

**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 McMahon at 5:32 PM.

**-PRESENT:** Jensen, McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

**ABSENT:** None

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

**ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION:** By President McMahon at 5:32 PM to discuss

**RECONVENE TO PUBLIC SESSION:** by President McMahon at 6:32 PM.

**CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Edison Elementary School students led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**INTRODUCTION OF BOARD MEMBERS & STAFF:** Board Members and staff present introduced themselves.

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

**MOTION: Member Mooney**

**SECONDED: Member Tam**

That the Board of Education adopt the agenda as submitted with the following changes: move item E-12 to F-8.

**AYES:** Jensen, McMahon, 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 these minutes):

**+Certificated Personnel Actions:** The Board of Education approved 3 appointments (Eisenman, Fiddes, Seltzer); and 2 retirements (Lee, Lew)

**+Classified Personnel Actions:** The Board of Education approved 9 appointments (Adams, Coghe, Pula, Cruz, Roundtree, Sims, Johnston, Hsu, Sydnor-Dickler); 3 changes of status (Krasky, Munoz, Poral)

**+Approval of Bill Warrants and Payroll Registers:** The Board approved warrants numbered 851795-851976, 851977-852058, 852059-852143, 852144-852155, 852156-852266, 852267-852338, 852339.

**+Resolution No. 09-0021 Approval of Budget Transfers, Increases, Decreases**

**+Proclamation: Asian-Pacific Islander Heritage Month**

**+Proclamation: Asthma Awareness Month – May 2009**

**+Resolution No. 09-0022 Classified Employees Week**

**+Resolution No. 09-0023 Day of the Teacher**

**+Approval to Adopt the K-5<sup>th</sup> Grade Math Instructional Materials**

**+Revise Heating, Ventilation, Air Conditioning (HVAC) Technician Job Description**

**+Revise Senior Accountant/Buyer Job Description**

**+Approval of Exemption Certification of Emergency Employment of Retired member – Assistant Superintendent**

**+MOU of Understanding between Alameda County Office of Education (ACOE) – Mathematics Development Center (MDC) and Alameda Unified School District for Mathematics Professional Development Support Program**

**+Approval of Donations**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Minutes of the regular meeting of April 14, 2009 and the special meeting of April 2, 2009 were considered.

**MOTION: Member Mooney**

**SECONDED: Member Tam**

That the Board of Education approve the minutes of the regular meeting of March 24, 2009 with the following change: remove the extra “e” on page 15.

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

**NOES:** None

**MOTION CARRIED**

**COMMUNICATIONS:**

**Written Correspondence:** Since the last meeting on April 14, 2009, the Board received 17 e-mails in support of the Caring Schools Curriculum, 12 opposed, and 1 e-mail in support of the existing no-nit lice policy.

**Superintendent’s Report:** Superintendent Kirsten Vital noted she visited several school sites. At BayFarm, Superintendent Vital had a conversation with teachers and families regarding the principal process for selecting a new principal since Jane Lee is retiring. Superintendent Vital also talked about implementing a process that supports a greater screening process in the district and establishing an applicant pool. Community members, families, staff, and teachers would be on a panel to interview Principals and recommend 3 candidates to the Superintendent for consideration. The Superintendent would then recommend a final candidate to the Board.

Superintendent Vital mentioned several events she attended and reminded the community about the Master Plan dates: May 20 at Haight, June 2 at Edison, August 18 at Wood from 6:30 PM – 8:00 PM.

Superintendent Vital also noted that tonight, there will be an informational update on LGBT lesson #9. This evening’s presentation is for clarifying questions and information, and the next meeting will be the Public Hearing. The last meeting in May is when the proposed final lessons and curriculum will come to the Board for action. In this process, we are looking for opportunities to achieve consensus. It is our responsibility as a district to provide a safe and welcoming, legally-compliant atmosphere for all students. Staff tried to really listen to everyone in order to incorporate feedback and help to bring people together. There are a lot of strong feelings on both sides, and not everyone is going to be pleased with the outcome. As we move forward, we need to keep in mind our responsibility as a district to provide a safe and welcoming environment and our obligation to develop policy and curriculum that enables us to best protect the rights of students, families, and staff. We are in the process of getting a legal opinion around “opt out” and noticing parents and will have that in open session at the May 12 meeting.

On another note, there was a letter put out to parents and guardians around the swine flu concerns in terms of understanding keeping kids home if they’re sick, what parents can do to help protect families from the cold and flu. The information is also posted on our website and was e-mailed to principals and

staff for inclusion in school Wednesday newsletters.

**Oral Communications – Non-Agenda Items:**

*Donna Wyatt* reminded everyone about Project Youth View on Thursday, May 7 at the Alameda Theater complex.

*Jennifer Howell* addressed the Board encouraging maintaining split contracts for teachers. Ms. Howell noted this arrangement has worked well for her and allowed her the work/life balance necessary for her family.

**Oral Communications – Consent Items:** Member Spencer noted the Proclamation for Asian/Pacific Islander Heritage Month. Member Jensen noted May 13 as Day of the Teacher and Employee Appreciation Month in May. Member Spencer also highlighted Asthma Awareness Month and Classified Employees Week, May 17-23.

**Student Board Member Reports**

Student Board Member Quach from Alameda noted juniors have a fundraising event with Jamba Juice; Spirit Week last week; Elections last week for leadership; Staff appreciation breakfast; Spring Concert; CST testing; Senior Breakfast and Art Show/Poetry Slam; Senior Talent Show audition.

Student Board Member Ramos from ASTI noted a Cinco de Mayo celebration; yearbooks on sale; Prom on Saturday; state tests this week; graduation on 6/8 at Auctions by the Bay; Seniors graduating with AA degrees – ceremony at College of Alameda at 2:30 on 5/29; student body elections coming up soon.

Student Board Member Reed from Encinal noted CST testing; seniors conducting Senior Olympics; studying for AP exams; beginning of end-of-year activities; Open House on 5/6; 100 Comcast volunteers on Saturday repaired/painted benches, did gardening projects, replaces basketball nets, etc. Comcast provided materials, breakfast and lunch – thank you to all volunteers and Comcast for making it possible.

Student Board Member Kesete from Island noted last hex of school year beginning; 5 graduates so far; STAR training this week; Close-Up trip coming up soon.

**Calendar Review:** President McMahon reviewed the calendar of events. Member Spencer noted on 5/2, Washington and Franklin will host a joint yard sale and donations can be made 5/1; April 29 Lum will have a guest speaker.

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

**DONATIONS:** President McMahon thanked the community for their generous donations.

**Reduce, Reuse, Recycle – Alameda Unified School District Earth Day Report**

In observance of Earth Day, the district is reporting energy use and consumption patterns. Reporting also on waste recycling and diversion performance and recognizing partnerships in these areas and setting goals for future performance.

Leland Noll – Maintenance, Operations & Facilities Director, introduced the item. Mr. Noll reviewed district-wide natural gas consumption, which has been reduced by 13.8% from July 08 to March 09. Our district-wide electrical consumption, likewise, has been reduced by 19.0% from July 08 to March 09. District-wide water consumption has decreased 17.45% from July 08 to February 09.

Mr. Noll introduced parents and community members to highlight more details. Meredith Owens from

Alameda Municipal Power noted 87% of AMP's power is renewable, whereas only 34% of California's power is renewable. Historical energy efficiency project benefits include:

- Annual electric cost savings of \$290,000
- Cumulative electric energy cost savings of \$3,000,000
- Rebates of \$162,000
- Energy star label for Bay Farm and Franklin schools
- AMP provided a 5-day class on energy facilities maintenance
- Energy education program:
  - Renewable energy curriculum
  - Make A Circus
  - 1 kilowatt solar PV system at Lincoln Middle School

Current & future energy efficiency projects:

- Free gasketing, door closures, and plastic strip curtains
- Energy efficient lighting retrofit at WCDC, district office, ACLC, MOF
- Energy audits at all schools

Our water partners:

- East Bay Municipal Utilities District
- Diversion permit
  - Should result in annual savings of \$13,000
- AUSD water conservation projects
  - Irrigation automation for our large fields

Mr. Noll reviewed recycling efforts at schools:

Alameda High School – 22.22% recycled

Encinal High School – 51.72% recycled

Island High School – 56.25% recycled

Chipman Middle School – 46.15% recycled

Lincoln Middle School – 46.15% recycled

Wood Middle School – 68.18% recycled

BayFarm = 36.36% recycled

Earhart = 65.22% recycled

Edison = 33.33% recycled

Franklin = 33.33% recycled

Franklin = 33.33% recycled

Haight = 46.15% recycled

Longfellow = 50.00% recycled

Lum = 42.86% recycled

Otis = 42.86% recycled

Paden = 38.46% recycled

Ruby Bridges = 33.33% recycled

Washington = 66.67% recycled.

Member Mooney asked about green bins for food waste. Mr. Noll noted food waste and organics is something staff is going to be looking at. Member Jensen noted concern that recyclable items are being sent to the landfill. Mr. Noll noted that classrooms should only have a small trash can of garbage, the rest

should be recycled.

Member Spencer asked if PTA's will be required to purchase recycling bins. Mr. Noll noted that recycling bins will be provided at no charge.

Mr. Noll reviewed recycling audit results:

- Three 30 gallon bags
- Reduced to two 2 gallon bags
- There were two aluminum cans
- Two postage stamps
- Remainder was green waste
- 95% reduction
- Mostly paper was in the wrong container

District-wide paper facts:

- Big paper use:
  - 1300 cases of paper food trays
  - 929 cases of paper towels
  - 3300 cases of copy paper (that's over 16 million pages)

Chantal Currid reviewed the Alameda Schools Go Green portion, which created a Google group in October made up of students, teachers, staff, parents, members of ACI, City of Alameda, AMP, and CASA. As part of ongoing education efforts, the group included presentations on waste reduction with ACI and the City of Alameda, student-led groups such as Bay Farm School's "Tree Musketeers", distribution of global warming checklist, and sharing of information about grants.

Ms. Currid also reviewed reducing waste ideas, items for recycling, reuse of items, rot, and celebrating Earth Day events.

"Alameda Green Schools Challenge" includes applying for a 3 year grant for \$124,000 for:

- Universal access to recycling
- Phase-in food scrap diversion
- Education to promote cultural change
- Communication and sharing best practices

The grant goals are to increase diversion from 41% to 75% in 3 years, uniform recycling and composting at all schools and facilities, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and creating zero waste cultural change.

Brian Miller reviewed federal stimulus funds that may be our one time opportunity to strike, and discussed how energy efficiency measures and solar power could work for AUSD.

Member Jensen noted that with regards to the RFP, it would be simpler if it came before the Board for approval once instead of at 2 separate meetings to help with the fast-tracked deadlines.

Member Mooney noted he is very encouraged that AUSD is aligning with the city and AMP in this work. It would be great to have science teachers in conversations with MOF and engineers to turn projects into teaching devices – measuring, data tracking, etc.

Member Tam commended the group for their involvement, passion, and vision. Member Tam noted we are really talking about changing habits and building sustainability; the challenge is to be consistent over

time. Member Tam suggested analyzing the demographics of each school's student population and forming an outreach effort specific to that group to be inclusive in addressing the needs of the whole community.

### **School Facilities Measure C Bond Audit**

Each year, the school district is required to have an independent audit of Measure C Bond Building Fund. Measure C was a Proposition 39 bond. Proposition 39 amended the California Constitution to include accountability measures. Specifically, the District must conduct an annual independent performance audit to ensure that funds have been expended only on the specific projects listed as well as an annual, independent financial audit of the proceeds from the sale of the bonds until all the proceeds have been expended for facilities projects. Upon passage of Proposition 39, AB 1908 was also enacted. AB 1908 requires formation of a Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee. This audit was reviewed by the Oversight Committee on April 8, 2009.

In the auditor's opinion, the financial statements referred to present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Measure C Bond Building Fund of AUSD as of June 30, 2008, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the US.

### **MOTION: Member Mooney**

### **SECONDED: Member Jensen**

That the Board of Education approve School Facilities Measure C Bond Audit as presented.

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

**NOES:** None

### **MOTION CARRIED**

### **Update on Elementary Caring Schools Curriculum, Lesson #9, Addressing Inclusion of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Information**

The Elementary Safe Schools Curriculum Committee was convened in October 2007 to provide tools and resources to teachers to address sexual orientation and gender identity. The committee then created lessons for grades K-5 to educate the students in regards to understanding and respecting all types of family structures. Community forums as well as individual school forums were held in the months of February and March, 2009 to inform the parents.

Based on the feedback from the community, staff presented an update of the revised and reformatted lessons. Margie Sherratt introduced Gail Rossiter and Barry Chersky who provided information on the history and background of work.

Ms. Rossiter noted that in fall 2007 at a training on LGBT which features a panel of speakers, teacher feedback noted a lacked the tools to deal with LGBT issues that were occurring on the campuses across the district. That's when staff decided to organize a task force of teachers.

Mr. Chersky added that the survey indicated 2/3 of teachers said from their perspectives, these issues need to be addressed. Many reported anti-gay behavior at every level, including Kindergarten. Teachers asked for resources, materials for use in the classroom, ongoing and onsite discussions to increase comfort levels, effective lessons, and integration of LGBT issues with other diversity dimensions.

#### **Updates & Revisions:**

- K-5 Principals reviewed all lessons
- Safe Schools Committee viewed samples of reformatted lessons
- One lesson per grade level – some lessons may have 2 or more sessions
- Added scripted vocabulary for use by all grade levels

Next steps:

- Teacher leaders to discuss grade level feedback
- Additional teacher training in implementing Caring School Curriculum including:
  - Class meeting format/modeling
  - Agreements on how to uniformly respond to sensitive subjects
- Creating FAQ's with scripted answers for classroom teacher use

Several public speakers addressed the Board with the following comments:

Opposition to LGBT tolerance training, but not to LGBT orientation of human beings. Teaching this in public schools at such an early age seems to be a step over the line of what is ethical to use faith-based people who have a culture more aligned with traditional families. In protecting children, no one should be bullied. Subjecting one group or classification is not the proper way to go about educating children about bullying – you're excluding other groups.

I was deeply affected by bullying growing up because my parents divorced when I was in first grade. At that time, there was quite a stigma attached to it and I was labeled as coming from a "broken home." I know what it feels like to be the odd kid out who comes from the "other" kind of home. I support making the schools a safe place for everybody and arming teachers with appropriate tools.

I support making schools safe for everyone, but the best way to do it is to expand general lessons on teasing/bullying we already have and use. Zero-tolerance needs to be taught to all, regardless of issues.

I am a bi-sexual teacher and parent and my children only know what I myself have told them. There is one little girl at a school who makes it very clear to me that having 2 mothers is not acceptable and that a "true" family consists of a mother and father. She has said this more than once, which is not only painful to my family, but completely unacceptable. This is part of our reality. As a teacher, I have been a witness to many verbal assaults and verbal anti-gay comments – this is a real thing that happens in our schools.

Last month, the NAACP gave a powerful speech in support of LGBT rights. Are gay rights civil rights? Of course they are. Everyone has the right to equal treatment, under the law. This curriculum supports children in many ways and helps build better citizens and attitudes by the time these elementary students get to middle and high school. LGBT families cover all other populations – race, class, religious beliefs, ability, etc.

I am a Christian conservative who supports the ability for parents to opt out of the curriculum. You are infringing on my rights as a parents. I am strongly opposed to teasing, harassment, and bullying over perceived or real differences, but I trust my ability to teach my children to respect others over the district's ability to handle this in an even-handed manner. Do you have curriculum about awareness of Christian beliefs? There are many families that find this curriculum at odds with their religious faith.

I am a straight, married parent who goes to church and is an active community volunteer. I am not part of any corrosive or brainwashing agenda. I grew up with a brother with mental illness who was bullied mercilessly. I have been a noon supervisor for 6 years and can testify that bullying does happen at the elementary level. This curriculum doesn't only protect LGBT children, but all. In the last month, 2 eleven year-olds committed suicide due to anti-gay harassment, and neither one of them was gay. I support the curriculum.

I am a gay man with 2 children in the district. This revised curriculum has left out some language originally included. I want to make sure that my children are not only not being bullied, but are having

their identity reinforced. A lot of this language is about bullying, but there's not enough recognition of who we are. To negate the definition of who we are empowers others with current definitions. Make certain we don't dilute the value of the vocabulary in these lessons in order to accommodate a perception of preference.

So many parents feel this curriculum is inappropriate for elementary grad levels. There is a Board policy that prohibits bullying and name calling – why isn't that being enforced? Is it not working? How will LGBT be defined in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade? Are the definitions and vocabulary online so parents can review? How will the district approach whether LGBT is a choice, behavior, or hereditary?

I am a parent of 2 young boys at Otis and a licensed marriage/family therapist who works with diverse families of all types. Many of these families are represented in the "Who's In A Family" video, a counter claim that the curriculum touts a purely LGBT agenda. It shows that many different kinds of families exist and that all children deserve to be respected. I applaud you for taking this on. All students have the right to know that the words gay and lesbian are adjectives used to describe valued and integral individuals and families in our community. There is also strong evidence that when LGBT issues are addressed, all children experience feeling safer. Allowing an opt-out would send a message of pro-discrimination for what is an inclusive, anti-discrimination curriculum.

My daughter is currently dealing with a bully at school. We need to address the root of the problem of why kids bully. That is the key. All year, this girl has been told that she can't treat others this way, but yet she still does it. This issue belongs with those doing the bullying; a lot of these kids have their own problems because they don't care. I hope that whatever changes you make, you include specific language or tools for teachers to really deal with the bullies as these are our kids, too.

I need clarification – my understanding is that the vocabulary list and FAQ's are for teachers to use as needed and not part of the curriculum. Also, this LGBT curriculum fills a current gap that has not been covered previously. The consensus of AHS SSC is that early intervention was relevant all the way through secondary school students. We commend the district for proactively addressing this safety issue and urge your support.

I volunteer as a noon supervisor and am a straight, white male. I can tell you that the current curriculum does not work. At very early elementary grades, kids are old enough to use words as weapons, even if they don't know what they mean. They are certainly old enough to have words explained and defined so they can learn not to throw bricks with those words. I challenge any person who opposes this curriculum, as a person of faith, to ask themselves, "do you condemn a child to abuse because you view what their parents do as inappropriate, immoral, or unacceptable?"

I will be 18 in June and I am a strong supporter of homosexual rights. My father is a gay man, and I support gay marriage. Living in the bay area, tolerance is a necessity, however, parents must have a say in how their children are raised. They should be given the right to opt out if they are morally opposed to the curriculum. They should have the right to control what their kids are exposed to.

This has become a volatile subject. Were all parents notified and invited to participate in this program? Were notifications put into other languages so parents were really aware of what was being taught? Were there independent psychologists who assessed this curriculum as age-appropriate? I know what it's like to deal with highly sensitive subjects, having been a sex education teacher in OUSD. I encourage transparency on everything that's done so parents know what's going on. Lack of information brings fear. Parents are obviously concerned about what's being taught, but the lessons are only as affective as the teachers teaching the program.



Students of every description come to AUSD to learn and succeed. AEA represents those who work most closely with students. The AEA rep council voted unanimously to support policies and curriculum to support students, and commends the district in moving forward. AEA members can attest to bullying and the damage done to self-esteem and school performance.

Gay and lesbian are not sexual words. I take great insult that this is defined as sex ed. I am a 2 dad family and experienced bullying myself. We took our kids out of the independent school system and put them into public schools because of this work you are doing. I am concerned the curriculum is getting watered down as it was anemic to begin with. Don't take out the vocabulary words as elementary kids are already wielding them. Don't enforce bias – support this curriculum.

I am well aware of your legal and moral responsibility to protect all children. This curriculum is an important component of that. But it's not sufficient. You need to start with this and build on it. You need to keep talking about this until the problem is gone – this is not a one step solution. LGBT kids don't all come from LGBT families. LGBT kids are growing up here and need to be mirrored.

I support the curriculum. 75% of schools have LGBT curriculum and ASUD is behind the curve. The reason we are focusing on one group is that all previous efforts ignored this particular issue, and this curriculum is finally filling that gap. We already have curriculum that shows the other diversities. And making these families visible is not promoting or teaching their values – that is a ridiculous argument. We need to show all members of our community so they feel reflected and understood. We don't allow opting out of other subject areas like science, history, etc., some of which counter beliefs and opinions of certain community members.

I am a lifelong Alameda resident and parent of a lesbian daughter. In this day and age, I am glad my daughter doesn't feel the need to hide her situation or to tell her children they need to be secretive about their family, either. They are looking for another home and I suggested Alameda, but my daughter said the community pressure was such that an already weak agenda was being proposed and was going to be withdrawn, so they declined. It's too bad; we lost the opportunity for a 3<sup>rd</sup> generation.

I support the curriculum, but please don't water down the language. I deeply disapprove of the British monarchy because I don't believe in the Divine Right of Kings, but I don't try to opt out of it because I realize that it is a part of history and the world and our students need to learn about it. In the same way, I believe all students need to understand different kinds of people in the world. I want every child in Alameda to know that there are different ways to live.

Generally, I support this curriculum, but it's a little late at this time. This isn't about sex or sexual activity – it's terminology in a positive fashion before kids hear about it on the playgrounds as a negative. There are teachable moments applicable to all other diverse groups. We need to pick up the ball and go with this.

Superintendent Vital clarified that the legal counsel will provide an opinion about opting out and parent notification. We are not recommending or saying anything about either at this point. Secondly, the vocabulary list and FAQ's are tools developed for teachers to use.

President McMahan asked for Board deliberation.

Member Jensen noted it was stated earlier that teachers, during initial discussions, requested more tools to deal with certain issues around family structure and identify. Right now, if this curriculum isn't adopted, if someone in the classroom called another student "gay", what could the teacher say? Ms. Rossiter responded that what has historically happened depends on the comfort level of the teacher. Questions

come at teachers all day long and we have heard that a lot of teachers don't know what to say. Very few feel cultural competency to deal with this subject matter. One of the motivating factors in researching curriculum is to give teachers language to discuss in an intelligent and appropriate way.

Ms. Sherratt again reiterated that this LGBT curriculum fills a current gap, as there has been tremendous training around racial and other issues in the past, but none regarding LGBT. Superintendent Vital added that this curriculum includes teachable moments applicable to any diverse situation, not just LGBT.

Member Mooney asked what the unit on families discusses. Ms. Rossiter noted it covers different types of family structures, what makes up a family, and children create pictures, words, and sentences that talk about their families.

Member Spencer asked if the caring schools curriculum specifically deals with gender, race, religion or disability issues. Ms. Sherratt noted it does not. But the teachable lessons cover problem-solving, team-building, anytime lessons which could deal with any of those diverse groups. Member Spencer clarified that this curriculum produced specific lessons for a particular group. Superintendent Vital corrected that there aren't specific cards for every class under the protected class law, but that LGBT issues were identified as a missing component, which is why this curriculum was proposed.

Member Spencer asked if we are sending a message that we have taken care of all other groups. Member Tam noted in the late 1990's, the Superintendent did a diversity audit which raised a lot of issues in the community as to whether or not Alameda was racist. Each school did their own audit, and the SSC's created a plan to address the needs of the school. As a result of that audit, there was a lot of diversity training. Within the last 10+ years, administrators and teachers were introduced to different types of trainings with regards to diversity, according to the needs of the school culture. However, LGBT training was lacking and this is in response to that teacher request for tools and training.

Member Spencer noted that other districts have adopted programs that address all 5 protected groups and asked if staff looked into those programs. Ms. Sherratt noted staff can review and research what other districts have done.

Member Spencer added she hopes definitions that apply to other protected classes are as clear – for example, “mixed family” vs “bi-racial”. Are we ensuring language used to refer to family units are respectful terminology/ Also, the crumpled figure lesson that discusses derogatory terms of others – parents don't receive any notification about this lesson before it is taught. How do parents know what's going on in the classrooms when sensitive subjects are to be covered? Superintendent Vital noted that typically, back-to-school nights are used to inform parents of what textbooks, writers, workshops, and lessons are taught.

Member Spencer questioned why nothing in this curriculum is direct like the “Think Before You Speak” curriculum. Why are we using books about animals? Why don't we use books with real families? Also, can parents buy books and donate them to the classrooms? What about when schools have book fairs? Superintendent Vital noted that books should be on the state-adopted list of books. Book fairs typically work with Scholastic, who has approved books for sale. Member Spencer asked for a list of approved books.

President McMahon reminded the community that there will be a Public Hearing on May 12.

**MOTION: Member Mooney**

**SECONDED: Member Tam**

That the Board of Education continue the meeting past 10:30 PM.

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

**NOES:** None

## **MOTION CARRIED**

### **Public Hearing: 6<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> Math Adoption**

Wendy Ponder, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, introduced the item. Under the California Education Code, schools must adopt appropriate instructional materials that address the California State Content Standards. Prior to authorizing the purchase of instructional materials, the Board of Education must conduct a Public Hearing.

The State Board of Education approved five publishers for Middle School mathematics adoption. A committee of Alameda Unified School teachers and administrators met to review the publishers' materials to determine which best align to the California State Framework, including the Mathematics Content Standards, and meet the needs of the AUSD students and teachers. Two publishers were selected for further review for each course by the task force members for 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> grade Math, 4<sup>th</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup> Grade Intensive Intervention, Algebra and Geometry. High School Math Departments reviewed several publishers for each Advanced Math Course from Algebra 2 through AP Statistics.

Based on the full adoption process, the adoption task force recommends that the following textbooks be adopted by the Board for use in our middle and high school math courses:

Middle School Math Course 1 and 2, 2008 Edition, McDougal-Littell

4<sup>th</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup> Math Intensive Intervention, Fast Forward Math – Houghton Mifflin/Holt McDougall

Algebra 1 for California, 2008 Edition, McDougal-Littell

Geometry for California, 2007 Edition, McDougal-Littell

Algebra 2 for California, 2007 Edition, McDougal-Littell

Precalculus – Larson, Precalculus with Limits, Holt McDougall

Calculus – Bittenger, Calculus and Its Applications, 2003 Edition, Addison Wesley/Pearson Education

AP Calculus – Calculus 1: Early Transcendental, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Holt McDougall

Statistics – Workshop Statistics, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Key College Press

AP Statistics – The Practice of Statistics, 3e, W.H. Freeman Publishing

Copies of these books and accompanying materials have been on display for public inspection and review at the Longfellow Education Annex since October, 2008 and subsequently at the District Office during the month of March through April 28, 2009. In addition, samples of these materials are on display at tonight's meeting. There has been no documented negative response to the materials.

The cost is \$550,000 for 6<sup>th</sup> grade – Advanced Math. There are free workbooks for the life of the adoption for 6<sup>th</sup> grade, Algebra 2 and an ongoing annual cost for 4<sup>th</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup> grade intensive intervention workbooks.

Next steps include teaching training, site plans for pacing, intervention and instructional practices, collaborative professional development, math coaches for 6<sup>th</sup> – Algebra, summer training for teachers, and Principal training in August.

President McMahon opened the Public Hearing at 10:24 PM.

Patricia Sanders, AEA President, encourage the Board and district to make sure whatever materials are adopted get into the hands of teachers before the end of the school year so teachers are prepared and not getting materials days before school starts.

Christine Weidler from Lincoln Middle School, urged the Board to move forward as rapidly as possible.

This process is happening at the very last minute of a 2-year cycle. There is no time for delay. We need to be respectful of teachers' time and get them information as quickly as possible.

President McMahon closed the Public Hearing at 10:28 PM.

### **Approval to Adopt 5<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> Grade Math Instructional Materials**

Under the California Education Code, schools must adopt appropriate instructional materials that address the California State Content Standards. Prior to authorizing the purchase of instructional materials, the Board of Education must conduct a Public Hearing which was held this evening on April 28, 2009.

Based on the adoption process, it is recommended that the following textbooks be adopted by the Board for use in our middle and high school math courses:

Middle School Math Course 1 and 2, 2008 Edition, McDougal-Littell

4<sup>th</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup> Math Intensive Intervention, Fast Forward Math – Houghton Mifflin/Holt McDougall

Algebra 1 for California, 2008 Edition, McDougal-Littell

Geometry for California, 2007 Edition, McDougal-Littell

Algebra 2 for California, 2007 Edition, McDougal-Littell

Precalculus – Larson, Precalculus with Limits, Holt McDougall

Calculus – Bittenger, Calculus and Its Applications, 2003 Edition, Addison Wesley/Pearson Education

AP Calculus – Calculus 1: Early Transcendental, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Hold McDougall

Statistics – Workshop Statistics, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Key College Press

AP Statistics – The Practice of Statistics, 3e, W.H. Freeman Publishing

Copies of the books and accompanying materials have been on display for public inspection and review at the Longfellow Education Annex since October 2008 and subsequently at the District Office during the month of March through April 28, 2009.

**MOTION: Member Mooney**

**SECONDED: Member Jensen**

That the Board of Education adopt the 5<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> grade math instructional materials as submitted.

Member Spencer requested that adoptions be scheduled earlier to avoid last-minute orders.

Superintendent Vital agreed, noting that an adoption calendar would be created to avoid this tight timeline.

President McMahon suggested a future presentation on what our math efforts are going to be in the upcoming year to get us ready for this process.

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

**NOES:** None

**MOTION CARRIED**

### **Budget Categorical Programs Recommendations**

Superintendent Vital introduced the item. The district's Categorical Programs provide various school services that are specially funded by the federal or state government. These Categorical Programs have been presented at previous school board meetings and the Public Budget Workshops. Since many of the Categorical Programs are coordinated by the district's Education Services department, the district reviewed how the funds from Categorical Programs are utilized and allocated to Ed Services and to the school sites. After this review, the district proposes a reorganization of the Ed Services Department in an effort to allocate more Categorical Funds directly to the school sites.

The amount of Categorical Funds directly allocated to schools will increase. The school principals will work with their school community, Ed Services, and the other school district departments, to submit a plan on how to best utilize the Categorical Funds towards all students' achievement.

Tim Rahill, Chief Financial Officer, reviewed the recommendations.

#### Ed Services Reorganization

- The Reorganization of Ed Services includes the replacement of three management positions with the following: 1 management position and 2 teachers on special assignment
- It also reduces the Ed Services clerical support from seven position down to four

#### Title 1

- 09/10 funding about \$1.3M
  - Source: federal grant monitored by state
  - To provide: partial FTE for Ed Services Director and TSA, 5% mandated professional development, 20% mandated supplemental Ed Services, \$10K for homeless
  - About \$900K to be allocated to Title 1 school sites

#### English Language Learners

##### EIA, Title III LEP, and ELAP

- 09/10 funding about \$1.6M
  - \$1.3M – economic impact aid (EIA)
  - \$200K – federal Title III Limited English Proficient (LEP) allocation
  - \$80K – English Learner Acquisition Program (ELAP) for grades 4<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup>
  - To provide: partial FTE for the TSA-EL, TSA Technology and EL Clerical
  - About \$1.2M to be allocated to school sites, which includes Fusion teachers and Beginning EL teachers at the high school level

#### CAHSEE Intensive Intervention

- 09/10 funding of \$62K
  - Source: state funded
  - To provide: CAHSEE teachers at high school and a partial FTE for clerical

#### GATE

- 09/10 funding of \$65K
  - Source –state
  - To provide: administrative stipend and partial FTE for clerical
  - About \$45K for programs and services to GATE students

#### School & Library Improvement Grant (SLIG)

- 09/10 funding of \$620K
  - Source: state
  - To provide: funding for school principals to work with their school community, Ed Services, and the other school district departments, and submit a plan on how to best utilize these funds towards all students' achievement

#### Professional Development

- 09/10 funding of \$400K
  - Source: federal funding from Title II Teacher Quality
  - To provide: partial FTE for Ed Services Director, TSA for Assessment, BTSA Coordinator,

Personnel Manager, TSA for Technology and Clerical

- About \$90K to be allocated to school sites which includes SIM teachers at the high school level

#### Professional Development Block Grant/Buyback Days

- 09/10 funding of \$500K
  - Source: state professional development (old Buyback Days)
  - To provide: funding for 3 teacher buyback days on the salary schedule and \$380K for Math Staff Development

#### Targeted Instructional Improvement Grant (TIIG)

- 09/10 funding of \$670K
  - Source: state
  - To provide: goal is to try and create some TIIG funds that can be allocated to the school sites. The district is currently using TIIG to pay for the Copy Center
  - Potentially about \$70K to be allocated to school sites

#### Other Categorical Allocations

Information on the following categoricals will be presented at the May 12 Board meeting:

- Supplemental Counseling
- Teacher Credentialing
- Peer & Assistance Review (PAR)
- Community-based English Tutoring (CBET)
- After School Programs
- Cal-Safe
- Health & Safety
- School Safety

#### Next Steps: Timeline

- May 12: provide specifics on categorical budgets, including staffing, for Ed Services and allocations to School Sites
- May 19: California statewide special election
- May 26: follow-up with potential impact on schools from Special Election results
- June 9: present 09/10 draft budget
- June 23: present 09/10 final budget

Superintendent Vital added we are trying to move the strategic work of instructional strategies and development of teachers to the sites, with compliance work at the district office. We have asked principals to start to look at what the priorities are around moving students at their sites. They are working with their SSC's and potentially putting in their school site plans. We want them to think about what it really takes to education a young person. Principals will have more autonomy and accountability.

Member Tam noted this is a paradigm shift to how we have typically done business in AUSD. Having been a principal, there are things that the district office has done that, at the time I was Principal, I didn't know about – it was just taken care of. We will have to shift in regards to what additional skill sets site administrators need to have.

Member Tam added that the ELL population has grown within the last 3 years, and the challenge is how will the site administrator know, specifically, what skill sets and strategies will be needed? The challenge is to ask the right questions and have the right data.

Superintendent Vital noted she appreciates Member Tam’s concerns and that executive staff is working one-on-one with principals to support them in this shift. This has been a difficult shift for people and resulted in a mix of emotions – excited, anxious, nervous, etc. part of our role is to offer coaching and support, looking at data, and making decisions that align with data.

Member Spencer noted she is interested in the transient rate. At EHS, how many students received AUSD services in elementary and/or middle school? We don’t allocate any Title 1 funds to high school because we focus on early intervention.

President McMahon reiterated there is about \$200K of free-up funds in net change of reallocation going to sites. What is the accountability model to determine whether or not this is the right thing to do? How are we going to measure the rightness/wrongness of the direction we’re moving in? Can we gather data to show this is working? We are diffusing responsibility down to the site level – how can they make decision on data that doesn’t come in until September? We’ve opened up a significant can of worms for the sake of transparency.

Superintendent Vital replied that at the end of the day, we are currently measured by NCLB, but she will propose through the master plan process that we build an accountability system that shows whether or not we are closing the achievement gap and moving students over time. Historically, the Board was approving school site plans in the middle of the year when they have already started doing the work. We tried to make a shift around that timeline – you will see positions signed off by the SSC on May 12 so we can meet about rehiring/rescinding on time, then see the final SSP on June 23 for approval. When they get school CST scores, we can step back and do data inquiry.

Carole Robie added that some SSC’s have already met and started to prioritize and approve Principals’ Theory of Action and prioritization so that they will be ready when they get allocations.

Member Mooney noted he appreciates Member Tam’s lens he sees through, being a former Principal, as it adds to Board understanding. While there is some risk, we need to move in this direction. For years, we have heard that the district office was “too fat”. Here is a change; we hope the community will see this as a paradigm shift and a positive one.

Member Tam added that usually, change only happens in reflection and we need to do a cycle of inquiry or use some other tool. It will be a critical component in creating that shift.

**Approval of Resolution No. 09-0024 Intent to Dismiss Classified Employees, California School Employees Association (CSEA – Chapter No. 27, Office/Technical and Paraprofessional Unit)**

California Education Code Sections 45117 sets forth dates and procedures by which the Board of Education must express its intent to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services and give notice to classified California School Employees Association (CSEA) office/clerical and paraprofessional employees that their service may not be required for the ensuing school year.

Karen Keegan, CSEA 27 President, addressed the Board and stated what’s happening here is change. We’re talking about the district office and the top-heavy way this district has operated. Ms. Keegan applauded Superintendent Vital and the Board for their courage by making this change; this is a painful process for some members of CSEA – we hope when sites plan out their year, they consider their work and value and what they do for the students and what they bring.

**MOTION: Member Mooney**

**SECONDED: Member Tam**

That the Board of Education approve Resolution No. 09-0024 Intent to Dismiss Classified Employees,

California School Employees Association (CSEA-Chapter No. 27, office/Technical and Paraprofessional Unit) as presented.

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

**NOES:** None

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Revision to Physical Education Board Policy 6142.7**

Superintendent Vital noted the purpose of this policy was to bring AUSD up to current law and CSBA policy. This change language came directly out of the current CSBA policy as recommended to this Board. Ms. Ponder introduced the item.

Member Mooney asked if CSBA knows we have a district-coordinated wellness program. Ms. Ponder added they do, and this is language from CSBA. All districts are required to have a wellness policy. Mr. Mooney asked about credit for athletic participation. Superintendent Vital noted it would be a policy question to the Board, whether or not they want to grant credit for a student who is a professional skater, for example. In the current language, we subtracted this, not CSBA. President McMahon clarified that this was part of the original revision made in 2002.

Ms. Ponder noted the main change in this policy and the point of bringing it forward is the exemption on page 3 related to Senate Bill 75. This language has been added that states if a student doesn't pass the physical fitness exam in 9<sup>th</sup> grade, they are not able to change when they take the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of PE – it has to be done the sophomore year. This is new law.

Student William Mooney and Allie Villa addressed the Board, requesting an exemption for students for the 2<sup>nd</sup> year requirement if they participate in school-sponsored athletic activities like marching band, cadet corps, etc. like other districts do. This would allow students to take more academic classes. Sports teams also promote a lifetime of health, and other programs offer more one-on-one attention. They would have already proven that they meet physical standards through the test as freshman.

Ms. Ponder noted that AUSD graduation requirement is 2 years of physical education. Opting out would not be an option according to our current policies. These would have to be changed if this is something the Board wants to pursue.

President McMahon added the Board has the ability to change the policy, and currently there is a similar exemption request sitting in the assembly. Having sat through this question year after year, there are varying opinions. The districts who have offered the exemption have had to go to the state department to get permission to do so. We could pursue it, but in order to get our policy current and get this going, we can pass this one at this time.

Member Mooney requested further investigation of the opt out opinion.

**MOTION: Member Jensen**

**SECONDED: Member McMahon**

That the Board approve the Revision to Physical Education Board Policy 6142.7 as proposed.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

**AYES:** Jensen, McMahon, Spencer, Tam

**NOES:** Mooney

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Board Member Reports**



Member Mooney noted the CSBA training all Board Members and Superintendent Vital attended needs follow-up, and suggested a date at the end of June/beginning of July.

Member Jensen agreed and noted the training was very informative. Member Jensen attended the Washington School Garden dedication, Edison Recycling event, GSA Speaker event put on by AHS, and various other meetings and activities.

Member Spencer noted concern about setting a meeting at the end of June/beginning of July for a special meeting because people like to attend. Member Spencer added she attended the EHS/AHS staff basketball fundraiser and hopes it becomes an annual event; she also attended the GSA Speaker event.

Member Tam added he attended the Citizenship Awards and Youth Collaborative meeting.

President McMahon noted he attended the ROP meeting last week and got some bad news – the entity now has a qualified statement due to accounting rules and budget cuts implemented.

**Adjournment:** President McMahon adjourned the meeting at 11:51 PM.