

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

MINUTES OF
Regular Meeting of the Governing Board

May 28, 2008

CALL TO ORDER	Board President Monach called the Board of Education meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.
ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM	President June Monach, Vice President Ray Gadbois, Board Members Roy Tolles, Martha Jones, Rick Raushenbush
ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION	The Board adjourned to Closed Session at 5:36 p.m. to discuss: A. Public Employee Performance Evaluation: Superintendent (Government Code Section 54957) B. Conference with District Labor Negotiator Constance Hubbard Regarding Negotiations with the Association of Piedmont Teachers (APT) (Government Code Section 54956.6) C. Conference with District Negotiator Randall Booker Regarding 2009-09 Negotiations with the Association of Piedmont School Administrators (APSA) (Government Code Section 54956.6)
OTHERS PRESENT FOR PORTION OF CLOSED SESSION	Constance Hubbard, Superintendent Michael Brady, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services David Roth, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent, Educ. Services Randall Booker, Principal, Piedmont High School
RECONVENE TO REGULAR SESSION	Board President Monach called the Regular Session of the Board of Education meeting of May 28, 2008 to order at 7:10 p.m. and led the Board and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.
OTHERS PRESENT AT REGULAR SESSION	Constance Hubbard, Superintendent Michael Brady, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services David Roth, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent, Educ. Services
Report of Action Taken In Closed Session	None
Agenda Adjustments	President Monach announced: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The presentation of CSEA scholarships has been moved to the June 11 Board meeting• The time noted on the May 28th Board agenda for the Special Board Meeting (Board Workshop) of June 4 indicates 2-4 p.m., but it is 4-6 p.m.• The approval for the "Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators" shown under the Consent Calendar will be moved to the "Review and Action" portion of the agenda, as mandated by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

- The wording for Item “F”, Proposal Between the District and Wilsey-Ham, under the Consent Calendar has been revised to clarify the intent of the proposal.

COMMUNICATIONS /
ANNOUNCEMENTS

Association of Piedmont Teachers (APT) None

California School Employees Association (CSEA) None

Parent Clubs None

Student Representative to the Board Riely White, Student Representative to the Board, reported that:

- The prom was great. The room was well decorated and the food was delicious
- The student Art Show is going on at the High School
- NCS Sports: Piedmont is playing Campolindo this evening
- The Associated Student Body election winners for next year has been posted
- The Senior Awards ceremony was held last night
- The acting class is putting on its final performance this weekend; Saturday, 8:00 p.m. and Sunday at 7:30 p.m.
- The A Capella concert is next week, June 3, at 7:30 p.m.
- Finals are in two weeks

PERSONS REQUESTING TO SPEAK ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA None

Superintendent Announcements None

Board President Announcements President Monach announced that:

- Graduation dates/times:
 - Millennium High School, June 11, Graduation June 11, 10:00 a.m., Veterans Hall
 - Piedmont Middle School Graduation, June 11, 4:00 p.m. PHS gym
 - Piedmont High School Graduation, June 12, 5:00 p.m., Witter Field
- A Special Board Meeting (Board Workshop) has been scheduled for Wednesday, June 4, from 4:00-6:00 p.m. at the school district administration office, conference room, 760 Magnolia Avenue, Piedmont, to discuss District goals for 2008-09
- The Piedmont track relays for 3-4-5th graders will be held on June 4 at 3:30 p.m.

PRESENTATIONS

Recognition of Piedmont High School Mock Trial Team

Randall Booker, Principal, Piedmont High School, introduced teacher Courtney Goen who coached the Mock Trial Team of students who placed first in the county and second in the state of California. Students were:

Sonia Aggarwal, Jacob Andreas, Kevin Arthur, Samaneh Bolourshi, Tiffany Chan, Jacob Cohn, Gideon Cohn-Postar,

Sarah Goodman, David Granberg, Alice Highman, Molly Highman, Christine Kuo, David Kuo, Emily Miller, Natalie Stumpf, and Jennifer Tszeng.

The attorney coach was Louis Highman and the consulting attorney coach was Piedmont High School Assistant Principal Rich Kitchens.

The students performed a brief segment of their "trial" for the Board.

The textbooks were first reviewed and discussed at the Board meeting of April 9, 2008 and have been on display for public review and comment for the State-mandated 30 days (April 10-May 22).

President Monach, on behalf of the Board, extended appreciation to the teachers and added that they are valued as educators who teach and inspire our students, and oversee this process to identify instructional materials that will support classroom learning. Board members have a responsibility to support the faculty and administration as the necessary "toolkit" is developed.

Board Members Gadbois and Jones commented on the fine presentation by the Middle School teachers at a recent Curriculum Council meeting. The Board members were pleased with the teachers' research and their explanation of why they chose the textbooks they did.

There was no one from the public requesting to speak.

It was moved by Vice President Gadbois, seconded by Board Member Jones, and passed unanimously to adopt the proposed new Middle School textbooks:

- "Math, Course 1" (Grade 8)
- "California Pre-Algebra" (Grades 6-7)
- "California Algebra" (Grades 7-8)

A presentation of this proposal was given at the last Board meeting. The proposal was also discussed at a Parent Education Night at the high school, and at a Boosters Club meeting. Information was also provided in the *Piedmont Highlander*, and *Piedmont Post*.

Superintendent Hubbard stated present coaching stipends are not competitive in any way. Increases have not been addressed in the last 10-15 years. The District has difficulty in attracting and retaining coaches which is why there was a request brought forward. In the past, coaches used to be on-staff employees. With the growing emphasis on single sports and club sports, walk-on coaches are the trend. Given that 75% of our students participate in sports, it is considered an integral part of the high school experience.

REVIEW & ACTION ITEMS

Conduct Public Hearing and Adopt Proposed New Middle School Textbooks

- "Math, Course 1" (Grade 8)
- "California Pre-Algebra" (Grades 6-7)
- "California Algebra" (Grades 7-8)

Approve Implementation of High School Student Athletic Participation Fees, and Approve Increase in High School Coaches' Stipends

Superintendent Hubbard agreed that the fees need to be increased. She liked the restructuring of the pay so men/women would get paid the same and popular/unpopular sports are paid the same based on the length of the season. The proposal was also discussed with the Budget Advisory Committee. Although Superintendent Hubbard is very reluctant to charge students for anything, she agreed to let the study proceed, and looked at the \$325 per student per sport proposed charge. One of the factors that will be looked at is if the fee will create a decrease in sports participation. Students will not have to request a scholarship but rather all students will be given a form to complete and there will either be a check attached or there will not be. Fees would be collected, placed in the General Fund, and the coaches would be paid out of that fund. The District is allocating \$50,000 toward this fund. Pay rates for the coaches still need to be discussed. The Superintendent is recommending this proposal for a period of one year, to be reviewed in the spring of the 2008-09 school year.

Although included in the proposal, Superintendent Hubbard is not recommending that students of head coaches be eligible for attendance in Piedmont schools. This issue needs to be dealt with as part of the interdistrict transfer policy.

A complete copy of the proposal was provided at the public information table. She thanked all of the parents and Boosters involved in putting this study and proposal together.

Discussion continued regarding what is currently done at the high school called an "internal" participation fee ("voluntary contribution") which is additional and involves something an individual student keeps, such as a sports bag or specialized uniform, or tournament memento that the team/parents want to do. There is a rotation for regular uniforms. It will be made clear that the athletic fee is a donation. Coaches will have no part in this. They will not know who has paid a fee or who has not. They will receive a final list from the athletic director only showing who is cleared to play.

Board Member Raushenbush wanted to clarify that if there is a dramatic shortfall between what is collected and what we hope to pay in stipends, that perhaps the stipend would not be increased as much as hoped, rather than the District making a commitment to pay the gap no matter how much it is.

Superintendent Hubbard responded that this is an issue that still needs discussion. The District is going to take on some risk the first year if this proposal falls apart. The outcome would affect recommendations for the following school year. However, for this first year, if the Board approves it, the District is obligated to pay what was indicated that it would pay. Whether the District can sustain the program over the years is something that will have to be looked at.

Vice President Gadbois was not in favor of rolling back any stipends for following years, and encouraged fellow board members to think of this as an ongoing cost.

Superintendent Hubbard said there are other ways to cut back if the athletic participation fees did not cover coaches' stipends; for example, the District could cut back on buses.

Parent Billy Allen expressed concern that this is only being considered as a one-year program. The District should be committed to funding ongoing fair coaching salaries. He also thinks there is over-concern about the scholarship issue.

Parent Drew Bendon stated the proposal is a well-detailed process and there is already a culture of understanding of fees that exist in the community.

Resident George Childs stated his concern about the additional \$50,000 to the budget for the 2008-09 school year at this difficult budgetary time. Perhaps the District should be looking at the full spectrum of programs being made available to sports enthusiasts to see if there are some that may not be missed if discontinued.

Parent Rod Brown, feels that what kids need more than anything else besides fields is coaching. Coaching has nothing to do with winning and losing but coaching is an incredible part of the educational experience in Piedmont. Also, the community has an economic reality about the fees.

Parent Tom Weatherbee has a freshman at the high school. Although he supports increasing the coaches' stipends, he also feels coaches should not be adding fees on top of the \$325 fee per sport. He also encouraged the Board to demand some accountability on the hiring and training process of coaches. His observations were of disorganization, lack of leadership, emails not returned, games being cancelled and parents not being notified until the last minute, and parents going to an away game and finding out there is no game.

Principal Booker advised that every coaching position is posted with the California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) which is the organization that establishes the rules on league games. Notices are also placed in various newspapers and every athletic department that will accept a fax. The reality is that most of the hires come from someone that somebody knows. Every hire is done by Principal Booker and sometimes the athletic director and a couple of veteran coaches. Usually there is only one candidate for a position. Each hire goes through a coach's training program where they are advised on how to hold parent meeting, establishing carpools, establishing goals, etc. The coaches are also evaluated. The same process is used as when hiring regular employees. The coaches must be fingerprinted, have to have completed CPR/first aid training, and by December 31, 2008, will have to be CIF-certified. He agreed that not all coach hires have been good ones.

President Monach stated that she supports the proposal in that it addresses the District's two program budget priorities: to attract and retain qualified staff (in this case, coaches) through fair and competitive compensation; and to offer a breadth and depth of

opportunities for students. She also was appreciative of the fact that the proposal calls upon the strong partnership that exists between the District and parent community in helping to fund important priorities.

Superintendent Hubbard added that the Boosters originally approached the District about contributing \$150,000-\$200,000 to this program but when the status of the State budget was learned, they only asked for \$50,000. The District may also be asking the Boosters for financial support for future capital improvement needs.

Board Member Raushenbush agreed that the athletics program is a big part of the school program and reaches a significant majority of the students. He was stunned at the current low coaching stipends. He does have hesitation about adding in an additional \$50,000 to support the operating budget of the athletic program but believes the parents will come forward with fees. He approves of the proposal, with the flexibility that if, against all expectations, there is a significant budget shortfall, the Board will need to discuss how to address.

Vice President Gadbois stated that athletics are a core part of the high school program and coaches, next to teachers, have the most influence on students, sometimes more than parents. It is important to have the right kind of role models.

Board Member Jones supports the proposal, although she does feel the amount of fees can add up; also, she wanted to ensure that the participation form needs to be worked on to ensure that the fee is voluntary and any non-payment or reduced payment is kept confidential.

All Board members agreed that considering student eligibility for head coaches should not be included in the proposal, as there are other groups or individuals who may want to be included in any interdistrict transfer application qualification changes.

It was moved by Board Member Raushenbush, seconded by Board Member Tolles, and passed unanimously to approve the voluntary student athletic participation fee and approve the increase in coaches' stipends, to be reviewed in the spring of 2008-09.

Boosters President Mark Menke thanked everyone who helped put this proposal together. He announced that, since the Piedmont baseball team beat Campolindo High School this evening, Piedmont will participate, for the first time, in the CIF North Coast Section championship against Northgate High School at the Oakland Coliseum this Saturday at 4:00 p.m.

Review of Proposed 2009-10 Instructional Calendar

Superintendent Hubbard stated that the goal between the District and APT was to adopt an Instructional Calendar that was at least two years in advance. Earlier this year, the 2008-09 Instructional Calendar was adopted, and tonight the 2009-10 calendar is being presented. Opportunities for public input were provided via an email address site specifically set up to receive

input on this issue. Feedback has also been received at Board meetings.

The Association of Piedmont Teachers (APT) put out seven different versions (teacher-negotiated item) of the calendar and APT narrowed it down to four. The calendar brought forth this evening was the overwhelming choice of staff. The calendar was presented tonight in order for the public to review for a two-week period, in anticipation of adoption at the Board meeting of June 11, 2008.

Parent Drew Bendon remarked that minimum days are disruptive for working parents. He appreciated the Board pushing the adoption of this calendar forward. He is concerned that the calendar is coming up now for consideration. He thinks parents are not focusing on the calendar issue at this time of the school year and he hopes in the future that a calendar can be brought forth closer to the beginning of the school year. He added that the October staff development days are inconvenient because companies don't recognize those dates as holidays; parents may have to use vacation days in order to stay home with their children.

Parent Tom Weatherbee asked why minimum days are not negotiable. Superintendent Hubbard responded that the calendar is considered a working condition, but the hours or how we treat them are not. It is part of collective bargaining law. He also asked why the District can't have parent-teacher conferences at night? One reason is because the District would have to pay the teachers overtime, so it would be a budget implication.

Parent Catherine Ogle noted that the 2009-10 calendar is different from the 2008-09 calendar and she prefers the 2008-09 version. It gives families an additional week during the summer. She added that having so many breaks disturbs the routine for the students.

Regarding Mr. Bendon's question of why can't staff development days be held later in the year, President Monach explained that professional development is ongoing but one purpose is to learn what the mix of student needs are in the beginning of the school year, and October is a good time to add some strategies and try them out during the school year.

Review and Approve 2007-08 Third Interim Financial Report of the District's Ability to Meet Financial Obligations for the Current Year and Subsequent Two Years; and Authorize Budget Transfers of Funds

Assistant Superintendent Michael Brady presented a summary of the Third Interim Financial Report as follows:

A Third Interim Financial Report is required whenever a district files a *Qualified Certification*. The report reflects the District's fiscal status as of April 30, 2008 and includes multi-year projections for 2008-09 and 2009-10. At its Second Interim report in March 2008, cost projections represented a \$1.3 million loss in revenue to the District for 2008-09 and beyond.

Next month, when the 2008-09 Adopted Budget is brought forth to the Board, the District will honor its obligation to perform due diligence and fulfill AB 1200/AB 2756 by meeting the required

reserve level in all three years of the Multi-year Projection (2008-09 through 2010-2011).

Assumptions

The Governor's budget for 2008-09 as presented in January revealed a growing economic crisis and identified a deficit in excess of \$14.5 billion. At the May Revise, this number had grown to \$17.2 billion, although the treatment of K-12 education within the overall State budget improved. For the purposes of the Third Interim, however, the District is required to use the same assumptions it has since the January budget proposal. Thus, the Third Interim includes the original cuts that would cost the District approximately \$1.3 million in ongoing funding (eliminating the projected statutory COLA of 4.94%; imposing a deficit factor of 6.99%, thus reducing the revenue limit by -2.4%; a 6.5% reduction in funding to both Special Education and categorical programs) reflected through 2009-10. All other assumptions from the Second Interim remain in place.

At the Second Interim, the District determined it was better to make informed decisions that balanced the needs of all members of the educational community than to rush to budgetary conclusions based on early political speculation. The District did not recommend issuing layoff notices for certificated staff by the March 15, 2008 deadline, and remains committed to upholding its current "footprint" for 2008-09. Working with the Alameda County Office of Education, School Services of California, PUSD support groups, the Budget Advisory Committee, and our employee associations, we will develop a balanced budget for presentation to the Board in June of 2008 for 2008-09. We will then use the entire 2008-09 fiscal year to plan for how to sustain the District's educational priorities over the long term.

The budget documents presented in this Third Interim report continue to serve as a reflection of the District's goals and philosophy, and are consistent with the top priorities of providing a breadth and depth of program experience for all students and maintaining highly qualified staff by providing a competitive compensation package. Immediately after the 2008-09 State budget was first proposed in January, the District began to look for ways to reduce expenditures, including possible workforce reductions in temporary staff, departmental spending, overtime expenses, and directing expenditures (when appropriate) away from the general fund. The District also took a conservative approach in looking at potential safeguards in the event of mid-year cuts. Some of the apportionments for categorical programs (class size reduction, supplemental counseling, block grants) were not yet confirmed, so some categorical funds were held before booking them to existing expenditures. Finally, the District looked to enhance revenue, including pointing to its reserves (the \$500,000 Parcel Tax Reserve fund), and made recommendations to authorize Board-approved annual increases to the Parcel Tax.

Second Interim (as of April 30, 2008) – Revenue: + \$222,597

- Revenue is based on an Average Daily Attendance (ADA) of 2518 as confirmed from the P-2 from 2006-07.

- An increase of \$141,940 in State revenue, including approximately \$90,000 in final apportionments for all class size reduction programs (both K-3 + Grade 9) due to minimal penalties for class-size overages; and approximately \$50,000 from the following: one-time apportionment for Instructional Materials Funding, additional CAHSEE, ROP, and limited mandated costs funds.
- Local revenues of \$30,000 (outstanding PEF grants, rentals, other receivables)
- An increase of \$48,000 in Revenue Limit sources and Federal Revenues based on the annual PERS reduction adjustment and updated Special Education taxes, plus a procedural accounting change in State & Federal coding.

Third Interim (as of April 30, 2008) – Expenditures: - (\$179,290)

- Reductions of \$144,830 in services and operating expenditures including savings of \$45,000 in lower than estimated utilities (PG&E, water, etc), \$16,000 in parcel tax fees previously booked; \$16,000 in reductions in maintenance and repairs budget, plus decreases in substitute costs, curtailment of overtime expenditures, and other services.
- Certificated and classified salaries, including school psychologists and speech pathologists and other student support services, previously expected to be contracted out, were provided with in-house services. Where appropriate, salaries for categorical programs for the confirmed apportionments added as revenue were abated. Employee benefits reduction includes nearly \$20,000 in the aforementioned PERS reduction.
- \$49,000 in savings from a reduction in the interfund transfer to Deferred Maintenance of \$25,000, and \$24,000 less in confirmed invoices.

Third Interim (as of April 30, 2008) – Ending Fund Balance: \$1,544,822

- The total ending balance on June 30, 2008 is projected to be \$1,544,822, which represents a total of 5.2% of total expenditures. AB 1200 requires each district to maintain a 3% reserve for economic uncertainty. The undesignated balance of \$647,665 is what remains after meeting the 3% requirement and is a source of one time funds to help balance the 2008-09 General Fund budget as part of its beginning fund balance.

Multi-year Projections (as of April 30, 2008) - 2008-09 Assumptions

Revenue:

- Use of \$647,665 of one time funds from 2007-08 ending fund balance beyond the 3% reserve requirement to support programs
- Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) of 4.94% as projected by School Services of California and the State Legislative Analyst's Office, with a deficit factor of 6.99%.

- ADA projected at 2482, based on the P-2 Attendance report.
- Categorical program revenue and Special Education funding down 6.5%.
- No mandated cost reimbursements are included as part of 2008-09.
- Adjustment to settlement estimate from Prop 98 lawsuit in 2004 to \$0.00.
- A 5% increase in parcel tax revenues from Measures B and C as approved by the voters in June 2005.
- Piedmont Educational Foundation Endowment contribution of \$158,000
- A reduction from \$91,000 to \$0 for designated anonymous donations.
- Parent Club contributions of approximately \$1.25 million (direct District-funded support and parent club funded personnel with additional benefits costs)
- A \$351,680 transfer from the Parcel Tax Special Reserve. Without the transfer from the Parcel Tax Special Reserve fund in 2008-09, the District would not meet its required 3% reserve for economic uncertainty.

Expenditures:

- A 2.0% increase in salaries for all employees over the 2007-08 rate.
- Step and Column increases for all employees at a total cost equivalent to approximately 1.5% of total salary expenditures.
- A 8.0% increase in health and welfare benefits.
- Savings of \$72,000 from a projected 4.0 FTE certificated retirements.
- Any unexpended funds in categorical programs to be reserved for the program from which the funding originated. All existing one-time funds expended.
- Transfer of \$90,000 (down from \$110,000) to Deferred Maintenance Program to maintain required eligibility levels for projected State matching funds.
- This leaves an ending fund balance of \$889,297 which meets the State required 3% reserve.

Multi-year Projections (as of April 30, 2008) - 2009-10 Assumptions

Revenue:

- Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) 3.0% over the 2008-09 level as projected by School Services of California in October 2007. Continue deficit factor of 6.99 %
- Same ADA figure used for 2008-09.
- Categorical program and Special Education revenue at the same rate as in 2008-09 plus a 3.0% COLA.
- No mandated cost reimbursement is projected in the budget.
- All Parent and support group contributions at the same level as in 2007-08: approximately \$1.25 million (direct District funded support and parent club funded personnel with additional benefits costs) and PEF contribution of \$158,000.

- A recommended 5% increase in parcel tax revenues from Measures B and C as approved by the voters in June 2005. The Board must hold a public hearing to determine the levy amount for the Parcel Tax for 2009-10. Ballot language authorized up to a 5% increase over the 2008-09 rate as the maximum amount that may be levied. The Public Hearing will be held in March of 2009 to determine the amount to be levied in 2009-10.
- Revenue from a potential parcel tax increase of 5% is approximately \$380,000.

Expenditures:

- Step and column increases for all employees (equivalent to 1.5% salary cost).
- No salary increase for any employee group (salary rate to be determined as part of the collective bargaining process)
- 8% increase in health and welfare benefit cost.
- Savings of \$72,000 from a projected 4.0 FTE retirements.
- Transfer of \$90,000 to Deferred Maintenance Program to maintain eligibility for projected State matching funds.
- A \$186,100 transfer from the Parcel Tax Special Reserve fund to support programs in 2009-10, exhausting this reserve fund. The District does show a positive ending fund balance of \$307,687, but this balance is \$601,717 below the State required 3% reserve.

Summary and Recommendation

The Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) is a vehicle for dissemination of information to as many parents, students, staff and community members as possible. Its purpose is to review the District's budget, share the information with constituent groups and generate recommendations for Board consideration in the budget development process. It provides frequent opportunities for the Piedmont educational community to review the District's budget and identify trends and make recommendations for Board consideration in the budget development process. The Committee is advisory in nature and does not have decision-making responsibilities. Over 80 members of the Piedmont education community met on May 20, 2008 to preview elements of the Third Interim Report. Discussions for budget priorities and recommendations will continue to be held with the BAC and findings will be presented to the Board of Education as part of the 2008-09 Adopted budget development process.

Board members asked some clarifying questions.

It was moved by Vice President Gadbois, seconded by Board Member Jones and passed unanimously to approve the 2007-08 Third Interim Financial Report of the District's ability to meet financial obligations for the current year and subsequent two years; and authorize budget transfers of funds.

Superintendent Hubbard thanked Assistant Superintendent Brady and Michelle Nguyen, Director of Fiscal Services for all of

their work on this report.

Adopt Gifted and Talented Education
(GATE) Plan, 2008-09

The District is applying for a three-year GATE Plan approval based on meeting exemplary program standards. Parents, teachers and administrators have been meeting throughout the year, as well as within the District with teaching staff and teacher representatives and the entire administrators' team about the development of the GATE plan and the forward direction that teachers, administrators and parents are seeing. The GATE plan is scheduled to be a \$24,000 program but with some of the budget issues, it may be reduced. The plan works in the spirit of maintaining the current footprint and using GATE funding to support current programs, not to add additional programming, but with the intent to use the monies to support current programming that serves the District's highest achieving, highest ability-talented students in the District. The \$24,000 is not the only funding source available for serving these students. The District also uses General Fund monies to support programs such as advanced placement classes. The District has a variety of enrichment programs going on, some of which are the high school Mock Trial Team, the Math Olympiads, Mathletes, and afternoon Jazz Band. The monies are not just going to students who are high ability in the IQ sense or high achieving, but also aimed at students who may be under-achievers in one area but who demonstrate high intellectual skills or demonstrate a particular skill in other areas such as leadership. The GATE program, as spelled out in the state regulations, does not only want to serve highly gifted students (150 IQ or higher), but also serve a broader range of students in different areas in order to be more inclusive. The plan targets grades 4-12. Important themes include making the plan well integrated within our current program, such as differentiated instruction in general classrooms. The District has math specialists at the elementary level that augment instruction. The math specialists are supported by parent club resources. The District also has many adept teachers to support differentiated instruction. Professional development has been made solely possible by the Piedmont Educational Foundation and their grant in the amount of \$120,000.

Professional development also applies to staff training around the GATE plan. The District is also looking to engage some of the specialists within the District to support staff with issues such as social/emotional functioning of students or other particular issues. Dr. Roth stated the District has competent counselors, also.

Addressing communications, Dr. Roth stated the Gate Advisory Committee plans to continue meeting and there will be ongoing conversation about issues that still need to be discussed. Site councils will also identify their needs at their sites. The identification process of a GATE student will be more thorough (grade point average, teacher rating, work samples, STAR test scores).

A section on the District web site has been devoted to the GATE

program.

The GATE plan for 2008-09 being submitted will be requested for a three-year approval (2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11) by the State.

Board Member Raushenbush asked if the District will be committed to paying for courses outside the District – are we taking on new budgetary responsibilities as a result of this? Dr. Roth responded none that we don't already do. He added that there is no programming option in the program that is solely for GATE students. He anticipates that over multiple years, there will be approximately 17-20% of students eligible for GATE. There is no limit per District, and there is quite a range of percentages throughout the state.

Parent Drew Bendon said there was a lot of parent participation during these meetings, and deserves continuation and expansion. He would like to see a broader discussion of the philosophy and how the District will implement. He feels the \$24,000 GATE funding should be directed to GATE students, only.

Parent Catherine Ogle attended all of the GATE Advisory Council meetings. She thinks the GATE program is about serving GATE students during their regular school day with appropriate programming. She agrees with early identification to make sure they are getting appropriate programming. She feels it is difficult for parents to attend GATE meetings during the day and that an evening meeting would generate a huge amount of parent interest. She said there is parent frustration over this plan because it is vague, there should be more programming options, there should be some peer grouping where accelerated students are grouped with the same to be at a whole other level. There has been a lot of parent comment about accountability. Parents do not find there is much accountability as far as students receiving appropriate programming, such as: is the programming effective, is the child progressing under the program? Regarding the budget, if we only have \$24,000 and there are about 400 GATE students, are we giving the appropriate programming for these students? They are entitled to programming during the regular school day, not having to come to school earlier or stay later. We shouldn't be allocating 27% of the GATE budget to go to mock trial and mathletes. We should direct that money to GATE programming. She proposed that the \$24,000 be used for professional development for teachers to received training in how to differentiate their programs for GATE students. Parents would like to be surveyed by the District regarding program evaluation of the GATE plan and how the program is working for their students. The plan does not contemplate doing that. Parents would also like to see a more meaningful evaluation of GATE student progress. She encouraged the Board to look at some meaningful evaluation statistics on the GATE students to see if this program is effective for them.

Parent Virginia O'Rourke regrets that there are no all-day GATE programs. She has appreciated the additional parent involvement. During the GATE Advisory Council meetings, there was a lot of discussion of ways to provide program for GATE-identified students, but the plan does not reflect the discussions, communications and education that went on this year. She hopes that in moving forward, the advisory council meets frequently during the year in the future. It is very difficult for a lot of the parents who hold full time jobs and parents with young children at home to attend day meetings. Perhaps not all, but maybe a couple of meetings could be held in the evening.

She continued that there is no accountability for anything, such as: is my child's teacher providing some benefit to my student – how would I know that? There needs to be someone who oversees/insures that differentiated instruction is actually being given. Are the students being challenged? Have their skills and knowledge been challenged? She's not sure how one would find accountability for that but it should be looked into. Are we meeting the standards that the state planned? How does this District serve GATE-identified students from the identification all the way through the benefits the students actually receive? Producing the GATE plan is a great place to start but it's only a start. If 17% of students qualify for GATE, we need to think about what we are going to do for them besides differentiated instruction.

Dr. Roth responded that a parent survey is being planned and accountability is also a discussion on which the administrative team has given considerable time. He cannot insure that everything is going to be in place all of the time.

Ms. Ogle wants to ensure the survey is a written survey.

Board consensus was to hold this item over to the next Board meeting before adoption.

Vice President Gadbois stated that, although he understands the frustration of the parents, the District would require significantly more funding and additional teaching staff, neither of which will be happening at this time.

Dr. Roth stated there are different views about a large or small GATE group. The District mailed out over 250 letters to parents about GATE identification. He checked with parents multiple times and he was struck that there was not more voices coming back. Although there may be some dissatisfaction level, that is not the way many parents feel. The more exclusive a GATE program is made, the District will end up in a lot of conversations about why their child cannot participate in the program. The exclusivity piece can bring about some unintended consequences. GATE is not intended in any way to be a commitment of a "special education" program. It is not about setting up individualized plans for every single GATE student.

Board Member Raushenbush stated that when parents are asking staff to arrange for night meetings, it puts the burden on

staff who are working all day. Although he would favor one or two night meetings, the majority should be held during the day.

He added that the overall goal is to provide an interesting, challenging program to all students. The GATE program should not be exclusionary program. He understands how differentiated instruction to meet all students' needs can be. Regarding peer grouping, he would want to know the impact and at what grade level it is appropriate to start.

Dr. Roth stated that from the perspective of staff, differentiated instruction is not the only way to meet all students' needs. There will always be room to grow. Part of the plan is to strive for clustering of students beginning at the middle school level. Pullout groups have been discussed, also. The District is trying to get a balance to make this a more inclusive type of program and give all students a range of opportunities.

It was requested that any additional public comments be emailed to the Board in the interest of time.

Adopt Schedule for 2008-09 Regular Board of Education Meetings

It was moved by Board Member Tolles, seconded by Board Member Raushenbush and passed unanimously to adopt the schedule of regularly scheduled Board of Education meetings for 2008-09.

Change in Order of Agenda
Approve Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators

This item was moved from the Consent Calendar to a Review and Action Item, per mandate by the California Commission on Teaching Credentialing.

This declaration is a prerequisite to the issuance of any emergency permits. It is required in the event that the District plans to hire emergency-credentialed teachers.

It was moved by Board Member Raushenbush, seconded by Board Member Tolles and passed unanimously to approve the Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ITEMS
Continuation of Discussion of Goals for 2008-09

A Special Board Meeting (Board Workshop) has been scheduled for a one-issue discussion item of goals for 2008-09. It was the consensus of the Board to hold discussion over to that meeting due to the late hour.

State Budget Update

Assistant Superintendent Michael Brady shared that the May Revise was an improvement over the January proposal. The difference to the District is going from a \$1.3 million deficit to a \$900,000 deficit. The District is looking at how to support programs with an almost \$1,000,000 reduction in funds. The challenge will be how to maintain program and operational costs. The District will have to make cuts. Right now it is absorbing expenses and pointing to reserves. It receives about \$350,000 annually from the lottery - about \$141 per pupil, but it is already known that it is going down next year - it will be about \$130 per pupil.

Resident George Childs said when he first heard about the lottery funding, it sounded absurd to him, and now that he has

reviewed the information, it still sounds absurd to him.

INFORMATION

Revised Administrative Regulation 5116.1,
"Assignment of Students to Elementary
Schools / Open Enrollment"

The wording "Open Enrollment" in the title created confusion to out of district parents thinking their student may be eligible for Piedmont schools. Thus, the wording was removed, and the word "intradistrict" was inserted within the regulations in order for all to understand that this process is speaking about Piedmont elementary students seeking a transfer to another Piedmont elementary school not within their attendance area.

Superintendent Hubbard also advised that wording was added to this regulation a couple of years ago advising that the District has up until the first two weeks of school in which to move students around, in the event of overcrowding.

Base Academic Performance Index (API)

Assistant Superintendent David Roth commented that the Base Academic Performance Index is calculated from the District's STAR test results from the previous year and serves as the baseline for comparison with the District's growth API. Piedmont continues to be second in the state among unified school districts. San Marino Unified School District is number one.

CORRESPONDENCE

Five emails were received by board members regarding athletic participation fees/coaches' stipends. Vice President Gadbois received an email in support of the fees/stipends. Board Member Jones received two emails, one regarding the athletic participation fees/coaches' stipends, and one on the math textbooks adoption.

BOARD REPORTS

Board Member Jones attended the Senior Awards Ceremony, which was very uplifting.

President Monach noted in the last issue of the *Piedmont Highlander*, an article where students give feedback to the faculty about the workload from a student's perspective.

CONSENT CALENDAR

President Monach acknowledged donations by Bijan Zahedi in the amount of \$1,000 for use by the District, and a donation by the Piedmont Basketball Foundation in the amount of \$15,000 for a new scoreboard at the High School Binks Rawlings Gymnasium.

It was moved by Board Member Jones, seconded by Board Member Tolles, and passed unanimously to approve all of the items on the Consent Calendar as follows:

- A. Revised Regular Board Meeting Minutes of May 14, 2008
- B. Donations as previously mentioned
- C. Personnel Action Report
- D. Warrant List for Goods and Services Rendered dated May 5, 2008
- E. Certification of Unused Sites
- F. (ratified) Proposal Between the District and Wilsey-Ham for Supplemental Survey Services at Havens Elementary

School, effective May 16, 2008 through June 30, 2008, at a total cost not to exceed \$15,146

G. Mini-Master Plan

H. 2008 Noda Grant Applications

I. *(Declaration of Need moved to Review & Action)*

J. Professional Services Agreement Between the District and Miller Brown & Dannis Law Firm for 2008-09

K. Updated California School Employees Association (CSEA) Job Descriptions of *District Data Manager* and *Coordinator of Specialized Programs*

FUTURE REGULAR AGENDA BOARD
MEETING AGENDA ITEMS
(subject to change)

- Adoption of District Goals (June 25)
- Accept School Accountability Report Cards (SARCs), 2006-07 (Jun)
- Identify Campaign Chairs for Proposed Renewal of Parcel Tax (Jun/Jul)
- Recognition of Retirees
- Recognition of Student Representative to the Board (Jun)
- Preliminary Next Year's Budget & Assumptions (Jun 11)
- Adopt Proposed District Budget (June 25)
- Consider Hourly Rate Increase for Adult Ed Instructors (Jun)
- Review of Board Bylaws (Section 9000) (TBD)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, and with no objections by the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

JUNE MONACH, Board President
Piedmont Unified School District
Board of Education

CONSTANCE HUBBARD
Secretary, Piedmont Unified School District
Board of Education