district by 2015.

We will seek partnerships with philanthropic organizations (both locally and nationally) that will support the need to build a "state of the art" education, beyond the funds needed to support basic education. Our partners' role is to work with AUSD to forge strong relationships with other nonprofit and business partners with strong track records raising money and/or managing successful education improvement projects. Foundations support new and innovative programs, not gap filling or budget shortfalls. Our plan positions us well in the competition for philanthropic resources.^{xi}

To prevent adding administrative staff, AUSD will continue to build and form additional strategic partnerships to leverage our existing resources while benefitting from the specialized knowledge, services and expertise of other organizations. Some strategic partnerships simply make good common sense such our increasingly beneficial relationships with the City of Alameda, Alameda Point Collaborative, and local business

and real estate organizations as well as other civic minded non-profit organizations. Additional partnerships will have to be established as our work becomes increasingly complex and specialized due to the transformation of the district as outlined in this Master Plan. We are confident that the vision and innovative strategies incorporated in this plan will make AUSD attractive to state and national networks looking to support the type of work goals we plan to pursue.

We anticipate that there may be some initial investment to help get us to the point where members of these network take notice of AUSD. The one-time investments for these services can be included into proposals and supported by a portion of the parcel tax. With a strategic development partner in place, Alameda will emerge three years from now in a better position to weather future financial storms and create sustainable progress. Beyond the initial few years of philanthropic start-up support, AUSD will seek to use cost savings and tax support to ensure support of all programs that prepare AUSD graduates for college, career and life success.

Our work in building the social and network capital we need has already begun as evidenced in our expanding relationship with the City of Alameda. Superintendent Vital has led staff on a mission to foster stronger relationships with city staff who share similar job responsibilities. The city manager and the superintendent facilitated initial meetings to build bridges between the two organizations. In addition the Superintendent established an expectation that staff will meet, problem solve and look for innovative opportunities to reduce redundancies in services the city and district provide. By reducing redundancies both organizations can save taxpayers money and better utilize existing resources in an efficient manner.

Our relationship with the city extends beyond merely providing services. The city and the district have real assets and property that make joint business opportunities a real possibility. Both the AUSD and the city are looking at our physical assets to see where shared use and joint use agreements of facilities makes good business sense. AUSD has increased and is actively pursuing joint use agreements for access to public facilities such as space at city parks. Additionally, unused facility space within AUSD and the city provide mutually beneficial opportunities to buy, sell or lease property as a means to free up fiscal resources for one or both parties. This Master Plan strategy is designed to allow AUSD to raise the anticipated fiscal resources needed to fund the educational programs our students deserve and our families desire and provides creative opportunities to leverage our facility assets and real property towards that end.

Assumptions

- 1) AUSD has multiple projects that will attract regional, state and national donors.
- 2) We will find and/or create the partners we need. We seek partnerships with philanthropic organizations (both locally and globally) that will support the need to

build a “state of the art” education, beyond the funds needed to support basic education.

- 3) We won't start initiatives without a source of funding from the parcel tax or from grants or donations.
- 4) Existing real property and facility resources can be leveraged to help fund desired programs
- 5) The city and AUSD have shared interests in strengthening our working relationships for a mutually shared benefit.

Trade-Offs

- 1) AUSD will continue to collaborate effectively with nonprofit partners to both manage and fund innovative programs.
- 2) District leadership will need to make and take the time necessary to manage external partners and do their tasks and make decisions when required.
- 3) AUSD is increasingly interdependent and increasingly linked to local civic and business organizations requiring stronger collaboration and an openness to new opportunities.

8. *Pass a parcel tax to ensure quality schools and keep Alameda as a destination of choice for businesses and families looking for a vibrant, well-resourced community in which to live.*

Challenges:

Since AUSD plans to maintain and improve most existing district services, programs and structures, we will need significant support from a new parcel tax to eliminate the structural deficit caused by the reduction in state funding. In the next year, due to the state cuts in funding, AUSD will see an increase of \$2.6 million to the deficit. In the following year, we will see a further increase in the deficit to \$11.5 million in 2011-12. And after the loss of an additional \$7.3 million in 2011-12 when Measures A and H sunset in June of 2012, AUSD will face the challenge of having to eliminate a total deficit of \$25.2 million in 2012-2013.

In order to be able to maintain most services, programs and structures at current levels and to achieve its goals to improve for the future, AUSD will need to eliminate the deficit through a variety of strategies, including saving money through efficiencies at the central office, temporarily increasing class size, recruiting greater numbers of inter-district transfer students, building nonprofit, business and philanthropic partnerships and passing a new replacement parcel tax.

Strategies to Reach the Goal:

In order to protect essential programs for our students and to achieve a resolution of litigation over Measure H that would work for our community, in the fall of 2009 the district and John Beery, one of the litigants in the Measure H litigation, convened a Superintendent's Parcel Tax Advisory Group. The group's purpose was to recommend to the Board of Education a proposed structure for a new parcel tax which, if successful, would replace the current parcel taxes. The group, representing a broad cross section of Alameda, was composed of 12 members: John Beery, Dick Rudloff, Rob Bonta, Andy Currid, Dave Hart, Kathy Moehring, Jim Oddie, Dennis Pagonos, Mike Robles-Wong, Christine Strena, Seamus Wilmot and Kirsten Vital. The group held public meetings on October 29, November 19, December 10 and January 7.

On January 7, the group voted to make 12 recommendations to the Board of Education regarding the structure for a new replacement parcel tax. Their recommendations, presented to the Board of Education on January 12, were:

- 1) The new parcel tax should replace the existing AUSD parcel taxes, Measure A and Measure H.
- 2) The new parcel tax should be a "split roll."

- 3) The new parcel tax should assess unimproved property on a per-lot-square-foot basis.
- 4) The new parcel tax should include a "per dwelling unit" tax on multi-family and multi-unit properties.
- 5) The "per dwelling unit" tax rate on multi-family and multi-unit properties in the new parcel tax should be lower than the rate for a single family home or a condominium.
- 6) The new parcel tax should balance the tax burden/responsibility between residential and nonresidential so that the taxes levied on nonresidential property account for not more than 25% of the total revenue raised by the new tax.
- 7) The new parcel tax should include a minimum tax for each parcel.
- 8) The new parcel tax should include a maximum tax or cap for each parcel.
- 9) The new parcel tax should be for a term of no less than 10 years.
- 10) The new parcel tax should include an "escalator."
- 11) The new parcel tax should include a mechanism to address any surplus funds.
- 12) The new parcel tax should include an option for seniors to exercise an exemption from the tax.

Although the group did not vote to recommend any particular tax rates tied to their recommendations for a new structure, at their meetings, the group did discuss rates that they thought Alameda could "tolerate." At the Board of Education meeting on January 12, 2010, Superintendent Vital reported that these possible "tolerance numbers" were \$499 per parcel for single family homes and condominiums, \$200-\$250 per unit for multi-family and multi-unit properties, and 12-13 cents per lot square foot for nonresidential properties, with a cap of \$5999 per parcel for nonresidential properties.

If AUSD were to adopt the group's recommendations for a new structure and were to use the "tolerance numbers" the group discussed, preliminary estimates are that a new replacement parcel tax would generate approximately \$11.5 million annually (i.e., with \$499 per parcel for single family homes and condominiums, \$200 per unit for multi-family and multi-unit properties, 12 cents per lot square foot for nonresidential properties, and a cap of \$5999 per parcel for nonresidential properties).

If the voters were to approve a new replacement parcel tax generating \$12 – 16 million annually and if the State of California's economy rebounds by 2112-13 these projected estimates for 2012-13 of \$ 25.2 million would be null and void. Of course it is difficult to project out what will happen in a year from now, never mind three years out.

Implementation of the Strategies:

In order to pass a new, larger parcel tax that would replace Measures A and H, the Board of Education will have to decide on the structure, rate(s) and language of a replacement tax.

In addition, the board will have to decide on the best date to place any measure on the ballot and will have to comply with all associated legal requirements, including voting to approve the measure at least 88 days before the date of the election. In order to qualify a measure for the statewide direct primary election on June 8, 2010, the

measure would have to be submitted no later than March 12 and so would have to be approved by the board no later than its March 9 meeting.

If the board were to decide to place the measure on the ballot for an all-mail election, (i.e., rather than as part of the direct primary election on June 8, 2010), the timeline for qualifying the measure would shift accordingly.

For example, if the board were to vote to call for an all-mail election on June 15 (with voting opening four weeks earlier), the measure would have to be submitted no later than March 19 (and so could, if necessary, be approved by the board at a special meeting on March 16). As part of this decision, the board would have to weigh the advantages of an all-mail election (e.g., all-mail elections allow voters to focus on school issues, make voting easier and more convenient for voters, provide greater flexibility in the timeline to qualify a measure for the ballot, and are becoming more common and familiar) against any disadvantages.

Assumptions

- 1) The community values quality local public schools
- 2) The community is willing to continue to provide substantial financial support for quality local public schools.
- 3) The community is willing to provide increased financial support for quality local public schools.
- 4) Volunteers are willing to devote significant time, energy and resources to passing a replacement parcel tax.
- 5) At least two thirds of voters will vote for a replacement parcel tax.

Trade-Offs

- 1) Passing a replacement parcel tax that will provide sufficient revenue to support the goals and strategies of this plan allows us to avoid the steps outlined **Scenario B: The "No Parcel Tax Scenario."** The *Listening Campaign* showed very strong opposition to Scenario B.
- 2) Not passing a replacement parcel tax that will provide sufficient revenue to support the goals and strategies of this plan will require that AUSD take the steps outlined **Scenario B: The "No Parcel Tax Scenario."**

Section 3: Scenario B: The "No Parcel Tax Scenario"

In this section:

- 1) Introduction
- 2) The Challenge and Goal
- 3) The Strategies to Overcome the Challenge
- 4) Implementation of the Strategies

Introduction

Although the primary goal of this Master Plan is to pass a parcel tax that will allow AUSD to build the highest quality education for all students, the future is unknown. Voter approval of a replacement parcel tax has not occurred and the results will not be certain for many months to come. With this reality in mind, this section of the Master Plan explains the challenges we will confront without a parcel tax and identifies this worst case scenario and the difficult decisions the district will be forced to make. This section outlines the alternate strategy the district will be forced to implement and the timeline that AUSD will be forced to follow to eliminate the structural deficit without a new parcel tax. Finally, this section of the Master Plan, identifies the exact fiscal implications of these alternate strategies as well as the assumptions and trade-offs of each alternate strategy.

Goal:

1. Be prepared for a worst case scenario and make hard decisions.

The Challenge and Goal

Unfortunately, if a parcel tax does not pass, especially due to the reductions in state funding, AUSD will have to strategically reduce spending by cutting programs and making other painful changes and reductions. In particular, by 2012-2013, without a new parcel tax to replace the current parcel tax, AUSD will face a deficit of \$25.2 million. This enormous deficit will dramatically alter how the district is able to function and will extremely limit the services the district will be able to provide. The anticipated cuts will ultimately have a highly negative impact on the quality of education all students receive in AUSD. Without a parcel tax, the most of the previously recommended strategies in this Master Plan will not be viable.

Although it is impossible to avoid painful cuts in a "no parcel tax" scenario, the district will have this alternate plan ready. The district will prepare a fiscal analysis of the budget without a parcel tax in order to determine the magnitude of cuts needed to eliminate the structural deficit. The district will continue to analyze district data and community feedback in order to prioritize cuts and it will establish a schedule for making these cuts, based on both what will be required to eliminate the deficit and what, in this limited resource environment, makes the most sense for schools. Those cuts

would begin in 2010-2011 and extend into the future. At the same time, the district will continue to try to pass a parcel tax. The district's constant goal will always be to secure the necessary funds to support overall higher student achievement and the elimination of the achievement gap.

Strategies to Reach the Goal

This fall, AUSD started to prepare for the possibility that the district will be forced to make hard choices to reduce or eliminate the structural deficit with significantly decreased state funding and no new parcel tax. Since September, AUSD has conducted a *Listening Campaign* led by Public Education Volunteers to deliver information about the budget, specifically focusing on all the programs, services and structures the district provides, as well as the need for a parcel tax to cover cost projections. Specifically, AUSD has shared, in Scenario B, how the district would have to transform the school system to remain fiscally solvent. The district has been transparent in its response to a "no parcel tax" situation and has shared potential plans with community members to guarantee that all stakeholders are fully aware of the risks. Through the *Listening Campaign* and other venues, the district has actively collected ongoing feedback and ideas about these existing costs and the potential parcel tax.

Throughout the Master Plan process numerous scenarios regarding how the school district may look have been shared. Since the publication of the final Facilities Master Plan, staff has received suggestions on what the school district might look like given a "no parcel tax" situation. Hypothetically there are numerous scenarios and variations on school configurations that can be developed using the school capacity chart found in the Facilities Master Plan. The most frequently shared configuration has the district moving to one high school, grades 10-12; one middle school, grades 7-9 and seven or fewer elementary schools with no enrollment boundaries for high school or middle school and new school boundaries for the remaining seven or fewer elementary schools. Just for illustration purposes, an example of the countless possibilities, a new district configuration has emerged drawing upon a desire to fully utilize schools with the most classroom space thus maximizing the largest school facilities. In this scenario, the district could house k-6 students at four newly configured elementary schools composed of Ruby Bridges (1000 students), a combined Lum/Wood campus (1500 students), a new elementary at Lincoln school (1000 students) and Earhart (1250 students). The Encinal campus could be converted to the single middle school with grades 7-9 (1730 students) and the Alameda campus could be converted to the single high school with grades 10-12 (2123 students). This will only occur as a separate recommendation and action of the board to reconstruct the school district resulting from a "no parcel tax" situation. Any and all possibilities that help balance the budget remain possibilities.

In addition, over the past few months, the district has surveyed the community, asking them to prioritize current programs and other cost saving measures, so that AUSD can take the community's perspective into account as staff determines what order to make cuts if the parcel tax does not pass. Currently, in order to prepare for this alternate possibility, AUSD is continuing to assess a potential district budget without a parcel tax as new information from the governor's office and the state become available. The governor's office provides periodic revisions of the state budget in order to update the public as financial information becomes available. This budget model will give the district a sense of the magnitude of cost reductions the district would have to make to eliminate the deficit with no new parcel tax and decreased state funding. Along with this very detailed fiscal information, AUSD is also currently evaluating the effectiveness and equity of existing programs, services and structures so that with the evaluation of community priorities, the district can perform an accurate cost-benefit analysis for every potential cost-cutting strategy.

In June 2010, if a parcel tax does not pass, the district will use the cost-benefit analysis created this winter and spring to begin the process of cutting programs, services, and structures to eliminate the structural deficit and to keep the district solvent. The district will need to negotiate these strategies with bargaining units. Based on early results from the district's cost-benefit analysis, cuts may include some or all of the following strategies:

- 1) Continue the redesign work in section 1, cutting central office to the bare minimum in necessary for legal compliance;
- 2) Change elementary configuration to K-6.
- 3) Change middle school configuration to 7-9.
- 4) Change high school configuration to 10-12.
- 5) Increase class size to 32:1 or higher for all grades.
- 6) Reduce the inter-district transfer student program to the most minimal level and to only "even out" enrollment anomalies.
- 7) Close three or more elementary schools across the island.
- 8) Close one high school and consolidate all 10th - 12th grade students to a suitable campus.
- 9) Close one middle school and consolidate 7th - 9th grade students to a suitable campus.
- 10) Change enrollment boundaries to ensure that all existing schools (7 elementary schools; 1 traditional public middle school and 1 high school) are filled to capacity at the increased class size of 32:1 K-6 and 35:1 for grades 7-12.
- 11) Eliminate or reduce most/all programs funded by Measures A and H including:
 - A. Measure A
 - a. maintain formula for student/teacher ratio at 29:1 in grades 4-8 and 10-12

- b. fund state deficit in K-3 class size reduction (CSR) program
- c. fund state deficit in two subject areas in grade 9 class size reduction (CSR)
- d. maintain student day at seven period day at grades 6 and 7
- e. intervention teachers at middle and high schools
- f. annual cost of teacher salary placements
- g. avoid reducing two high school counselors
- h. maintain two middle school counselors

B. Measure H

- a. fund state deficit in two subject areas in grade 9 class size reduction (CSR)
- b. maintain .5 FTE for Independent Study
- c. maintain 2.5 FTE for music prep
- d. maintain 1 FTE for Advanced Placement (AP) courses
- e. maintain .94 FTE for clerical support at Encinal High School
- f. maintain 3.5 FTE for technology classified staff
- g. support school site instructional supplies
- h. support for custodial subs
- i. support professional development
- j. avoid reducing one middle school counselor
- k. support for high school athletic coaching stipends and transportation
- l. support for swim centers
- m. minimize school closures, three elementary schools
- n. maintain ROTC
- o. avoid reducing for health clerks
- p. annual cost of teacher salary placements

- 12) Provide only the most absolute minimum of classroom/instructional supplies.
- 13) Cut teacher positions due to the reduction of the inter-district transfer program; fewer classrooms with an increased class-size.
- 14) Reduce salaries and benefits for teachers, administrators, and classified staff.
- 15) Cut up to five (5) instructional days.
- 16) Reduce or eliminate teacher work days.
- 17) Cut professional development/resources.
- 18) Reduce the work year and corresponding salary for classified and administrative staff.

Assumptions

- 1) In this scenario, the parcel tax does not pass.
- 2) Current predictions of reductions and state cuts to base revenue limits continue
- 3) Because the parcel tax does not pass, the district does not have enough money to support basic education services.

- 4) Without a parcel tax, the district has to make very difficult cuts that will harm students.

Trade-Offs

- 1) Without a parcel tax, the district will not be able to offer current programs, services or structures e.g. class size reduction and the current academic calendar that provides professional development time for teachers.
- 2) Because the district will not be able to offer the current programs, services or structures the academic achievement of all students will suffer, leading to increases in the achievement gap and harming educational opportunities for all students.
- 3) Because the district will not be able to maintain class size reduction or teacher preparation time, for example, staff will no longer benefit from necessary resources to develop as professionals.
- 4) Because the district will have to eliminate the current inter-district transfer program; close schools; change enrollment zones, etc., it will be impossible to preserve the currently strong AUSD neighborhood school communities.
- 5) None of the specialized programs, like creating academic initiatives and educational choice at school-sites will be possible.

Section 4: Conclusion

In this section:

- 1) Introduction**
- 2) Final Stages of the Master Plan Process**
- 3) Next Steps**

Introduction

At the December 8, 2009 Board of Education meeting, Superintendent Vital presented an executive summary of a first draft of the Master Plan to update both the board and community members on the status of the plan. After a period of revisions and edits, a working draft version of the Master Plan was posted on the AUSD website on January 25th. On February 9th, the superintendent will present the working draft version of the Master Plan to the board for information. This section details the final stages of the Master Plan adoption process and next steps.

Final Stages

In order to design a Master Plan with a comprehensive set of strategies, the district gathered and analyzed additional data and elaborated on the details recommended to the board by the superintendent and her staff. In the week of December 7th, results from the Master Plan strategies community survey were pulled, processed and analyzed in preparation for a report of the survey results at the December 15th board meeting. These survey results have been important so that staff could design strategy that aligned with the needs of the community. Additionally, in December and January, staff finalized the Facilities Master Plan, including data from a demographic study of the district, also reported at the December 15th and the January 12th Board meetings. This facility data has been essential since the district planned to suggest strategy in the Master Plan that optimized facility-use, using resources most effectively in a limited resource environment. At the January 26th Board meeting, the district, with assistance from an efficiency expert, finalized the central office efficiency study, sharing the completed report, including recommendations.

Staff began to incorporate data from the central office efficiency study into the Master Plan strategies, ensuring that these strategies allow the district to both continue to perform essential tasks, those that are legally mandated and create savings that could be redirected to schools. At the January 12th board meeting, staff presented the recommendations of the Parcel Tax Advisory Group including their analysis of the parcel tax challenge and goal and their recommendations for parcel tax strategy and implementation. The board also listened to public comment on the recommendation.

On February 9th a working draft of the Master Plan will be presented to the Board of Education for feedback. Staff will complete the fiscal analysis of the budget both with

and without the parcel tax the before the February 9th board meeting. They will also include a revised cost-benefit analysis for both the recommended and alternative Master Plan strategies. Staff will produce the final Master Plan document for approval at the February 23rd board meeting.

Next Steps

Assuming the Board of Education approves this final version of the Master Plan and the parcel tax strategy proposed by the Parcel Tax Advisory group, the district will turn over all responsibilities to launch a parcel tax campaign to an external community organization. Many of the community members who were involved in the *Listening Campaign* are gearing up to continue to sponsor community outreach. An external (to the district) community group will have to run the parcel tax campaign because state law prevents the district from organizing and running the campaign. After four months of campaigning for the parcel tax, Alameda citizens will go to the polls to pass or reject the parcel tax in June. If the parcel tax passes, the implementation timeline of the recommended Master Plan will go into effect immediately. If not, the district will unfortunately begin the implementation of the alternate plan.

*Note the costs of the items found in this appendix on the following pages are our best estimates. Many will be funded through outside partnerships. The estimated costs provided are not intended to be added up to an aggregate total. Difficult choices must be made and priorities established in order to determine which strategies will be funded. Actual costs are dependent on which strategies are selected.

Appendix A -1

Goal 1 Redesign Central Office	Costs	Savings
Strategy 1 - Establish Core Functions		
Upgrade FTE 1 Facilities	\$ 2,000	
Upgrade Lead Facilities	\$3,600	
Upgrade Lead Facilities	\$6,000	
Add FTE 1 Business	\$ 49,425	
Eliminate FTE 1 Facilities		\$ 67,994
Reduce FTE .5 FTE Fiscal		\$ 49,107
Reduce FTE 1 Fiscal		\$ 67,437
Reduce FTE 1 Ed. Services		\$ 57,192
Reduce FTE .5 Ed. Services		\$ 25,000
Reclass Director to Coordinator		\$ 20,000
Reduce 1 FTE Fiscal		\$ 65,447
Eliminate Student Mail Distribution		\$ 9,170
Eliminate Task Leader Facilities		\$ 48,000
Special Education – revenue generation (MAA)		\$110,000
Total	\$61,025	\$ 519,327
Departmental Scorecards – Customer Service and Training		
Total	\$10,000	\$0.0
Strategy 2 Technology Enhancements		
Hand held devices for MOF (x 12 one for each tradesman \$200 ea)	\$2,400	
Total	\$2,400	\$0.0
New student assessment program		
Move from Datawise Measures		\$ 17,565
\$ 3.50 per student x 9250 students (annual) e.g. Data Director	\$ 32,375	
\$ 1.00 per student data grader (annual) e.g. Data Director	\$ 9,250	
Site data scanners 30 x \$350 (one time) e.g. Brother scanners	\$ 10,550	
professional development - site staff/district lead	\$ 10,000	
Total	\$ 62,175	\$ 17,565
APTA Replacement e.g. QSS		
savings from move from APTA (current annual APTA cost)	\$85,900	\$100,000

start up costs, professional dev. (one time cost), then on-going support/yr	\$25,000	
Total	\$110,900	\$100,000

Appendix A-3

Goal 2 Raise the Bar

Costs

Savings

Strategy 1 Individual School Initiatives

Stipends at school for specific site initiative roles 17 x \$1,200	\$ 20,400	
External support to help school with program design	\$30,000	
Professional development	\$ 100,000	
Resources and time to study best practices and develop whole school improvement initiatives	\$ 75,000	
Total	\$225,400	\$ 0.0

Strategy 2 Accelerate Learning – Eliminating the Achievement Gap

External support to guide school-sites and teachers through the process	\$ 30,000	
SIMI 2 Math Initiative ACOE		
Math Coaches	\$ 357,000	
Double participants every year	\$ 30,000	
Professional development	\$20,000	
Total	\$437,000	\$0.0

Cal State East Bay

Summer Math Academy- Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II \$28,298 per academy, \$1,132 per student/per year	\$ 28,298	
Math On-line (partnership agreement) \$900 per student x 30	\$27,000	
Early College \$5,000 per student x 40 students	\$200,000	
STEM-Pre Algebra Academy \$15,000 per academy (2)	\$ 30,000	
Total	\$285,298	\$0.0

SIM (contract)	\$ 132,000	
Professional development for teachers (grades 6-high school)	\$ 24,000	
Teacher on Assignment .6 FTE	\$ 35,241	
Total	\$191,241	\$0.0

Inquiry by Design (Contract)	\$ 70,000	
Professional development	\$15,000	
Total	\$85,000	\$0.0

Appendix A-4

	Costs	Savings
21 st Century Technology – Education Tech Plan per year costs		
Tech support staff	\$ 404,000	
Computer/printers and hardware	\$ 450,000	
Multimedia A/V	\$50,000	
Software	\$12,000	
Infrastructure	\$ 27,000	
Professional Development	\$ 40,000	
Total	\$ 983,000	\$0.0

Teacher Incentive Plan		
To be negotiated	\$TBD	
Total	\$TBD	\$0.0

School Calendar and Collaboration Time		
To be negotiated	\$2,000	
Total	\$2,000	\$0.0

Strategy 3 Ensure School Principals are Instructional Leaders

BayCES (contract)		
Principal learning	\$ 35,000	
Principal coaching	\$ 30,000	
Total	\$65,000	\$0.0

Strategy 4 Develop a Tiered Intervention System for Schools

Tiered Intervention System	\$10,000	
Total	\$ 10,000	\$0.0

Strategy 5 Redirect Funds to Schools: TBD based on needs of individual schools

Targeted assistance to schools (note- funds are redirected at no cost)	\$TBD	
Funds for release time to develop individualized education plans for all struggling students	\$TBD	
Time and materials to train teachers to implement these intervention strategies for each struggling student	\$TBD	
Total	\$TBD	\$0.0

Appendix A-5

Goal 3 System of attractive school options

Costs

Savings

Strategy 1 Small learning communities (SLC)

Person at District for support, Director of Development	\$ 140,000	
Elementary school		
Start up cost \$750 per student year 1 (400)	\$ 300,000	
On-going cost per student \$500 year 2 and beyond	\$ 200,000	
Middle school		
Start up cost \$750 per student year 1 (600)	\$ 450,000	
On-going cost per student \$500 year 2 and beyond	\$ 300,000	
High school		
Start up cost \$750 per student year 1 (1,200)	\$ 900,000	
On-going cost per student \$500 year 2 and beyond	\$ 600,000	
Assumption is that schools will need \$750 for research proven programs to implement (SLC) (International Baccalaureate, High Tech High, Big Picture Learning Models		

*Cost dependent on which strategy is selected

Total	\$TBD	\$0.0
--------------	-------	-------

Strategy 2 Magnets and/or Academies

Elementary school		
Start up cost \$250 per student year 1 (400)	\$ 100,000	
On-going cost per student \$250 year 2 and beyond	\$ 100,000	
Middle school		
Start up cost \$250 per student year 1 (600)	\$ 150,000	
On-going cost per student \$250 year 2 and beyond	\$ 150,000	
High school		
Start up cost \$250 per student year 1 (1,200)	\$ 300,000	
On-going cost per student \$250 year 2 and beyond	\$ 300,000	

Assumptions schools will \$250 per student to transition to magnet type schools for the following items: Instructional Materials, Program Fees, Professional development, Stipends for lead teachers, release time for design teams

*Cost dependent on which strategy is selected

Total	\$TBD	\$0.0
--------------	-------	-------

Community Market Research

	\$ 1,500	
Total	\$1,500	\$ 0.0

Charter Partnerships

MOUs for buy back services for back office support		\$201,428
MOU for Special Education services (approx.)		\$ TBD

Total

	\$TBD
--	-------

Appendix A-7

Goal 4 Maintain Neighborhood Schools

Cost

Savings

Approximate operations costs for schools

Maintain one elementary school open (approximate due to staff experience) \$ 304,382

Administrator \$ 107,903

Office Manager \$ 44,612

Office Support \$ 17,057

Custodial Services (2 FTE) \$ 81,745

Total Benefits Certificated and Classified \$53,065

Maintain one middle school open (approximate due to staff experience) \$ 574,065

Administrator (2 FTE) \$ 212,835

Office Manager (2 FTE) \$ 86,779

Office Support (1.55 FTE) \$ 48,398

Custodial Services \$ 122,588

Campus Supervisor (.6250 FTE) \$ 15,102

Total Benefits Certificated and Classified \$ 88,363

Maintain one high school open (approximate due to staff experience) \$ 1,094,995

Administrator (3) \$ 288,096

Office Manager (2.91) \$ 141,538

Office Support (3.8) \$128,504

Custodial Services/grounds(5.75) \$ 246,213

Misc. Classified Staff (2.2) \$ 111,584

Total Benefits Certificated and Classified \$179,060

total	\$1,973,442	\$0.0
--------------	-------------	-------

Appendix A-8

Goal 5 Strengthen Enrichment Programs

	Costs	Savings
Maintain Current Enrichment Programs		
Maintain elementary Music Prep time 6.6 FTE	\$510,926	
Music equipment/materials	\$ 11,000	
Maintain elementary P.E. 6.6 FTE	\$549,555	
P.E. Equipment	\$ 11,000	
Maintain elementary Media Center teachers	\$859,304	
Provide middle school Media Center teachers (2 FTE) Lincoln/Wood	\$178,986	
Maintain seven (7) period day for middle school for 6th and 7th gr.	\$563,441	
Maintain Advanced Placement 1 FTE	\$79,981	
Maintain ROTC 1 FTE	\$81,294	
Maintain two high school counselors	\$197,497	
Maintain two middle school counselors	\$162,613	
Maintain high school coaching stipends	\$155,885	
Total	\$ 3,361,482	\$0.0
Increase Current Enrichment Programs		
Alignment of Art program	\$ TBD	
Planning, increased classes, increased FTEs, increased materials		
Alignment of Music program	\$ TBD	
Planning, increased classes, increased FTEs, increased materials		
ROP and Adult School Course Alignment	\$ TBD	
Planning, increased classes, increased FTEs, increased materials		
Total	\$ TBD	\$0.0

Appendix A-9

Goal 6 Optimize Enrollment

	Costs	Savings
Facility Study/Cost Analysis	\$35,000	
Target Schools	\$5,000	
Release time for teachers to review new inter-district student files (Time for intake management)	\$1,000	
Additional instructional materials, books etc. for inter-district transfer students	\$80,000	
Elementary Class Size		
Class Size Reduction (CSR)		
Increase in K-3 22:1		\$40,000
Increase in K-3 24.94:1		\$ 625,000
Increase District Enrollment by Intra District Students (200) per ADA \$4978 200 students2010-11		\$995,600
Total	\$121,000	\$1,660,600

Goal 7 Build Non Profit, Business and Philanthropic Partnerships

Development Director	\$140,000	
Initial start up costs	\$30,000	
Total	\$170,000	\$0.0

Goal 7 Build Non Profit, Business and Philanthropic Partnerships Revenue Generation

Three year projection	\$1.2 million
-----------------------	---------------

Goal 8 Parcel Tax

Election \$75,000 -\$175,000 depending on method	\$125,000	
Total	\$125,000	\$0.0

Appendix A-10

Plan B No Parcel Tax

Costs

Savings

Measure A

maintain formula for student/teacher ratio at 29:1 in grades 4-8 and 10-12

\$ 529,497

fund state deficit in K-3 class size reduction (CSR) program

\$ 489,346

fund state deficit in two subject areas in grade 9 class size reduction (CSR)

\$ 20,004

maintain student day at seven period day at grades 6 and 7

\$ 563,441

intervention teachers at middle and high schools

\$ 467,409

annual cost of teacher salary placements

\$ 878,027

avoid reducing two high school counselors

\$ 197,497

maintain two middle school counselors

\$ 162,613

Measure H

fund state deficit in two subject areas in grade 9 class size reduction (CSR)

\$ 36,394

maintain .5 FTE for Independent Study

\$ 42,580

maintain 2.5 FTE for music prep

\$ 200,000

maintain 1 FTE for Advanced Placement (AP) courses

\$ 79,981

maintain .94 FTE for clerical support at Encinal High School

\$ 47,601

maintain 3.5 FTE for technology classified staff

\$ 254,561

support school site instructional supplies

\$ 150,000

support for custodial subs

\$ 50,000

support professional development

\$ 20,000

avoid reducing one middle school counselor

\$ 85,850

support for high school athletic coaching stipends and transportation

\$ 155,855

support for swim centers

\$ 120,000

minimize school closures, three elementary schools

\$ 780,114

maintain ROTC

\$ 81,294

avoid reducing for health clerks

\$ 31,124

annual cost of teacher salary placements

\$ 764,616

Elementary Class Size

Class Size Reduction (CSR)

Increase in K-3 32:1

\$1,735,380

Grade 9 Class Size Reduction in two subjects 32:1

\$379,275

Teacher Professional Development Days (3) annually

\$ 651,794

Teacher Work Days (2)

\$ 434,529

Instructional Days

\$ 1,086,323

Appendix A-11

	Costs	Savings
Classified Furlough Days (10)		\$ 465,084
Administrative Furlough Days (10)		\$ 330,835
School closures		
Three elementary		\$ 913,146
One middle school		\$ 574,065
One high school		\$1,094,995
Salary Reduction \$ 609,538 per 1% reduction		\$ TBD

Appendix B Master Plan Time (attached as a separate chart)

Appendix C ASTI Enrollment

ASTI	Alameda Students	Inter-district students	Total ASTI Enrollment
2009-10	83	63	146

End Notes

ⁱ Led by Superintendent Vital, the Master Plan work group also included a Master Plan Project Manager and the Director of Educational Options, Rob Siltanen; the Interim Assistant Superintendent, Ruben Zepeda; and former Chief Financial Officer, Fil Guzman. Beyond the work group, AUSD also formed project teams that operated both together and in smaller working groups to ensure the satisfactory completion of pieces of the Master Plan. Various members of the project teams included Assistant Superintendent, Debbie Wong; General Counsel, Danielle Houck; Director of Student Services, Jeff Knoth; the former Director of Maintenance, Operations and Facilities, Leland Noll and Director of Fiscal Services, Lydia Lotti.

ⁱⁱ Outside of the work completed by the internal work group and project teams, the external support teams also provided much needed assistance to the internal team in order to develop the highest quality Master Plan for AUSD students. The Pivot Learning Partners consulting team has advised the leadership and project teams on Master Plan strategy; produced rough drafts of Master Plan documents and processed community feedback and supported the Public Education Volunteers who hosted the Listening Campaign. The architectural, engineering and facilities planning firm, LPA, has performed an in-depth study of district facility-use and demographics. Their analysis has informed by the Facilities Master Plan and shaped the content of this general district Master Plan. Additionally, AUSD employed an expert to analyze the Central Office functions identified by the internal and project Master Plan teams. This expert will make recommendations to improve Central Office efficiency.

ⁱⁱⁱ AUSD has been invited to apply for Pivot Learning's District Redesign Network. This invitation-only network supports grant-funded or contracted projects in one or more of the following areas: Talent Management, School Quality Management, Equitable Resource Allocation, Central Office Redesign, Data and Information System Integration, Community Engagement, and Instructional Leadership. Districts must be invited to join and are accepted based on alignment of vision, readiness to tackle a large scale redesign effort, potential positive impact on achievement and equity, and the political will to make substantive changes.

^{iv} See AUSD website for a list of frequently asked questions (including definitions of commonly used education terms). <http://www.alameda.k12.ca.us/index.php/district-information/master-plan/master-plan-faqterms>

^v The process of starting up a magnet program includes selection of leaders and staff, training, curriculum development (where appropriate), and establishment of the magnet's mission, vision and culture. It also involves fund development to secure the resources start up these programs. Specifically, at Encinal, AUSD will support each small school as it aligns A-G curriculum and develops solid academic core in each choice program. The district will need to focus significant support on the transition from former school design to the new systems and structures for choice school success. In addition to working with the choice program communities, the district will also need to work at the Central Office level to market the programs to the community, set enrollment targets and develop a selection process.

^{vi} For a list of these programs see AUSD website to see the results of the online survey used during the fall engagement.

<http://www.alameda.k12.ca.us/images/stories/pdfs/boemtg/boe121509masterplansurveyresults.pdf>

^{vii} See slides 29-33 for data presented at the October 20, 2009, Community Workshop #7 for more information on Inter-District Transfer Students sound on the AUSD website.

<http://www.alameda.k12.ca.us/images/stories/pdfs/boemtg/boe102009workshopseven.pdf>

^{viii} The recommendation to increase class size is based not only on fiscal analysis but also on a review of education research considering the impact of class size on academic achievement. These education resources included:

- 1) Biddle, Bruce J. and David C. Berliner. 2002. Small Class Size and its Effects. *Educational Leadership*. 59 (5). 12-23.
- 2) Krueger, Alan B. 2003. Economic Considerations and Class Size. *The Economic Journal*. 113 (485): F34-F63.
- 3) Mosteller, Frederick. 1995. The Tennessee Study of Class Size in the Early School Grades. *The Future of Children*. 5 (2). 113-127.

^{ix} See the AUSD Website to read the Facility Master Plan.

<http://www.alameda.k12.ca.us/index.php/home/master-plan/87-master-facilities-plan>

^x See page E-18, Table: Enrollment Projections by School, Demographic Study found on the AUSD website

http://www.alameda.k12.ca.us/images/stories/pdfs/master_plan/demographic_study_final_draft.pdf

^{xi} The Bay area has many examples of these types of relationships with local philanthropic organizations. Oakland, Berkeley, Emeryville, San Francisco and West Contra Costa all have intermediary partners — sometimes two or three — who raise and contribute money to support district initiatives on an ongoing, annual basis.