

PIEDMONT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Council Chambers, City Hall
120 Vista Avenue
Piedmont, California 94611

MINUTES OF

Regular Meeting of the Governing Board

October 25, 2006

CALL TO ORDER	Board President Lindenmayer called the Regular Meeting of the Board of Education to order at 7:03 p.m. and led the Board and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.
ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM	President Ward Lindenmayer, Vice President June Monach, Board Members Cathie Geddeis, Ray Gadbois, Roy Tolles
OTHERS PRESENT FOR REGULAR SESSION	Constance Hubbard, Superintendent Michael Brady, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services
Agenda Adjustments	None
COMMUNICATIONS / ANNOUNCEMENTS	
Association of Piedmont Teachers (APT)	None
California School Employees Association (CSEA)	None
Parent Clubs	None
Student Representative to the Board	Not present
Superintendent	None
Board President	Board President Lindenmayer reported on the: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Friday, October 27 Homecoming Game at Witter Field; 7 p.m. Varsity against John Swett High School• Saturday, October 28 Homecoming Dance• Friday, November 10 – Veterans' Day Holiday; no school
Moment of Silence	Board President Lindenmayer requested a moment of silence in honor of former Piedmont High School student Molly Miller who passed away last week.
REVIEW & ACTION ITEMS	
Update on Bond Projects by Capital Program Management, Inc. (CPM) Project Manager David Burke; Approve List of Architectural and Engineering Firms for Services, and Authorize Superintendent to Work with Program Manager to Enter Into Contracts with Selected Firms	Superintendent Hubbard explained the search process for the architectural and engineering firms to be interviewed. The District is recommending the designation of five firms to be placed in a pool. Per Government Code 4525, in compliance with the qualification-based selection, the District wants to have a list of firms to call on to preclude doing another <i>Request for Proposal</i> . The District will pursue one firm to start the next phase of calculations. She introduced Project Manager David Burke from Capital Program Management, Inc. to go over the process.

Mr. Burke shared that the District sent out a *Request for Qualifications* (RFQ) related to its bond projects. CPM participated in this at the conclusion of the process. The District received fourteen responses to the RFQ. A combination of the Steering Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, and Capital Program Management, Inc. (CPM) pared down the qualified candidates to eight firms, who were interviewed on October 18, 2006. All eight firms were very capable and professional. After the interviews, the selection subcommittee, consisting of two Board members, the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent for Facilities, and two members of the Technical Advisory Committee (Stan Moy and Janiele Maffei) debriefed and narrowed the list down further to five firms from which to move forward as a "short list".

Superintendent Hubbard added that the District met with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for additional feedback. The assignment process was discussed and it was agreed it would be appropriate to select one firm and assign all the projects to that one firm and begin negotiations with them. That firm is Murakami & Nelson, who works in conjunction with R.P. Gallagher. They have a very strong structural engineer.

Mr. Burke continued that if, for some reason, the District is unable to reach agreement on terms such as scope of work, schedule, and fee, it will go back to the four firms remaining and select one of them and proceed with negotiations. The other four pre-qualified firms chosen for the pool are: VBN, Arthur Tam & Associates, ATI Architects and Engineers, and HTI.

The scope will be more narrowly defined in the beginning and once the scope becomes more largely defined, there may be another agreement proposed.

Board Member Geddeis asked what set Murakami/Nelson apart from the other candidates. Mr. Burke replied that their structural engineer was very strong and understood their role regarding the project. They had a very nice statement of qualifications; they answered the interview questions well and stayed on task during the interview process; and they have experience in dealing with the Division of the State Architect. Their references checked out very well. They have a lot of related school experience and some of their co-workers reside in the community.

Board Member Tolles shared that he was on the interview panel and once everyone talked about the various firms, the best ones went to the top and there was general agreement on choosing one firm to be the lead firm. Technical Advisory Committee members involved - Janiele Maffei, a structural engineer; and Stan Moy, an architect - were both very qualified to interview the groups. The TAC also agreed with the selection of this group. Murakami/Nelson would be working in conjunction with the engineering firm of R. P. Gallagher Company. Board President Lindenmayer also commented on the process.

Board Member Gadbois asked how the scope of the project is figured out at this point.

Mr. Burke replied that the first step is to have the structural engineer do a structural and quantitative analysis. There are scoping issues related to seismic upgrade, accessibility (Americans with Disabilities Act – ADA),

and hazardous materials. Following that, an analysis would need to be made on whether to seismically retrofit. Then there is additional scoping required in the event of modernization. Mr. Burke emphasized that the scoping exercise will be very time-consuming but extremely important.

He continued that while the structural engineer is going through the analysis process, Mr. Burke will be meeting with school sites to address the development of some of the educational issues related to facilities.

Mr. Burke stated the District will need to bring in a geotechnical engineer to identify soil conditions and slope issues. A surveyor for detailed surveying will be required, and we need to think about having a hazardous materials consultant come in and document the location of any possible hazardous materials. Following all of this, the District will move forward with peer review. A peer review Statement of Qualifications will be presented after we have moved forward with everything noted above.

It was moved by Board Member Tolles, seconded by Board Member Geddeis, and unanimously passed to approve a pool of five firms for architectural and engineering services as provided for under Government Code Section 4525, using a "qualification-based selection process"; the firms being: VBN, Arthur Tam, HTI, ATI, and Murakami Nelson (lead).

The Board was polled and the motion passed unanimously.

Board Member Gadbois requested that, at the appropriate time, a brief presentation be given by Murakami/Nelson at a future Board meeting. The Superintendent added this was something already planned.

Update by Board Subcommittee on
Public Engagement Process

Superintendent Hubbard noted that the agenda from the October 12 community meeting was included in their packets, along with the timeline for bond project activities. For questions or comments on the bond project, there is an input@pusd.org and persons can sign up to receive e-news on the bond projects via the District web site: www.piedmont.k12.ca.us. A new web site will be implemented on November 1, which can be accessed at: www.pusdbond.org.

Vice President Monach thanked everyone who participated and presented at the first public engagement meeting on October 12. It seemed attendance was equal parts of parents with students in the schools, and community members with no students in the schools, along with individuals who were from architectural firms doing their homework in anticipation of the October 18 interviews. The focus was to bring the public up to speed on the projects and give them time to hear information and ask questions. Parts of the presentation on the bond program planning from the community meeting were presented in PowerPoint form and explained by Project Manager David Burke.

Ms. Monach concluded by advising that additional community meetings will be held.

David Burke said, in talking about timelines, there are very different construction duration periods for a rebuild versus a seismic retrofit so in talking timelines, there would be different schedules involved depending on what the projects ultimately turn out to be. Assuming we can move forward with a seismic retrofit project, which has the shortest construction duration, it would involve seismic retrofit, accessibility (ADA)

issues, and fire/life safety. The soonest that this could happen at Havens and the High School (because we would want to focus the main construction during the summer) would be the Summer of 2008 because the construction documents would not be completed until the summer of 2007, and would then have to go to the Division of the State Architect (DSA) which takes them four to eight months to review and approve.

A preview of the web site home page was shown.

Vice President Monach added that the City Administrator, Mayor and Vice Mayor, along with the Board President, Vice President and Superintendent recently held a City-School District Liaison meeting to discuss matters of mutual interest. One of the items was the coordination of the public engagement calendar. The City is committed to working in coordination with the school district on civic center plans.

Review and Approve 2007-08 Instructional School Year Calendar

Superintendent Hubbard explained that in the background information submitted in February 2005, there was an explanation of the previous survey and history for the 2005-06 school year calendar. In June 2005, parent clubs were asked if they again wanted to participate in a survey regarding the calendar and they did not wish to do this.

The calendar reflects both the mutual interests of having a calendar presented as soon as possible for employees, parents and the community, as well as an instructionally based schedule that endeavors to optimize student learning. In response to questions raised about the process, background information presented as part of the proposed Instructional Calendar for the 2005-06 school year had been included in the Board packet.

The survey of calendars and the process used by other districts that was presented by a group of parents at the last Board meeting has been shared with the negotiating team. A procedure that allows for input by CSEA members and parents has been discussed. She said the District is committed to the development of a more transparent, inclusive calendar development process for the 2008-09 school year.

The District and Association of Piedmont Teachers (APT) are committed to the interest-based bargaining negotiation process and therefore have agreed to continue to move forward with the calendar separate from the regular negotiations process. The calendar is presented for Board approval this evening so that staff, parents and students can plan for next year.

Board Member Tolles felt that the calendar for 2007-08 is not something that the Board can now easily change; it is part of the teacher/district negotiating process. Information was gathered in Spring for the following year. It would be hard to change now because it is the end of the process. The calendar is now considered part of a separate negotiation item. It would be nice to make some changes but we should look at the overall process and how complicated it is and integrate it into the 2008-09 school year calendar. We should also look at having a higher level of parent input. He spoke with several parents who did the survey. He said the problem was the survey had general opinions but not specific proposals. It needs to be more detailed. The calendar process is difficult. The teachers are the ones working on it and they take it seriously and set it up to give the best educational experience for the

students from start to end and it is important to consider their opinion, also. They spend a lot of time trying to figure out the schedule. It is a well-considered opinion on the teachers' part and then they vote on it.

Board Member Gadbois tried to summarize the survey process. Five questions were asked. Only 348 parents [out of over approximately 2300] responded. Of those responding:

- 1) 55% felt starting the school year close to Labor Day was very important
- 2) 44% wanted to end school by mid-June
- 3) 26% thought the week off at Thanksgiving was very important
- 4) 31% thought the week off in February (ski week) was important
- 5) 43% thought the week off in spring (spring break) was important

The results are not definitive. Although it is clear that people would like to start school later, it is not clear other days would be given up. The next step would be to see if there is any consensus on tradeoffs.

He then asked what the purposes are and how are the minimum days decided?

Superintendent Hubbard responded that the other minimum days are: conferencing, which is grade-specific so they would not always be on the same day; Back to School nights, which would not always be on the same day (all elementary schools are now on the same day); there are exam weeks for the High School; and there is a minimum day before Winter Break. There are also shorter days for collaboration time at all sites.

He asked if it would be possible to ask the negotiating team if more time could be added to solicit more input from parents before a vote is taken on the calendar.

Superintendent Hubbard felt this is the process that was implemented and that, per APT contract, the calendar is to be voted on in October. She feels this is the process we started and we have a certain obligation to finish this way. She added that what was not even asked here was the timing of telling the community when the next school year starts and she doesn't know if that would be a good tradeoff for holding off for another month.

Board Member Gadbois stated that the first goal is to have a good educational program. He feels students benefit from a longer school year rather than a longer summer. In other words, they benefit from having more breaks over the school year. From the teachers' perspective, they are the heart of the program who deliver the program and teach our students. One of our goals is to attract and retain the best teachers. Working conditions are a part of their compensation package program. If the teachers feel this school year calendar is good, he would like to support it. The third perspective is the parents. One of the reasons the school district is so successful is because of the parents. We need to have dialogue with parents about this issue and make them feel a part of the process. He would like to take more time to have that dialogue, even if it means no change to the calendar would be made this year and even if the calendar does not come before a vote in October.

Board Member Geddeis heard the message from the parents who attended the last Board meeting that the parents needed to be more included in the process. She is concerned about making any changes on the calendar being presented for 2007-08 that was already voted on by APT. She is also concerned because the District has a commitment in the teachers' contract to bring this in October for action; the District has been operating under this method. She would rather bring the 2008-09 calendar to parent clubs/other groups in a more measured and considered fashion than bringing it up now.

Vice President Monach has thought a lot about the calendar development process. She contacted a person previously serving on the Palo Alto Board of Education. Palo Alto has a calendar development process which provides a timeline for public input and FAQs are disseminated. One year, what guided the construction of the school year calendar at Palo Alto was that as a result of their WASC process, it was recommended that their high school students take finals and have reached the end of their first semester before their winter break. The other constraint was that the bulk of the curriculum or instruction be delivered prior to the taking of advanced placement exams, standardized tests, and SATs, so that the net effect was to shift their calendar for the sake of the secondary level. Because of that, their school year calendar started about two weeks before Labor Day. Parents of younger students complained.

The calendar is a District-teacher negotiated process. Palo Alto [as does Piedmont] puts forth two or three alternative calendars to their membership for a vote. The calendar with the highest vote is recommended for adoption by the Board. There are no parents who serve as representatives. They do, however, have calendar committee meetings which are open, although the public cannot participate in the process. We need to keep in mind that the calendar is a series of competing interests. Palo Alto's calendar is very close to Piedmont's. They have a two-year consecutive calendar process. She wants to respect and honor the process of the calendar being a teacher-negotiated item and feels we should set our sites to the future. Ultimately, the most important development is the product – that the calendar is educationally sound in order to give the students the time they need. She thought it would be a good idea to see how other districts do their calendar process.

President Lindenmayer shares many of the comments of the other Board members. He would like to see a more open process where the parent community feels that their point of view is at least heard. It is a terribly complicated process. He feels it is too late to change the 2007-08 calendar. He shared some thoughts about the "evolution" of the District calendars which showed changes over a fifteen-year period (1993-94 school year to the present):

- In 1993-94, school started on Sept 7 (day after Labor Day); it ended on June 16.
- For 2007-08, it is proposed that school start on August 22 and end June 12
- For the 1998-99 school year, the State mandated that there be 180 instructional days in a school year.
- Columbus Day did not used to be a holiday and now it is; there are now 3 Staff Development Days (in the past, these days could occur *within* the instructional day; Labor Day is now included as a day off

(before, school had been starting before that holiday); a day was added between the two semesters; and in earlier years, only two days were given for Thanksgiving. Christmas, Spring Break, Ski Week, Veterans' Day, Martin Luther King Jr. Birthday and Memorial Day all stayed the same. That's 10 out of the 11 days that weren't there in the early 1990's.

Therefore, there is a way to account for and explain some of the disapproval of the calendar.

A Beach school parent said she is not sure who was on the calendar committee. She respects the fact that the calendar is a teacher-negotiated item. She is concerned that several parents were never aware of a previous survey and were bewildered that parents did not want a survey for the 2006-07 school year. She is somewhat concerned that the Board would be willing to hold this matter over until the next school year calendar; and that even if parents may want, for example, less days for Thanksgiving, the teachers may feel they want the whole week so that parents will really not have much say. The way the parent survey is done needs to be more explicit.

Lisa Scimens, Beach parent, read a portion of the APT contract in which it states that the calendar will be negotiated separately beginning in September for the following year and the goal is to have the calendar for the subsequent year to be approved by October of the current year. She asked that Board approval be delayed for a month to have the parents feel that they have more input. She still has a lot of questions. Why couldn't the parents have a copy of the different calendars that were presented for a vote? The need for more public openness is way bigger than the calendar issue.

She read comments from a parent who could not be present: if the calendar does not reflect a later start date, as has been expressed by parents in the District, she urged the Board to refrain from approving the calendar until a version more representative of the community's wishes is submitted. She read another comment from parent Dana Serleth who said she hopes at the very least that the school board will commit to insuring transparency and consider and value parents' input and opinions. She would like to see them vote to do so.

Superintendent Hubbard stated there was not agreement to release all of the versions of the proposed 2007-08 calendar with the public. Because it is a teacher-negotiated item, the versions of the calendar are considered confidential.

Ms. Scimens asked that, if there is a desire from the public to have the calendars shared, why can't those be stated in the openers?

Board Member Geddeis felt that the Board made a contractual promise to abide by the APT's decision and we shouldn't change what has already been voted on and approved by APT to go to the Board.

Board Member Tolles stated we can't change what we already have. Summer camps usually start the third week in June and a lot of parents complain when school goes longer into June. Thanksgiving is historically a poor attendance week. Even if parents are willing to have Thanksgiving be fewer days, the issue is that it also becomes a financial decision for

the school district because it affects our revenues. All stakeholders involved need to realize all of the constraints.

Superintendent Hubbard advised that calendars, salary and benefits are automatic openers. In November or December, other articles are "sunshined" and can be brought before the Board at that time.

She wanted to clarify that when the parents requested to do the survey previously, the District negotiators went to the APT negotiators and APT negotiators agreed that they would listen to the input of the parents. The parents wrote the survey and fashioned it the way they wanted to present it; the District was not involved in creating the survey or the questions it asked. There was openness on the part of the negotiators at that time. We do have a commitment from them to try to change the process for the future.

Discussion ensued about how to provide opportunity for more parent input when the calendar is up for adoption this evening.

Valerie Smith, Beach School parent, stated that the APT contract says it is a *goal* to have the calendar approved; there would be no repercussions if it was not approved in October. She thinks there should be some sort of parent liaison group involved with the bargaining issues, as well as other issues. Communications between organizations don't always get flushed out. Can agenda materials be put on the web site to make information flow more freely? It is unclear to her where it says in the Rodda Act that certain things cannot be discussed.

It was moved by Board Member Gadbois to table this item until the next Board meeting, allowing time to publish the material and have it discussed at the upcoming APCP meeting.

Board Member Tolles stated there is not enough time to have an impact, however, the public didn't see this schedule until tonight and there has been no opportunity for feedback. The only way to really get substantial surveys or additional information could take months, so he is willing to have a committee to go through all of the ins and outs to make parental recommendations. He doesn't want this to be a negative connotation toward the APT.

Board Member Gadbois stated the calendar could be presented to the APCP and then the APCP presidents could be asked to do their own discussion and come back with one summarized input.

Board Member Geddeis is very cognizant that it's a serious problem that the calendar wasn't out for a period of time. She could see where it would be preferable to table the vote until the next meeting but she comes back to what she would do with the input they get?

Vice President Monach felt there is consensus among the Board that there is a commitment for developing a more transparent process for calendar development, but what is important to consider is that we help the public understand that in developing a more transparent process, what are the primary contractual and legal obligations we have, and being clear what the process is and communicating out to all the stakeholders.

Public input is considered, but who is the representative at the negotiating table that represents that input: it is the District. It is not three parties at the negotiating table. She also wants to respect the negotiating process.

President Lindenmayer tended to agree with Vice President Monach. Because the calendar is only one element of an overall negotiating process, and the District has been fortunate to have a very supportive process, he would hate to damage that in a major way and he is not sure how much the Board is going to learn to be able to do anything for the current calendar. He would rather vote on the calendar with additional caveats for going forward in the future.

The motion was restated by the Board President.

After discussion, the motion was seconded by Board Member Tolles.

Board Member Geddeis requested an amendment to the motion to include that the discussion with the APCP should not only solicit input on the content of the 2007-08 calendar, but the process in which future calendars should be devised.

The Board President restated the motion to include the amendment.

Board Members Gadbois and Tolles agreed to the amendment of the motion.

Beach parent Valerie Smith read a section from the Rodda Act (3547b) to reiterate that there has to be some time for meaningful input to be heard.

The Board voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Adopt Resolution 08-2006-07,
"Support for Proposition 1 D"

The District is eligible for at least \$9 million in state matching funds, which can only be provided if Proposition 1-D passes. We have to "get in line" for the funds.

It was moved by Board Member Geddeis and seconded by Vice President Monach to adopt Resolution 08-2006-07, "Support for Proposition 1 D".

Resident George Childs is concerned that the District is lobbying the electorate to pass a measure that will impose additional taxes upon the taxpayers of the State of California. In reading through the information that came from the booklet from the State, the proposal would have the taxpayers fund this through General Obligation funds. He read the opposing view for the record: "We should make school construction a top priority for current spending. We cannot afford \$10-\$14 million in new debt which today's school children will still be paying back long after their own children have graduated. Most schools will receive nothing from this bond. Fairness requires local districts to pay for local projects."

President Lindenmayer responded that, as board members of a public school, they are spokespeople or ombudsmen for students of the state. The Board is not taking a position on the other propositions; only on Proposition 1-D because the Board feels it is in the best interest of the students of California and secondarily, we as an individual school district, stand to perhaps benefit financially from this proposition.

The Board was polled and the motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATION

Announcement of Board Workshop to Discuss District Policies and Procedures on Student Discipline and Governing Law, Monday, November 6, 2006, 8:00-10:00 a.m., City Council Chambers

Superintendent Hubbard announced the Board Workshop of Monday, November 6, from 8:00-10:00 a.m. regarding Student Discipline. The workshop is to inform the Board about how discipline is handled at the school sites, policies, etc. The workshop is informational, only; no action will be taken. Various other Board workshops are being scheduled. The meeting will be taped. The meeting could not be taped at the District Office because it would disrupt staff in the conduct of their business.

Board Member Gadbois wanted the public to understand the purpose of the meeting is for the Board to hear and review this information.

CORRESPONDENCE

Some written correspondence was received regarding student discipline and one email was received on the calendar.

BOARD REPORTS

Board Member Tolles attended the October 12 Curriculum Council meeting, the public engagement community meeting, the Beach Pancake Breakfast and Chalk Art Festival, participated in the interviews for the Seismic Risk Reduction Program, the Beach Book Fair, the Technical Advisory Committee, and the October 21 Board workshop.

Board Member Gadbois attended the Curriculum Council meeting, public engagement community meeting, the Middle School Parents' Club meeting, CHIME meeting and the October 21st Board workshop.

Board Member Geddeis attended the Beach Pancake Breakfast, the Chalk Art Festival, the Budget Advisory Committee meeting, the Board workshop and the Piedmont High School Boosters reception.

Vice President Monach has spent most of her time preparing for the public engagement community meeting; she attended the Board workshop, and is working on the development of the bond project web site to bring it online on time.

President Lindenmayer is a participant on the WASC process for Millennium High School; he attended a meeting. He also attended a Board workshop and a Piedmont Educational Foundation meeting.

CONSENT CALENDAR: ACTION ITEMS

It was moved by Board Member Geddeis, seconded by Vice President Monach and passed unanimously to approve the Consent Calendar as presented.

Items approved on the Consent Calendar were as follows:

1. Adopt Board Minutes from Regular Meeting of October 11, 2006
2. Approve Overnight Field Trip for Wildwood fifth grade students to attend Marin Headlands Institute as an outdoor education study program, January 10-12, 2007
3. Approve Out of State Field Trip for Piedmont High School Journalism Students to Journalism Education Association conference, Nashville, Tennessee, November 8-12, 2006
4. Adopt Resolution 09-2006-07, "Disposal of Surplus Property – Beach School"

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, and with no objections by the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:22 p.m.

WARD LINDENMAYER, Board President
Piedmont Unified School District
Board of Education

CONSTANCE HUBBARD, Superintendent
Secretary, Piedmont Unified School District
Board of Education