

**SANTEE SCHOOL DISTRICT
REGULAR MEETING
OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

October 16, 2012
MINUTES

Douglas E. Giles
Educational Resource Center
9619 Cuyamaca Street
Santee, California

A. CLOSED SESSION – 6:30 p.m.

- 1. Public Employment Matters** (Govt. Code § 54957)
Superintendent

The Board met in closed session. Following discussion, the closed session was adjourned and the Board moved to the open session meeting. No action was reported.

A. OPENING PROCEDURES

- 1. Call to Order and Welcome**

President Bartholomew called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

Members present:

Dan Bartholomew, President
Dianne El-Hajj, Vice President
Ken Fox, Clerk
Dustin Burns, Member
Barbara Ryan, Member

Administration present:

Dr. Patrick Shaw, Superintendent and Secretary to the Board
Karl Christensen, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services
Minnie Malin, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources/Pupil Services
Dr. Stephanie Pierce, Director, Educational Services
Linda Vail, Executive Assistant and Recording Secretary

- 2. Pledge of Allegiance**

President Bartholomew invited the audience to recite the District Mission and then invited Kate Baranski, daughter of Principal Kristin Baranski, to lead the members, staff, and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

- 3. Approval of Agenda**

It was moved and seconded to approve the agenda.

Motion: Ryan Second: Fox Vote: 5-0

President Bartholomew introduced audience member Elana Levens-Craig, a candidate for Board seat # 4. He also congratulated Dianne El-Hajj who is running unopposed for Board seat # 2.

- 4. Special Action Item: Approval of Contract for Incoming Superintendent**

The Board was presented a contract to employ a new Superintendent for Santee School District, effective November 1, 2012. Member Burns moved to approve the contract for Dr. Cathy A. Pierce, effective November 1, 2012 to June 20, 2016. The contract was available for public review.

Motion: Burns Second: Ryan Vote: 5-0

President Bartholomew introduced Dr. Cathy Pierce, newly appointed Superintendent, to assume the leadership of the Santee School District upon Dr. Shaw's retirement. Board members expressed their delight and excitement to have Dr. Pierce as our new Superintendent. Dr. Pierce said she is honored by the appointment and looks forward to getting to know everyone and working together.

B. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS

- 1. Superintendent's Report**

- 1.1. Developer Fees Collection Report
1.2. Use of Facilities Report
1.3. Enrollment Report
1.4. Schedule of Upcoming Events

Dr. Shaw reported that a little over 3 years ago Prospect Avenue School underwent a significant change to an "academy focus." After observing the Administration and staff work diligently to change their image to the community and increase student achievement, Dr. Shaw was pleased to announce that he is submitting the paperwork to the State of California to formally change their school name to PRIDE Academy at Prospect Avenue School. The new name continues to preserve the history of the school while signifying their instructional focus.

- 2. Spotlight: Santee School District Video**

Dr. Shaw reported that over the last 2 years the Professional Leadership Team worked in groups to develop "picture stories" of Santee School District. Last year all 5 "picture stories" were shared with the Board. Following those presentations, Dr. Shaw asked Dr. Laura Spencer to take the photos and ideas from each of the great presentations and develop a video that could be placed on the District website to share the overall

theme of Santee School District. The completed project was presented to the Board. Board members liked the video and it will be placed on the District home page and used as a marketing tool.

3. Spotlight: Joey Sutera, Santee School District's Teacher of the Year

Dr. Shaw introduced Mr. Joey Sutera, Santee School District's 2012 Teacher of the Year, who competed in the County Teacher of the Year program earlier in October. Mr. Sutera was selected as one of the 10 finalists. It was an honor to have Mr. Sutera recognized at that level as we know the quality of his work. Mr. Burns shared that following the County program, other teachers who participated in the competition and got to know him shared with him that Joey is a fantastic teacher and an awesome human being.

4. Report on 2012 API and AYP Results

Dr. Shaw introduced Bonner Montler to share the results on 2012 API and AYP. Mr. Montler reported there were no surprises; however his earlier estimates were a little skewed because the State substituted CALPAD information. The District has an 872 API. The schools have the following API scores:

Cajon Park – 854	Pepper Drive –895
Carlton Hills – 894	PRIDE Academy –849
Carlton Oaks – 879	Rio Seco –895
Chet F. Harritt – 872	Sycamore Canyon – 892
Hill Creek –858	

Unfortunately, Chet F. Harritt did not meet their AYP and goes into Program Improvement (PI) status. They met 16 of the 17 AYP criteria for 2012, missing one ELA subgroup target. This put them into Program Improvement-Year One.

Pepper Drive met 20 of the 21 AYP criteria for 2012, missing one subgroup target in mathematics. Because they met all targets in mathematics last year they are not assigned to PI. In 2013, Pepper Drive must meet all mathematics targets to avoid Program Improvement Year 1.

Carlton Hills met 17 out of 17 AYP criteria, meeting and exceeding the Federal target. The math target was met by safe harbor. This removes Carlton Hills from the watch list and there is no chance of being assigned PI in 2013.

PRIDE Academy met 21 of 21 AYP criteria for 2012. Both Math and ELA were met by safe harbor. PRIDE Academy does not advance and remains in year 1 of Program Improvement. If they meet all AYP targets this year, they will be removed from PI status.

The District met 26 of 29 AYP criteria. We met Participation Rate and API criteria, and district wide met ELA and Math criteria by safe harbor. Three annual measurable objective targets (AMO) were missed. The 6-8 grades met all AMO and AYP criteria. These targets needed to be met in order to not be assigned as a PI district. The focus this year will be ELA to meet one grade span target to avoid PI. Principals will be receiving documents showing their targets for 2013.

Member Ryan thinks the results are fantastic. President Bartholomew said everyone did a great job and he is blown away by the great scores this year. Member Burns said everyone did a great job. The Board thanked Mr. Montler for a great presentation.

Member El-Hajj asked about the information the State used for their calculations. Mr. Montler said in September the District prepares estimates based on subgroups identified in PowerSchool. The State is now pulling student data, including attendance subgroup numbers, from CALPADS and we are not certain when they take that snap shot of the student population. This change makes it more difficult to calculate, as even one student can change a subgroup population enough to not meet the criteria.

Member El-Hajj said last year we had issues with too many students taking the CMA and asked if there was any impact from that this year. Mr. Montler said we incurred a penalty in ELA for exceeding the cap, although not significant, and as a result students were assigned different proficiency levels. The criteria were met in Math. Member El-Hajj said she is proud that Administration does what is in the best interest of the students and provides the appropriate test materials.

C. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

President Bartholomew invited members of the audience to address the Board about any item not on the agenda. There were no public comments.

D. CONSENT ITEMS

Items listed under Consent are considered to be routine and are all acted on by the Board with one single motion. President Bartholomew invited comments from the public on any item listed under Consent. There were no comments.

1.1. Approval of Minutes

- 2.1. Approval/Ratification of Travel Requests
- 2.2. Approval/Ratification of Expenditure Warrants
- 2.3. Approval/Ratification of Purchase Orders
- 2.4. Acceptance of Donations
- 2.5. Approval/Ratification of Revolving Cash Report
- 3.1. Personnel, Regular
- 3.2. Adoption of Resolutions Authorizing Teacher Services – Education Code Sections 44256(b), 44258.2, and 44263
- 3.3. *Pulled by Member Burns for separate consideration.*

It was moved and seconded to approve Consent Items, with the exception of Item 3.3., which was pulled for separate consideration by Member Burns.

Motion: Burns **Second:** El-Hajj **Vote:** 5-0

Pulled Consent Item:

- 3.3. Approval of Memorandum of Understanding Between Santee School District's After School Education and Safety Program (ASES) and San Diego County Superintendent of Schools for Fiscal Year 2012-201 (Pulled for separate consideration by Member Burns)

Member Burns said he would abstain from voting on this item as he is employed by the County Office of Education. Member Ryan moved approval.

Motion: Ryan **Second:** Fox **Vote:** 4-0 (Burns, abstain)

E. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION ITEMS

President Bartholomew invited comments from the public on any item listed under Discussion and/or Action. There were no comments.

1.1. Committee Recommendations for Revisions to Board Policy and Administration Regulation 5127 Promotion Ceremonies and Activities and Discussion of Protocols for Promotion Ceremonies

Dr. Shaw reported during the promotion appeal process last year, questions were raised by Board Members as well as Administration about the process. It was suggested that this would be a good time to review the process. As recommended by the Board, a committee was convened, chaired by Principal Stephanie Southcott.

Ms. Southcott and parent committee member Valerie Ryan reported to the Board the outcomes of the committee meetings. Ms. Southcott said she was excited to participate in this process and have the opportunity to provide the feedback that was important to the committee members. Ms. Southcott reported that parents, teachers, and an Administrator from each school were invited to participate on the committee. There were 15 members who participated in all 3 meetings. The committee reviewed current practices of schools and of other districts and discussed the various expectations. The goal of the committee was to be more standardized, not at the expense of lowering expectations. It was found that surrounding school districts required 1.5 GPA, as well as various requirements for citizenship. Most had no appeal process in place. Some school board policies were extremely general and had no administrative regulation to provide process. Through discussion it was determined the committee felt the activities and ceremonies were two separate events and should be treated differently. The committee felt that an 8th grader, in order to be eligible for the 8th grade promotion activities, must have 2.0 accumulative GPA, maintained throughout the school year. It was recommended by the committee to have no appeals process for the participation in 8th grade activities. For eligibility to participate in the promotion ceremony it is also recommended that students must maintain a GPA of 2.0 throughout the year. Parents will be notified at the end of the 7th grade year, the beginning of the students' 8th grade year, and continued notifications following each report card period. It is also recommended to have an appeals process for participation in the promotion ceremony.

Ms. Southcott shared that it was requested to have student input be included. A survey was provided to 8th grade students and 584 responses were received. One of the questions was, "What academic GPA should a student earn to participate in the promotion ceremony?" Eighty-three percent of the students said "a 2.0 or higher." Students were also asked if attendance and/or receiving suspensions should disqualify a student from participating in promotion and nearly 2/3 said attendance or suspensions should not be considered. Students were asked if special circumstances should be taken into consideration. Three-fourths of the responses said special circumstances should be taken into consideration.

Ms. Ryan, parent member, said the committee felt pretty strong about the recommendation for a 2.0 requirement for all activities with no appeal process. The committee considered the ceremony a celebration and discussed at length if participation should be automatic. The committee consensus was that going onto 9th grade is a given but not necessarily the ceremony; it is a celebration of commitment and hard work.

The committee recommended an appeal process be in place for the promotion ceremony. The recommendation was not to have a site level appeal but a District appeals committee, comprised of 5 people: a site administrator and an 8th grade teacher with a connection to the student, an additional 8th grade teacher representative, another administrator, and a support staff member. This will provide consistency throughout the District so all schools are provided the same

appeal process. Notification will be made by the administrator of the appealing students, personally to the parent, and if denied, the parents will be provided the next steps in the process.

On behalf of the committee, Ms. Southcott thanked the Board for considering their recommendations. The committee worked very hard and had great passion. They have brought forth a recommendation they feel good about.

Member Fox asked how many students were affected last year by the criteria. Ms. Southcott said at PRIDE Academy last year there were 4 or 5 students out of 57. Dr. Shaw said it does vary by school. Vice principals work very hard at assisting students to meet the criteria and it is discussed often at their vice principal meetings.

Member Fox asked, other than notifying parents, if there are programs or steps in place to help students meet their goal. Ms. Southcott said the committee did not include this in the AR as each school works differently. Dr. Shaw said each school had something in place to monitor student growth through the course of the year and assist the students as needed. Schools each provide before or after school or special class assignments to assist students to reach their goals.

Member Ryan thanked the committee and their consideration of what the Board expressed. She believes it will still be a challenge with multiple appeal committees. She questioned the recommendation of no appeals process for the activities and she believes there needs to always be an appeal process. There are always cases of extenuating circumstances and she would hate to see a child excluded without the opportunity to make a case on their behalf.

Member Burns likes the consistency of the process. He feels an appeals process is important and is also provides an educational experience for students. He is concerned about the notification procedure when there is no appeals process for activities. Maybe there could be an alternate way to appeal for participation in activities, such as a site appeal. He appreciated that the students were surveyed. Member Burns would also like to discuss tightening up the protocols at the site promotion ceremonies. It should be consistent at every school that the Board members hand out the promotion certificates.

Member El-Hajj said if a student has to prepare an appeal for the promotion ceremony it would be the same for the activities. She is a middle school teacher and understands what the committee is recommending. Member El-Hajj asked about report card grades and asked if it would make a difference if we graded in quarters instead of trimesters. She also asked if special education students are considered in the grading process. Ms. Southcott said as needed, appropriate grades are given with a notation of modified curriculum and she did not believe there would not be much change if we graded quarterly.

Member El-Hajj noticed a change from more than 3 to more than 2 suspensions for ineligibility and asked if it matters when the suspensions take place. Ms. Southcott said the suspensions would count if they occurred during their 8th grade year, and noted that these would be "out of school" suspensions. Member El-Hajj works at a school with a 1.5 GPA expectation and believes the students will rise to the occasion. She is thrilled to see that effort grades were maintained and hold kids to the same standards.

Member El-Hajj asked if the GPA was cumulative through both 7th and 8th grades, Mr. Southcott said just their 8th grade GPAs. Dr. Shaw reiterated that teachers and Administrators put a great deal of effort into making students eligible for activities and promotions.

President Bartholomew agreed there needs to be some bottom level of expectation. Board Members thanked everyone on the committee, many who were in the audience. They greatly appreciated the parents' participation.

Dr. Shaw said he would bring the revised Board Policy and Administration Regulation for a 1st reading in November. Member Burns asked for information about how the decision was going to be made by the appeals committee. He would also like to have a conversation with the Board about protocols at that same time. No action was taken.

2.1. Arbitrage Rebate Liability for 2007 Series A General Obligation Bond Issue

Karl Christensen reported that in May 2007, the District issued its first series of GO Bonds for \$18 million under the authorization of Proposition R passed by the voters November 2006. These bonds are subject to the IRS's regulations governing arbitrage which requires a calculation to be performed at the end of 5 years. Arbitrage is generally defined as the difference between two markets, and in the case of GO bonds pertains to the difference between interest earned on proceeds of bonds and interest paid to bondholders with some adjustments. IRS rules generally work to prohibit or discourage two events from occurring, 1) issuing bonds too early so that bond proceeds are held for extended periods before being spent, 2) earning more interest on proceeds than that paid to bondholders. IRS regulations are very strict and penalize school districts for issuing bonds too early and earning too much interest.

The District contracted with Vavrinek, Trine & Day (VTD) to conduct the calculation for the Series A GO Bonds in January of this year. The results of VTD's analysis revealed that \$10 million or more of the proceeds sat in the County Treasury earning over 5% for a year. This earnings rate was higher than the approximate 4.3% yield paid to holders of the bonds and resulted in the bonds being subject to payment of an arbitrage liability to the IRS of approximately \$95,000.

A review of the bond documents by VTD also revealed a shortening of the arbitrage calculation period to 4 years and 3 months, rather than the normal 5 years. Consequently, the arbitrage liability is subject to a penalty of approximately \$49,000. VTD has drafted a letter to the IRS requesting a waiver of the penalty due to the fact that the current administration was not here at the time of the GO bond issue and was unaware of the shortening of the arbitrage calculation period.

Mr. Christensen recommended approval of filing the appropriate tax form to be accompanied by payment of the arbitrage liability of \$94,828.60 and a letter requesting waiver of the estimated \$48,848 penalty for late payment. Mr. Joe Aguilar from VTD was available to answer questions.

President Bartholomew asked the likelihood of the IRS accepting a waiver. Mr. Aguilar said they usually get the waiver but their posture is changing. Mr. Aguilar stated that the IRS is more likely to approve a waiver if the liability payment is included at the time the waiver is requested. Mr. Christensen said the payment will be taken from CIP funds. President Bartholomew confirmed with Mr. Christensen that this information would come to the ICOC

Member Ryan move to approve filing of the appropriate tax form and payment to Internal Revenue Service for arbitrage liability for Series A General Obligation Bond and authorization to request waiver of penalty.

Motion: Ryan Second: Burns Vote: 5-0

3.1. Value Engineering and Enclosure of Stairs for Pepper Drive 10-Classroom Addition

Mr. Christensen reported that he is very optimistic we will get the \$2 million dollars from the SAB for the Pepper Drive project. That being the case, staff will be working toward getting both buildings constructed at Pepper Drive early next year.

A financial analysis of both projects was provided to the Board and based on current design and estimates showed a shortage of approximately \$625,000. Reviewing the current estimates for the project, he showed some items that may be postponed, eliminated, or reduced. He presented five options for the stairs for the PD addition showing renderings of each:

- Option 1: Leave both stairways as fully exterior as submitted to DSA
- Option 2: Partially enclosing west stairway at a cost of \$20k
- Option 3: Partially enclosing both stairways at a cost of \$40k
- Option 4: Fully enclosing west stairway at a cost of \$75k
- Option 5: Fully enclosing both stairways (requires enclosure of bridge also for fire and emergency safety) at a cost of \$250k

To avoid incurring any design costs now, Mr. Christensen said one of these options could be included as an Additive Alternate when we do the bidding in Jan/Feb and determine then if there are enough funds to pay for it. Mr. Christensen said several other school districts in San Diego County were contacted who have 2-story classroom buildings with exterior stairways and they expressed no concerns regarding safety. Due strictly to the most recent financial analysis for these 2 projects, Mr. Christensen recommends leaving the current design with the stairways as completely exterior to avoid adding any additional costs to the project at this time.

Member Ryan is concerned if you had to move students from the one floor to another in an emergency staff and/or students would be exposed. Member Burns said exposed stairs are a safety issue for him.

Other Board Members were comfortable with the 10 ft. wall and door. Member El-Hajj asked if both designs could be bid as additive alternates. Christina Becker said it is not easy to ask for bids on other designs as the costs for design will increase.

Board members agreed that Option 3 was the minimum acceptable but would prefer the stairs to be enclosed. Member Ryan moved to approve Option 3, which is their minimal requirement and to direct Administration to seek an additive alternate bid with a real cost in the bid for total enclosure of the stairways.

Motion: Ryan Second: Fox Vote: 3-2 (Burns, Bartholomew, no)
Member Burns stated that Option 3 does not meet his safety threshold.

H. BOARD POLICIES AND BYLAWS

1.1. First Reading: Revised Board Policy 3511, "Storm Water Master Plan"

Revised Board Policy 3511 was presented to the Board of Education for a first reading. No action was taken and the item will return for a second reading and request for approval.

2.1. Second Reading: Revised Board Policy 4112.42, "Drug and Alcohol Testing for School Bus Drivers"

Revised Board Policy 4112.42 was presented to the Board of Education for a second reading.

2.2. Second Reading: Revised Board Policy 3311, "Bids"

Revised Board Policy 3311 was presented to the Board of Education for a second reading.

Member Burns moved to approved revised Board Policy 4112.42 and revised Board Policy 3311 as presented.

Motion: Burns **Second:** Ryan **Vote:** 5-0

I. BOARD COMMUNICATION

Member El-Hajj reported she visited the "Flipped Classroom" at Carlton Hills and she was able to talk with students at the end of class. Kids really like it because if you need to review the material you can watch the presentation again. The teacher, Laura Barker, said she received some resistance the first year but this year she is not getting that resistance.

Member Burns said he was impressed with the ACI meeting and the inclusion of the Strategic Planning Action Planning committees. For the future, he would like to look at a day of the week and time when all committee meeting could convene at a school. This makes it much easier for Board Member participation.

Minnie Malin reported the Bully Reporting Hot Line is in service. The number is being distributed. She also shared a Student Wellness Survey developed by the Student Well-Being Committee she would like to distribute at Chet F. Harritt, Carlton Hills, and Sycamore Canyon preschool.

Mr. Christensen reported now that online payments have been introduced, a BAC recommendation to place a "donate button" on the district web site is being considered. Fees will be waived. Board members liked the idea.

Dr. Shaw presented the plan for signage on the ERC and DO buildings. Member Ryan thinks the entire building name should be on the frontage. Other Board Members were comfortable that the entire names were on the buildings so a direction title as proposed would be satisfactory.

Member Ryan reported the SDCSBA executive committee has recommended sponsoring a January meeting for all Board Members to come and have the opportunity to hear what Dan McAllister wishes to say. The Board does not wish to have Mr. McAlister on the agenda at a Board meeting and will plan to participate in the January meeting.

The Board was reminded of the Strategic Plan Leadership Meeting on October 24th. Member Ryan reminded Administration that when the committees meet, the Board should receive an agenda and the minutes for all committees.

J. CLOSED SESSION

President Bartholomew announced that the Board would meet in closed session for:

1. Public Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release (Govt. Code § 54957)

2. Conference with Labor Negotiator (Govt. Code § 54956.8)

Purpose: Negotiations

Agency Negotiator: Karl Christensen, Asst. Superintendent

Employee Organization: Classified School Employees Association

3. Conference with Labor Negotiator (Govt. Code § 54956.8)

Agency Negotiator: Karl Christensen, Assistant Superintendent

Employee Organizations: Santee Teachers Association

The Board entered closed session at 9:35 p.m.

J. RECONVENE TO PUBLIC SESSION

The Board reconvened to public session at 10:15 p.m. No action was reported.

K. ADJOURNMENT

The October 16, 2012 regular meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.