

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 5:04 PM.

PRESENT: Jensen, McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

ABSENT: None

PUBLIC COMMENT: None at this time.

ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION: By President McMahon at 5:07 PM to discuss Student Discipline/Expulsion/Readmit (1 case); Public Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release; Conference with Labor Negotiator Laurie McLachlan-Fry: AEA, CSEA, ACSA; Conference with Legal Counsel Regarding Anticipated Litigation – Significant Exposure to Litigation Pursuant to Subdivision (b) of Section 54956.9 (2 cases).

RECONVENE TO PUBLIC SESSION: by President McMahon at 6:30 PM.

CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Board of Education Members 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 Tam

SECONDED: Member Jensen

That the Board of Education adopt the agenda as submitted with the following changes: consider public agenda items in this order – F-1, F-2, E-7, F-6, F-7, F-3, F-5, F-4, E-9, 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 (Kleinman, Thomas-Knight, Worcester); 4 resignations (Baddell, Broome, Gilbert, Ryle); 1 retirement (Lopez); 1 leave of absence (Zunguze); 5 changes of status (Botts, Crawford, Kruger, Passmore, Valler).

+Classified Personnel Actions: The Board of Education approved 19 appointments (Anderson-Barrett, Edwards, Rowe, Love-Sangco, Solares, Sutton, Boyington, Hsu, Limpiada, Solares); 2 resignations (Wirrom, Wright), 5 changes of status (Huang, Moreira, Walker, Whittington, Woods).

+Approval of Bill Warrants and Payroll Registers: The Board approved warrants numbered 851518-851526, 851527-851527, 851528-851542, 851544-851684.

+Resolution No. 09-0016 Approval of Budget Transfers, Increases, Decreases

+Proclamation: Public Schools Month – April 2009

+Proclamation: Cesar Chavez Day – March 31, 2009

+California High School Exit Exam Waiver for Students with Special Needs

+Approval of ROP Course Descriptions Between AUSD and Bay Area School of Enterprise

/Alternatives in Action: Legal Studies

+Approval of ROP Course Descriptions Between AUSD and Bay Area School of Enterprise

/ Alternatives in Action: Sociology of Education

+One Time Site Discretionary Funding Proposals – Haight Elementary School

+Donations

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of the regular meeting of March 10, 2009 were considered.

MOTION: Member Mooney

SECONDED: Member Spencer

That the Board of Education approve the minutes of the regular meeting of March 10, 2009 with the following corrections: Page 7, change “that needs to be part of a future conversation” to “classroom availability at other sites needs to be part of a future conversation”; Page 10, change “32 fewer administrators” to “30 fewer administrators”.

AYES: Jensen, McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

MOTION CARRIED

COMMUNICATIONS:

Written Correspondence: Since the last Board meeting on March 10, 2009, the Board has received 1 e-mail regarding Gifted and Talented Education funding; 1 e-mail regarding enrollment, budget, and API scores; 13 e-mails opposed to the Safe Schools Curriculum and 19 e-mails in support of the Safe Schools Curriculum.

Superintendent’s Report: Superintendent Kirsten Vital noted she is continuing to visit sites as part of her listening campaign; staff will come back to the Board in the next couple months with a public hearing around math adoption items; she attended “RENT” at Encinal High School, an incredible production; she attended “Zombie Prom” at Alameda High School, which is still playing; this Saturday is the EHS Crab Feed; tonight, Superintendent Vital will be presenting a framework for the Master Plan and is looking forward to feedback from the Board; lastly, Assistant Superintendent is out on medical leave for at least the next month, maybe 3 months. We have hired retired administrators to help cover this position – Margie Sherratt, Carole Robie, and Sue Woerhle – who are generously working in partnership to cover Debbie’s role while she is out.

Oral Communications – Non-Agenda Items: *Stephanie Palmer* addressed the Board regarding accommodations for her special needs son that have yet to be met. Jess Stephens has been wonderfully supportive, but so far, her son has only received one of the needed textbooks. Ms. Palmer pleaded with the Board to ensure that her son’s accommodations are met.

Superintendent Vital assured Ms. Palmer that we will follow-up and at the next Board meeting, this issue will be an item that the Superintendent will report back on in her report.

Cyndy Wasko, Family Literacy, thanked the Board for their support of the Alameda Family Literacy

Program, which is in its 9th year. The program is happy to know they have a home for next year. Secondly, Ms. Wasko noted that as a community, we are blessed with several agencies and organizations that provide for social service needs for the children and families in Alameda. AUSD alone cannot meet the needs of the children they teach, and children cannot learn effectively if basic needs are not met. In many situations the past few years, AUSD has not been a leader in forming collaborative partnerships. We can no longer stand on the sidelines. We need to get involved. Lastly, money is always on our minds and we have an incredible opportunity with the new stimulus package. There are many opportunities that require AUSD to partner with other local groups to provide services to children not traditionally served otherwise. It's time for creative program development and creative, innovative partnerships. We need to think in fresh ways in order to educate our children. There are many grants available right now that have very quick timelines – we have to act, know what our vision is, and be courageous about it. We need strong leadership that's going to take us in these new directions.

Superintendent Vital added staff is working with Alameda Family Literacy together on Community Schools and McKinney-Vento grants, but will follow-up.

Vickie Smith, McKinney Vento, addressed the Board and thanked them for their support of the West End community. Ms. Smith provided a brief snapshot of her family's history in Alameda, noting how through her years here, she has seen families moving out, schools closing, and low-income housing being evicted. Ms. Smith noted she questions how long she can stay before she herself is pushed out. How can anyone say they will enrich and improve the community that they have not included in their own discussions?

Oral Communications – Consent Items: Member Spencer noted the Proclamation for Public Schools Month and thanked the community for their support. Member Spencer also noted Cesar Chavez Day on March 31, 2009.

Student Board Member Reports

Student Board Member Quach from Alameda High School noted the WASC visiting committee was enthusiastic and welcoming; leadership students provided the tour and met for lunch to discuss how students viewed the school; Junior Prom tickets on sale 3/9 – event will be at the Scottish Rite Temple; Counselors are programming for the 2009/10 school year; AP and HP classes are hosting informational meetings; leadership held an information meeting yesterday about next year's leadership class; seeking artwork for the literary anthology; Spring musical matinee on 3/29; Sophomore fundraiser at Viva Mexico; Voyagers planning Spring Break trip to Greece; Key Club planning trip to district convention.

Student Board Member Ramos from ASTI reported the first spelling bee is Thursday 3/26 with Superintendent Vital to serve as guest judge; Last Friday, community service group held a carnival to create volunteer opportunities; Prom tickets on sale; Sophomore information night – SAT and college information; Laney Flea Market sale postponed to this Sunday to raise money for the Southern California college trip.

Student Board Member Reed added the musical production “RENT” finished its amazing 2-week run and received a standing ovation at the end of each performance with Saturday being the largest audience ever; seniors are receiving and awaiting acceptances; Norman Yau is a finalist for the Gates Millennial Scholarship and Van Sickle Scholarship; Leadership will hold its second blood drive; Saturday night is the Crab Feed; Comcast has adopted EHS and is sponsoring a day of Community Beautification on Saturday, April 25; AHS and EHS are teaming up for grad night fundraisers with a staff basketball battle on Friday, April 17.

Student Board Member Kesete from Island noted there has been one more graduate since the last meeting; Leadership is hosting “Spirit Week”; results of the February exit exam – 15 students passed Math, 15

students passed English; 4th hex awards – 29 students earned a 3.5 GPA or higher, 48 students earned 15 credits or higher.

Calendar Review: President McMahon reviewed the calendar of events.

Closed Session Action Report: The Board designated Superintendent Kirsten Vital as the district client representative in matters of ongoing litigation with one dissenting vote.

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

Approval of Community Learning Center Schools, Inc. Nea Proposition 39 Facilities Request – Longfellow Site

The District timely received the Nea Community Learning Center's ("Nea") request to provide facilities in accordance with Proposition 39. Nea specifically requested facilities at the Longfellow Education Center (LEC) to house its 292.6 2009-10 projected in-district classroom ADA.

On February 12, 2009, the District provided Nea with a Preliminary Facilities Proposal expressing its willingness to offer space at LEC to accommodate Nea's in-district classroom ADA for the 2009-10 school year. Following Nea's receipt of the District's Preliminary Proposal, the District has held several meetings with representatives of Nea and with organizations and district programs currently housed at LEC, including visits to the LEC site, to facilitate negotiations regarding the space that will be provided to Nea in a Final Facilities offer.

The organizations and district programs at LEC are: Adult Family Literacy and Preschool Classes, McKinney Vento Homeless, Multi-Cultural Center, Head Start Preschool, Alameda Education Foundation, Project pipeline, After-School (ASES), Adult English Learners (CBET) and Food Service. Many of the programs will stay at LEC or they are in current discussions with the Director of Maintenance, Operations and Facilities for a suitable location at another site. Communications with the representatives from these programs have been very productive and cooperative.

While the District is still negotiating with Nea and working out the specifics regarding the space that will be offered, the District will be providing Nea with exclusive use of 11 rooms for classrooms, exclusive and shared use of other rooms for specialized classrooms and non-teaching space at LEC, including a multi-purpose room.

The District will provide its Final Facilities offer to Nea by April 1, 2009, as required by Proposition 39. Nea will then have up until May 1, 2009, to notify the District if it intends to occupy the offered space. The parties will subsequently finalize a Facilities Use Agreement outlining the parties' responsibilities related to Nea's use of LEC, which will come before the Board for approval likely in May 2009.

Pursuant to Proposition 39, the District is obligated to make facilities available to Nea for the 2009-10 school year that are sufficient to accommodate all of Nea's in-district students in conditions "reasonably equivalent" to those in which the students would be accommodated if they were attending other public schools of the District. The facilities provided must also include reasonably equivalent equipment and furnishings necessary to conduct classroom instruction and to provide for student services that directly support classroom instruction. The benchmark of what is reasonably equivalent is the schools in the Encinal High School attendance area.

Costs associated with placing Nea at LEC approximate \$250K which includes fire alarm upgrade (Bond fund) and relocation services/site work (Capital Facility fund).

For the 2009-10 school year, the District will provide Nea with substantially rent-free facilities. As a result, the District shall charge Nea the actual costs of supervisory oversight in an amount not to exceed three (3) percent of the revenue of Nea pursuant to Education Code section 47613(b).

Member Spencer asked for more detail regarding which organizations will stay at LEC and which will not. Tim Rahill, Chief Financial Officer, noted that up to this point, Adult Family Literacy, the Preschool, Multi-Cultural Center, Head Start, and McKinney-Vento are staying at the site. Staff has contacted the others and are working with them to locate a suitable location at another site. Member Spencer asked if other facilities were being considered. Superintendent Vital noted yes, the former Island High School, Woodstock, and Longfellow were all considered. Member Spencer urged staff to give the organizations that serve families priority at Longfellow and/or Woodstock.

President McMahon added that LEC has been used for District training events and asked if that would continue. Superintendent Vital noted it will be continue to be used in that capacity, and staff is looking at ways to deal with the parking in order to do that.

Request for Proposals (RFP) for Two (2) Special Education Transportation Companies

Susan Mitchell, Special Education Director, introduced the item. Education Code Section 56040 states: "Every individual with exceptional needs, who is eligible to receive educational instruction, related services, or both *under this part* [Part 30] shall receive such educational instruction, services, or both, at no cost to his or her parents or, as appropriate, to him or her." Special education transportation is defined in federal regulation 934 *CFR*. (Section 300.34) as a related service. Transportation IS Required to be provided if it is necessary for the student to benefit from special education instruction. IN addition, as required for any special education program, the service must be provided to meet the criteria for a free, appropriate public education.

For the 2007-08 school year, NR SELPA contracted with Durham for about \$700,000. There were service issues in regards to student time on the bus, late pick-ups and numerous parent complaints.

NR SELPA contracted with American Logistics Company (ALC) to provide transportation for our Special Education Students for the 2008-09 school year. The costs were originally estimated to be \$1.3M and are now projected to be \$1.5M. The cost for transportation services has almost doubled from 2007-08 to 2008-09. Alameda would like to provide cost effective transportation services to eligible special education students for the 2009-2010 school year.

MOTION: Member Mooney

SECONDED: Member Tam

That the Board of Education approve the Request for Proposals (RFP) for Two (2) Special Education Transportation Companies.

AYES: Jensen, McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

MOTION CARRIED

Resolution No. 09-0017 Intent to Grant City of Alameda Right of Entry to Maintain Storm Drain at Woodstock Education Center (Woodstock School)

The City of Alameda has requested that the District grant it an easement for the recently completed City of Alameda Storm Drain Improvements at Woodstock Education Center (Woodstock School). Education Code Section 17556 permits the Board to grant this easement by a two-step process. The Board must adopt a resolution by a two-thirds vote of the entire Board, announcing the Board's intention to act, and schedule this publicly noticed hearing on the issue at a regular Board meeting at least ten days later. The

process is completed after this public hearing, if the Board votes by a two-thirds majority to grant the easement. If no petition is received signed by at least ten percent of Alameda's qualified voters protesting this easement, the resolution can be granted. The requested permanent easement will allow the City of Alameda to maintain the storm drain at Woodstock School. Staff therefore recommends that the Board announces its intention to act, and schedule a public hearing on this issue at the next regular Board meeting.

Member Spencer noted the resolution is dated April 7 and the next meeting is April 14.

MOTION: Member Mooney

SECONDED: Member Spencer

That the Board of Education approve Resolution No. 09-0017 Intent to Grant City of Alameda Right of Entry to Maintain Storm Drain at Woodstock Education Center (Woodstock School), changing the April 7 date on the Resolution to April 14.

AYES: Jensen, McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

MOTION CARRIED

Master Plan Process Update

Superintendent Vital introduced the item. The new Superintendent and Board of Education wish to begin the process of crafting a Master Plan for the Alameda Unified School District. While we have been able to mitigate the continuous budget cuts and financial crisis forced upon us by the State of California with Measure H funds, we need to address the long-term needs of the District and discuss various ideas for long-term solutions.

The purpose of this item is to introduce the community to the overall Master Plan process and agree upon the outcomes and timelines with the intent of completing the Master Plan by December 2009.

Superintendent Vital reviewed the Master Plan 3 Possible Scenarios:

Scenario 1: Examine if you can educate a student on the funding the State of California provides

Scenario 2: Examine AUSD becoming a charter district with conversion, independent, and dependent charters

Scenario 3: Examine what the total cost is to educate a student in Alameda (including support programs and enrichment) and ask the Alameda community to support the delta between what is provided by the state and the actual cost

Scenario 1 – Questions to Consider

- What is the impact on educational programs based on \$5,575 per ADA in a declining enrollment district?
- Do we have to close schools?
- How will we solve the overcrowding in the east and decline in the west?
- Would there be one high school?
- Would we have to increase class size?
- How will we be able to give fair and competitive compensation to our employees?
- Would we have to reduce electives, art, music, athletics and other extra-curricular activities?
- What is the impact on facilities?

Preliminary Steps:

- School Services of California can do analysis on the impact on education programs based on \$5,575 per ADA in a declining enrollment district

- Propose a Board of Education Master Plan Workshop for May 19, 2009 (alternative Tuesday from Board Meetings)
- Proposed cost is \$10,000

Scenario 2 – Questions to Consider:

- Do all schools have to be either a conversion, dependent, or independent charter? We will examine other districts in this case study and do the financial analysis of the impacts
- Would we bring in a charter management organization (Aspire, Greendot, Kipp) to run some of the schools?
- What is the “tipping point” of enrollment (district vs. charter) needed to sustain core services for district schools? What is the law?
- What services would the charters be asked to buy from the District through an MOU process?
- What would the core District Office look like to support facilities, finance and achievement monitoring?
- How much-if any-additional funding would the district receive from the state?
- What would be the role of the Board of Education?

Preliminary Steps:

- We have a Masters of Business Administration (MB) Masters in Education candidate student from Stanford who can work with us on doing this analysis and the case study
- Our analysis can be concluded by the June 2, 2009 proposed Master Plan Board of Education Workshop
- Proposed cost = no fiscal cost; 1 credit for degree and indirect staff time

Scenario 3 – Questions to Consider:

- What is our vision of education for every student in Alameda?
- How will we solve the overcrowding on the East vs the under-enrollment on the West?
- What facilities will be needed to support these efforts?
- Will we offer greater programmatic choice?
- Will we offer more robust arts, music, athletics, and other extra curricular programs?
- What role would technology play in our plan?
- How can we consider the stimulus monies?

Preliminary Steps:

- Solicit input from community on vision and needs
- Hire School Services of California to do an analysis to determine costs of programs and choices to support the vision
- This case study work would occur during the months of August (18th), September (15th / 29th), October (2nd); November (3rd / 17th); and December. Our analysis should be concluded by the December 15, 2009 proposed Board of Education Master Plan Workshop meeting
- Proposed cost = \$10,000 for School Services of California; \$50,000 for facilitation and communications

Timeline:

4/12: What do we already know from previous work?
 5/19: Community Workshop, Scenario 1
 6/2: Community Workshop, Scenario 2
 8/18: Scenario 3

9/15, 9/29, 10/20, 11/3, 11/17: Scenario 3 topics as decided by analysis
12/15: Proposed Final Master Plan

Next Steps:

- BOE feedback to Superintendent on process
- Superintendent to hire support services to help do the work
- Begin fiscal and facilities analysis
- Superintendent to form a Master Plan Planning Committee to support process
- Review work of prior years' task forces
- Build on existing feedback loops
- Build a Communication Plan

Superintendent Vital reviewed the communication feedback loop, which was originally constructed under the previous Superintendent, Ardella Dailey.

Patricia Sanders, AEA President, noted the timeline shows a potential Workshop on May 19 which is the day of the Special Election, which may limit public participation. Ms. Sanders suggested selecting a different date. Ms. Sanders also noted teachers need to be considered as stakeholders at the table and be involved.

Member Jensen noted she agrees with Ms. Sanders – the communication feedback loop should be disregarded because part of the process was never realized. It should be considered a remnant. Member Jensen noted she would like to hear feedback from the many groups that were previously formed if they arrived at any consensus points.

President McMahon added that the communication feedback loops were adopted from the prior task force process. We had task forces who went off to do work revolving around pulling together educational community experts to begin to look at various issues and problem statements. Task force members were responsible for taking information and feeding it back – this diagram represents that process. There will be many opportunities for the public to see the work of this group that's coming forward. But at what point do we re-examine feedback we received on Scenario 1 and 2?

Member Tam concurred with President McMahon's comments, adding that one of the things we need to do as a Board is reflect on the pros and cons of what happened in the past. Decisions were made based on certain factors at the time. Member Tam commended Superintendent Vital on being very transparent with regards to the different scenarios, albeit an ambitious timeline. Once we go to one scenario, we need to make sure we go back and reflect.

Member Spencer added that for Scenario 3, the meeting with the public is scheduled for August 18 when most people would be on vacation. It is important that it be moved up so all 3 are treated similarly and held before summer. There should be no meetings during the summer vacation that impacts our community to this extent. Member Mooney clarified that Scenario 3 runs from August 18 through November.

Member Spencer noted the first meeting should take place after September. Member Mooney noted that this is important, and unfortunately is a trade-off. There is some sense of urgency, and we need to hold ourselves to having discussions and bringing items forward in a timely timeframe in order to make the best decisions.

Superintendent Vital noted these dates are placeholders and can be moved to whatever dates the majority of the Board feels work best.

Member Spencer suggested having 2 meetings in September, 2 in October, and 2 in November to avoid any summer meetings. Member Spencer asked for clarification on the Planning Committee.

Superintendent Vital replied that the Planning Committee would be made up of “think tank” people who would serve on a Superintendent’s Committee to help her think about how we can do this work. Member Spencer voiced her opposition to having a small group make these decisions and expressed concern that people will be left out and excluded. Member Spencer added she envisions a process that includes everyone that wants to attend and can express all opinions.

Superintendent Vital assured the Board that we are not excluding anyone from this process, but as Superintendent, she needs a small group working with her for analysis, facilitation, and communication; people in a room to help the Superintendent think about this as we present it. It’s not about decision-making and doing something behind closed doors, but about the Superintendent to get support to do this work. Superintendent Vital added she is looking to the Board to support her in doing this process on an accelerated schedule.

Member Mooney added the meetings scheduled are opportunities for members of the public to voice their opinions and concerns as part of an open process. Member Spencer again voices her concern that certain people will be on the committee and others are not. Member Jensen noted she is confident that the process will be transparent, supportive of the Superintendent’s process and timeline.

Member Spencer expressed concern about spending money and then not making a decision at the end. It’s important we commit to doing this if we’re going to spend \$70K or more. Member Spencer requested that all scenarios be presented positively to be unbiased in presentations. Superintendent Vital noted that she has met with over 100 people, and these are the questions that come up as they’ve asked.

President McMahon added it seems the community doesn’t seem to engage until there’s some level of finality or a direction that seems concrete. You need to readjust your perspective in this case simply because the process we’re trying to accomplish is a dialogue. We want you all to reserve judgment, but keep engaged in the process. We will continue to provide as many opportunities to be kept aware of the process as possible. President McMahon noted he is not concerned about having an August meeting as the District runs 12 months a year, and teachers and staff are preparing to come back at that time. We can attempt to publicize these dates and make sure individuals who are unavailable for any particular meeting have the ability to see any documentation upon request. The Superintendent needs people with expertise outside this little island with the ability to look outside to find the best processes and practices out there to help her process what it takes to make this a model district.

Member Mooney urged the public to become involved in this process.

School Board Stipends and Health Benefits

Up to until June 30, 2008, the Alameda Unified School District (AUSD) paid each Board Member a \$300/month stipend and paid for health benefits if the Board Member elected to take health benefits. Effective July 1, 2008, the school Board took action to stop paying the stipend and health benefits for Board Members.

Of the eleven (11) Alameda County School Districts which responded to our inquiry, ten (10) provide a stipend to Board Members and nine (9) provide health benefit coverage.

If AUSD reinstates the Board stipend, the cost would be \$18,000/year for a stipend of \$300/month for each of the five Board Members. Additional costs would be incurred if health benefits were provided to the Board (same health payments as teachers). Depending on the health plan selected, (single, 2-party, or

family), the cost for five Board Members could range from \$27,067 to \$40,037 per year. The cost of the stipend and health benefits could be covered by the District's reserve for multi-year projections.

Member Mooney requested a copy of the Ed Code relating to Board Member stipends be provided to the Board.

Member Spencer asked what our classified staff receive for benefits and what expenses do Board Members get reimbursed for in regards to attending conferences and events. Mr. Rahill replied that with classified staff, it ranges from \$370 - \$570 per month, which does not cover the full cost of the monthly health premium.

Member Jensen noted that the district pays for Board Member travel but not per diem. Previously, the monthly stipend was enough to cover any expenses incurred. Member Jensen asked staff to come up with some methodology for reimbursement, mileage, subscriptions, meals, etc. vs providing a stipend to determine which is most effective. Superintendent Vital noted it would be more work to do reimbursements than provide a monthly stipend.

Member McMahon clarified that Board business is related to educational or other events just as employees attend professional development trainings and activities. Member Mooney requested a copy of the District's reimbursement policy, and suggested any event outside the district should require a majority vote of the Board.

Student Board Member Ramos from ASTI asked about mileage reimbursement for Student Board Members. Superintendent Vital noted staff will bring this item forward at a future meeting.

Categorical Program Budget Review Part II

The Alameda Unified School District (AUSD) provides various programs that are funded by special-purpose funds, better known as "Categorical Programs". The Program Directors presented data on their programs to Executive Cabinet (EC), which includes the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Chief Financial Officer, and the Chief Human Resources Officer. The Program Directors used Data Gathering Templates which provided narratives, costs and outcome data. The programs were divided into two parts. Part 1 was presented at the Board meeting on March 10, 2009.

Superintendent Vital added we are not at a point of making recommendations, but will bring back at the end of April. Tonight, staff is showing how we're currently spending out dollars.

Categorical Program Review Part II items covered:

- Title 1
- Community-Based English Tutoring (CBET)
- Special Education
- After School Programs
- School Safety
- Health & Safety
- Gifted & Talented
- Professional Development Buyback Days
- Peer Assistance & Review (PAR)
- Targeted instructional Improvement
- Discretionary Block Grant
- Medi-Cal Billing

Title 1

Suzanne Bryant, Director – English Language Development & Categorical Programs, reviewed the Title 1 items, noting that allocations are made according to a rubric we've set up with fiscal services. Part of it has to do with what is allowed for indirect, central services, and what is required for Program Improvement (20% of entire amount must be set aside for school choice), plus \$50K for each site for a literacy coach. The remainder is divided based upon the number of free/reduced lunch students. Each elementary school gets an allocation based upon the number of free and reduced lunch, which takes the majority of funding because we have emphasized early intervention. There is a modest amount set aside for Chipman and Wood and that also goes towards things they are implementing to help with low-achieving students.

Staff did look into becoming our own support provider. We could establish another entity, and that entity would have to compete with the commercial entities.

President McMahon asked what is the threshold for becoming a Title 1 school. Ms. Bryant noted 40% of students on free/reduced lunch would qualify for Title 1 status. That is generally what we look at. At the elementary level, Lum and Paden are trending towards the 40% threshold. We've never gone to the high school level because of the division of the early intervention model. As a district, we've chosen to focus on elementary and concentrate the funding at that level.

Member Spencer requested revisiting the allocation so we give the same amount to each site, regardless of level. Why is EHS left out? The middle schools receive significantly less, yet based upon our test scores, our middle and high school students are not being supported. Are students receiving the early intervention the same students we see in middle and high school? What is the transient rate?

Superintendent Vital added we will bring back recommendations in April, based on our Theory of Action. There are different kinds of monies spent on different schools. For example, EHS doesn't have Title 1 money, but they do have SLIG, FUSION, and other buckets of money that pay for services. We will be able to show which buckets of money have supported which students.

Member Spencer noted that she continues to hear concerns from the community that citizens pay parcel taxes and students from outside Alameda do not.

Community-Based English Tutoring (CBET)

Member Spencer asked why there is a carryover amount of \$64K. Ms. Bryant replied that there are a couple reasons – when Prop 227 passed and initiated CBET back in 1998, 2 years of funding was given in the first year of implementation. We never used that surplus that we started with. Also, the size of CBET hinges upon the requirements for CBET at school sites. Currently, we are at 8 different sites. According to space and days we can provide services at certain sites, we have lived within our means and still have the surplus we essentially started with. If the state completely eliminated funding, we could still operate for another year or two; that would be the benefit of keeping the surplus.

Member Jensen asked how tutoring was monitored. Ms. Bryant noted tutoring is usually provided by adult friends and families in the home. Our CBET teachers have ongoing feedback from families when they come each week that is non-threatening and informal to solicit feedback regarding tutoring. We teach in English, but are fortunate to have teachers who speak Cantonese, Mandarin, and Spanish.

Member Jensen suggested this would be a good partner for Adult Ed, with a focus on supporting job training and job readiness. Ms. Bryant noted services are offered near elementary schools where families can walk to get services and the classes are quite small. Staff wouldn't want some over-arching requirements for attendance or testing to eliminate the small-group feel.

Special Education

Susan Mitchell, Director of Special Education, introduced the item. With regards to transportation, 163 students participate in transportation services at a cost of \$1.5M. Member Jensen asked about the eligibility requirements for transportation. Ms. Mitchell replied that it depends on the student needs, disability, aide, and distance. When the student doesn't attend their home school, it is our obligation to transport.

Member Jensen asked how sites are determined for placing SDC classes. Is it by population in that area?

Ms. Mitchell noted all the schools have resource specialist programs and many have mild to moderate SDC classes. A part of it has to do with space, but also shared responsibility to house SDC. The goal is for all students to have a program at their neighborhood schools. But as programs become more specific, there are not enough students at each site to provide a class. As we move forward in the long-term, we are looking at it again to make sure we are providing SDC classes at the best possible sites.

Member Jensen requested a breakdown by grade level and whether or not students are attending classes at their neighborhood schools. Superintendent Vital added that is something we are currently looking at to determine how to offer a continuation of program and getting programs back to the home schools.

ASES, 21st Century, ASSET

Member Spencer asked about students attending – can we breakdown by subgroup? What is the percentage eligible and how often do they attend?

School Safety

Member Spencer asked for a break down of the percentage of subgroups at sites. Superintendent Vital noted the breakdown of this data by site is connected to the demographics of that site.

Health & Safety

Superintendent Vital noted staff is thinking about how to measure some of these pieces. Member Spencer noted that bullying seems to be mentioned, and it's not clear we are doing enough work to reduce bullying. The #1 reason students reported being bullied is for racial reasons. How does this relate to our achievement gap? Maybe we should emphasize a reduction in racial tension at all our sites. This could result in increased achievement for all students.

President McMahon asked if there was any way to measure the impact of the DARE program. Wendy Ponder, Director of K-12 Curriculum, noted that DARE is one of the many programs that were coordinated and it's hard to factor one program out over another.

Gifted & Talented Education

Member Spencer asked about the \$62K carryover. Is it possible to allocate more money to sites to help improve serving those students? Ms. Ponder responded that there has been an interesting situation recently in our region. We usually send teachers to professional development through the County Office as there are several GATE trainers who help certify teachers. We have set aside money to send several teachers but unfortunately, a neighboring district recently enrolled all their staff and took all the available seats, so AUSD was locked out of training which left us with carryover. We have learned that we should potentially offer training in house ourselves so we're not reliant on the impact of regional decisions.

Member Spencer asked if staff has considered testing at another grade level to better identify and serve GATE students. Ms. Ponder noted at this time students are tested based on referrals above the 3rd grade. Testing costs \$15,000 per grade level.

President McMahon asked if allocation is a set, fixed number and how much of the allocation is actually making it into the classroom? Member Mooney asked for more information about how many students are referred to GATE.

Peer Assistance Review

Member Spencer asked about the \$72K carryover. Laurie McLachlan-Fry, Chief Human Resources Officer, noted she inherited this program and honestly does not know why there is so much carryover except we had more referral teachers. Due to different circumstances, they did not participate. We are looking at how to build a positive feeling about PAR so it is not always seen as a negative, but as a support mechanism. We are reviewing how the funds have been allocated in the past and how we can use them in a different way to make sure that teachers who need additional support can get it.

Buyback Days

Member Spencer asked how much money is spent on these various buyback days specifically? It appears some money could be spent on race relations, and it's unclear as to whether or not that topic is covered. Superintendent Vital noted there are recommendations around the math plan and staff is also looking at professional development throughout the year. As a district, we want to focus on supporting math development and we need to think about how we support teachers and administrators in implementing these strategies.

Member Spencer asked about the \$950K carryover. Mr. Rahill noted that this grant was originally the 3 buyback days the state provided funding for, which was rolled into a block grant. It was used to pay for salaries for staff attending those 3 days. Now that it is part of a new block grant, districts were given the option to use the funds for professional development activities. Over the years, the carryover has built up and currently, we have over \$200K being used for professional development, and just over \$400K going to pay for salaries for buyback days. We are looking to spend \$400K on staff development in the coming year.

Member Spencer asked for specifics on how much money we've spent on these and other trainings, and expressed concern that we are not doing enough work to close the achievement gap and discuss race relations.

Targeted Instructional Improvement

Superintendent Vital noted as we move forward, we are looking at doing some journaling and thinking of these funds in a different way as we move the Copy Center to the general fund. We will look at general fund items that could be moved to TIG, as it should really be about innovation.

Member Spencer asked about the carryover amount of \$423K. Mr. Rahill noted funds are used to pay for the Copy Center, to which all sites have access. However, the funds were not fully tapped into and a carryover has developed over the years. Member Spencer added that as the former PTA Council President, she knows that at some of our sites, teachers are very restricted as to the number of copies they can make and would solicit the PTA to cover costs or go without. Why are parents and teachers being asked to fund copies when we have \$423K carryover? Superintendent Vital noted staff will be bringing back an item regarding copying and recycling for our Earth Day presentation in April.

Discretionary Block Grants

Member Spencer asked what is the variety of uses covered. Superintendent Vital noted this is a very open category that doesn't have the same strings attached. Again, this is something we inherited. This is money set aside to pay for OPEB, which we didn't have to pay for after all, so it was freed up. Staff is recommending using these funds to make up for the budget shortfall. It can be used for many, many different things.

Budget Categorical Flexibility Information

As an option to address the reduction in school funding, the State has allowed the use of special-purpose funds (called Categorical Programs) for the general operations of the school district. This is called Categorical Flexibility and requires a Public Hearing.

For 2008/09, staff is proposing using \$800,000 from the Adult Education Program. No current use was designated for these funds and after this transfer, the Adult Ed Fund will still have an 11% reserve. \$350,000 reduction in General Fund Contribution the Facilities Routine Restricted Maintenance. This reduction in current year funding will be covered by the same amount that this program had in carryover. This would equal \$1.2M for 2008/09.

For 2009/10, staff is proposing using \$340,000 transfer from the state contribution to the Facilities Deferred Maintenance Program. These funds would have been applied to future facility projects on the 5-year Deferred Maintenance Plan, and such projects will be covered by this separate fund's reserve of more than \$3M. \$448,000 from TIG, which has no current plan for expenditure. This would equal \$0.8M for 2009/10.

Categorical Carryover & Other for 2009/10

Categorical Carryover: \$634K from Professional Development Buyback Days (no current plan for expenditure. After this transfer, there is still \$275K available for professional development on math instruction)

Categorical Carryover: \$218K from one-time District Block Grant (this was going to be used for the district's annual retiree health benefit obligation, which has already been covered by the current budget)

Other: \$120K reduction in the District Match to the Facilities Deferred Maintenance Program (these funds would have been applied to future facility projects on the 5-year Deferred Maintenance Plan, and such projects will be covered by this separate fund's reserve of more than \$3M.

= \$1M total for categorical carryover and other for 2009/10

Budget Timeline

3/24/09: public hearing on categorical flexibility

4/2/09: public budget workshop, review budget and categorical flexibility

4/14/09: action item on categorical flexibility

4/28 and 5/12/09: informational items on budget

5/26/09: information item on May revise

6/9/09: information item on DRAFT 2009/10 budget

6/23/09: action item on 2009/10 budget

Public Hearing Items

Use the following funds for the district general operations in the Unrestricted General Fund:

2008/09: \$800,000 from Adult Education

2009/10: \$340,000 from the State Contribution to the Facilities Deferred Maintenance Program

2009/10: \$448,000 from the Targeted Improvement Program

The following transfers were part of the old Mega Transfers or Block Grant Transfers. They have already been approved and included in the 2008/09 budget. These transfers are now included in the categorical flexibility and require a Public Hearing. Transfer the following funds between programs for 2008/09:

\$97K from School and Library Improvement Grant to Special Ed
\$7K from Gifted and Talented Ed and \$5K from Professional Development (PAR) to Special Ed
Transportation

Member Mooney asked that slide 4 show Measure H uses in addition to what's already been budgeted and approved. We want to be clear that we are spending Measure H dollars today.

Member Mooney asked for clarification regarding what the Board is being asked to do at this Public Hearing. Superintendent Vital noted a community meeting is scheduled for April 2 where we will be reviewing all pieces to hear more information. Staff is not seeking Board approval until April 14. This item will count as fulfilling the public hearing requirement.

President McMahon opened the Public Hearing at 9:51 PM.

A speaker addressed the Board regarding the Adult School carryover, noting that they saved a lot of money because they were prudent. Now they are being rewarded by having the money taken away from them. You shouldn't be going to conferences if you don't have the money. You could have saved money on Special Ed transportation by hiring a "floater" bus to pick up any slack. The Governor has made it legal for you to take money from the Adult School – money that two Principals have saved for a rainy day, and not that rainy day has come.

Another speaker addressed the Board about the SLIG and GATE money. Are these active funds? Before you take that money, why not involve the school sites' SSC in discussing it? We assume for most sites, SLIG is active money being used. That's going to be a direct hit at this point unless there is some preparation to talk about what to do with that money.

A speaker noted she has paid \$20K out of pocket, and to hear all these carryovers exist while she has never had appropriate services and accommodations for her special needs students is appalling. You really need to make technology more of a priority than it's been. The parent noted she has been told that her son cannot get things because teachers cannot afford the copies. On the technology front, if you would have teacher development days, teach all teachers how to use School Loop to communicate with parents. Parents can print things so the sites are not using the copy funds of the site/district. The parent noted she was able to pose as a student and get into many classes and was shocked at the bullying she saw – teachers bullying special education kids. Post more information on the web for transparent communication. No one wants to meet during the day, but if you post things than parents can get to them anytime they want to. Have a comments section to solicit feedback.

Hearing no further comments, President McMahon closed the Public Hearing at 10:02 PM.

Superintendent Vital asked Mr. Rahill to clarify SLIG, PAR, and GATE transfer of funds. Mr. Rahill responded it was allowable under the old rules to transfer funds from some of the special purpose funds into other special purpose funds. What this district has done over the years is carved off the top. With GATE and PAR, this is an attempt to provide some dollars to special education transportation. This is just for 2008/09. This was part of the existing 2008/09 budget that was approved and adopted, but because now the old program rules have been lumped into the new program rules, it requires a Public Hearing. If this doesn't carry through, this would be an additional hit to the general fund in regards to the dollar amounts into programs. Site would never have seen those. Superintendent Vital added we are not cutting dollars from any site, this is budgeting cleanup around where the money was placed. There are no cuts to any schools.

Member Mooney clarified, the Board already made the decision to do this, but we are holding a Public

Hearing at this time because the state changed the rules halfway through the game and now requires us to do this extra step. Mr. Rahill confirmed, the old rules did not require a Public Hearing, but the new rules do, that is correct.

Member Spencer asked for more input from the Adult School Principal regarding taking this \$800K and using it for other purposes. When we have departments that are spending over what's budgeted, how is staff being held accountable?

Peggy McCarthy, Adult School Principal, addressed the Board, noting that the reserve came about over many years. The rainy day, as pointed out previously, is now. We've been planning over the last couple years for at least a 10% cut per year over a 5-year period. That day has come. The other piece is in a 10-year time period, the Adult School was moved 5 times. Each time, there was a huge cost associated with re-establishing the school. With the last couple of administrations, there was still lingering conversations about the Adult School perhaps being moved again. If the Adult School were uprooted completely, we would need the entire reserve to refurbish a defunct property. Just prior to Superintendent Vital's arrival, the Adult School was told we could assume no move and we started planning program expansions. Although there has been some declining enrollment just like the K-12 schools, this year the Adult School is looking at some increases. It is an interesting challenge trying to decide what the adult community in Alameda is looking for.

Superintendent Vital noted there are no plans to move adult education. Additionally, Ms. McLachlan-Fry has been working with Adult School administrators to look at connections between adult ed, alternative ed, and ROP to really think about what these programs could look like as we do concurrent enrollment with the Adult School. All these programs can be expanded.

President McMahon added there will be one more opportunity for public comment on the staff recommendations at the April 2 meeting at Wood Middle School, 6:30 PM. The Board will be asked to take action at the April 14 regular Board of Education meeting. If we don't make this transfer for this year, we'll have to find \$800K to cut somewhere else.

MOTION: Member Mooney

SECONDED: Member Spencer

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

AYES: McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

ABSENT: Jensen

MOTION CARRIED

School Site & Unrestricted Departmental Budgets

As part of the modified zero-based budget process for 2009/10, the Alameda Unified School District is presenting the current year, 2008/09, budget information for the School Sites (both unrestricted and restricted funding) and for District-wide Services (the unrestricted funding). The restricted funding, also known as Categorical funding, for district-wide services has been provided to the school board in other presentations as Categorical Programs Part I and Part II.

Mr. Rahill quickly ran through the slides by site and department.

Roxanne Clement, Bay Farm, thanked staff adding that she has never seen a budget so clearly defined and transparent before. With this much detail for the first time, we really need to have a little bit more

education behind some of the lines. Before the April 2 budget meeting, we need to have more specificity. It will be hard for the general public to understand which parts sites truly have control over – very few get to say how funds get spent since so much is centralized.

Member Mooney echoed the speaker's comments regarding detail and suggested Board Members forward written questions and suggestions to the Superintendent prior to the April 2 workshop.

Member Spencer requested detail on how much we spent per student at each of our sites – a compilation that includes restricted and unrestricted funds. Also, more information as to the breakdown of students that are being educated at Alameda schools who are coming from outside of Alameda and the money from donations, parcel taxes, etc. being used to educate students outside of Alameda. Member Spencer also requested an explanation of the disparity among the different SLIG rates.

Superintendent Vital thanked Fiscal Services staff for this huge amount of work in a short amount of time.

President McMahon added more information means more work. The level of transparency will build the level of trust in the organization and with the community as they understand where the dollars are and how the dollars are being spent. In the interim, we are working to get documentation on the district website.

Approval of ROP Course Descriptions Between AUSD and Bay Area School of Enterprise/Alternatives in Action: Legal Studies

Oakland Alameda ROP currently has an active and collaborative partnership with the local educational non-profit agency Alternatives in Action (AIA) and its subsidiaries Bay Area School of Enterprise (BASE), Home Sweet Home and Home Project.

Currently, BASE students as well as AUSD students can earn credit and obtain career training in courses offered on the campus of BASE. Courses currently being offered include Developmental Psychology of Children and Sound Engineering and Recording.

We seek to add a new course, Legal Studies, to the previously mentioned courses. The Oakland Alameda ROP will garner funding through collection of ADA under an established Memorandum of Understanding, effective August 2008. ROP ADA will be generated to cover costs; there will be no impact to the AUSD general fund.

Member Spencer asked how EHS and AHS students could participate. Donna Wyatt, ROP and Secondary Options Coordinator, noted that some programs are offered after school, which allows other students to participate. Patricia Murrillo, Executive Director of BASE, noted there are 2 courses offered between 4 PM – 6 PM that have about 12 EHS students enrolled. The Legal Studies and Sociology of Education courses will not be offered after school, but the intention is to offer them next year after hours. Member Spencer asked why BASE was not listed on the district website. Ms. Murrillo noted that BASE is a completely independent charter school, but does disseminate information through presentations at the Counselors Roundtable.

MOTION: Member Mooney

SECONDED: Member Tam

That the Board of Education approve the ROP Course Descriptions Between AUSD and Bay Area School of Enterprise/Alternatives in Action: Legal Studies as presented.

AYES: McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

ABSENT: Jensen

MOTION CARRIED

Board Member Reports

Member Spencer noted she attended the Alameda Services and Alameda Youth Collaborative lunch, and joined teachers at Otis and Washington in participating in a gardening event.

Student Discipline

MOTION: Member Mooney

SECONDED: Member Tam

That student #68712 be expelled from the Alameda Unified School District.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: McMahan, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

ABSENT: Jensen

MOTION CARRIED

Adjournment

President McMahan adjourned the meeting at 11:17 PM.