

BOARD OF EDUCATION
November 24, 2009
Alameda City Hall Chambers
2263 Santa Clara Avenue
Alameda, CA

ADOPTED MINUTES

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

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by President Mc Mahon at 4:05pm.

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

ABSENT: None

PUBLIC COMMENT: None at this time

ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION: By President Mc Mahon at 4:05 to discuss:
Student Discipline/Expulsion/ Re-admit (1 case); Public Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release.

RECONVENE TO PUBLIC SESSION: By President Mc Mahon at 5:35 pm.

CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Led by Otis Elementary Principal and students.

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

ADOPTION OF AGENDA/APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR:

MOTION: Member Jensen

SECONDED: Member Spencer

That the Board of Education adopt the agenda with the following change: pull F-6.

AYES: Jensen, McMahan, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

MOTION CARRIED

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

Certificated Personnel Actions: The Board approved 2 changes of status (Allen, Dunn).

Classified Personnel Actions: The Board approved 14 appointments (Dunlap, McDonald, Norwood-Coleman, Villaume, Watts-Holman, Bahrami, Gray, Ve'e, Baca, Jamelo, Saxton, Lim, McClure, Stuart-Riascos); 1 resignation (Tench); 1 retirement (Estes); 6 changes of status (Abapo, Aubert San-Feliz, Chakib, Fernandez, Garcia, Mercardo).

Approval of Bill Warrants and Payroll Registers: The Board approved warrants numbered 958925-959016, 958924, 879989, 958911-958921, 958922-958923, 879990-880000, 958801-958910.

Resolution No. 09-0070 Approval of Budget Transfers, Increases, Decreases

Resolution No. 09-0071 Certification of Routine Restricted Maintenance Account

Approval of Board Policy 3310- Transfer of Funds; 6146.1 – High School Graduation Requirements; 5121 – Grades/Evaluation of Student Achievement

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of the regular meeting of November 10, 2009, the special meeting of September 21, 2009 and the community workshop of October 6, 2009 were considered.

MOTION: Member Jensen

SECONDED: Member Spencer

That the board approves the minutes as presented with the following consideration: that the approximately 30 questions and answers from the community workshop be placed on the website.

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

Noes: None

Motion Carried

COMMUNITICATIONS:

Written correspondence: An e-mail dated 11/18/09 from Lissa Sorenson regarding a language immersion magnet school and an e-mail dated 11/19/09 from Cheryl Karton regarding a language immersion magnet school.

Superintendent's Report: Follow-up item from last Board Meeting:

Q: How many students in our schools have been granted District residency status as a result of their parent being an AUSD employee and where are the students located.

A: 7 Elementary, 1 Middle and 4 High School students are currently enrolled.

Q: How does the District determine which school students enrolled under this policy will attend?

A: Education Code 48204 grants residency status if employed by the district. BP 5116.1 explicitly provides that if a neighborhood student enters the attendance zone and there is only one spot available, the non-neighborhood student can be bumped to the closest available seat in another school. This is a policy decision over which the Board has discretion.

Site visits this since November 10 were Encinal, Island, Chipman, ASTI, Franklin, Alameda High, Lincoln, Haight, Wood, Edison and Bay Farm.

The Parcel Tax Advisory Group will meet on 11/19/09 and should complete their work on 12/17/09. The plan will go before Judge Burr with a status report on the proceedings and possible resolution. By January 12, 2010 the group will recommend a new parcel tax to replace Measure A and H.

Reminder: There will be two board meetings in December – Dec. 8 and Dec 15. The first will be the annual organization meeting and a review of the Draft Master Plan. The second will be held at Alameda High School Little Theater where the Boards decision on the Academy of Alameda charter petition will be made.

The Master Plan road shows have all been completed with the exception of one at Ruby Bridges on December 1st. I want to thank principals, Board members, staff and faculties sharing this information with their school families.. Please remember that the survey on the Master Plan Strategies is on our website and was posted on Friday. A few changes have been made since launching and should be easier to complete. The survey will be closing on 12/7.

Member Spencer asked if we will be revisiting children of employees school placement on a future agenda. Superintendent Vital indicated yes, it would be a future agenda item.

Oral Communications: None at this time.

Board Oral Communications: None at this time.

Student Board Member Comments: Student Board Member Mooney from Encinal High School noted the football team is the 1st seat in NCF Playoffs with its second round next Friday night. The college and career center continues to be of great assistance to all seniors as deadlines for college applications draw near. The AP songfest will be held on 12/10.

Student Board Member Gamalinda from Island High School shared 2 more students have graduated with 2 more very close. The 2nd hexamester has just finished with 13 new students arriving for the 3rd hexamester. The next edition of the TB times is ready to go be published.

Student Board Member Datuin from ASTI noted the dress code has changed again at ASTI, they will return to the original polo shirt requirement. They will be holding a potluck and talent show with the first annual PTSA Silent Auction on 12/5 @ 6:00pm in the AHS Little Theater.

Student Board Member Inlow from Alameda High School stated the senior banquet will be held on Saturday night. On 11/18 the SSC gave feedback on the master plan. 11/30 is the deadline for the CSU and UC applications.

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

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

President McMahon acknowledged the donations received from the community.

Highlighting Alameda Schools – Otis Elementary School

Principal Dr. Shirley Clem and students will share Otis School's vision and mission statements, and highlight some of the school's extraordinary programs that support us in achieving the school's goals: Learning Groups, Art Docent, Stock Market Club, Creative Arts Education, EdMo Science Enhancements, Go Green! Through working in partnership with our parents and

community, Otis provides a caring, inclusive, safe and engaging work environment to support high achievement and personal best for all students. Principal Dr. Shirley Clem, Teacher Mr. Haden and 7 students presented.

Member Tam thanked Dr. Clem for the presentation and asked how often and long do the teachers at Otis spend in collaboration around these programs. Dr. Clem replied at least 2 hours once a month on average.

Member Spencer also thanked Dr. Clem for the presentation and commended her for her excellent work. A token from the Otis students was given to each board member from their recent walkathon.

Side Note: Superintendent Vital welcomed back Assistant Superintendent Debbie Wong back from medical leave. This is her first official Board of Education meeting since her return.

Approval of 2009/10 School Based Coordinated Plans & Program Improvement Watchlist
Robert Shemwell, Director of Compliance, Curriculum, Categorical and ELD will present the status of the plans for approval and an update on the PI watchlist. The purpose of bringing the plans to the Board for approval is to comply with education code for the use of categorical funds.

There are 8 requirements that school plans must meet in order for the board of education to approve the plans. Once they have been approved, the schools may spend their categorical funds. The plans themselves were meant to be developed on a continuous cycle and not redeveloped each year. A good plan can become a working plan for perhaps 5 years with just minor “tweaking” each year. In November of each year they will be presented to the Board of Education for approval. This allows for a working blueprint or business plan to be in place at the beginning of each year with revisions being made in the Spring. The plans will come back to the Board of Education in May for an update on where they are in implementing their plans. During the August retreat with Principals the plans can be reaffirmed and revised if necessary.

Mr. Shemwell shared three examples of plans ready to be approved, one each from the three levels, elementary, middle and high. (Ruby Bridges, Lincoln and Island High). The main points were: Theory of Action inside the plan, narrow focus, impact on student learning, focus very clear. All are data driven using CST, API and other data.

Six plans are not being presented tonight but will be brought back on December 15th after staff has had the opportunity to work with Principals on refining and stating their theory of action in a more focused way. The plans held back are Edison, Washington, Wood, AHS, ASTI and EHS.

Program Improvement Update

Chipman is working on their plan for PI year 4, a charter application. Wood and Washington are both on the PI watchlist. To be placed on the watchlist you did not make adequate progress in either one or both of ELA or Math categories in at least one of your subgroups. Wood’s socioeconomically disadvantaged subgroup did not make adequate progress in ELA.

Washington’s socioeconomically disadvantaged and English Learner subgroups did not make adequate progress in ELA. Paden will need to be watchful of their SED and English Learner

subgroups. They did not appear on the official watchlist even though they did not make adequate progress in the above two categories because they are in their first year as a Title 1 school. You need to have two years of no growth to be placed on the watchlist.

Member Jensen noted every year we review and approve the plans. These plans can and should be used as a tool to improve student achievement and yet we are not reaching all subgroups. How will these issues, points be monitored and assessed? Mr. Shemwell noted the district office has been working more closely with each site to be sure that Ed Code has been followed in regards to developing the plans. Due process was handled properly. We can help to monitor and assess progress. The actual plans will become the blue print for the school to follow. The staff can work from the plan and not let the plan work them. The plans are much improved from just 6 months ago. If the plans are working then the site will become a dynamic learning organization and we will continue to support each principal in the revisions and making sure they are right for them.

Member Jensen added the mission and objectives are not clear in the plans that we have and the Board has not been given the entire plan to review. Mr. Shemwell responded we do have the entire plans available tonight if Board members would like to see them. Systemic change happens naturally once a system is in place. The plans we have here tonight we see a focused thread throughout the plans. This was not always the case.

Superintendent Vital noted the Support and Accountability – Evaluation piece is new this year. The principals are using data and metrics and linkage and connections throughout the day. These are all part of the plans which is new to AUSD this year. The inquiry cycle changed to a new date.

Member Mooney stated he appreciates seeing the plans now instead of later in the year. Clearly there's a difference from past plans. Member Mooney added he would like to see the plans written in a language that is easier for the lay person to understand as most is written for the professional educator and it is unclear what is being said if you are not a member of that group. The general population should be able to clearly understand what the plan is saying.

Member Mooney asked if we are moving subgroups up thru this process. We need to know if Ed Code 1-7 was followed before the Board can approve the plans. Mr. Shemwell noted that yes, Ed Code 1-7 has been followed. We are developing plans that are working plans for more than 1 year now.

Member Mooney asked what schools do we have, that are not Title 1, which would be on the watchlist. Staff responded we do have some sites that would be on the list and can back to the Board with the specific sites and their statistics.

Superintendent Vital added the Assessment – Inquiry with teachers and Debbie Wong really looks at assessments given in this district. We have many assessments and we need to see which ones are really meaningful and useful for the teachers. We will report to the Board of Education on all of the new math assessments.

Member Tam noted the Ruby Bridges plan excels. All schools have CST data. The plan is a working document and improvement will come about by using the document. Member Tam inquired if we use the Cycle of Inquiry Process. Staff replied that only Earhart still uses this process, but all sites use pieces and some of the resources around the Cycle of Inquiry Process.

Member Tam asked if all schools are using Professional Learning Communities. Staff noted yes, most school sites have some degree in place but not all are proficient yet. Site visitations help and are a key factor in change.

Member Tam asked about the SSC composition, noting it should reflect the student population. How does the district office provide support to schools who cannot get the diversity on their councils? Ms. Wong responded that we try to do that now. We would look and see what it looks like at each site. Even when the principals have taken the time to go door to door to ask the parents to run for the council it is an elected position. There is no guarantee that they will be elected to serve. It is a very complex issue and we continue to try to get a diverse group to serve on this committee. Our job continues to be to be sure the issue is on a higher conscious level of the principal. We also acknowledge that there is less participation at the middle and high school levels.

Member Tam noted Washington and Wood on the watchlist. There is a lot of transition at Washington. How does the district office support the site looking at student data with a lens on transition? How do you focus on a moving target? Staff replied we look to see if a specific sub group is addressed. The data showed that the group that scored the highest last year dropped significantly and there is no plan to address the drop.

Member Spencer asked if the sites share the plans. Staff replied yes – we have always shared plans across the sites and they can be posted on the web.

Member Spencer noted that the Chipman plan has no measurable academic goals. The plan refers to the charter as part of their goals. How does this service our students this school year? Goals should not be dropped because they may become a charter. Staff replied that the Chipman staff had a two branch plan – one was the restructuring plan for 10/11 and the other was to address the needs of the 09/10 students. Given the circumstances they did an adequate job of addressing both needs. The work is being done and due process is being followed. We will relook at the plan and do what needs to be done to address clear academic goals for this year.

Superintendent Vital added on the recommendation from Debbie Wong, the Superintendent decided to hold back Chipman’s plan until clear academic goals are defined within the plan.

MOTION: Member Mooney

SECONDED: Member Jensen

To approve the plans as submitted with Chipman being removed.

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

Noes: None

MOTION CARRIED

Revised Anti-Harassment Policy

The Alameda Unified School District operates under a set of policies, administrative regulations, and bylaws. AUSD has historically contracted with the California School Board Association (CSBA) to host our policies online at www.gamutonline.net and to provide mandated and optional updated information. As appropriate, staff will review and provide suggested revisions to policies reflecting the Board of Education's intentions and directives.

The following amended Board Policy is being brought to the Board for information. BP 5145.7 Anti-Harassment Policy – this policy has been updated to reflect the Board's commitment to providing an educational environment that is safe and supportive and free from harassment and discrimination. This includes harassment based on race, national origin, marital status, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, or disability. This policy is intended to prevent harassment by directing staff to teach why harassment is wrong and teach that tolerance and respect are essential to a free society.

Member Jensen asked where teaching comes in within the policy. Staff responded that it is referred to toward the bottom of the page under instruction and information. That is the language that was added that was not previously in the policy.

Member Spencer asked if this is language straight from the law or is it discretionary language. Staff responded the language comes from Ed Code 200. The words were not directly lifted from the code but paraphrased.

Member Spencer asked what the law says exactly. Does our language satisfy the law? We need to compare. What part is discretionary vs. what is mandatory? Superintendent Vital replied this is the first read; if the Board would like any changes made to the policy, then staff would make the changes and come back for approval. This was a follow-up on our policies on hate-motivated behavior and non-discriminatory and anti-harassment. Legal counsel has done all of the comparisons and assures that we are in compliance with what is discretionary and what is mandatory. Ms. Houck, General Counsel, will provide the Board with a copy of Ed Code 200.

Member Jensen asked if the Board has to adopt the policy or is it a discretionary option. Ms. Houck answered that we must adopt a policy on sexual harassment but the other sections that were added are discretionary and our option.

Anti-Bullying Instructional Materials Review

The Superintendent directed staff to investigate a new curriculum that addresses bullying and harassment and explicitly addresses all six protected classes identified in Education Code 200: gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, or sexual orientation.

Superintendent Vital stated it is an expectation of Alameda Unified School District that every child feels safe, welcomed, supported and valued in our schools. It is with that in mind that we were directed by the board of education to find explicit curriculum to address all of the 6 protected classes. In our search we found that such a curriculum does not exist in a K-5 format. How can we make provide such a curriculum to our students? The answer the two committees

have discovered is by bundling materials from different sources. To that end, Dr. Zepeda will be bringing you the concept and not the actual materials.

Dr. Zepeda began his presentation with stating that it was an honor to do this hard work. He worked with two different groups of individuals to accomplish the task of ensuring that all of our students are given a safe learning environment. We are continuously striving to get better. There is no termination point. Where are we on this journey?

Brief History: A few years ago we adopted a social/emotional content program for our K-5 students called Caring Schools Community. Lesson 9 was added to the 8 lessons in this curriculum to address anti-bullying within one of the protected classes. It was then that the board decided that we need to address all of the protected classes and gave us the charge to find curriculum that would do just that. Two committees were formed to search for curriculum that would address all 6 protected classes – disability, religion, sexual orientation, nationality, gender and race/ethnicity.

Two committees were formed: Community Advisory Committee and Teacher Advisory Committee. Each had their own mission and met separately.

Community Advisory Committee: 26 members

The purpose of the committee was to give input and guidance to the teacher committee, establish criteria for the materials adoption and to present a recommendation to the superintendent to take to the Board of Education. This group met 3 times. The criteria set had 5 points, address anti-bullying, character education, inclusive of all classes, school wide and tools for all.

Member Jensen asked if all members attend all meetings. Dr. Zepeda noted that no, life happened to some of the members some times, but no one person opted out of the process.

Teacher Committee – 12 members

The purpose of the teacher committee was to search for, review and screen out materials that could be taught in the classroom around anti-bullying that was explicit around the 6 protected classes. Their next task was to provide the community advisory group with the best options and any additional suggestions.

The teacher committee used the 5 criteria to while researching over 23 different sources of materials. Only one program filled all five criteria for the protected classes but did not address anti-bullying – Open Minds to Equality. That program would have to be accompanied with Links to Literature to be a complete solution. From the 23 the teachers recommended 6 different programs to the Community Advisory Committee to consider in their recommendation to the superintendent. They were:

- A. Caring Schools Communities K-5
- B. Second Step K-2 and Steps to Respect 3-5
- C. Safe and Caring Schools K-5
- D. Connected and Respected K-5
- E. Open Minds to Equality
- F. Links to Literature

The teachers also recommended to the community committee that they could bundle the above materials to include E and have a more complete program.

Using the teacher's suggestions, the Community Advisory Committee made the decision to recommend to the superintendent the following:

Caring School Communities K-2
Steps to Respect 3-5
Literature List of Books

The literature list of books would consist of 36 books, 18 books K-2 and 18 books 3-5. The research and recommendation of the books will be made by the teacher committee. These books would be taught throughout the school year and would mirror the six protected classes.

Dr. Zepeda explained the different components in each of the above programs and stated that all of the curriculum and support materials are available for public viewing in his office at 2200 Central Ave.

The timeline for the remainder of this process is as follows:

Nov – Dec 2009 – Public review of materials
December 2009 - Board adoption of curriculum (minus the literature list)
February 2010 - List developed by teacher committee
Feb – June 2010 - Create Support and Structures
Feb – Aug 2010 - Expand to Middle and High School
August 2010 - Provide professional development to teachers
August 2010 - Implement new adoption of Elementary curricula

Beyond the adoption the follow up accountability piece will be to monitor effectiveness, professional development, feedback from teachers and analyzing the Healthy Kids Survey.

Superintendent Vital noted the literature unit is the only way to address all the protected classes. We honor our teachers expect that a teacher led group will be our best resource to compile a comprehensive list of literature that will address all of the protected classes at each grade level. Just a reminder that it was teachers who requested support from the district office to help with curriculum in teachable moments and anytime lessons around the protected class addressed in Lesson 9. The new literature list will address the Boards direction of having explicit curricula to address all of the protected classes.

Barbara Mc Clung, Member of Community Committee – noted the process fair and collaborative. Everyone had a voice in this intense process and applied the principle of inclusion. Ms. McClung saluted the Board and the Superintendent for their time and commitment to work together for the common good of our children.

Michael Williams, Member of Community Committee – thanked Dr. Zepeda. The process and staff recommendation reflect a movement in the right direction and are consistent with the

direction given by the Board but are incomplete. Success will depend on how fully, fairly and explicitly we support teachers in addressing all 6 protected classes. Don't take away what is currently in place but instead add to it.

Anne Faria Poytner, Member Teacher Committee – It was a daunting task to provide the highest quality education to our students around the 6 protected classes. All children deserve affirmation in their school environment. Children trust us. Thank you to the Board for your patience and dedication to protecting all members of Our Alameda.

Zoe Holder, Member Community Committee - thanked Dr. Zepeda and welcomed back Debbie Wong. Ms. Holder noted she is in agreement with 4 of the 5 recommendations, but urged the Board to not drop Lesson 9. Total consensus was not achieved on the all of the curriculum. Open Minds to Equality 3-5 would address all of the protected classes without needing any supplementary materials. Why reinvent the wheel? This program is available right away. The reason it was pulled by Dr. Zepeda was that it was not agreed on unanimously. The actual vote was 10-6 in favor. My hope is that the Board would consider this curriculum as a way to quickly implement the Boards direction.

Marcus Holder, parent of 2 children that attended AUSD – asked the Board to make the decision on what is best for the children, not on the fear of controversy or litigation. The teachers recommended Open Minds to Equality. This program would address all of the 6 protected classes. Lesson 9 works and was requested by the teachers. If it were to be removed it would be a blow for the LGBT community. The opposition was not coming from our Alameda Community but from external forces. Please make your decision based on what is best for children and our community.

Board Member Feedback:

Member Tam asked of the five recommended programs which one is explicit? Staff responded that Open Minds to Equality; the one concern was that it may have a negative impact on another protected class.

Member Mooney asked if Steps to Respect was state adopted. Staff responded that it is not; Only Caring Schools Community is state approved.

Member Spencer asked with the established criteria, are we going to work with parents? Staff noted that Steps to Respect includes a parent component. Member Spencer noted the Teacher Committee was not equal in site representation. Staff commented the process was to ask Principals for two names of teachers who were not on the original committee and who would or could represent the broader diversity of their site if possible. These teachers were then invited to participate. When everyone did not chose to participate, principals were again asked to give names in the grade levels needed to round out the committee.

Member Spencer asked why the committee did not reflect our actual population. Staff noted it is almost impossible to do, but noted the community committee was very diverse. Member Spencer asked what “recommend for Middle School and High School” meant. Staff responded we need to

have systemic work throughout the grades. The LGBTQ youth in middle school have a very hard time. Member Spencer noted concern that the recommendation is not specific enough.

Superintendent Vital responded that the first thing we would do is an inventory of where we are now and starting in January. The timeline for the literacy work would be February. Before we move on to the middle or high schools we would finish the elementary work.

Member Spencer asked if the Board be asked to approve 36 additional books. Staff replied yes. All protected classes will be taught.

Member Spencer added any surveys given should cover all protected classes and expressed concern that the current recommendation does not cover all of the protected classes. This adoption will not meet the charge. Lesson 9 is currently being taught without an opt-out option.

Member Jensen asked if the literature-based curriculum is about anti-bullying or protected classes. Staff noted Steps to Respect is about bullying, race and ethnicity. Member Jensen asked if the teacher recommendations need to be unanimous. Staff indicated no, we did not want to take a vote. Member Jensen asked if most people came to all meetings. Staff responded most people were very respectful of the process and there were above 20 attendees at every meeting.

Member Jensen asked how many teacher meetings were held. Staff noted there were 3 and all participants were volunteers. Member Jensen asked if A-G requirements were recommended and do they cover the protected classes. Staff noted only one covers all of the protected classes – Open Minds to Equality coupled with Links to Literature.

Member Jensen asked why the Community Committee disregarded Open Minds for Equality. Staff replied there was not a consensus to move it forward. There was some concern over language in the book toward a particular religion. The committee was very divided.

Member Jensen noted 1/3 of the Teacher Committee recommendations were brought forward. Why did all of their other recommendations get taken out of the equation? Staff responded that teachers have expertise in the field of curriculum. All of the teacher recommendations went to the community and they decided which ones to move forward in a recommendation to Dr. Zepeda.

Member Jensen asked Ms. Wong when did the Caring Schools Community get implemented. Ms. Wong noted she would need to double check the exact date, but it was about 4 years ago. Member Jensen asked how do we know it (CSC) is being taught now. Ms. Wong noted not all lessons have been taught yet. Time is the issue.

Member Jensen asked if staff could incorporate all this work into our current schedule. Staff noted the upper grade levels are a concern. Perhaps we could make a literature connection or replace current literature.

Member Jensen noted members of our Community Committee had a hard time agreeing with all of the Teacher recommendations. How can they agree on 36 books? Staff noted community members would be involved with the selection process and we would have lots of books to choose from; perhaps we could fill libraries as well with the excess books.

Superintendent Vital clarified that the only curriculum not agreed upon was Open Minds to Equality and Caring Schools Community K-2. All the others are bundled. We will return to the teacher committee for a literature list by February. A teacher led group would work on the teacher guide. The protected classes helped us to focus on the task. The current adopted curriculum is not necessarily being taught at every school.

Member Mooney: offered sincere thanks to all on the committees and to Dr. Zepeda and noted there are no “off the shelf” materials available for grades K-6. Member Mooney added he would like to hear about the work that will happen in January and February. Can things be in place? Does CSC have tools for teachers? Does kindergarten need the six protected classes’ covered? They are too young to know the classes. When you make a recommendation, will it meet the needs of students and community? We don’t just want to select something we “could live with”.

Member Spencer added there is time needed to address this issue in the classroom and asked if we change out the literature, what will we lose? How will each book be taught? Will the list be brought back to the Board? What was the charge of committee? Superintendent Vital noted our role was to bring the curriculum to the Board for approval. The teachers will write the lesson plans. Lesson plans are not board approved Literature books would have lesson plans developed for the teachers. Member Spencer commented we are then treating other protected classes differently than we treated LGBT.

Member Tam suggested revisiting Open Minds to Equality. What are the issues? Ten members were not present when the vote was taken. Staff responded that community members met on Saturdays, sometimes until 3:34 PM. Some of the members were not there because of family issues, but no one opted out of the process. Some felt that there was objectionable material in the teachers’ portion of the curricula. The student materials were not looked at.

Member Jensen asked if we are working with media center teachers, classroom teachers, community members, and members of all 6 protected classes to develop a literature and supplemental book list. Staff responded that teachers will recommend the actual books with help from community members.

President McMahon asked if we are at a place that we have given enough direction to come back. Is the expectation of recommendation the items listed on slide 8? Does that address our directive?

Member Jensen is if President McMahon was suggesting an alternative to the literature list. President McMahon noted he would feel comfortable adopting the first two bullets as protected classes are not his priority, but rather, his issue is around anti-bullying.

Superintendent Vital added this was a teacher committee and they understand more deeply about the curriculum not chosen. The Board would approve or not approve the materials.

President McMahon noted it is now 9:50 PM and we are only on item F-4. There is nothing in this recommendation that addresses all of the protected classes. We as a Board need to prioritize our focus. Is it anti-bullying, the Master Plan, or something else? Should we only look at the anti-bullying portion of the recommendation?

Introduction of Proposed School Accountability Tiering

This item was introduced by Superintendent Vital. In order to accelerate achievement in every school, AUSD will find it necessary to differentiate the supports and interventions provided based on where schools currently exist along the continuum from needing intervention to having demonstrated a capacity to accelerate achievement.

The Tiering Accountability System is a “conceptual framework” which will provide an annual snapshot of school performance through monitoring and support. It will provide targeted support to help build cohesiveness and alignment around key instructional practices. The results will provide additional resources to be allocated towards those schools most in need of accelerating student achievement.

The Tiering Accountability System is a research-based “value-added” model and will be piloted and refined throughout the 2009/10 school year.

This system would report on the progress being made in each individual school in our system. It would be based on a snapshot of the AYP scores. It would help us know how the school is accelerating the growth and are we closing the achievement gap. What can this look like in Alameda? We would have to pre-teach this process to our sites.

Member Tam asked if this would be K-12. Superintendent Vital noted yes, it would be district wide at all sites.

Member Mooney asked if this is ranking or not. Superintendent Vital noted it is not ranking, but rather a grouping. Member Mooney asked if it is absolutely performance-based on AYP – achievement gap? Superintendent Vital explained that no, not necessarily; when it is unpacked it could change. Everyone is significant. This system would allow us to monitor and support. And celebrate good work.

Member Jensen asked if the annual snapshot would be based on AYP and are cohorts in the same school. Superintendent Vital replied yes to both.

Member Spencer asked if the financial support comes to the Board. Superintendent Vital explained that the Board passes the budget and we work within that budget.

President Mc Mahon noted this gives us the opportunity to focus on all students.

Review of Draft Demographic Study

The purpose of the 2009-10 Demographic Analysis was to provide detailed demographic information, determine the effects of those demographics on District enrollments and assist in planning long range facility needs. The end result assures that appropriate and equitable facilities are provided for the students of the District

President McMahan noted an aging population and asked what is your experience in other communities. The associate noted they did study this issue and looked at the housing turnover and tracked it using the last 9 years statistics.

Member Tam asked if there were any studies of the Coast Guard or military housing. The associate noted no, but that analysis can be included at the Boards direction. Member Tam asked if the demographers looked at section 8 housing. The associated noted yes. This type of housing usually generates .892 students per unit. Member Tam noted due to the economy, many families are returning home to live with their parents. Can we track this? The associated noted this is difficult to track as movement is significant with no measurable data.

Member Tam noted an increase in the homeless population. How do you collect data? The associate added they have not been asked that question before. There is really no way to track students who are not enrolled.

Member Mooney asked if military influx could be predicted. The associate noted not at this time but this information will be included in the 12/8 report.

Member Spencer asked if the demographers addressed charters, and if this analysis was this pre or post Nea. We need to include charters in study as they have grown in our community. The associate noted no, charters were not a part of this draft.

Member Spencer asked where are families migrating to. The associated responded that in this report, all of the migrating families have gone to other schools within this district. There is no way of capturing students living in the district but attending private schools. Member Spencer asked how would Chipman be included in the study if it were to go charter. The associated replied we would keep the charter portion of the study separate and include Chipman in that section.

MOTION: Member Mooney

That the meeting be extended past 10:30 PM.

SECONDED: Member Tam

AYES: Jensen, McMahan, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

MOTION CARRIED

Alameda Boys & Girls Club California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Mitigated Negative Declaration

The public notice went out that the ground breaking on the new Boys and Girls club has been posted. An environmental study was done on the property that the Boys and Girls club will be developing. This property is on the Woodstock site. If any problems are found we must mitigate. On December 8th I will have more information to share with the Board. It is necessary for us to proceed with this process.

First Interim Report for the 2009/2010 Fiscal Year

The district's budget will experience deficit budgets from 2009-10 through 2012-13. The district projects that it will meet its financial obligations for the 2009-10 and the 2010-11 fiscal year. The district should end the year with a positive ending balance (excluding Fund 17) and will meet the 3% Reserve for Economic Uncertainties requirement. However, current spending trends report a structural deficit of \$14 million by 2012-13.

Member Spencer asked if these changes were previously approved by the Board. Staff responded that all the changes to the budget come to the Board for approval including any new positions that are hired. Some of these were not included in the budget in June and so requires us to get them into the budget now. In January, we will begin a new process for reporting our monthly spending to the Board.

Member Spencer asked if it is possible to have one list of the categorical flexibility funds so that the public can clearly see what we are working with in the Public Hearing. Staff noted yes.

Member Mooney asked how the audit is coming and how is the cash flow. Staff noted cash flow is good and we expect to have the audit report to the Board on December 15th and the first meeting in January.

Member Jensen asked what exactly is an economic uncertainty? We have a 3% reserve for just such an uncertainty. Staff noted we can dip into that anytime the Board directs us to, but keep in mind that if we do use this fund (Fund 17) we will have to have a plan in place to replace the funds. That is our legal obligation.

Member Jensen asked how we are doing with regards to the ARRA funds. Staff noted ARRA funds for the Special Education use have all been spent; ARRA funds in Title 1 – Not spent – need to be allocated; ARRA funds will bring 1.2 million that will go into the 10/11 budget. All of the funds that we are carrying over are for maintenance of effort and going to the bottom line.

Superintendent Vital added categorical flexibility is what we are continuing to use. We will have a public hearing on 12/8 will look at the carry over amounts and ask to have it included as part of the 1st interim report. Categorical flexibility funds are considered as general funds that can be used for any purpose. We do need to report to ACOE our plans about the \$3 million deficits in 10/11 and the \$4 million in 11/12. Our hope is to build the categorical reserve. These funds are not allocated for anything but instead will be used to fill the hole.

President Mc Mahon noted on page 3 – is the \$1.6M ending balance a negative or positive? Staff noted it is a positive. President McMahan asked if the \$1.6M is positive then how can it be shown again on the next page as a budget cut? This is confusing and should be removed. Staff explained that this page shows a strategy used to come up with safe guards. The \$1.6M is an insignificant amount when dealing with \$100 million dollar budget.

President McMahan asked how can we cut out \$7 million dollars in expenditures? That seems impossible. Staff noted we will have that detailed out for you at the next Board meeting.

Inventory of School Programs

As part of the Master Plan discussion and planning process, the Board requested an inventory of school programs available at each site. The inventory is presented in a matrix that lists programs and identifies the schools that offer such programs. The current matrix is a snapshot in time, is continuing to evolve, and will change over time.

The purpose of doing the inventory of schools programs was to identify and collect in one location programs offered district-wide and/or at specific school sites and to allow parents and the community in general to understand the variety of school programs offered in Alameda schools.

President Mc Mahon noted we need to have the programs more detailed out. For example what foreign languages are being taught at the middle schools and high schools? What AP classes are offered and at which campuses. We need to develop this inventory wearing a parent lens wanting to see what is being offered at a specific site. List the programs by school, groupings, academic enriching, after school and use standardizes definitions and names. A glossary of terms would be helpful.

Member Spencer asked that the inventory items be categorize if possible. Are all schools included accurately? What is the definition of K-1 music? Staff reiterated that this is a draft and a work in progress.

Member Mooney commended this is a great start. We need more marketing on our website about our great programs.

Alameda Education Association (AEA) addendum to AEA Initial Sunshine Proposal to the 2009-2012 Contract

The Alameda Education Association (AEA) proposed to supplement its initial proposal to the District by opening additional articles of the Collective Bargaining Agreement for the 2009/2012 contract.

AEA and the district are currently in negotiations. AEA would like to sunshine 2 articles of the current contract dealing with placement of unit members children in Alameda Schools and facilities use.

President McMahan opened the Public Hearing at 11:28 PM. Hearing no public comment, President McMahan closed the Public Hearing at 11:29 PM.

Member Spencer asked about association rights and use of facilities. Staff replied that this process will open up opportunities to negotiate this item.

A motion was made to approve to sunshine AEA articles

MOTION: Member Jensen

SECONDED: Member Tam

That the Board approve the addendum to the initial AEA proposal.

Ayes: Jensen, McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

Noes: None

MOTION CARRIED

Board Member Reports

Member Jensen offered congratulations to the Alameda High Girls Tennis Team 10/0 run. They are the 13 seed in the North Coast Region playoffs.

Member Spencer noted she attended walkthroughs at Chipman and Washington, the Washington Master Plan Road show, PTA Council meeting, and the EHS Football game – EHS won and will play again on Friday night.

Member Mooney added he attended the ACSBA Association meeting and the Alameda High Master plan meeting.

Student Discipline

MOTION: Member Mooney

SECONDED: Member Jensen

That student number 6118 be expelled through January 4, 2010.

Roll Call vote:

AYES: Jensen, McMahon, Mooney, Spencer, Tam

NOES: None

Reconvene into Closed Session

President McMahon reconvened to Closed Session at 11:30 PM to consider 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.

Reconvene into Public Session

President McMahon reconvened to Public Session at 12:15 AM.

Adjournment

President McMahon adjourned the meeting at 12:15 AM.

