

**BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
**January 26, 2010**  
**Alameda High Little Theater**  
**Oak and Walnut Streets**  
**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 5:02 PM.

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

**ABSENT:** None

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

**ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION – Superintendent’s Conference Room:** By President Mooney at 5:02 PM to discuss: 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 v. 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; Public Employee Performance Evaluation: Superintendent; Public Employee Appointment: Chief Financial Officer.

**RECONVENE TO PUBLIC SESSION:** By President Mooney at 6:40 PM.

**CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Led by Haight 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 Spencer**

**SECONDED: Member Tam**

That the Board of Education adopt the agenda with the following changes: The Master Plan item is being pulled; E-5 moves to F-11.

**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 of Education approved 1 resignation (Sargent); 2 changes of status (Green, Shemwell).

**+Classified Personnel Actions:** The Board of Education approved 8 appointments (Shemwell, Amiri, Biggs, Burns, Harris, Amiri, Burns, Carlson); 1 resignation (Gifford); 1 termination (Guzman); 4 changes of status (Fradella, Keegan, Kurtz, Morgan).

**+Approval of Bill Warrants and Payroll Registers:** The Board of Education approved warrants numbered 959958-960082, 960083-960096, 960097, 960098-960141, 960143-960163, 960142, 960164-960166.

**+Resolution No. 09-0072 Approval of Budget Transfers, Increases, Decreases**

**+Approval of E-Rate Application**

**+Approval of Alameda High School Voyager's Club Trip to Rome, Italy, April 1 – 10, 2010**

**+Approval of Lincoln Middle School Trip to New York City/Paris & Geneva, June 20 - 29, 2010**

**+Approval of Certification of Administrators for Evaluation in Accordance with Education Code 35160.2 (a-1)**

**+Approval of Donations**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Minutes of the regular meetings of December 8, 2009, December 15, 2009, and January 12, 2010 were considered.

**MOTION: Member Spencer**

**SECONDED: Member McMahon**

Member Spencer noted she provided some edits to the minutes of the December 8, 2009 meeting, and moved that the Board approve the minutes as revised.

**AYES:** Jenson, Mc Mahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

**Noes:** None

**MOTION CARRIED**

**COMMUNICATIONS:**

**Written correspondence:** Written correspondence will be recorded and noted at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

**Superintendent's Report:** Superintendent Vital noted a school visit to Island High School and SunCal follow-up items from the joint City/School Board meeting, but added most of her time has been spent working on the Master Plan, efficiency expert's work, and digging deeply into the fiscal state of AUSD and what the Governor's budget means for Alameda.

Superintendent Vital thanked the Board for accepting her recommendation to pull the Master Plan item to allow time for the community and the Board to thoroughly review documents. The item has been rescheduled for February 9, 2010.

**Oral Communications:**

*Deesha Moore, parent,* noted it is clear the West End is not a priority in the Master Plan. The reference to closing EHS wouldn't bridge anything and would instead create a lot of disunity.

There would be transportation issues with one high school. If you do a cost benefit analysis before threatening to close EHS, you would see that closing the school would be a detriment to the district – increase in absences, tardies, drop outs, etc.

*Clay Pollard, parent*, addressed the Board regarding Lesson 9, stating that the District lied about priorities when it passed the first tax and concealed Lesson 9 completely in the planning stages. You adopted the curriculum knowing full well you would have to spend money defending it. This was a poorly conceived plan and you now have no credibility with the taxpayers. Everyone should vote against any tax from this Board.

Superintendent Vital clarified that the Master Plan assumes Plan A – passage of a parcel tax. Plan B, if a parcel tax does not pass, speaks to cuts, including closures. There are no specific schools. The Facilities Master Plan is on the district website with the analysis of cost savings benefit in both scenarios. Dr. Ruben Zepeda, who has been instrumental in this work, can answer questions for those who need more information. The demographic study is also available on the district website.

#### **Board Oral Communications:**

Member Jensen noted the Facilities Master Plan was adopted on the consent calendar, and urged the community to thoroughly review the document in conjunction with the Master Plan. The Facilities Master Plan is comprehensive and effective, and analyzes the fiscal impacts of different scenarios and changes to configurations which are feeding into the Master Plan.

Member Spencer noted the data from the Facilities Master Plan is used to get the specifics – demographic breakdowns, number of classrooms being used for flex space, etc. that plug into the Master Plan. There is some overlap, but it is not always the same.

**Student Board Member Comments:** Student Board Member Inlow from Alameda High School noted finals are over; 8<sup>th</sup> grade Parent Info Night this Thursday; poetry slam; appreciation breakfast; dance; Junior Prom; mock Congress; Iron Chef competition; portfolios due on 2/8.

Student Board Member Datuin from ASTI noted Information Night for incoming students; research conducted on why students are leaving early college high schools.

Student Board Member Mooney of Encinal High School noted Open House and 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Parent Info Night on 2/3; JROTC drill meet – EHS won 1<sup>st</sup> place the 3<sup>rd</sup> year in a row; Winter Ball fundraiser raised \$3K; college/career center is helping students with financial aid forms.

**Calendar Review:** President Mooney reviewed the calendar of events for Board members.

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

President Mooney acknowledged the donations received from the community.

#### **Highlighting Alameda Schools – Haight Elementary School**

Henry Haight Elementary School, with its diverse student body of young learners, provides students with numerous opportunities to excel academically and socially. Principal Margaret

Harris introduced a slide presentation that highlighted students in the classroom, family science night, cultural experiences, outdoor learning, the art docent program, and Reach to Achieve with the Warriors.

Member Tam thanked Principal Harris for continuing the relationship with the Golden State Warriors, who have “adopted” Haight Elementary School.

### **Teacher of the Year Launch 2009/2010**

Laurie McLachlan-Fry, Chief Human Resources Officer, introduced the item. Every year, the District sends out nomination forms to be distributed to staff and the community to nominate and recognize excellent teachers in the District.

Nomination forms will be distributed to the sites and will be available on the District website.

Each nominee will complete a letter of application and three letters of support to complete the process. The Teacher of the Year (TOY) committee will review the documentation submitted and selected finalists. The finalist will be notified and a classroom visit will be scheduled. Each finalist will be observed by the TOY committee.

The TOY committee will determine the candidate to represent Alameda at the county level. The Teacher of the year and the finalist will be honored at a Board of Education meeting in September 2010.

Ms. McLachlan-Fry noted we are on an earlier schedule this year to ensure adequate time for site visits.

Member Spencer noted she has served on the committee for several years and would like to serve again.

### **Approval of Audit Report for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2009**

Lydia Lotti, Director of Fiscal Services, introduced the item. Each year, a school district is required by law to review at a public meeting, the annual audit of the school district’s financial records for the prior fiscal year.

The audit examines the District’s compliance with state and federal standards and procedures in order for the District to implement sound fiscal management practices for the most effective and efficient use of public funds.

Kristi White, a representative from the District’s audit firm, Nigro Nigro & White presented the audit, who noted overall, the District did a good job in closing the books. Ms. White reviewed the audit findings and recommendations, many of which are in process.

Member Spencer asked about the SARC’s finding and if it would be more appropriate to have the SARC’s available at the school sites, particularly since we know not all families have access to computers. Ms. White noted many schools have both – SARC’s posted online, and hard copies available at the sites. Debbie Wong, Assistant Superintendent, noted hard copies are available at

the sites. Superintendent Vital added staff will ensure that the SARCs are posted at each school site.

Member Spencer asked about the ASES over-attendance reporting. Ms. Wong noted the attendance was being calculated on an excel spreadsheet, and an incorrect formula was the cause of the reporting error. This has since been fixed.

**MOTION: Member Jensen**

**SECONDED: Member Tam**

That the Board approve the Audit Report for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2009 as presented.

AYES: Jensen, McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

**MOTION CARRIED**

**LEA Equitable Distribution of Effective Educators Report**

California's federally approved and State Board of Education adopted a revised state plan for No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) which requires Local Educational Agencies (LEA) to develop and implement a detailed, coherent set of specific activities to ensure that poor and minority children are not taught by inexperienced, under qualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than other children in the district.

In June 2007, CDE identified 247 California school districts to participate in the Compliance Monitoring, Intervention and Sanctions (CMIS) program. These districts were selected from a wider pool of California school districts that feel short of compliance with full staffing of core academic subjects by NCLB highly qualified teachers.

To meet federal and state requirements, each CMIS school district is required to collect data about the qualifications and experience of its teaching staff and calculate whether any inequities exist, specifically as it relates to the staffing of schools with high rate of poverty, a large minority student population, and schools that have consistently been unable to meet AYP.

Ms. McLachlan-Fry reviewed Alameda's report which shows there were 30 not NCLB HQT for 2008/09, and 18 not NCLB HQT for 2009/10. In summary:

- 18 schools are included in the review
- 474 teachers
- 62 teachers have less than 5 years of experience:
  - Elementary: 31 12%
  - Middle School: 17 20%
  - High School: 14 10%
  - Districtwide: 13%
- 10 General Education teachers are not currently considered HQT
- 10 Special Ed Teachers are not currently HQT

What has changed from 2008/09 to 2009/10:

- Decreased the number of not HQT by 12 (the District moved 4 teachers for the 2009/10 school year to new sites and positions due to their HQT status)
- Currently 10 of the not HQT are Special Ed teachers – this is a statewide issue due to new requirements
- 7 schools have hired new staff with less than 5 yrs experience
- AUSD does not have an equitable distribution issue with HQT using the state formula
- AUSD does have a greater number of teachers with less than 5 years of experience at the Title 1 middle schools and one Title 1 elementary school

Member Spencer requested that staff clearly note percentages by school site in future presentations.

Member Jensen asked about recruitment. Ms. McLachlan-Fry stated that the District has done a better job of screening applicants in terms of NCLB HQ. We do have some teachers still working through requirements. Efforts have been made to increase the diversity of our teacher population and we have some good, young teachers who are really adding to the sites.

*Patricia Sanders, AEA President*, noted she was moved to comment after Member Jensen’s recruitment question. Ms. Sanders reminded the Board that AUSD is one of the lowest-paying districts in the county and it is hard for teachers to want to come here. We need to make it attractive and work to retain the teachers we have. Make them feel appreciated and compensate them fairly.

**Report on the Governor’s 2010/11 Budget Proposal**

Robert Shemwell, newly appointed Interim Chief Financial Officer, introduced the item.

- For the current year, 2009/10, the Governor’s January budget proposes no change in revenue limit funding, with the deficit factor remaining at 18.355%
- In 2010/11, the statutory cost of living adjustment (COLA) is negative -0.38% and is fully “funded”
- The deficit factor of 18.355% remains unchanged in the 2010/11 budget
- In addition to the negative COLA and the continuation of the 18.355% deficit factor, the Governor’s budget proposes an ongoing targeted cut of \$1.5B in 2010/11:
  - \$1.2B is aimed at “school district administrative costs”
  - \$300M assumed to follow from the “elimination of administrative costs”
- The Governor’s budget provides no specifics on how this will be implemented

Loss in AUSD Revenue 2010/11 (real dollars)

Ongoing (\$201) per ADA	
2009/10 P2 ADA = 9375	(\$1,884,375)
2010-2011 COLA (-0.38)	
2009-2010 P2 ADA = 9375	(\$225,000)
TOTAL:	(\$2,109,375)

The Governor's budget proposal includes significant policy reforms. Reforms will:

- Eliminate seniority as a consideration in employment decisions
- Allow layoff notification for teachers up to 60 days after the state budget is adopted
- Eliminate the requirement to give laid-off teachers priority as substitute teachers at their former pay rate
- Suspend most education mandates

Member Jensen clarified that the Governor can say he's not reducing funding to schools (even though we see reductions) because they are not in the revenue limit. Mr. Shemwell concurred, stating that the \$1.5B is aimed at administrative costs, not targeted at classrooms.

Member Spencer asked if it made sense for AUSD to look at becoming a basic aid district. Mr. Shemwell noted we don't get to choose; our status is determined by the amount of tax revenue the City takes in.

### **Alameda Unified School District Supplement to its Initial Proposal to the Alameda Education Association (AEA) for a Successor Agreement**

Consistent with the relevant provisions of the Educational Employment Relations Act (Government Code section 3540 *et seq.*), the District desires to supplement its initial bargaining proposal to AEA, dated February 24, 2009, to include a proposal to revise Article 14 – Salaries.

Ms. McLachlan-Fry explained that we are in the process of negotiations with teachers and are bringing this forward given our changing circumstances.

President Mooney opened the Public Hearing at 8:14 PM.

*Patricia Sanders, AEA President*, addressed the Board, asking specifically what the District is sunshining. Ms. McLachlan-Fry replied that Article 14, Salaries addresses the costs associated with certificated employees' compensation.

Ms. Sanders reiterated that to have good, quality public education, the District has to act accordingly. We need to be able to attract teachers and retain them, and looking at cutting into those salaries in addition to potentially changing work conditions is just asking more of teachers. The quality of education you end up with may not be what you're presenting over and over again. For many years, teachers have subsidized this District; we've taken zero when our counterparts have gotten increases. Please keep this in mind.

Hearing no further comments, President Mooney closed the Public hearing at 8:17 PM.

Member Spencer asked for an example what this would include. What does this mean exactly? Ms. McLachlan-Fry noted in order to bargain any item at the table, there has to be a process in which we have brought forward what we want to talk about in a public setting. Superintendent Vital cautioned that specifics cannot be discussed as that would be considered bargaining in

public. Member Jensen clarified that there is no proposal, this approval just gives us flexibility in terms of negotiations.

**MOTION: Member Mooney**

**SECONDED: Member McMahon**

That the Board approve the Alameda Unified School District Supplement to its Initial Proposal to the Alameda Education Association (AEA) for a Successor Agreement as presented.

AYES: Jensen, McMahon, Mooney, Tam

NOES: Spencer

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Reorganization of the District Office for Greater Service and Efficiencies – Part 1**

Barb Gee, efficiency expert, introduced the item. The objectives of the project were to:

- Identify opportunities to save District funds
- Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the District Office as the District Office moves to a service organization model in which its primary function is to support the schools in delivering a quality education to every student in Alameda
- To assure the Alameda community that the District Office is operating without waste
- To develop solid metrics by which the performance of the District Office can be continually monitored and improved

Ms. Gee reviewed, via PowerPoint presentation, the office redesign methodology and detailed Phase 1 and Phase 2.

Phase 1:

- 8 interviews conducted with the purpose of providing an overview of scope of work and getting input into Phase 2
- 3 focus groups were held: Principals, Teachers, Office Managers
  - For each District department, what's working/not working
  - Identification and prioritization of "major pain points"

Phase 2:

- Selection of processes heavily driven by focus group input
- 14 processes mapped
- Gap analysis performed for all 14 processes
- Gap analysis informed organizational recommendations
- 42 jobs analyzed
- Choice of jobs to review heavily driven by input from Directors in Phase 1

Organizational Recommendations:

Today:

- Human Resources
- Fiscal
- MOF
- Technology



- Change Management Plan (Part 1)

Next Board Meeting:

- Assessment
- Compliance/Curriculum
- Student Services
- Special Ed
- Change Management Plan (Part 2)

Ms. Gee reviewed the summary findings for the Human Resources, Fiscal, Technology, and MOF departments and offered recommendations.

President Mooney asked about the issues raised with APTA. Ms. Gee noted that enough flags were raised during the review – we need to relook at whether or not APTA is the right system.

Member Tam asked about the additional of a clerical position in Human Resources. Ms. Gee replied that more clerical support would help keep up with the day-to-day load and relieve people so they can help with the improvement process.

President Mooney noted budget cuts have impacted the district over the past years, but we still have to keep asking how we move forward. We may have to be even leaner. With regards to APTA, President Mooney wondered why the state doesn't certify software programs that work and provide a short list to districts from which to select.

President Mooney suggested reassessing where we are every 6 months.

Member McMahon clarified that at the time APTA was adopted, it was one of the first web-based softwares available that allowed sites to access budget information.

Member Spencer noted the cover page notes no fiscal implications as this is just information at this point, but notes that Phase 1 realizes \$463K cost savings with Phase 2 showing anywhere from \$109K to \$219K. Ms. Gee noted backup numbers will be shown after the second presentation.

### **Principal Learning Update**

Debbie Wong, Assistant Superintendent, introduced the item. In order to effect school improvement, one significant factor is to have a highly qualified principal in every school equipped to build a professional learning organization focused on high student achievement. In AUSD's theory of action, if we:

- Recruit, develop, support, and retain strong, learning-focused principals at each school;
- Hold them accountable for achieving ambitious goals;
- Allow tiered flexibility on how to meet those goals; and
- Support principals and the community through a service organization,

Our principals will have highly effective teachers, empower their communities, and create a vibrant, collaborative culture so that all students achieve at high levels.

Ms. Wong reviewed the Principal Course Organizer for 2009/2010, highlighting work with BayCES (Bay Area Coalition for Equitable Schools), SIM (Strategic Instruction Model), and Inquiry by Design – a new current pilot at Chipman, Lincoln, and Island.

Superintendent Vital noted she brought Inquiry By Design to this District and is excited about its implementation. The kind of work we're seeing is extraordinary. During a recent walkthrough at Island High, a student asked why we didn't implement this last year.

Member Spencer asked about efforts to recruit and develop principals from within. Ms. Wong noted the District does want to do that – to build the capacity of our teacher leaders to think about that role. Oftentimes, teachers and Vice Principals will take on summer school as a development process.

Member Spencer expressed concern about the number of principal hires from outside our own pool and noted she would like to see some focus on supporting our teachers so they would be the ones we would look to first.

Member Spencer also questions if having a principal in classrooms 2 hours per day was a good use of their time, and asked how the time limit was assigned. There are many other urgent matters principals need to attend to; what research supports this? Superintendent Vital noted it is not an arbitrary number, and there is a lot of research that supports principals being in the classrooms. This allows principals to participate in classroom observations, provide feedback, look at assessments, work at data, etc. to improve their instructional program.

Member Spencer asked how the schools were selected for the Inquiry by Design pilot. Superintendent Vital explained that all secondary schools were invited to look at the program. The point is now, more teachers are interested. Member Spencer asked for a breakdown of the cost of the program – training the teachers and the materials and substitute costs. Ms. Wong noted there will be another report in early spring which will detail the plan and its cost as part of the budget development process.

Member Tam added that many years ago, the District implemented an internship program. Through an agreement with AEA, it was possible for teachers to become interns for experience other than summer school. Member McMahon noted it is critical that principals are exposed to various programs and strategies as it helps throughout the entire district.

President Mooney noted he enjoyed looking at the course organizer as it lays out expectations. This is something we really need to do; everyone needs to know what's expected of them.

*Patricia Sanders, AEA President*, commented that she has had conversations with the Superintendent and discussed participation of many AEA members in the passport training. At times, some administrators are very good at communicating with teachers and letting them know what's going on, others not so much.

With regards to walkthroughs, being cognizant of what's going on in the classroom is sacred. Sometimes when you walkthrough, you upset the flow of the lesson.

**Approval of Resolution No. 10-0008 Intent to Reduce Classified Employees, California School Employees Association (CSEA – Chapter No. 27, Paraprofessional Unit)**

Ms. McLachlan-Fry introduced the item. A paraprofessional was hired to provide aid to a specific student, who has since withdrawn.

**MOTION: Member McMahan**

**SECONDED: Member Tam**

That the Board approve Resolution No. 10-0008 Intent to Reduce Classified Employees, California School Employees Association (CSEA – Chapter No. 27, Paraprofessional Unit).

AYES: Jensen, McMahan, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

**MOTION CARRIED**

**State of the District II – Graduation Rates, Drop Out Rates and Analysis of Advanced Placement Results**

Dr. Ruben Zepeda introduced the item. Quality of instructional programs in school districts can be measured using a variety of data sources. California's *Standards, Testing and Reporting* system also known as *STAR* provides the public with a wealth of data. The Academic Performance Index (API) and the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) measures provide another source of data to measure student success and program quality.

Graduation rates, drop out rates, completion of UC/CSU course requirements, SAT participation and Advanced Placement results provide system level information about students exiting schools at the end of their K-12 experience. The information presented provided District specific information gleaned from the 2005-2009 graduation rates, drop out rates, and Advanced Placement data reports.

Dr. Zepeda reviewed 2009 ELA CST results, 2009 Algebra 1 CST Grade 7 results and 2009 data.

Initial conclusions:

- Overall district-wide and at individual school levels, the instructional program is meeting the needs of most students as measured by state testing and state accountability reports.
- When data are disaggregated by student subgroups the instructional program at District and individual school levels result in performance and opportunity gaps and missed targets especially for African Americans, Hispanics, Students with Disabilities, English learners and socioeconomically disadvantaged students.

Dr. Zepeda reviewed alternative measures of success, high school graduation rates, high school drop out rates, UC/CSU eligibility rates, and College Board data (PSAT, SAT, AP).

Conclusions:

- At the high school level, the instructional program providing all students access to college appears to work for some groups of students, predominantly Asian and White students.
- The instructional program and other barriers at each high school appear to inhibit successful completion of a college prep program for many African American and Latino students.

Our action plan:

- Create a system of secondary school options
- Examine counseling supports for secondary students
- Examine supports and access programs for students
- Promote innovation and instructional initiatives at schools
- Create “certificate” options and career and college pathways through ROP, Adult Ed and Career Technical Education
- Continue to align afterschool programs to support classroom instruction
- Partner with CSU East Bay to participate in:
  - Mathematics Achievement Academies, Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II
  - On-line Math Remediation Program
  - Early College Program for seniors
  - Gateways: Cradle to Career Education and Workforce Partnership
- Continue to provide professional development for teachers, counselors and principals
- Examine BOE graduation policy for alignment of UC/CSU coursework
- Conduct a course audit for all secondary coursework for UC/CSU alignment

Member Jensen asked about the PSAT participation rate. Is there data that shows whether or not participating in the PSAT has an impact on college admittance since the PSAT is not required?

President Mooney asked if there were different prerequisites for getting into AP classes for the two comprehensive high schools. Member Spencer noted from her personal experience, there are prerequisite requirements for taking AP classes at Alameda High School because they are so impacted and don't have enough sections offered to meet the demand. At Encinal, anyone who wants to take an AP class may enroll. Member Spencer added she would like to see drop out % by ethnicity. Dr. Zepeda noted that data was not available from the state, but he tried to identify gaps in the numbers provided.

Member McMahon added he recently read a position paper from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation about their high school reform work and will send the link to Board Members. One thing they mentioned is that it is critical for institutions to really take a hard look at 9<sup>th</sup> graders. They not only struggle when they enter high school, but beyond. This is the biggest determinant of the drop out rate. If we have the ability to identify these struggling incoming students, we may help them survive by providing additional supports. We also need to recognize that we have a strong community college system and a fine institution with the College of Alameda – are there opportunities there where we can partner?

### **Approval of Alameda Unified School District Educational Technology Plan**

Jess Stephens, Technology Director, introduced the item. This updated AUSD Educational Technology Plan 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. Our goals

and objectives were established to meet the identified needs of integrating technology to improve student learning; providing equitable technology access and support; providing secure, timely information flow between home, school, and community; and providing coordinated, ongoing high quality educational and federal requirements for technology use plans and current and future standards related to technology during its life cycle.

Alameda Unified School District has established clear curricular goals tied to the academic content standards monitored by various district and site-based assessment systems, and referenced in comprehensive planning documents and efforts.

- Teachers will use technology to improve instruction and to assist students in meeting state language Arts, Social Studies, Science and Math content standards.
- All students in grades 4 through 8 will use curriculum-embedded or curriculum related technology resources on a regular basis to support the district's goal of having 90% of all students meeting grade level standards in Language Arts, Social Studies, Math and Science.
- Students will acquire and use the ISTE National Educational Technology Standards (NETS\*S) for Information and Communications literacy skills needed in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.
- Increase student, teacher and administrator awareness of legal and ethical use of the internet and other forms of electronic communication through a CyberEthics program of instruction that includes concepts and purpose of copyright and fair use, lawful and unlawful downloading, peer-to-peer file sharing, avoiding plagiarism, and understanding CyberBullying.
- Increase student, teacher and administrator awareness of safe, secure and ethical use of the internet and other forms of electronic communication through a Cybersafety program of instruction for students so that students understand how to protect their identify and remain safe from online predators.
- All students will have access to technology appropriate to their learning needs.

The district believes that teachers and administrators need professional development opportunities and the time to develop and practice the necessary skills to become proficient technology using educators. In an effort to have every teacher and administrator meet the level II professional proficiencies, as identified on the EdTech Profile, by 2013, the District will create a Training of Trainers program that will be directed by the Teacher on Special Assignment. This training will be aligned to the professional teacher's proficiency in Computer-Based Technology standards detailed in the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Standards 9 and 16 – (for the Multiple and/or Single Subject Teaching Credential) Using Technology to Support Student Learning.

- Teachers will utilize technology to support student record keeping, access student assessment data, and administer assessments in order to support their efforts to meet individual student academic needs.
- List of clear goals and a specific implementation plan to utilize technology to make teachers and administrators more accessible to parents.
- AUSD site administrators and teachers will become proficient with the same general technology skills, and information literacy skills required of students as well as proficient with work specific productivity tools.

- AUSD site administrators, teachers and district support staff will become proficient in the use of technology to improve student achievement data collection, analysis, reporting and decision making.
- AUSD site administrators and teachers will become proficient in the use of technology to improve two-way communication between home and school.

Economic conditions in California and the nation will continue to impact K-12 education budgets and grants through the duration of our tech plan. Therefore, our established and potential funding sources to implement our Educational Technology Plan may be impacted as well:

- Technology funding and budget planning will take place on an ongoing basis guided by the goals and objectives of this plan.
- All AUSD students will have access to up-to-date computers and appropriate software to support achievement of the district’s academic standards in the classroom, district curricular goals, and ultimately for lifelong learning and success in our digital society.
- AUSD will continue to improve and maintain the infrastructure at district schools as needed.
- All AUSD school sites will have access to timely district or site technical support so teachers and students have access to technology needed to support standards in the classroom, district curricular goals, and ultimately for lifelong learning and success in our digital society.

Member Spencer questioned the low percentage of teachers participating with technology, noting the plan states it will take 3-4 years before we get to the maximum of 80-90% participation.

**MOTION: Member Mooney**

**SECONDED: Member McMahan**

That the Board approve the Alameda Unified School District Educational Technology Plan as presented.

AYES: Jensen, McMahan, Mooney, Tam

NOES: Spencer

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Board Member Reports**

Member Spencer noted she attended the Chamber mixer, Alice Lai-Bitker’s “Health is Not Just Healthcare” meeting, and commended the Kiwanis on the Special Olympics bowling event. Member Spencer encouraged everyone to buy raffle tickets for the Ruby Bridges fundraiser.

**ADJOURNMENT:** President Mooney adjourned the meeting at 10:32 PM.