

I. PRELIMINARY

Cook called the September 4, 2007, meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

Roll Call

The following members were present:

Matt Cook, president
Jeanette Carmany, vice president
Susan Tabacheck, secretary
Judy Edberg, treasurer
Jane Barber, director
Debbie Barton, director
Edward Lord, director

The following members were absent:

Also meeting with the Board of Education were:

John L. Barry, superintendent of schools
Anthony Van Gytenbeek, deputy superintendent
Lisa Escárcega, chief operating officer
William Stuart, chief operating officer
Anthony W. Sturges, chief operating officer
Rodney R. Weeks, chief financial officer
Kari J. Allen, chief personnel officer
Tonia Norman, assistant to Board of Education

Pledge of Allegiance

Tabacheck led the Board and audience in the pledge to the flag. Cook welcomed visitors to the meeting.

Approval of Agenda

The September 4, 2007, agenda was amended to move information item II-A-3 to follow Items of Current Interest.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the regular meeting of the Board of Education held August 21, 2007, and the amended minutes of the Board of Education held August 7, 2007, were approved as written.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Items of Current Interest

Barry introduced and recognized Clyde Rucker, PACEsetter and Gateway graduate, for putting a new twist on the Quiznos theme, "MMM...Toasty." Instead of focusing on hunger for food, Rucker talked with Gateway students about how to feed their hunger for success. Rucker is the new executive vice president and chief administrative officer at Quiznos. He graduated from

Gateway in 1981.

Tabacheck and Barry attended the presentation at Gateway where Rucker gave a compelling speech to seniors that focused on success through education. He provided gift certificates from Quiznos and donated \$5,000 for scholarships. The principal asked Rucker to come back and speak to the freshman class about the importance of education.

Barry shared that the APS Equity and Diversity Education Department is sponsoring a Hispanic Forum, Thursday, September 20, at Aurora Central High School. The forum will begin at 5:30 p.m. The keynote speakers will be Dr. Bárbara Medina, English language acquisition director for the Colorado Department of Education, and Rodolfo José Cárdenas, senior news anchor and producer for Univision. We encourage staff, students, parents and community members to attend. A similar forum was held for African American students last spring and we want to continue our diversity element in APS. We are looking forward to hearing both keynote speakers.

APS was awarded a \$207,597 grant for Readiness in Emergency Management from the U.S. Department of Education Safe and Drug Free Schools Office. Tudy Wicks, security supervisor in the risk management department, will manage the grant.

On August 29, 2007, more than 100 APS staff and community attended a groundbreaking for the new Aurora Quest K-8. The new school will serve the Aurora Quest/Summit Academy gifted and talented programs and provide more than 300 additional students an opportunity to enroll. Aurora Quest has received an excellent rating since opening its doors in 1999 and is one of the top performing schools in the state based on CSAP scores.

The school site is located near East 1st Avenue and Airport Boulevard on the APS Community Campus. The highlight of the day was watching the kids and Lord throw dirt.

Cook shared that three seats are open on the APS Board and recognized Mary Lewis, one of the official board candidates. Approximately five official candidates will be on the ballot for three open positions. Barry will meet with all the candidates on September 10 at 6 p.m. to answer questions and provide information about APS. Names will be drawn for ballot placement tomorrow at noon. After the election, new Board members will receive professional development training; the entire Board will receive professional development training in December.

Carmany shared highlights from the first, fun run fundraiser at Aurora Hills. This is the first year the school has organized a fun run, but Carmany believes it is destined to become an annual event. Participants ran three miles and walked one mile. Staff raised about \$300.

VISTA 2010 Update

Cook shared that at the first Board meeting of the month, a different element of the VISTA 2010 Plan will be reviewed by district leadership.

People

Allen invited Damon Smith, director of classified and licensed personnel, to the table to present information on Action One, increase partnerships with colleges,

universities and leadership organizations.

Smith shared that Action One speaks specifically to recruitment and retention in the strategic plan. The Grow Your Own program is aimed at moving classified employees to teachers by providing opportunities to take college course work. Twenty-one classified employees are currently enrolled in the program, which is slightly down from last spring. Four of the six candidates that were accepted to the program this year are well on their way to earning a bachelor's degree and moving into the classroom in the next two to three years.

We have visited several local colleges and universities and met with educational representatives to discuss employment opportunities in APS. We currently have 65 to 70 student teachers from local colleges and universities. We are working to increase numbers significantly later this year and next fall. At a recruitment information session at Metropolitan State College last week, we were the only school district represented and had an opportunity to share what APS has to offer with about 250 students that will be looking for placement in spring 2008.

Lord asked how Smith pulled that off. Smith replied that it is part of the effort to establish relationships. He and Linda Damon, professional development director, have been meeting with college and university representatives to schedule opportunities to speak with and recruit student teachers.

Tabacheck asked what specific colleges and universities have we recruited students from. Smith mentioned Metro, University of Colorado at Denver, Regis University, University of Colorado at Boulder, Colorado Christian University, University of Northern Colorado, Colorado State University, and Denver University.

Lord asked where the majority of student teachers were recruited. Smith replied that the majority of recruitments come from the University of Colorado at Denver. At least 36 to 40 students of the 65 to 70 student teachers were recruited from UCD.

Carmany asked what percentage of student teachers become APS employees. Allen shared that we have not reviewed data, but it is available. We are trying to increase the number of student teachers so we have a better pipeline for those hires. Carmany asked if we were recruiting student teachers to place in high needs areas such as special education, science, and math. Smith commented that he was surprised to see the limited number of potential student teachers specializing in math, science, and special education when he polled students in the audience at the recruitment presentation at Metro. There are just not enough students enrolled in high needs areas, but it is a priority and we always request to meet with those students after presentations.

Smith presented an overview of the VISTA Scholar program that will provide college educations to graduates of APS starting in spring 2008. We are working collaboratively with colleagues from University of Colorado at Denver and we have met with the senior class to inform them of the opportunity. We will be meeting with high school counselors and students who we can potentially recruit back to APS in four years.

Smith presented an overview of linguistically diverse education cohorts. We ran four different cohort groups last year, two at Regis University and two at UCD. We had about 100 participants in the program and we are currently collecting data from each university to determine how many of our teachers have completed the program. We recently completed the selection process for the

2007-08 cohort groups and we have four cohort groups again this year, three at UCD and one at Regis University. Approximately 100 spots were available; 88 spots have been filled with teachers interested in pursuing a certificate in linguistically diverse education.

Barber questioned how many teachers that we have directly recruited are presently ELL certified. Smith replied that it is more informal recruiting efforts and data is not available presently. Cook clarified that we have spoken to potential teachers regarding what we are looking for, now we have a specific goal that we are going after to target those people. Smith shared that we are looking at about 100 teachers to go through the certificate program. We have also had conversations with Metro State, and they are just starting a linguistically diverse program and some of our linguistically diverse students will attend their program.

Achievement

Stuart presented a slide on Action 40 of the achievement plan relating to data driven decision-making. Our goal is to have 100 percent of teachers and principals trained in the data driven decision-making model by the end of the school year. New principals have received training on data driven decision making utilizing the data team model from Doug Reeves. Directors and staff in the Division of Instruction discuss implementation on a weekly basis and will begin discussions with the Instructional Advisory Group, the joint group created through the Division of Instruction and AEA. This will enable feedback and open communication with AEA to determine what we can do to better support teachers.

We are finalizing plans for Doug Reeves to address our teachers in the distinguished lecture forum at Hinkley High School on December 4. Reeves will meet with district leaders the morning of December 5.

Community

Escárcega presented a slide from the community section of PACE relating to parental involvement. Barry commented that the goal is to obtain 100 percent parental involvement and the capability to track effectively. The challenge this year is to have every parent volunteer 20 hours of time district-wide.

Escárcega shared that title schools currently have a compact plan within their school-wide title plans and the plan for parental involvement is quite extensive. We would like all schools to have this level of resources, but most schools do not have the resources of Title I schools. We have developed and included a parental goal in the school improvement plan focusing on parental involvement. Plans are due from district schools by September 14. We will review the plan and request that the District Accountability Committee provide feedback when they review their plans in the next few weeks. Within a month, we will expect to meet the goal of 100 percent of schools having a parental involvement plan. When the directors, Barry, and Van Gyteenbeek begin reviewing and monitoring the plans, they will ask for a list of implementation questions. Escárcega encouraged the Board to ask building administrators where they are with their plans and what supports they might need when visiting buildings.

Barber emphasized that parents need to know how important they are to schools and how important they are to their student's learning and education.

Escárcega shared that one of the exciting things about school achievement

teams is the ability to share resources across elementary, middle, and high school. We are identifying active and involved parents early, and articulating with them to develop qualities essential to school leadership. Our hope is that we can retain more parents throughout the middle and high school years when parental involvement tends to drop.

Tabacheck commented that schools are starting to recognize parents and ensure parents know that they are part of the team. Through our new plan, students of all ages, especially high school students are learning that their parents are still important factors in their education. In order for parents to participate in schools, they need to know they are important and their viewpoints are important.

Environment

Sturges shared that in an effort to maximize the safety and security of all staff and students in APS, we are now requiring all staff to have photo identification in their possession at all times. This metric is our attempt, on a monthly basis, to track compliance with staff and our secondary students while on school property. We will have random visits by our security staff and our regularly scheduled security meetings with principals. At the start of second semester, we will update the Board on progress of this metric.

Tabacheck shared how impressed she was with Gateway staff when she went to hear Clyde Rucker's presentation. She was required to sign in and get a visitor's badge. It is a good, safe way to identify people in buildings.

Pilot Schools Study Group Progress Report

Van Gytenbeek shared that the strength of the United States has been its belief, creation, and support of the public education system. Today the professionals in the business of American public education are the best in the world at their jobs. They are skilled, effective, dedicated, and passionate professionals.

The professionals in APS are no exceptions. Our classified, licensed, and administrative staff are the best in the business. They are the experts who are now and should continue to be running our schools today and in the future. However, some of the systems and structures within public education are impediments to efficiency and effectiveness prompting sharp and justified criticisms, which have resulted in a backlash of people who feel they must reform schools and districts outside of the public education system. Public school districts, teachers, associations, and teacher unions across the state and the nation must now respond intelligently to the often short-sighted solutions from this backlash, which will damage the integrity of our nation's foundation if we don't step up and do our jobs better. The popularity and success of charter schools, magnet schools, and private and public schools of choice are clear indicators of our need to be responsive to the changing needs of our parents and students. The ground swell of support for alternative schools to traditional public education is being fueled by legislative mandates and private funding sources.

The state of Colorado was granted a \$21 million federal grant. Under the grant, 95 percent of funds are slated for new and developing charter schools in their first three years of operation. Private foundations across the state and nation are pumping millions of dollars into educational reform. Much of this reform is driven by those working outside the realm of public education and is designed to be in direct competition with public education. This support for and competition with public education is impacting schools districts across the state and country. In

APS alone, the current financial impact of charter schools on our annual funding is \$6.6 million. Each charter school of 400 students costs APS \$2.6 million annually. Leaders of public education must be in a position to respond to this ground swell of competition and initiate policy, regulation, and work rules in a manner that maximizes the expertise of the professionals in public education who are the best decision makers in the business. We need to design structures that dominate the competition in the new world of educational reform.

In early June, the Aurora Education Association and the APS Board charged a task force to explore the concept of pilot schools and to ensure APS continues to provide the best education for our students, and provide more choices for our students and staff to compete and be successful in the global economy. It is designed from a model that has proven to be successful in an urban school district facing similar challenges. Pilot schools recognize the expertise of teachers and are designed to empower staff and parents and give them direct responsibility and accountability for the success of their students.

Brenna Issacs, AEA president, introduced members of the Pilot Schools Study Task Force: Amy Achtermann, fourth grade elementary teacher at Jewell; Edward Snyder, principal at Mrachek; Camille Schiraldi, natural resources/animal sciences teacher, TH Pickens; Lisa Nieto, principal at Fletcher; Debbie Ellis, principal at Century; Laurie Foster, art teacher at Kenton; Jane Shirley, principal at William Smith; Monica Wilbanks, language arts teacher at Columbia; Cheryl Dalton, former CEC president; and Tony Van Gytenbeek, deputy superintendent. Sue Clark served as the facilitator and two members from the Center of Collaborative Education from Boston, Ann French and Christina Brown, collaborated with the group.

Issacs shared that the purpose of pilot schools is to promote educational innovation and increase student success and achievement while offering a choice to teachers, parents and staff. The goal is to provide schools with autonomy and maximum control over their resources in exchange for increased accountability.

- Pilot schools are innovative K-12 public schools
- Pilot schools have greater autonomy that allows them to develop based on a unifying vision and mission that is identified by individuals who will be working at those schools.
- Pilot schools can be applied to any grade or school level
- Pilot schools will have no more than 500 students
- Pilot schools are exempt from most district policies except state or federal mandates and are exempt from most work rules defined within the negotiated agreement.
- Pilot schools have collaborative cultures that support staff and administration working together to best meet the needs of students and families.

Van Gytenbeek reiterated that we were given a charge that came out of negotiations to create an outline of a pilot school for APS from models seen in Boston and Los Angeles. The study group focused on areas outlined in the presentation and completed research structures in order to maximize time. Van Gytenbeek praised Ann French and Christina Brown, Center for Collaborative Education. They have been terrific resources for the group and both were readily accessible with advice on how to proceed and development of framework.

If we get the green light from AEA representatives, and the AEA and APS Boards to proceed, we will enter into a special round of contract negotiations in early

October to determine if and how pilot school language can be written into our contract to allow us to continue.

Issacs presented an overview of features that make pilot schools unique.

- Pilot schools remain a part of the district
- Pilot schools have greater flexibility
- Pilot schools are not subject to the negotiated agreement or the teacher contract except in basic areas that require an agreement.
- Pilot schools require that 66 percent of licensed staff working in the building vote on whether to become a pilot school.
- Classified staff and parents of students would have an opportunity to offer recommendations

Barber asked for clarification on whether classified staff or parents would be able to vote to on whether to become a pilot school. Issacs replied that both groups would have an opportunity make recommendations, but would not be able to vote. The study group felt that since it is part of the negotiated agreement only licensed staff would be able to vote.

A joint steering committee comprised of leadership from the association, superintendent (or designee), district representatives from the Division of Instruction, teacher representatives, representatives from SEA, and classified representatives would be created to oversee and support pilot schools. The committee would also be responsible for

- monitoring the application process
- coordinating implementation
- monitoring budgets and budgetary agreements
- serving as a liaison between pilot schools and the district
- ensuring pilot schools are preparing students for state mandated tests

Carmany asked if there was any consideration to having a Board member on the joint steering committee. Van Gyteenbeek explained that the final recommendation from the joint committee comes to the Board for approval. He also commented that parents will be involved significantly on the governance board.

Cook clarified that the joint steering committee would be like every other element or department in the district in that it comes before and reports directly to the Board. The Board would have control and approval would be granted through the normal channel for governance.

Foster shared that we used The Essential Guide to Pilot Schools developed by the Center for Collaborative Education as a study guide. We received input from the Boston Teachers' Union, the Los Angeles Public Schools, and the Zone of Choice Belmont Schools, which is also in the Los Angeles Public School district. We are recommending the following structures based on models used in Boston and Los Angeles for APS.

Ellis explained that there are four essential features to ensure the success of pilot schools. Foster reiterated that pilot schools will not exceed 500 students in order to create low teacher to student ratios and create a personal learning environment.

Barber asked how the group settled on the maximum of 500 students. Ellis explained that we utilized models from the Center for Collaborative Education and structures in place in Boston and Los Angeles to determine 500 students.

Most of the models and structures seen had 400 students. We looked at schools in APS and we wanted to maximize opportunities in existing schools. We are recommending that it does not exceed 500 students. Another advantage of a smaller school is a smaller staff that will develop into a more cohesive group, creating more collaborative cultures in the building.

Another essential feature was a commitment to equity focusing on remaining neighborhood schools. Pilot schools will reflect similar demographics as the neighborhoods they serve. Whatever the demographics for grades, ethnicity, second language learners, special education students, gifted and talented will apply to the pilot school based in that neighborhood. We believe that every student can be successful regardless of background and we will not screen based on student achievement.

Foster shared that pilot schools will have control over key areas, but they will have increased accountability for academic student performance. Autonomy is an area where the district and the association both released their historical authority over key areas. This allows the pilot school to focus on higher achievement for the 21st century learners. Pilot schools will have control over staffing, budget, curriculum and assessment, professional development, governance and schedules for both students and staff. These decisions will be based on the individual mission and vision of each school.

The governing board is a critical, essential element in pilot schools and the overall purpose is to

- foster shared decision making
- meet requirements by the state for school accountability committees
- A minimum of 12 members would serve on the governing board:
 - the principal of the school
 - four teachers selected by peers – half of the teachers would be AEA representatives
 - one classified representative selected by peers
 - four parent representatives selected by parents
 - two community members
- The purpose of the mixed representation is to continue to maintain the balance between staff, parents, and community members
- The governing board has power over the principal selection and evaluation in conjunction with the superintendent of schools
- The governing board has authority to make final decisions for educational and operational policies taking into account state and federal requirements
- The governing board approves and maintains the annual budget
- The governing board will adhere to guidelines for working conditions (within the Annual Election-to-Work Agreement which is collaboratively developed and supported by two-thirds of licensed staff within the school)

Pilot schools will be able to hire and release staff including the principal in order to ensure a unified school community that supports the vision and mission of the school. The governing board is involved in establishing the hiring process. Teachers will play a significant role in the hiring process, but the principal will make the majority of staffing decisions.

- All staff, licensed and classified, must choose to work at a pilot school
- Assignments are on a year-to-year basis
- Annual Election-to-Work Agreement must be approved by two-thirds of

teachers and identify timelines for transfers and hiring to allow affected teachers ample opportunity to make an informed decision regarding where to apply for transfers within the district.

- Non-probationary teachers are guaranteed placement in the district and retain same transfer rights as any other teacher in the district.
- The governing board is responsible for hiring and evaluating the principal, but the superintendent has the final authority.
- When the governing board makes a recommendation to hire a principal, it will submit the name to the superintendent.
- If that candidate is not accepted, the governing board will submit another name until consensus is reached.
- The principal is responsible for evaluating staff using the district-approved process for regular and alternative recommendations.
- The school could also request a peer evaluation for both licensed and classified staff as long as it is district approved and is identified in the Election to Work Agreement.
- Pilot schools can recommend termination of any employee for an unsatisfactory evaluation or just cause. The recommendation must be approved through the district evaluation process to ensure due process.
- Staff plans are based on student needs and support the mission and vision of the school.
- Staff compensation is based on negotiated salary and benefits for all APS licensed staff.

Pilot schools will receive the same funding as comparable schools within the district. They will have access to discretionary funds from district services, which they may choose to access.

- Pilot schools receive their funding in a lump sum based on their per pupil budget in accordance with the equivalent budget at other district schools with similar enrollment and grade levels.
- The budget includes salaries and all specified discretionary funds.
- Enrollment projections will be confirmed by December of the prior school year. Budgets will be calculated based on enrollment projections. If projections come over or under, a one-time adjustment will be made.
- Pilot schools determine how to allocate funds for staffing and scheduling to support their vision and mission
- Funding for staff is based on the average teacher salary
- Pilot schools will hire experienced and diverse staff; staffing choices will not be based on budgetary amounts
- Pilot schools may choose to purchase central office discretionary line items (this is still under consideration). Line items may include substitutes, textbooks, athletics, instructional coaches, ELL services, career and technical education, curriculum and instruction, professional development, gifted and talented, and library and media services.
- Maintenance and operations will initially be fixed costs
- Pilot schools will receive fair portions of district grants if they agree to adopt the initiative. It is encouraged that outside sources of funding from grants, partnerships, and foundation be pursued to supplement the budget. Collaboration with the Aurora Education Foundation is also recommended.

Snyder shared an overview of curriculum and assessment, accountability, and

schedule.

- Pilot schools must have freedom to structure curriculum and assessment practices to meet the growing need of students.
- Pilot schools have flexibility to determine curriculum and assessment practices, but they will be held accountable for state and federal mandates such as CSAP and ACT.
- Pilot schools will determine how to best prepare students for the assessments
- Pilot schools do not have to follow district curriculum requirements
- Pilot schools can create or modify curriculum to fulfill each school's vision and mission
- Teachers have autonomy to work creatively on curriculum designs
- Students must demonstrate competency in a defined set of skills and content knowledge through a series of assessments developed by the school
- Pilot schools are encouraged to create more personalized environments
- Pilot schools may set their own promotion and graduation credit requirements as long as they are equal or more rigorous than district requirements
- The measurement emphasis should be on performance state assessments
- Pilot schools must demonstrate sustained growth for years one and two and exceed district averages in year three
- Pilot schools will select professional development based on the mission and vision
- Pilot schools must be in control of their time in order to structure schedules to meet the mission and vision of the school
- Pilot schools must have the right to implement flexible schedules to support school reform and increase student achievement including different student days as identified by the district and different calendar constructs for both staff and students
- Pilot schools may want to consider longer instructional periods, significant academic time, and significant amounts of collaborative planning time so faculty can increase professional development.
- Pilot schools should ensure time for staff planning and professional development in organizing school schedules to maximize learning time for students.
- Pilot schools may have longer school days and school years if agreed to in the Annual Election-to-Work Agreement .
- Pilot schools are held to higher levels of accountability in exchange for increased autonomy; accountability requires both internal and external reviews
- Pilot schools are expected to exceed district averages and achievement and show growth for higher levels of student engagement in areas of attendance, reduction of mobility, and fewer discipline concerns.
- Pilot schools in high schools are expected to show increased graduation rates and increased college enrollments and postsecondary career advancements.
- Each pilot school will identify yearly benchmarks to review and identify progress and every three years pilot schools participate in a school quality review that has common benchmarks for all pilot schools.

Achtermann explained that the school quality review (SQR) process is the

evaluation process that that will be completed in the school every three years. This focus will be on criteria used to evaluate high performing schools including condition of the school, student outcome, leadership and governance, teaching and learning, professional development, and family and community engagement. The SQR team is comprised of four-to-six members including APS staff, AEA representatives, staff from other districts, and community members. The SQR process would begin after the pilot school develops a portfolio of information. The SQR team visits the school for three days and gathers information. The team develops a report of findings including accommodations and recommendations for improvement. Findings are submitted to the joint steering committee and they provide feedback to the SQR report and the school's response to the report. The pilot school develops an action plan based on findings from the SQR report, school response, and feedback from the Joint Steering Committee. The SQR should be coordinated with state mandated accountability.

Listed below are recommendations of possible areas that the study group felt needed further negotiations.

- The current transfer language will need to be addressed to include teachers who sub, select, or choose to transfer from a pilot school. If a school transitions to a pilot school, we would need to identify transfer policies. Teacher positions that are converted or eliminated would also need to be addressed.
- More discussions on the cost of start up schools versus converting an existing school to a pilot school
- Under what or any conditions would teachers receive additional compensation including more hours or days of the year and how to outline it in the Election-to-Work Agreement
- What should be the process for dispute resolution
- What are the implications for pilot schools in a reduction in force
- Should pilot school contract language be discussed every year for the first three years until they are established

We have identified three ways to apply to become a pilot school in APS:

- Convert an existing APS schools that has 500 students or less that has chosen to become a pilot school
- New, start-up schools: new schools may form a design team of APS staff and parents to submit a proposal to the joint steering committee
- Conversion of a separate schools within an existing facility

Shirley presented recommendations and the process for applying to become a pilot school:

- A core design team comprised of principals, school staff, parents and community patrons will start developing the mission and vision of the pilot school
- A letter of intent is submitted by the core design team to the joint steering committee
- The joint steering committee reviews letters of intent and assigns a liaison to work with the interested school through the core design process and provide technical assistance to the team
- The joint steering committee offers training and support for all schools who have submitted a letter of intent to help them understand what autonomy means, what needs to be in place instructionally, and to help the design team draft a proposal
- Once the proposal is drafted, the design team works with the liaison, school staff, and the community to finalize and move toward the

approval process

- Classified staff and the school accountability committee will be asked to submit a recommendation to the design team to present to licensed staff prior to voting by the licensed staff
- The proposal must be voted on and requires approval from two-thirds of the licensed staff working more than 50 percent of their week at the school
- The final proposal is submitted to the joint steering committee for approval
- If the joint steering committee approves the proposal, it will be submitted to the Board of Education for final approval
- The joint steering committee may refer the application back to the core design team with feedback and recommendations
- The joint steering committee could deny the proposal if all requirements are not met
- The Board of Education makes the final decision on whether a school becomes a pilot school
- The entire process could take three months to a year depending on the above recommendations and process

Issacs presented an overview of proposed implementation timelines

- Report presented to both the AEA and APS boards with recommendations to proceed by September 4, 2007
- Present report to the Association Representative Council on September 11, 2007
- Share general concept with all staff and schools September 12 through October 1, 2007, via e-mail, pod casts, and the district Web site
- Potential contract language developed through negotiations on October 3, 2007 and October 10, 2007
- AEA election to approve contract language October 15 through October 19, 2007
- Present the final negotiation information to Board of Education for approval October 23, 2007
- Begin forming a joint steering committee in early October 2007
- Continue communications with schools and community October through November 2007
- Two information forums will be held for interested schools in November 2007
- Call for request for proposals for the 2008-09 school year by November 1, 2007
- Letter of intent due to the joint steering committee by November 20, 2007
- Core design team training November 26-30, 2007
- Submission of proposals to joint steering January 15, 2008
- Joint steering makes recommendations to BOE February 13, 2008
- Board of Education announces selections February 19, 2008
- First school or schools open in August 2008

Van Gytenbeek presented an overview of the Annual Election-to-Work Agreement staff would sign prior to the start of the school year to ensure adequate staffing. He also stressed that study group's recommendations and responses outlined for pilot schools come as a whole. As negotiations begin between the two district teams we must consider recommendations and responses as a whole.

Barry thanked the group and praised the entire team. This is a perfect example of “trust and teamwork” and how we as a community can work together and create an exciting, innovative alternative that focuses on children. It shows the cooperation we have among teachers, principals, AEA representatives, and administrators and the commitment to do what is necessary to be competitive in this world. We must have options of choice and this is an excellent example of extremely hard work done by some stupendous people in our district. He commended Issacs and Van Gytenbeek for all their hard work and leadership.

Barber asked if each school would determine how the Election-to-Work Agreement would be structured. Issacs explained that common elements would be in all agreements, but different sites may have different elements. The content could differ from site to site depending on the mission and vision. Based on the model in Boston, the governance board would develop some of the elements included in the Election-to-Work Agreement or a group of school staff would developed some of the elements included in the agreement. Every year the governance board or a group of staff would update the Election-to-Work agreement and the licensed staff would vote on it.

Tabacheck asked about the selective process and placement of special education students. Cook clarified that there is no basis for admission. If it is a student’s home school, he or she can attend the pilot school. A student can also apply for open enrollment at any of the district schools.

Cook asked whether the principal of a pilot school would be able to vote. The reply was that all votes would require a two-thirds majority by licensed staff.

Lord asked if there would now be two negotiated agreements. Issacs replied yes and expounded that this provides us with extraordinary opportunities to do something different to address what is best for kids. Lord asked if we have enough time and energy to hold two negotiations. Issacs replied that we would have negotiations for pilot schools in October and full negotiations in March. Van Gytenbeek shared that bargaining teams have worked together and they are familiar with the charge so we should be able to maximize time in October.

Carmany thanked the group for all their hard work and collaboration. She had an opportunity to meet with the group and commended them for their willingness to be open and honest with one another.

Carmany asked if we keep enrollments at pilot schools to 500 or less, would that impact class sizes at other district schools. Van Gytenbeek replied that it would not impact class sizes because we will be working with the same allocation. The pilot school governance board has the option to look at how allocations and resources are distributed and they may structure classes so they have lower teacher to student ratios.

Edberg shared how impressed she was with the attachments that came with the Board agenda. Information was clear and she has a good understanding of pilot schools. She commended the task force on the work and organization of the attachments.

Van Gytenbeek shared that the task force will be working with Ivan Duran and Tom Fox to film the pod cast that will be posted to the Web site. People will be able to access information once Issacs meets with association representatives on September 11. If they agree to move forward, we will hold three information forums.

Carmany commented that the development of pilot schools is a result of contract negotiations from last spring. People want choices and this is one way to answer that need. Part of it is community driven and part of it is political climate.

Cook thanked the presenters for the incredible amount of work accomplished toward the first step of implementation of pilot schools. The Board unanimously agreed to move forward with the implementation of pilot schools.

Issacs shared that the AEA board met earlier in the evening and they also gave their support to move forward. Association representatives will meet September 11.

Van Gytenbeek thanked the task force for all of their hard work. Carmany also thanked Sue Clark for her work as facilitator of the task force. Issacs commented that Clark was a phenomenal facilitator. She thanked the task force for all of their hard work as well.

Section E – Support Services Policy Revisions

Brian Donovan and Rosemarie Hebert presented information on Section E – Support Services Policy revisions to the Board.

- A total of 38 E section policies are in the review process.
- Two are recommended for deletion because:
 - One is a duplicate of a policy in the J, Student section policies (EEAEC/JICC, Student Conduct on Buses).
 - One is recommended for deletion (EEAF/EEAFA, Special Use of School Buses/Extra-Curricular Activity Buses/Field Trips-Special Events Transportation) because the information is contained in other policies.
- 10 of the E section policies received only minor revisions, such as:
 - Added cross references
 - Updated capitalization to current practice
 - Minor word changes to clarify text
- Eight E section policies have no changes, and are presented for information only and to update the “review” date on the policy header prior to posting on the Web.
- EF, Nutrition Services and Wellness, is a new policy that is required to conform to the new wellness policy.
- Another new policy is EHB, Aurora Public Schools Records Retention and Destruction.
- This is to comply with records retention schedules established by CDE.
- This also provides much needed retention information and guidelines to the Student Records Office, Human Resources and other offices.
- A policy still in the revision process is EGAD, Copyright Compliance, which is in progress.

All E section, Support Services’ policy revisions will be presented to the Board for action on Sept. 18.

Section D: Fiscal Management and Section K: School, Community & Home Relations, will be presented to the Board as information on Sept. 18.

Cook asked Sturges to compile information on policy EEAA, transportation distances to and from school, to determine the impact of reducing mileage of high school students from 3 miles to 2 or 2.5 miles.

Barber requested clarification on policy EEAEA, bus driver requirements—training and responsibilities, questioning if we have made our bus driving training more stringent. Sturges replied that state law governs training. A portion of the training is in policy, but state law governs it.

Cook clarified that we had mentioned that we go above and beyond training requirements. Barry also clarified that elements listed in the regulations cover items such as crossing railroad tracks, fire prevention, and maintenance of vehicles. The policy was last updated in 1993, but our safety record indicates we have a pretty thorough process. Hebert pointed out that the policy was adopted in May 1993 and revised in May 2006.

Tabacheck asked about policy EEAB, special education student transportation, sharing that we had discussions on whether siblings of special education students could ride the bus when Scott French was transportation director. Sturges replied that each request is reviewed individually on a case-by-case basis.

Carmany asked if it states in policy EBBA, prevention of disease/infection transmission, that APS staff, especially new employees, would receive training on procedures for handling body fluids. Cook requested that Donovan provide more information before the policy comes back for action.

Barber asked if policy EHC, Children's Internet Protection Act: Internet Safety, included Cyber Bullying and My Space. Donovan replied that we have a separate bullying policy that addresses cyber bullying.

DIVISION OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND RESEARCH

No items

DIVISION OF FINANCE

No items

DIVISION OF HUMAN RESOURCES

No Items

DIVISION OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

No Items

DIVISION OF SUPPORT SERVICES

No Items

III. CONSENT AGENDA - ACTION ITEMS

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

No Items

DIVISION OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND RESEARCH

No items

DIVISION OF FINANCE

No items

DIVISION OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Classified Personnel

Licensed Personnel

Non-Licensed Administrative and Professional/Technical Personnel

DIVISION OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

No Items

DIVISION OF SUPPORT SERVICES

No Items

Barton moved and Tabacheck seconded to adopt the consent agenda as presented.

Roll Call: Barber, Barton, Carmany, Cook, Edberg, Lord, Tabacheck #7914

The motion to adopt passed on a vote of 7-0.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Sections I – Instruction and J – Students Policy Revision

Donovan shared that the Board was presented with Section I – Instruction and Section J – Student Policy Revision as information on August 7.

Lord moved and Carmany seconded to approve Sections I – Instruction and J – Student Policy Revision as presented.

Barber questioned if policy JLIB, Student Dismissal Precautions, that Carmany had asked about at a previous meeting had been revised. Hebert checked with several schools and the Department of School Services, and shared that whenever someone picks up a student from school they must show identification. If someone calls about a student, the school checks to determine if their name is listed in Infinite Campus. If their name is not listed, he or she cannot pick up the student. Tabacheck clarified that one of the concerns was that there was not a verification process to adequately identify a caller. Barry recommended that more information be provided before policy JLIB is approved.

Cook amended the motion to approve Section I and Section J as presented with the exception of policy JLIB until more information is presented.

Roll Call: Barber, Barton, Carmany, Cook, Edberg, Lord, Tabacheck #7915

The motion to approve passed on a vote of 7-0.

DIVISION OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND RESEARCH

No items

DIVISION OF FINANCE

No items

DIVISION OF HUMAN RESOURCES

No Items

DIVISION OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

No Items

DIVISION OF SUPPORT SERVICES

**Name Changes – Administration Building,
Highline A and B, and Centretech**

Sturges shared that many district offices have relocated due to reorganization and strategic planning. Name changes were presented and discussed at the Board meeting on August 7. Taking into consideration input from the Board, the following name recommendations are submitted for consideration.

- Highline B to Educational Services Center, Building 1
- Highline A to Educational Services Center, Building 2
- Centretech to Educational Services Center, Building 3
- Administration Building to Educational Services Center, Peoria Building

Lord moved and Tabacheck seconded to approve name changes as presented.

Roll Call: Barber, Barton, Carmany, Cook, Edberg, Lord, Tabacheck #7916

The motion to approve passed on a vote of 7-0.

Drainage Easement at Vassar Elementary School

Sturges invited Josh Hensley, district planner, to the table. Sturges shared that the City of Aurora is requesting a .0494-acre drainage easement as part of the parking lot project at Vassar Elementary School. This project is submitted to the Board of Education for consideration.

Sturges shared that this item was presented for information on August 21 and Barber voiced concerns regarding pipeline safety. Hensley shared some of the safety precautions in place to ensure the safety of the pipeline. Vassar, Mrachek, and Rangeview are three schools impacted by the pipeline owned by Conoco Phillips. The pipeline runs through a 60-foot wide easement. There are two gas lines within the easement, one is a six-inch line and one is an eight-inch line. One was installed in the early fifties; one was installed in the early seventies. The biggest concern of pipeline failure is third party error. Over 90 percent of all problems are from a third party excavating. Conoco Phillips controls activity in the easement and that is why we had to go through the lengthy process of obtaining an encroachment agreement. They inspected all of our design work when excavating started to ensure safety and damage concerns.

In addition, they routinely fly across their easement to check for any signs of encroachments.

Conoco Phillips monitors and checks for signs of corrosion. Pipes are coded with a physical barrier to reduce contact that might cause corrosion. Conoco Phillips runs a "smart peg" through the pipe that takes measurements within the pipe to check for differences in wall thickness, dents, and corrosion. Pipes can also be shut off remotely if they suspect a leak or any other issues or concerns.

Tabacheck moved and Edberg seconded to approve the drainage easement as Vassar as presented.

Roll Call: Barber, Barton, Carmany, Cook, Edberg, Lord, Tabacheck #7917

The motion to approve passed on a vote of 7-0.

IV. CONCLUDING ITEMS

Cook recognized Peter Cukale in the audience. Cukale is another official Board candidate.

Opportunity for Audience

Sharolyn Hohulin, 2594 S. Eagle Circle, voiced frustrations regarding repeated requests to review student policies that were passed tonight. She shared that since mid-summer, she has been attempting to get clarification on quarter grades and no one in the district could get the policies until she became very persistent this last week and today. She checked the Internet, spoke to Linda Witulski, and e-mailed Susan Olezene to obtain information.

Hohulin shared that Rosemarie Hebert sent an e-mail with information regarding student policies this afternoon and she was able to meet with William Stuart. She shared that Information received from Hebert differed somewhat from information received from Stuart.

Hohulin voiced concerns regarding the implementation of quarter credits sharing that district leaders have the ability to do whatever they chose since quarter credits are part of regulations instead of policy. She asked Cook if the Board understood regulations. Cook responded that the Board understands regulations and the implementation of quarter credits are part of regulations. Policies approved tonight did not deal with quarter credits.

Hohulin shared that if a student fails a test or enrolls late, it will be difficult for him or her to achieve the grade they want with the implementation of quarter credits. She also shared that if a teacher does not continually inform the student and parent of progress within a nine week period it could create a problem because the grade would be permanent at the end of the quarter. Student GPA's might decrease with quarter credits and it puts stress on honor students who are already stressed trying to make good grades and maintain a good GPA for college admissions. She shared that her daughter is an honor student. As an example, she might have a B at the quarter, but she could raise it to an A by the semester.

Hohulin requested to speak to the Board because she felt that control had been relinquished to the administration to make rules that parents and the public had no means to change. This is a policy that helps kids who are not engaged. As a parent, Hohulin asked to have better communication from the district before it

September 4, 2007

becomes too frustrating. Cook asked Stuart to contact Hohulin with additional information or clarification.

Next meeting date

The next business meeting of the Board of Education will be on September 18, 2007, at 6:30 p.m. in the boardroom of the Administration Building at 1085 Peoria Street.

Adjournment

The regular meeting of the Board of Education adjourned at 8:57 p.m.

President

ATTEST

Secretary