

BOARD OF EDUCATION
January 12, 2010
City Council Chambers
2263 Santa Clara Avenue
Alameda, CA

ADOPTED MINUTES

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

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

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

ABSENT: None

PUBLIC COMMENT: None at this time.

ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION: By President Mooney at 5:01 PM to discuss: Student Discipline/Expulsion/Re-admit (2 cases); Public Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release; Conference with Labor Negotiator Laurie McLachlan-Fry: AEA, CSEA, ACSA; Conference with Legal Counsel Regarding Existing Litigation – Pursuant to Subdivision (a) of Section 54956.9 – Beery vs. AUSD, Case #RG 08-405984; Balde, *et. al.* v. AUSD, *et. al.*, Case #RG 09-468037 (3 cases); Conference with Real Property Negotiator, Legal Counsel Danielle Houck and Superintendent Kirsten Vital: Property – Alameda Point.

RECONVENE TO PUBLIC SESSION: By President Mooney at 6:33 PM.

CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Led by Franklin Elementary School students.

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

ADOPTION OF AGENDA/APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR:

MOTION: Member Jensen

SECONDED: Member Spencer

That the Board of Education adopt the agenda, moving item E-7 to F-2, pulling item F-5, and moving up item F-9.

AYES: Jensen, McMahan, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

MOTION CARRIED

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

+Certificated Personnel Actions: The Board approved 3 appointments (Carman, Lee, Stephens); 2 releases from temporary contracts (Jaber, Stephens); 1 resignation (O'Boyle)' 1 retirement (Jones); 1 leave of absence (Lee); and 7 changes of status (Altenburg, Frankel, Kayler, Koeberl, Lewis, McKenna, Morrison).

+Classified Personnel Actions: The Board approved 12 appointments (Chassereau, Fanto, Hsu, Dominiquez, Dundon, Huynh, Lim, De los Santos, Lim, Reading, Dundon, Rosalio); 1 resignation (Batres); 1 retirement (Bradley); 6 changes of status (Anderson, Solomon, Timmons, Tolentino, Tongson, Williams).

+Approval of Bill Warrants and Payroll Registers: The Board approved warrants numbered 959514-959540, 959541-959616, 959617-959646, 959647-959691, 959692-959849, 959850-959919, 959920-959925, 959927-959930, 959932-959933, 959926-959931, 959934-959955, 878349, 878397, 878401.

+Resolution No. 10-0001 Approval of Budget Transfers, Increase, Decreases

+Resolution No. 10-0002 Local Agreement for Child Development Services July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010 CSPP-9001

+Surplus Vehicles

+Proclamation: African American History Month

+Resolution No. 10-0004 Approval of Arts and Music Block Grant Categorical Flexibility

+Williams Uniform Complaint Quarterly Report

+Resolution No. 10-0005 Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Boys & Girls Club

+Approval of 2009/10 Single School Site Plans

+Approval of Donations

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

COMMUNICATIONS:

Written correspondence: None at this time.

Superintendent's Report: Superintendent Vital reviewed follow-up items from the City Council/School Board joint meeting regarding SunCal, recapped the last PTAG meeting, noted Honor Band/Orchestra middle school students, and shared a photo of President Obama holding an Encinal Jets sweatshirt. Superintendent Vital recapped what she learned at the School Services of California workshop on the Governor's Budget Proposal this morning.

Oral Communications:

Jerome Thomas, representing CSEA 860, addressed the Board on behalf of Food Services employees, urging the Academy of Alameda Middle School to consider utilizing all of our district services if possible, including our Food Services. These workers know the children personally and do a wonderful job. They are proud of their work, know the students personally, and do a good job.

Lynne Kameney, representing ACLC, submitted ACLC's renewal petition.

Board Oral Communications: Member Spencer commended both Edison and Wood schools School Site Plans for clearly stating their goals and sharing them with the community.

Student Board Member Comments: Student Board Member Mooney from Encinal noted Friday if Filipino Culture Night in the Cafeteria; Jet Fest will be held on 1/30 from Noon to 3:00 PM and everyone is encouraged to attend as there will be all ages games, music, and performing arts; Winter Ball is scheduled for January 23 from 7:00 PM – 10:00 PM; seniors finished college applications with the new trend of many students applying to out-of-state colleges and universities.

Student Board Member Gamalinda from Island reported the basketball team is undefeated and will play at Oracle Arena at 3:00 PM tomorrow, although the game is not open to the public; Thursday will be the ribbon cutting for the new Island High Health Center; 5 students have graduated since the beginning of the school year; Leadership is working on the 3rd edition of the Tiki Times and Valentines Day grams.

Student Board Member Datuin from ASTI noted Friday is the Annual Day of Motivation; the Spring semester starts Thursday, January 21; ASTI is preparing for recruitment events, and prospective students have been shadowing ASTI students in class and turning in applications.

Student Board Member Inlow from Alameda High added Winter Ball is February 26 at the old gym; finals are next week; seniors are working on exit portfolios due February 8; Junior Prom is March 13; Iron Chef Competition is February 25 where they will be celebrating African food; the Junior Class bake sale fundraiser is scheduled for Thursday; La Val's Pizza Night is Thursday, 1/19; AHS is currently taking applications to be "Buzzy", the school's new mascot.

Calendar Review: President Mooney reviewed the calendar of events.

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

President Mooney acknowledged the donations received from the community.

Highlighting Alameda Schools: Franklin Elementary School

Principal Jo Fetterly and the Franklin Leadership Team (Darlene Norman, Gatee Esmat, and Jeni Marr) shared the breadth and excellence of daily instruction and special interest programs that support student education, Franklin's academic achievement and emphasis on differentiated instruction, as well as Franklin's financial resources enriched by community support and focused on achieving equity.

Employees of the Month

Laurie McLachlan-Fry, Chief Human Resources Officer, introduced the item. The employee recognition program is a district-wide program to promote a greater appreciation of district employees and to publicly honor special employees for outstanding service which directly or indirectly contributes to students in AUSD. Each month, at the first Board meeting of the month, those employees selected will be recognized by the Board with a presentation.

Ann Casper, AHS Teacher, read the nomination for Karen Roemer, the Media Center Coordinator.

Ms. Roemer noted she works with a great group of people and thanked all teachers. Member Jensen added she appreciates all the hard work Ms. Roemer does on our students' behalf. Member Spencer thanked Ms. Roemer for being the teacher liaison for the AHS PTSA and thanked her for serving as an incredible mentor to our students.

Thomas Orput, Principal of the Adult School, read the nomination for Nilo Garcia, Custodian.

Season for Nonviolence

A Season for Nonviolence, January 30 through April 4, 2010 is a national 64-day educational, media, and grassroots campaign dedicated to demonstrating that nonviolence is a powerful way to heal, transform, and empower our lives and our communities. Inspired by the memorial anniversaries of Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., this international event honors their vision for an empowered, non-violent world.

A Season for Nonviolence encourages students to participate in this celebration by being nonviolence in their actions and interactions with each other in their homes, schools, places of religious observance, and public places, and supporting programs and projects conducted in the spirit of nonviolence.

Member Jensen noted she pulled this item to share information with the public. The Alameda Youth Collaborative unfortunately didn't have the capacity to oversee this event last year, but is happy to be celebrating it again this year throughout our schools. There are many activities, including reviving the middle and high school speech contest.

Jim Franz, City of Alameda, thanked the Board for celebrating good things happening in the district and thanked the Board for their support for the Season for Nonviolence.

MOTION: Member Jensen

SECONDED: Member Spencer

That the Board approve the Proclamation for the Season for Nonviolence.

AYES: Jensen, McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

MOTION CARRIED

District Mathematics Initiatives Update – First Trimester Progress Report

Debbie Wong, Assistant Superintendent, introduced Phil Gonsalves and Drew Kravin, Math Coaches on loan from the County Office of Education, who noted the district is now finished with the first trimester of math assessments.

Phil Gonsalves provided a recap of work to date and the theory of action associated with this work.

Member Tam thanked Mr. Gonsalves for an excellent presentation and asked how we build and sustain capacity with staff turnover. What is our plan to continue to develop our coaches' skills? Mr. Gonsalves noted ideally, when teachers come in, they would go through an induction intake

that shows them best practices and what we're trying to do collaboratively. Coaching is expensive, but the County continues to contribute funds to Alameda. This is not the kind of work that you do when you have extra money, but it should be an obligation to your teachers. Administrators also need coaching support and we should all be coaching each other. That's how you could sustain professional development.

Member Spencer asked if students are still coming home with math sheets that don't provide enough space to work a problem. Mr. Gonsalves said he is not a big supporter of "ditto sheets" as they are known, but would encourage teachers to recommend students do 5 problems in multiple ways. Since this has just been implemented, it takes some time to enact these types of changes.

Member Spencer noted the sample math problems reviewed are very different from the way many parents were taught to work math problems. Is there a training provided for parents? Mr. Gonsalves noted several schools hold "Math University Night" where they show parents how their students are learning math. Mr. Gonsalves noted he will provide each Board Member with a parent guide on how they can best support their students in math instruction.

Superintendent Vital added she appreciate Mr. Gonsalves pointing out this is our first year. As we provide support, it takes time for teachers to experiment, collaborate, get coaching, etc. We want to do this collaboratively with our teachers and we're learning together how to move math and the instructional program forward. As we come back with budget recommendations, our hope is to continue to focus our energies in math.

President Mooney asked Mr. Gonsalves to provide a personal assessment as to how we are doing. Mr. Gonsalves responded that administrators and teachers are huge supporters and appreciate the support. We continue to be massively impressed with the administration here and the level of support we're getting; thank you to Superintendent Vital and Assistant Superintendent Wong.

Superintendent Vital reiterated that consistency and stability is critical. We can't change our mind from year-to-year; we have to stick with this through any bumps and bruises along the way. We have to figure out what supports people need in order to get through when it gets more difficult.

Member Spencer commented she has a 3rd grader learning these concepts who taught her about grouping. He and his friends are excited about math and its integration into other subjects.

Member McMahon asked about any gender differences in math and to what degree we can address any issues. Mr. Gonsalves noted historically, females were discouraged from taking higher mathematics classes, but that is not the case any longer. Math is a great equalizer and a great way for students to get caught up quickly and be academically competitive.

Patricia Sanders, AEA President, thanked staff for giving the gift of time to teachers to really be able to take what they're learning and getting from this program and assimilating it. As you go forward in making budget decisions, think about how we make sure teachers have time to do this without overloading their plates.

State Student Achievement Data: English Language Learners

English Language Learners (ELLs) are initially identified when the required Home Language Survey (HLS) is completed at the time each student registers in AUSD. The instrument used to assess English language proficiency is the California English Language Development Test (CELDT).

By law, the CELDT must be administered annually to an English Learner until that student is redesignated. All English Learners must also take the annual California Standards Tests (CSTs) and, beginning in Grade 10, the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE).

Robert Shemwell, Director of Curriculum, provided a review of English Language Learners in the district noting that currently, AUSD has 2,280 ELLs: 23% of our student population; 1,241 in elementary school; 407 in middle school; 616 in high school; and 16 in other settings (ALC and Special Ed out-of-district). Since July 1, 2009, there have been a total of 2,594 CELDT tests administered in 4 months. Mr. Shemwell reviewed EL performance of AYP in ELA and math.

70 languages are spoken by ELLs in AUSD, and among all AUSD students, there is a total of 81 languages spoken. 197 ELLs were redesignated to Fluent English Proficient in 2008/09. Of those, the 4 largest language groups were: 11.8% Cantonese; 6.4% Spanish; 9.9% Vietnamese; 9.6% Tagalog.

Local conclusions:

- We have much to be proud of in the progress of our English learners
- We are exceeding all current state targets
- We cannot relax with state AYP targets increasing so greatly each year
- Our Spanish-speaking ELLs continue to need heightened instructional focus

Mr. Shemwell reviewed the State Accountability Report and AMAO results. Only 32% of districts met all three AMAOs, and Alameda is one of them.

Member Tam noted challenges in working with ELL parents who may have difficult reading English and cannot help their child with homework. How do we provide support in addressing that need? Mr. Shemwell replied that the elementary school sites have the PARI process which identifies students who need extra support in afterschool tutorials. There are also direct and specific summer school programs targeted for ELL students. The CBET program can also help build the skill level of parents to support their students.

Member Tam suggested thinking “outside the box” about how we can work with other organizations that may work with different ELL populations and what resources they have available, not just in Alameda but maybe Bay Area-wide. Member Spencer noted it is important to set the bar high and work towards those measurable goals. Member Spencer asked about meeting the needs of students at all sites. Suzanne Bryant, Teacher on Special Assignment, replied that there are 7 locations with CBED classes – the locations with the densest population of ELL students. The objective is to help parents learn English to help their students with school. There are ELD resource teachers at 9 out of 10 elementary sites, which are paid by the sites. At

the middle and high school levels, the sites use money to fund paraprofessionals and site coordinators.

Member McMahon noted there aren't many students in level 5. Students are testing proficient, yet could be in levels 2, 3, or 4. How is the redesignation process executed? It seems like it is almost to our advantage not to redesignate them. The best and the brightest end up getting exited out of the program and they get lost in the cohort. Mr. Shemwell replied that when the students exit the system, it is true we are losing the proficient students. The difference is that the state sets their proficiency target lower than the district. We do not redesignate students until they reach the 5 level, but the state redesignates as low as 4, which is why the numbers don't match up. Their data shows that when a student scores at that level, they are counted as proficient.

Ms. Bryant added that the CST does not test listening or speaking, only reading and writing. We have a lot of students who can read and write but not listen and speak in English. The CELDT tests more than the CST, hence the disconnect.

Parcel Tax Presentation – Information and Recommendations from the Parcel Tax Advisory Group (PTAG)

Superintendent Vital framed the presentation and asked Rob Siltanen, Director of Educational Options to report out on the recommendations from the PTAG. The purpose is to share information based on their recommendations and to get direction from the Board.

The Superintendent's Parcel Tax Advisory Group consists of 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 met on 10/29, 11/19, 12/10, and 1/7. On January 7, the group voted to make the following recommendations to the Board regarding the structure for a new parcel tax:

1. The new parcel tax should replace the existing AUSD parcel taxes, Measures A and 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

The Board asked clarifying questions regarding parcel taxes for surrounding districts and definitions of multi-family housing, residential, and apartment status.

Mr. Siltanen noted the group had different comfort levels for caps to address concerns that some parcels aren't paying their fair share. The group did not make a recommendation raising or lowering the cap, but the consensus was there should be a cap.

Member Spencer asked about an exemption for the disabled. Mr. Siltanen replied that the group is not in opposition to it, it just was not in the formal recommendation. Member McMahon asked about the escalator; if it's tied to an index, what happens if the index goes down? Mr. Siltanen noted it all depends on the ballot language used. Albany has an escalator and we can look at their language to see how it is worded.

Member Jensen asked about unimproved property and how it compares to per square foot improved property. Mr. Siltanen noted the group did not make a recommendation. One idea, for fairness, is that the unimproved property is taxed at a lower than. The other view is that property is an asset regardless. Measure H does not distinguish between improved and unimproved. The term unimproved has a very specific legal definition, and is classified by the county. In Alameda, fewer than 100 properties qualify.

Superintendent Vital added the group did not talk about particular costs or prices for each of the different categories, but did talk a little bit about tolerance levels. Mr. Siltanen noted there was a lot of discussion around a \$6K cap rather than \$9500.

Seamus Wilmot, PTAG member, thanked the Board for the opportunity to serve, and added he wanted to be on the committee to help the district as we are in dire need of funding. Mr. Wilmot noted he has 2 children in the district and his wife teaches in the district. Working for UC Berkeley, Mr. Wilmot noted he has gone through a similar experience there – furloughs, layoffs, efficiency experts, etc. Student fees have gone up 32% in a year which is tough on the students. Mr. Wilmot noted he was pleased with the diverse group of PTAG members representing residential owners, commercial owners, parents, etc.

Mr. Wilmot added his personal view is there needs to be a split roll. The parcel tax needs to be as simplistic as possible for the majority of the voters. We don't want to confuse them.

David Teeters, Community Member, addressed the Board noting he has reviewed the language of various parcel tax ballot measure for which we have campaigned since 2001. There is no mention of charter schools in any of that language. Mr. Teeters noted he attended the last PTAG meeting and was impressed with the level of discussion and thanked them for their service. Please ensure that charter students will benefit equally from this parcel tax, as well. Public charter schools should not be distinct from regular public schools.

Christine Strena, PTA Council President, added that PTA Council presidents were asked if the parent body at their school sites would support a campaign and if there were any considerations the Board should be aware of. In general, no parent replied negatively to supporting a parcel tax.

Very specifically, it was suggested a long-term parcel tax to support Alameda public schools be enacted. Nea PTA also expressed concern about the inclusion of charters. Also, there is a misconception that we are talking about a third parcel tax rather than a replacement. We need to be clear with the community in any campaign moving forward that this is a replacement.

Mike Robles-Wong, PTAG Member, thanked the Board for the opportunity to serve and noted he is here as an individual representing his own opinion. He thanked staff for their professionalism in trying to lead the group to a solution. The committee worked very hard trying to come up with something that would work. Mr. Robles-Wong recommended shifting to multi-unit dwellings which could add a significant amount of money.

Ed Hirshberg, community member, urged the Board to follow the statute and focus on uniformity. Otherwise, we will have the same situation that got us into this mess in the first place. Payments are all over the place; how do these recommendations resolve that problem?

John Beery, PTAG Member, noted the whole experience was very interesting. Mr. Beery noted that there was some disagreement to suggestions and ideas he provided. The reason for the lawsuit was that we did not believe the district was following the law. Please keep this in mind when making your final decisions. Mr. Beery suggested when the Board conducts thorough research into the replacement parcel tax, talk to some attorneys who specialize in this. ReedSmith is one of the best. Make sure it's right and it's legal.

President Mooney stated that in February, the Board will really have to make a decision about whether or not we're going to go for a parcel tax in June. We have to let the County know sometime in March so it can be placed on the ballot. Tonight, this is information only. President Mooney expressed concern that there is a valid database showing the number of housing units on a parcel in Alameda. President Mooney also wanted to make sure staff has an appeal process in place.

Member McMahon noted he is guessing the Master Plan is going to have to make some first commitments as to timeframes – either that or at least identification of scenarios if we do take this course of action. What are the implications of our decisions? If the recommendation is going to be that we have a parcel tax coming to us in June, we need to recognize that we have a very short time frame to put something together.

Member Jensen stated she appreciates the fact that this has been worked through a diverse committee and this seems to be a much better way to develop this kind of work. Alameda has a big portion of apartment buildings and a lot of these residents use our public schools so it makes sense that this group is addressed in the recommendations.

President Mooney thanked everyone involved in this process and noted the Board is going to have to make some hard decisions. If we go this route, we want to make sure we put a measure on the ballot that we believe is legal. President Mooney requested a review of Piedmont's ballot language in reference to clarifying condominiums and townhouses versus family homes.

Member Tam noted this is very complex, and asked about other parcel taxes that have mentioned charters. Superintendent Vital noted we are not aware of any that specifically mention charters. Member McMahon added Oakland Unified had problems with their parcel tax because it specified an amount of money for charters and the teachers' union opposed the measure, which is why it failed.

Member Spencer requested that the capacity of the PTAG members be shared with the public so the community is clear about the diversity of representation. If we ran numbers on square footage alone, what would that look like? We have a lot of small business owners in Alameda and we want to protect our business community. This measure will need a supermajority to pass, and we will need the support of our charter families.

Certificate Of Participation (COP)

Fil Guzman, Chief Financial Officer, introduced the informational item. In March 1997, AUSD joined with several California school districts to secure \$27M in funded debt through a Certificate of Participation commonly referred to as a COP. Alameda used its share of the debt (\$1M) to improve 12 modular classrooms.

The COP is a financing mechanism offered to government agencies when a bond issue is created. But rather than paying interest on the bonds or guaranteeing a face value at the end of the project, the investor receives a return based on the lease revenues associated with the offering. Making use of this process can work very well for the municipality, since it will free the issuer from restrictions on the amount of debt that can be incurred during the course of the project.

To date, the district has an outstanding debt balance of \$385,000. Annual payments are approximately \$85,000 with the last payment at July 2014. However, we have recently learned that the Bank of Nova Scotia, the provider of the letter of credit that provides both credit and liquidity enhancement for the COP, wants out of the transaction. The district's options are:

1. pay off the existing balance plus interest and fees
2. Participate in a new COP (creates a high cost of issuance)
3. Enter into a standard lease with the Bank of Nova Scotia (higher interest rate and adds \$21K to the loan in issuance costs and interest)

In light of the economy, our COP consultant recommends paying off the loan if possible.

This item will return to the Board on January 26 for approval.

Facilities Master Plan

At the December 15, 2009 Board meeting, the first draft of the Facilities Master Plan was presented by district staff and Steve Newsom of LP Architecture and Design. The Board requested additional analysis as well as clarification of the data presented. This revised plan responds to Board questions, provides corrected data, and replaces some sections with a clearer narrative.

Mr. Guzman noted this is a revisit of the Facilities Master Plan that was presented on the December 15 meeting. At that time, the Board asked clarifying questions and suggested items to be added. This is the revision of that original document.

Member Jensen noted there was not sufficient time provided to the Board for review this revised document and it is not appropriate for a vote at this time. Superintendent Vital agreed. Staff will highlight changes this evening and will add this item for acceptance at a future meeting.

Dr. Zepeda added that the major changes were to section 3 and section 6 in regards to content and design. There are other minor corrections, and inaccurate data errors were corrected. Section 3 provides a synopsis for each school site with specifics. Section 6 reviews classroom loading factors and student population numbers.

Dr. Zepeda reviewed the 11x17 quick reference guide which shows every school site at different loading capacities.

Member Jensen noted the idea of moving to one high school has been around for years and she appreciates the scenario being part of the Facilities Master Plan and the Master Plan.

MOTION: Member McMahon

SECONDED: Member Tam

That the Board extend the meeting beyond 10:30 PM.

AYES: McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

ABSENT: Jensen

MOTION CARRIED

President Mooney asked what the Board expects to accomplish in the next few minutes. Is it preferable to allow time for the Board to fully review to understand the changes and send any questions to the Superintendent so the staff can bring this item back at the next meeting?

Member McMahon added we've already spent an extensive amount of time reviewing sections and feels comfortable we can move forward.

Superintendent Vital noted the purpose of tonight is to fill the gaps mentioned at the December 15 meeting. It is probably not appropriate for the Board to accept this report this evening given the late delivery and lack of adequate review time for such an important document.

Superintendent Vital requested Board Members send any questions to her. This item will be brought back to the Board on January 26. This information is posted on the district website and is available for everyone to review. Superintendent Vital asked Mr. Guzman to review the cost analysis.

Mr. Guzman noted in the first scenario, there would be a cost savings of \$1.9M annually. In Scenarios 2 and 3, which call for closing a middle and high school, it depends on the choice of school. Potential costs incurred are upgrading AHS or allowing for additional classroom space at EHS. To upgrade AHS would be \$1.3M and EHS would be \$5M.

Scenario 2 implementations would also be based on choices. An initial estimate is \$3.5M in savings. Based on new class loading and identifying a certain number of schools to close, savings could be about \$6.6M.

Superintendent directed staff to collect the Facilities Master Plan notebooks, integrate handouts into the notebooks and redeliver to the Board by the end of the week.

Member McMahon commented that it doesn't look like we can actually consolidate schools. Even though K-6 shows a bump of 600 students, how could we move 4700 students into a Scenario 1 column even though it shows capacity? We would have to play games with triads. For example, if Edison were to close, 380 students would be diverted to multiple schools. We can't send them all to a single site. It gets tricky.

Member Spencer suggested when reviewing the possibility of consolidating schools, we need to look at our values. There are some sites that have very little flex space and other sites that seem to have a lot. This may present an equity issue with regards to student environment. It appears school with a higher student population have figured out a way to offer services using less flex space.

Member Tam noted part of the challenge is there is a part of our population that is unpredictable. How would the movement of these families fit into the scenarios? How will that be factored in?

Member Spencer asked if the Board is limited to just these 3 scenarios. Superintendent Vital noted the Board is not limited at all. The rationale behind the tool is for us to be able to do this analysis and present some "what if" scenarios. President Mooney reiterated that the Board will be accepting this report on January 26 and this is the information we will use to make informed decisions. That's why it's important Board Members send any questions to the Superintendent.

Budget Development Calendar

All school districts are required by law to adopt a balance budget each year. The attached calendar shows the budget development cycle for the district. It includes important legal deadlines, an outline of the budgeting process, and Board meeting dates.

Mr. Guzman reviewed the budget development calendar, noting it provides a summary as to the steps taken in developing the budget. President Mooney commented the potential of a February 23 Board budget session seems a little early, given everything that is scheduled to happen in February.

Member McMahon noted this is more of a fiscal responsibility calendar as a budget development calendar typically focuses on the development and approval of the upcoming budget the Board must approve before June. This includes much more. Although not as explicit as in the past, this is fine if this is the way staff wants to manage the entire process.

MOTION: Member Tam

SECONDED: Member Mooney

That the Board accept the Budget Development Calendar as presented.

AYES: McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

ABSENT: Jensen

MOTION CARRIED

Educational Technology Plan

AUSD went through a process to update and complete the Educational Technology Plan for 2010-2013 required by the State Department of Education. This document is intended to serve as both a guide for technology-related decision-making and an instrument to monitor and evaluate progress toward identified goals and objectives.

These goals and objectives were established to meet the identified needs of integrating technology to:

- Improve student learning
- Provide equitable technology access and support
- Provide secure, timely information flow between home, school, and community
- Provide coordinated, high-quality, educational technology professional development

Jess Stephens, Technology Director, provided a brief overview about the education technology plan and outlined the process and procedure for developing the plan and identifying multiple goals.

Education environments tend to resist change, particularly when it comes to technology. But we have learned that all successful organizations understand and embrace those changes in order to evolve, adapt, and create new processes and procedures to encompass those procedures into daily activities. We need to work smarter, not harder, and continue to move away from our 1890's model and into the 21st century model. Technology is a tool available to use and one that students are well familiar with and readily acceptable to use.

Mr. Stephens reviewed the next phase in AUSD's journey which is obtainable, sustainable, and aligns with the district goals and objectives.

Roxanne Clement, BayFarm Media Teacher, shared the importance of training and moving forward with technological advances. With the new library/textbook management system, sites will be able to share collections throughout the district and can work together to manage collections more efficiently. There will be 24/7 access to library resources through web access and more students will be able to see school catalogs online after hours and visit recommended academic websites. Thank you for continuing to support school library and media centers.

Member McMahon asked about funding. Mr. Stephens noted currently, there are multiple things going on and staff is discussing a dedicated funding stream with Executive Cabinet members. Staff wrote a \$600K ARRA grant that was supposed to be awarded in December, but funds have not been received yet.

Mr. Stephens added education is changing and the field will have to adapt teaching ability to the learning ability of the students. Students are very technologically savvy and can use their devices to enhance their educational experience.

Superintendent Vital commented we are really looking at how we make this a reality and if we can't, how do we scale it back to something reasonable. What will the tradeoffs be? We haven't made enough of an investment in technology, but these are also very trying economic times. It's a value and important, and we need to figure out how we fund it.

Mr. Stephens noted this plan is a roadmap. It's not cast in stone, but the direction we want to head. Member McMahan added ideally, we would like to be able to take this particular document and overlay it against the Master Plan to be able to present it to the public – perhaps a single sheet of paper synopsis – of what to expect in each area. That becomes part of the overall selling and a huge component of the parcel tax. Explain how we want to transform the district.

Member Spencer asked about the numbers of teachers using the technology tools available at the present time. Mr. Stephens noted right now, less than 40% of students use SchoolLoop. But we are also implementing and migrating to AERIES which has a lot of components built into it. Member Spencer noted her experience is that some teachers use SchoolLoop and some don't; it varies from site-to-site. Some teachers use power points and put those online for student access, others do not. It would be great to have 100% teacher participation in using technology as best they can.

2010/2011 School Year Calendar Information

Laurie McLachlan-Fry, Chief Human Resources Officer, introduced the informational item. The district and AEA are negotiating an agreement on the 2010/2011 calendar. Our bargaining unit agreement states that internal holiday arrangements within the calendar shall be mutually-agreed upon by AEA and the district following input from unit members and the public. The process is to give some samples and provide the public with the opportunity to give feedback. The PTA Council has already been given samples to look and to solicit feedback from their member school sites.

Christine Strena, PTA Council President, added that parents appreciate AEA and AUSD getting this information out to the PTA's. Most feedback has been very favorable.

Member McMahan asked whether or not Spring Break is tied to Easter, which can be very early in the year. Ms. McLachlan-Fry added the calendar also takes into consideration the testing window dates, which impacts when long breaks are scheduled.

General Counsel Danielle Houck cautioned the Board that the calendar is a negotiated item and is presented tonight for information only. Specific requests that should be brought to the table should be shared with staff in Closed Session.

Member Spencer noted she had previously suggested using Columbus Day as a day off if necessary since some business do recognize that as a holiday. We want to make our calendars

family-friendly, and if some parents will be off that day anyway, it makes more sense to take advantage of that as opposed to another random day that may create daycare issues for our families.

Job Description for Grants Program Coordinator

Member Spencer noted she pulled this item. The fiscal implications are for 6 months only. Where is the money coming from? Ms. McLachlan-Fry replied that it is a reduction in cost to the grant and comes from the program. This person will supervise the supervisors, which is a critical component to running the programs. There is no program director – that was part of the layoff in December. This position has fewer job responsibilities at a lesser salary. This will get us through the next few months while we reapply for the grant. Staff will look at what afterschool programs look like moving forward.

MOTION: Member Tam

SECONDED: Member McMahon

That the Board approve the job description for a Grants Program Coordinator as submitted.

AYES: McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

ABSENT: Jensen

MOTION CARRIED

Board Member Reports

Member Tam noted he attended the Alameda Family Services Board meeting and mentioned the new School-Based Health Center opening at Island High School.

Member Spencer added she walked EHS with the Superintendent and commended LEAPS for the first spelling bee held on December 17. There was great participation and it was a wonderful event. Hopefully, this event can move district-wide in the near future. Member Spencer added Ruby Bridges PTA is selling raffle tickets to support their camp program and encouraged everyone to purchase tickets.

Student Discipline

MOTION: Member McMahon

SECONDED: Member Tam

That student #70990 be readmitted to the Alameda Unified School District.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

ABSENT: Jensen

MOTION CARRIED

MOTION: Member McMahan

SECONDED: Member Mooney

That student #61188 be readmitted to the Alameda Unified School District.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: McMahan, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

ABSENT: Jensen

MOTION CARRIED

Adjournment

President Mooney adjourned the meeting at 11:54 PM.