

REVISED MINUTES OF THE ANCHORAGE SCHOOL BOARD
REGULAR MEETING OF DECEMBER 12, 2005

The Anchorage School Board met in Regular Session on Monday, December 12, 2005, at 6:30 p.m. in the Board Room, at the Anchorage School District Administration Building. President, Jeff Friedman, presided.

A. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, FLAG SALUTE, Jeff Friedman Presiding

Board Members Present: Tim Steele, Mary Marks, Jake Metcalfe, Jeff Friedman, Crystal Kennedy, Macon Roberts, and John Steiner

Others Present: Jan Christensen, Enid Hunter, Mike Henry, Patricia McRae, Jerry Sjolander, Leslie Vandergaw, Janet Stokesbary, George Vakalis, Ray Amsden, Mike Price, Michelle Egan, Larry Wiget, LTC David Jones, William Johnson, Johanna Lee, the press, and other interested people.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Kennedy requested that ASD Memorandum #90, Revisions to the Six Year Instructional Plan, be postponed to the January 9, 2006 meeting. This request was made so that the members will have additional opportunity to thoroughly review the revisions and prepare questions. Ms. Comeau indicated that the Administration has no objection to this request.

The revised agenda was approved without objection.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

D. AWARDS/RECOGNITIONS/PRESENTATIONS

Capriccio, the East High String Quartet, under the direction of Margaret David, performed for the entertainment of all those present.

E. SPECIAL ADVISORY REPORTS

1. Student Advisory Board

Mr. Feriani reported that the Student Advisory Board (SAB) met on December 5, 2005. Ms. Comeau was one of several speakers in attendance. She discussed the budget, 1% for Art and proposed resolutions on wearing hats during Spirit Week. Mr. Henry was

also present to discuss the budget and issues regarding hats. Mr. Arndt attended the meeting to explain Title IX and the efforts to make cheerleading a sport, and to update the SAB on suspension statistics. Ms. Vandergaw was there to discuss Middle School trends and the possibility of moving sixth grade to the Middle Schools. Ms. Blackney spoke about the Social and Emotional Learning Standards. These standards will be a core class in high schools. The SAB passed a resolution which would allow students to wear hats during Spirit Week. Each school representative will take the resolution back to their own school.

Mr. Steiner questioned whether the hat resolution necessitates a Board policy change or an Administrative change. Ms. Comeau explained that all but one of the District's high schools has gone to a "No Hat" policy. The resolution specifically requested that Mr. Henry discuss the idea of allowing the students to wear hats as part of a costume during Spirit Week with the principals. Mr. Feriani clarified that the resolution was directed to the schools, not to the School Board.

The next meeting of the Student Advisory Board is scheduled for Monday, January 9, 2006 at 8:15 a.m. at the King Career Center.

2. Military Delegate

LTC Jones was not in attendance.

3. M.E.C.A.C.

Mr. Johnson reported that the MECAC meeting scheduled for December 15, 2006 has been cancelled. The next meeting is scheduled for January 19, 2006. As always, the meeting is open to the public. On behalf of the MECAC, Mr. Johnson wished everyone present and in the viewing audience the best during the holiday season and the upcoming new year.

F. PERSONS TO BE HEARD NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Rich Kronberg, President of the Anchorage Education Association, was present to speak to the Board about the need to more actively involve the Association in important decisions that impact its' members. He noted that both the Revisions to the Six-Year Plan (which was to be addressed the

evening) and the Districts' Annual Improvement Plan contain provisions that significantly impact AEA members. It is his contention that the AEA was not asked to participate in updating these documents. He noted that these documents contain changes in teacher responsibilities, some of which have generated serious concern on the part of many AEA members. Without direct AEA involvement and participation in crafting changes, Mr. Kronberg does not believe that the Administration will receive complete information as to their potential impact on both students and teachers. He referenced Article 740 of their negotiated agreement which states, in part, that when the School Board or the Superintendent creates committees with teacher representation that the Association, as an entity, will be included. Mr. Kronberg clarified that these concerns represent a professionals' desire to participate in making decisions that impact his or her professional life. Beyond that, Mr. Kronbert contends that the AEA has repeatedly requested that the District engage in conversation regarding proposed changes that would impact its members. He explained that the response has typically been that teachers have been involved in the discussions. While that may be so, Mr. Kronberg feels that unless the Association is involved there is no assurance that the concerns they have heard will be addressed. He noted that many AEA members are frustrated with the seemingly top down decisions that are thrust upon them, a practice that has been identified as in a national study as a key factor that leads teachers to leave teaching. Mr. Kronberg identified programs, such as the Joint Mentoring Program, in which the District and the Association have worked collaboratively, producing positive results. He believes that this type of collaborative effort should be the model for dealing with future issues that impact AEA members and students.

Ms. Comeau voiced her appreciation for Mr. Kronberg's comments and assured him that the Administration had no intention to slight AEA members. Mr. Steiner questioned whether there would be opportunity for further revision to the Six Year Instructional Plan which is scheduled for Board review this evening. Ms. Comeau noted that, once the revisions are approved, there would not be opportunity for further changes. She did, however, indicate that she has noted the concerns raised by Mr. Kronberg and that a concerted effort will be made to invite the Association to nominate some members from which teacher representatives can be selected to participate in the process as the next Six Year Plan is being developed.

G. CONSENT AGENDA

Consent Agenda is attached. **All attachments referred to in memoranda Recommendations are on file in the Superintendent's office.**

1. Approval of Minutes

- a. Special Meeting - October 24, 2005
- b. Special Meeting - November 14, 2005

2. ASD Memorandum # 131 - 2006 General Obligation Bond Recommendations

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve a Bond proposal package totaling \$99,865,000, comprised of Proposition 1 - High School Renewal/Additions in the amount of \$48,200,000; Proposition 2 - Elementary & Middle School Design/Renewal in the amount of \$30,775,000; and Proposition 3 - Major Maintenance & Districtwide Site Acquisition in the amount of \$20,890,000.

3. ASD Memorandum # 149 - Approval of School Board Out-of-State Travel, November, 2005 - April, 2006

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the attached School Board Out-of-State Travel Report.

4. ASD Memorandum # 148 - Nomination to Alaska Association of School Boards' Board of Directors

It is recommended that the School Board nominate Crystal Kennedy for a seat on the Association of Alaska School Boards' Board of Directors.

5. ASD Memorandum # 11 - School Board Policy Revisions: Section 332.3 Lottery Procedures - Open Enrollment (First Reading)

It is the recommendation of the Administration that the School Board adopt on First Reading the recommended policy changes for School Board Policy 332.3 - Lottery Procedures - Open Enrollment.

6. ASD Memorandum # 63 - School Board Policy Revisions: Sections 524 and 617 Nepotism and Sections 524.1 and 617.1 Fraternalization (First Reading)

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board adopt the recommended policy changes for Nepotism, Sections 524 and 617 and the new policy on Fraternalization, Sections 524.1 and 617.1.

7. ASD Memorandum # 146 - Acceptance of Grant Award: Western Alaska Council, Boy Scouts of America 2005-2006

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to accept a grant award from the Western Alaska Council (WAC) Boy Scouts of America (BSA) in the amount of \$3,103.52. Funding will provide Boy Scouting activities at seven of the 21st Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) sites. The sites are Government Hill, Muldoon, North Star, Ptarmigan, Russian Jack, Taku, and Wonder Park elementary schools.

8. ASD Memorandum # 134 - Acceptance of Grant Award: Title II D Enhancing Education Through Technology

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to accept grant funds from the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (DEED) in the amount of \$300,000 for the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years. Anchorage School District has partnered with Fairbanks North Star Borough School District (FNSBSD) to provide training and leadership for effective use of technology, providing teachers and students with the tools to increase higher order thinking skills and technology integration.

9. ASD Memorandum # 135 - Acceptance of Grant Award: Alaska Tech Prep

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to accept the Tech Prep Grant in the amount of \$15,675. Funds are provided as flow-through funds through the State of Alaska Department of Labor and the Tech Prep Consortium and will be used to establish business and industry partnerships, and to develop documented articulations that provide high school students with direct entry into post-secondary programs.

10. ASD Memorandum # 136 - Prior Approval of Competitive Grant: FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to apply for a grant from the U. S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, to install seismic gas shut off valves at 17 of 21 shelter schools around the District.

11. ASD Memorandum # 94 - Approval of Consultant Selection for the Southeast Hillside Elementary School Site Evaluation

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve the selection of R & M Consultants, Inc., to perform the engineering analysis of three candidate sites for an elementary school in Southeast Anchorage and authorize the Superintendent to negotiate and enter into a contract with R & M Consultants, Inc.

12. ASD Memorandum # 130 - Award of Contract: Student Nutrition Hot and Cold Pack Equipment

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract for the acquisition of the Student Nutrition Department Hot and Cold Pack Equipment to the lowest responsive bidder, Hammett Packaging for the total amount of \$248,231.

13. ASD Memorandum # 137 - Award of Contract: Service High School Generator Installation

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract for the Service High School Generator Installation to the lowest responsive bidder, Norcon, Inc. for the Base Bid amount of \$572,211, and Assignment A in the amount of \$270,914 for a total award of \$843,125.

14. ASD Memorandum # 140 - Award of Contract: Consulting Services for Medical & Life Insurance Benefits

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract to Mercer Health & Benefits LLC for providing Consulting Services for Medical & Life Insurance Benefits in the amount of \$75,000 for the period of January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2006; \$78,000 for the period of January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007; and \$81,000 for the period of January 1, 2008 through December 31, 2008 for a total fixed fee amount of \$234,000; with an option to renew for two (2) additional (1) one-year periods in the amounts of \$84,000 for the period of January 1, 2009 - December 31, 2009; and \$86,000 for the period of January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010.

15. ASD Memorandum # 145 - Superintendent Evaluation and Contract Changes: January 1, 2006 - December 31, 2008

The School Board met on December 1, 2005 to conduct the annual evaluation of Superintendent Carol Comeau. The School Board and Superintendent have

agreed to extend her contract for one year to December 31, 2008. The contract specifies a salary of \$141,100 per year, effective January 1, 2006.

16. ASD Memorandum # 90 - Revisions to the Six Year Instructional Plan

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board adopt the attached revisions to the Six-Year Instructional Plan.

17. ASD Memorandum # 115 - Adoption of the District Improvement Plan for the 2005-2006 School Year

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve the Anchorage School District's *District Improvement Plan* for implementation and submission to the Department of Education and Early Development.

18. ASD Memorandum # 133 - Emergency Preparedness Project Phase I Revised

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract for Emergency Preparedness Project Phase I Revised to the lowest responsive bidder, F & W Construction Company, Inc., for the Base Bid amount of \$1,026,078, Alternate No. 1 of \$372,671, Alternate No. 2 for \$408,492, and Alternate No. 3 for \$639,286 for a total award of \$2,446,527.

19. ASD Memorandum # 132 - Adoption of Tentative Agreement: Anchorage Council of Education/AFT, Local 4425, 2006-2009

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and adopt the collective bargaining agreement between the District and Anchorage Council of Education/American Federation of Teachers, Local 4425, which will establish terms and conditions of employment for ACE employees during the period between July 1, 2006 and June 30, 2009.

20. ASD Memorandum # 141 - Personnel Report

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve the attached Personnel Report.

Mr. Friedman requested that ASD Memorandum #11 be pulled for discussion. Mr. Roberts requested that ASD Memorandum #132 be pulled for discussion. Mr. Steiner requested that ASD Memoranda #131 and #115 be pulled for discussion.

ACTION:

Moved by: Jake Metcalfe
seconded by: Mary Marks

To approve the minutes of the Special Meetings of October 24, 2005 and November 14, 2005, and ASD Memoranda #149, #148, #63, #146, #134, #135, #136, #94, #130, #137, #140, #145, #133, and #141.

VOTE:

Ayes: Steiner, Roberts,
Kennedy, Friedman,
Metcalfe, Marks, Steele

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

Mr. Steiner noted that one of the items approved on the Consent Agenda was an Award of Contract for Consulting Services for Medical & Life Insurance Benefits. He pointed out that, in the text of the pertinent facts it was noted that the contract was subject to annual appropriation. He requested notation for the record that the approval of the memorandum is binding for this budget year only and is subject to the Board's approval of funds in following years.

ASD Memorandum # 131 - 2006 General Obligation Bond
Recommendations

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve a Bond proposal package totaling \$99,865,000, comprised of Proposition 1 - High School Renewal/Additions in the amount of \$48,200,000; Proposition 2 - Elementary & Middle School Design/Renewal in the amount of \$30,775,000; and Proposition 3 - Major Maintenance & Districtwide Site Acquisition in the amount of \$20,890,000.

ACTION:

Moved by: John Steiner
seconded by: Mary Marks

To approve ASD Memorandum #131, the Administration's 2006 General Obligation Recommendations.

Ms. Comeau recognized the members of the Capital Request Advisory Committee, thanking the members, the parents and other citizens, representing all areas of Anchorage, as well as all of our Alternative Programs. She explained how the capital request process had been changed to a year-round committee effort.

Ms. Comeau acknowledged that this is a large bond proposition, larger than had been anticipated but less than what was requested by the Capital Request Advisory Committee. The Administration believes that every one of the projects listed here is absolutely essential. In keeping with a commitment made after public support of District projects in November, 2004, the District did not go to the voters with a bond proposition last April. Passing the bonds in support of this strong recommendation of much needed projects is important not only to maintain District buildings, but to bring them up to current code and to make sure that facilities are equitable for all students.

In a response to a question from Mr. Steiner, Mr. Amsden pointed out an error on page 17 of the Memorandum, noting that the cost of Conceptual Design for West High School is \$300,000 (not \$3 million). Mr. Amsden explained that the \$300,000 is additive to monies we already have and is intended to do a thorough, comprehensive master plan for that facility. The plan will look at bringing the school into closer alignment with current Districtwide high school education specifications.

Ms. Comeau introduced Mr. Ivan Moore, who conducted the Anchorage School Bond Survey, and requested that he summarized the highlights of the survey and respond to questions regarding the results. Mr. Moore noted that the survey was completed in mid-November and that the bonds being considered at that time were a bit different from those in the proposed bond package. Support for the High School Bond, listed at \$53 million, was 51%. The Middle School and Elementary Bond, listed at \$33 million, garnered 56.1% support. The Maintenance and Site Acquisition Bond had the support of 61.2% of respondents. Mr. Moore cautioned against too much optimism based on these results, explaining that the results of the poll will, almost always, be better than the results on Election Day. He briefly compared the results of the survey to the anticipated election results, explaining that the High School Bond will, in his opinion, require a significant community outreach effort to push the bond. He indicated that the other two bonds look like they will fare better, although with a typical 5% drop between the survey and the actual vote it will likely be close.

Mr. Steiner noted that West Anchorage respondents represented the lowest level of support for the High School Bond and that West High School was the only school provided for in the bond that was not mentioned in the text of the question. He feels that this might have something to do with the weak numbers from that segment of the community. Mr. Moore acknowledged that this might have had some impact but, given the small

percentage of the sample from that area he didn't feel that it was significant.

Mr. Steele requested clarification regarding the respondent distribution and why one-third of the respondents were from one attendance area and how that might impact the results. Mr. Moore explained that the geographic distribution was not indicative of District attendance areas. He explained that he computes the areas by telephone prefix and zip code, noting that the South Anchorage area in this survey includes everything south of Dimond extending down to Girdwood. Ms. Comeau noted the importance of reminding the public of the significant amount of money that was bonded for West High School and Romig Middle School in the 1990's. That effort is what really began the commitment to renovating the older schools. It will be critical to explain that the money being designated for conceptual planning at those two schools this year will enable forward movement toward future design changes, which will be designated next year once the exact needs are identified.

Mr. Steele complimented the Capital Improvement Advisory Committee and the staff for putting together this very informative and enlightening package. He found it to be very well balanced geographically and philosophically appropriate and responsible in terms of asking for the money when it is needed, not before.

Mr. Steele brought up the issue of Southwest Anchorage, and questioned whether the option to decide between middle school and elementary school should be left open either by specifically listing both levels in Proposition 2 or by removing "Elementary" from the wording.

Ms. Kennedy questioned what impact the increased number of voters who do not have children in the District might have on the ability to get the bonds passed. Mr. Moore explained that rather than trying to take a cross-section of people in Anchorage for the survey he attempted to get a cross-section of people who are going to vote in the election. Typically speaking, people who vote are more childless. Over the years he has noticed that people who did not have children in the District tended to vote in favor of school bonds in almost the same numbers as people with children in the District. This survey shows a very different picture, with a 15 - 20 point differential between responses of those who do and do not have children in school. He noted that it will be important to get the people with children out to vote, emphasizing the need to push the bonds and the need to get advocacy groups out to support the bonds. Mr. Steiner asked Mr. Moore to comment on the fact that this is a mayoral election, therefore probably

eliciting a larger turnout than would be expected if it were not and how that might impact the bond question. Mr. Moore explained that he believes a larger turnout would be a positive factor noting that when turnout is smaller you get an older, more married, more childless group of voters and as the turnout increases the numbers tend to more closely reflect the regular distribution of the population.

Ms. Comeau addressed the Southwest Anchorage question raised by Mr. Steele. She explained that, while not disputing the need for another middle school, the Administration continues to believe that the first priority needs to be the additional elementary school. Mr. Steele questioned whether the boundary changes currently being reviewed will take the pressure off of Mirrors and Hanshew. Ms. Comeau noted that, while boundary changes will have some impact, those schools will still be overcrowded. The Boundary Task Force, which will begin work early 2006, will be looking to see if there is a way to shift students to alleviate some of the pressure. At this time the Administration has not begun to draft scenarios for middle school boundary changes. Mr. Steiner wondered whether it would be worth doing a formal analysis to ascertain if the question of middle versus elementary school should be left open on the funding request rather than locking in to one or the other. Ms. Comeau reviewed the status of elementary schools in Southwest Anchorage, reiterating her absolute belief that an elementary school is a higher priority than a middle school at this time. She further explained that the District is nowhere near securing a site for a middle school. She noted that an elementary school could be up and running within twelve to eighteen months depending on the site. Mr. Steele voiced his concern that there are no current options for alleviating the population problems at the middle school level in Southwest Anchorage and his belief that pursuing a 6, 7, 8 middle school option could address population problems at both elementary and middle schools. Ms. Comeau reminded the Board that the projected enrollment numbers for middle school are going down. Mr. Metcalfe voiced his support for the Administration's request.

Ms. Kennedy requested clarification as to what is included in the Dimond High School Gym/Pool Code Upgrade and Renewal. Mr. Amsden explained that the proposal includes the entire building that houses the pool. There are no proposed renovations to the pool itself except for a project being developed for sprinklers. He explained that we are under direction of the Fire Marshall to get all of our school buildings under sprinklers as a requirement of occupancy. The Board had approved funding last spring to install sprinklers. Mr. Amsden clarified that the work currently being done in the Dimond pool area is limited to that

element. The project as proposed in the bond is an exterior repair to make the building compatible with the other buildings on the property, repair the wood siding, and other code related items. He reminded the Board that we are currently precluded by fire code from using the second floor of that building for any kind of class settings. The proposed renovations are necessary to recapture that space. Another important element within the scope of the renovation will be to address the current lack of fire alarm communication and intercom connectivity between buildings.

Ms. Kennedy questioned whether the Municipality is responsible for any of the cost of the renovation since it includes the pool area. Mr. Amsden explained that the District retains responsibility for any building issues for locations where pools are housed within the school building.

Ms. Marks asked about the reduction to the proposed funding for Clark Middle School Design Phase 1, which has been attributed to "adequate Phase 1 design costs". Mr. Amsden explained that the \$3,000,000 figure is adequate to cover a comprehensive master plan of what the total project needs to look like, how it will be phased, when the construction will be done, and how it will be delivered. It is believed that the funding requested will be adequate to accomplish that task, while conforming to the past practices of asking for money only when it is needed. Ms. Comeau added that it is important to preserve the flexibility to adjust future recommendations for funding based on identification of unpredicted circumstances identified during the design phase. She noted that it would not be unusual to find hidden conditions as we begin the renovation of older buildings like Clark. Ms. Marks questioned whether the topic of moving sixth grade into Clark Middle School had come up during discussions on the design phase of this project. Ms. Comeau noted that the discussion is coming up all over the District and will certainly be part of the whole discussion regarding boundary changes. The Administration is also watching class enrollment changes in light of the impact those changes might have on school capacity.

Ms. Kennedy questioned where the plans for renovations to Gladys Wood Elementary stand in light of the combined impact overcrowding and the "open concept" school design has on that school. Ms. Comeau noted that Gladys Wood is Priority #36 on the current Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) with \$65,000 indicated for planning. Ms. Comeau explained that the Administration recognizes the issues at Gladys Wood and, while there are higher priorities projects at this time, the school is rising closer to the top. She noted that the priorities on the CIP are reviewed every year. Mr. Amsden explained that the District received \$65,000 of funding from the

Legislature last year for the planning effort at Gladys Wood and will be underway with that task this spring.

Ms. Kennedy noted that the District had bonded for \$10,000,000 in site selection money in 2003 and is now asking for \$6,000,000 more for site selection. Her concern is that the same sites continue to be referenced in the CIP making it look as though the District is asking for money for the same thing again. She wondered if there is a better way to designate what the money is being used for when we request money for site selection and acquisition. Mr. Vakalis explained the bonds allow the District to go through the site selection process, which does cost money. Availability of bond money allows the District to buy as much of the land as is covered under the proposition, based upon the price at the time of negotiation. The unfortunate and unforeseen issue is what the true cost is going to be at the time the negotiation process starts. The District has seen a severe escalation in prices throughout the Municipality of Anchorage and in Eagle River. Mr. Vakalis explained that it is a challenge to clearly define this process for the public. If the District has to go back and rename a particular site again it is only because there wasn't enough money because of the cost at the time of acquisition. Mr. Vakalis noted that the Municipality of Anchorage has the same dilemma. Ms. Kennedy indicated that the answer may be in how we advocate for the bonds, clearly explaining how those particular monies will be used in the process. Ms. Comeau added that we could also explain to the public that the reason the District hasn't spent the first \$10,000,000 is that we are actively engaged in acquiring the elementary and middle school sites in Southwest Anchorage, but additional funds are needed to complete that acquisition. In addition, the District would also like to purchase a site in Eagle River with the rest of the funds. Ms. Comeau further noted that the site selection process takes a very long time. Mr. Steele added that it is a public process when the property is purchased, so the information about the disposition of the money is widely available. The idea has always been that we would like to be in a position to respond in a reasonable manner when acquisition opportunities present themselves. Mr. Metcalfe noted that the District is at a disadvantage because land owners know that we want to buy the land so they can charge more.

Mr. Steiner reported that he is glad to see that the bond is for a generic site selection rather than identifying a specific location, which will allow the District the flexibility to adjust as population and enrollment changes. He asked whether the District is proceeding with the planning at Gladys Wood in light of the funding received. Mr. Amsden reported that the planning will start this spring. Mr. Steiner questioned whether the

renovation process at Gladys Wood will be adjusted forward due to the fact that we have been able to move up the planning process. Ms. Comeau explained that the District goes through a very extensive re-prioritization process every year. Completing the planning phase will help identify issues that need to be addressed at Gladys Wood and enable us to re-prioritize the next step in the process at that location.

Mr. Steiner requested some clarification regarding the sprinkler system requirements in pool area at Dimond High School. Mr. Amsden explained that the purpose of the sprinkler system is to protect the structure over the water, not the water itself. Regarding that same location, Mr. Steiner questioned whether there will be a physical connection built between the two buildings or just a connection between systems. Mr. Amsden noted that the current plan is simple to join the systems to enhance communication, not to build a corridor.

In response to another question from Mr. Steiner, it was noted that the amounts requested in the bonds take into consideration the increased cost of supplies and fuel after Katrina. Ms. Comeau also pointed out that the recommendation includes authorization for the Superintendent to adjust the project costs in accordance with updated project estimates.

Mr. Steele noted that the memo clearly identifies the amount of state reimbursement allowed by the Legislature, where in the past whatever the voters passed could be submitted for reimbursement. He feels that it is important to point out to Legislators the commitment that our voters make in supporting the bonds and attempt to get some reconsideration of what items are eligible for reimbursement. Along those same lines, Mr. Steele reminded the Board that the District used to receive reimbursement for the cost of replacing older buses. He noted that it will now take special appropriation in order to receive funds for reimbursement. The State mandates school transportation but does not help fund it.

Mr. Steele voiced his appreciation to the Capital Improvement Advisory Committee and other citizens interested in the District's bonding issues. He emphasized the need to get out and talk about the bonds. He noted the need for support when the school bond proposition goes to the Assembly.

VOTE

Ayes: Steiner, Roberts,
Kennedy, Friedman,
Metcalf, Marks, Steele

Nays: None

MOTION PASSES

ASD Memorandum # 11 - School Board Policy Revisions: Section 332.3
Lottery Procedures - Open Enrollment (First Reading)

It is the recommendation of the Administration that the School Board adopt on First Reading the recommended policy changes for School Board Policy 332.3 Lottery Procedures - Open Enrollment.

ACTION:

Moved by: Jake Metcalfe
seconded by: Mary Marks

To adopt, on first reading, ASD Memorandum #11, School Board Policy Revisions to Section 332.3 Lottery Procedures.

Mr. Howard Katz, addressed the Board and asked them to consider formalizing the kindergarten through twelfth grade sibling preference system currently practiced in the Japanese Immersion Program. He indicated that when his family first became involved with the Japanese Immersion Program they were told that there was a K-12 preference. He explained the level of commitment required by the entire family when students are accepted into the program. Students who make it to the seventh grade have parents who have clearly demonstrated their commitment to the program. Mr. Katz also explained his belief that the program consists of a community that extends from Sand Lake Elementary to Mears Middle School to Dimond High School. He requested that the Board formalize the current practice of giving preference to children who have siblings in the program in kindergarten through the twelfth grade.

In response to a question from Mr. Steiner, Mr. Katz explained that transportation becomes an issue for families who don't live in the Sand Lake/Mears/Dimond attendance area and who have one student in the program and another who must attend their local school. His personal situation would require a forty minute round-trip to transport an older child to Mears while needing to get a kindergarten student to the local elementary school. The logistics will be very difficult to work out. Ms. Comeau explained that, while it is not known where the precedent of a K-12 preference got started, clearly the understanding of families is that there is one. She pointed out that whatever decision is made regarding this issue, it should to be looked at in light of not only the Japanese Immersion Program but also the two Spanish Immersion Programs and the Russian Immersion Program. She added that it is much harder to fill slots in these programs after the second grade, so the family commitment is real.

Whatever decision is made, the policy needs to be made very clear to the public.

Mr. Steele clarified that, with no K-12 preference, a younger child would not automatically have to attend his/her neighborhood school but that they would have to stand for the program lottery. He wondered if the Administration had received any feedback from the other immersion programs. Ms. Christensen noted that, aside from the Japanese Immersion families, the only other feedback received was in June when there was testimony on the other side of the issue. In response to another question Mr. Garrity, Sand Lake Elementary Principal reported that there are usually 100 applications for the 50 program spots available each year. Ms. Comeau, referencing a membership report she had received today, reported that Sand Lake has a waiting list of 65 students. Mr. Steiner asked whether there is a preference in these programs for students who live in the attendance area of the school housing the program. Ms. Comeau clarified that there is a neighborhood preference and a sibling preference, noting that it is only a preference for the lottery drawing not a guarantee that the child will get into the program. Based on the information shared by Ms. Christensen regarding contrary testimony that the K-12 preference is exclusionary, Mr. Steiner noted that it appears the District is in need of more of these programs. Ms. Comeau agreed that the immersion programs are very popular and very successful. She indicated that the District would be doing more such programs if qualified staff were available.

Mr. Metcalfe voiced his belief that the issue is transportation and that the programs are exclusionary in the sense that families who can't afford to transport their children across town will not enroll in the programs. He believes that these programs exclude students because the District can not afford to provide transportation which then causes diversity problems in the schools. Ms. Kennedy agreed that it is a transportation problem to a certain extent but that the bigger issue is not having enough teachers. She noted that if the District could offer the programs in other locations we would, thereby alleviating the transportation issue. On the other hand, if we had the ability to transport students from all over the District we would clearly overload the capacity host schools. Ms. Comeau noted that transportation is an issue with all alternative programs, not just with the language immersion programs.

Mr. Friedman explained that there is a districtwide sibling preference policy. He noted that the issue tonight is whether the Board would like that to be a program-based preference or a site-based preference. Mr.

Steiner asked whether the Policy Subcommittee delved into the question of site-based versus program-based preference. Ms. Christensen explained that this was initially referred to the Policy Subcommittee following the testimony in June. There was a complaint at that time that the sibling preference had been given to a student at Sand Lake Elementary with a sibling at Dimond High School. The sense at that time was that allowing the preference was probably a misapplication of the policy and so the issue was directed to the Policy Subcommittee for clarification.

In response to a question from Mr. Roberts, Ms. Comeau noted that the policy does address districtwide lottery procedures not just the Japanese Immersion Program. She noted that the commentary tonight reflects the fact that, for the most part, this complaint is heard mostly from the immersion programs because the other alternative programs are school specific. It is only in the immersion programs that there is an automatic feed between schools as the student progresses through grade levels. Based on that information, Mr. Friedman suggested that a change needs to be made because the way the policy currently reads indicates that students would have to enter a new lottery for attendance at the middle school and at the high school. With the current wording, students in the lower grades may not necessarily be able to continue through the program as they move through the upper grades. Mr. Friedman does not believe that was the intention of the proposed policy changes. Ms. Comeau emphasized that the District has always committed K-12 for the immersion programs and that there was never any intention to require students in the program to stand for the lottery in order to remain in the program through the upper grades and if that is not clearly articulated in the policy it should go back to the Subcommittee for clarification. Ms. Comeau requested that the Board provide direction to the Subcommittee as to whether they believe that having a middle school or high school sibling should confer sibling preference on a student entering the program. Mr. Metcalfe noted that the Policy Subcommittee's intention was that, once a student got in to a program they could stay in that program for as long as they desired to continue. He explained that it was his understanding in regards to the question of sibling preference that the Policy Subcommittee's recommendation was that once the student was out of the educational program, be that elementary, middle or high school, the preference did not continue. The Board needs to decide whether the Subcommittee should revisit that question.

In response to Mr. Friedman's call for direction from the members, Mr. Steele voiced his opinion that once a student is in a program they should be allowed to continue in that program. He pointed out that it is more

difficult for him to answer the question whether sibling preference should remain for siblings of higher level students no longer in the school.

Mr. Steiner clarified the problem as being indicative of a dual standard. He explained that the only way that the student in a program continues in the program into middle school and on into high school is if you interpret the program to be K-12, otherwise the language of the policy does not address the issue. Then, once the program is interpreted to be K-12, it would seem that the sibling preference applies throughout the program regardless of which grade level the older sibling attends. While acknowledging the difficulty of the question, his opinion leaned toward the belief that the harms of being exclusionary may be more severe than the burden on the family who doesn't get the sibling preference.

As a current student in the Japanese Immersion Program, Mr. Feriani voiced his support of a K-12 sibling preference for all of the language immersion programs. He also supported students being allowed to remain in the program K-12 without having to stand for the lottery as they move into middle school and high school.

Mr. Freidman agreed that the policy should reflect that once a student is in a program they are allowed to remain in the program. He indicated that the Policy Subcommittee may need to review current wording in order to make sure that intention is clear in the policy. He further noted that he would advocate for a K-12 sibling preference for the reasons discussed this evening. He indicated that these are K-12 programs, they have always been treated as K-12 programs and he feels that the Board should be consistent in the way they are handled.

Mr. Steele noted that when this policy was reviewed in 2003 there was heated discussion and notation made at that time that the Board might want to eliminate sibling preference altogether.

Ms. Janice Gullickson, World Language Coordinator, noted that she is only aware of two cases where the issue of sibling preference for significantly younger children has come up. There would have to be quite a spread in the ages of the children so the issue does not occur very often. She explained that when a student enrolls in a language program it becomes the second language for the entire family. The older children are tutoring and helping the younger children. The families become involved in the culture and may even take interns into their home. It really becomes a whole value system that they are incorporating into their lives.

Mr. Metcalfe reported that one of the criticisms he has heard about these programs is the elitist nature of the program which he believes is perpetuated when preference is given to the fact that a much younger sibling. He acknowledged that there is a family nature to the program but that it would have dissipated by the passage of time. It is his belief that people see that as being unfair when it comes to the process because the family is at an advantage because they won the lottery the first time. He indicated that the Policy Subcommittee needs to keep that concern in mind. Ms. Kennedy agreed with Mr. Metcalfe in that the fewer families given the opportunity to participate in these programs can not be a good thing. She indicated that if the Board decides to continue the sibling preference it would basically provide a greater benefit to a family with three children than a family with one child. She explained her difficulty to supporting preferences when the system is a lottery and to give some an extra chance to win based on the fact that they have won before doesn't seem to her like the fair thing to do. She did agree that, once someone is in the program they have the right to stay through the entire program but she is unsure about her ability to support giving any student a better opportunity to get into the program just because they have an older sibling who is already in the program. In response to a question from Mr. Friedman, Ms. Kennedy indicated that she would like to see the sibling preference eliminated altogether and she certainly does not want to see it expand into all three school levels.

Mr. Roberts suggested that the Board send this recommendation back to the Policy Subcommittee and ask them to assess how many programs would have K-12 implications. He agreed with Mr. Metcalfe's explanation of the criticisms of the current sibling preference in the system. Mr. Steiner added his concern about what has been termed as elitist or economic elitism in the sense that if families can't afford to transport their children, it is not really an option to enroll them in one of these programs. That being said, the sibling preference doesn't really impact that type of elitism because even without the preference the program is still only available to students who are similarly situated economically. He noted that while there are certainly some families whose children have wide-spread age differences, the numbers in that situation are probably much lower than the siblings within the school. He indicated, therefore, that having a K-12 preference in these programs is a relatively small matter. If the issues that are being discussed regarding sibling preference in general are genuinely a problem then there shouldn't be any sibling preference at all. Before making a decision on this issue Mr. Steiner would like to know what the school counselors and school psychologists would say about possible educational and psychological problems a family might experience when

one child in the family wins the lottery and another does not and whether those concerns are enough to justify keeping the preference. He clarified that it could be more difficult for a child who has an older sibling in the program and whose family is immersed in the language who doesn't win the lottery than it would be for a child who has no previous ties to the program. Ms. Comeau indicated that she does not believe that we will be able to get a definitive answer to Mr. Steiner's question noting that every child is different, every family is different and every situation is different. She requested that Board members provide answers to two questions; 1) Do you support the idea that the language immersion programs are K-12, and 2) What direction should be taken on the issue of sibling preference? While she identified previous discussion that seemed to indicate agreement in support of the first question, she requested that the members weigh-in on the second question. A decision needs to be made as to whether the recommendation should go back to the Policy Subcommittee or if the Board will take a vote this evening. Ms. Marks voiced her opinion that the policy should be left as it is presented, with the sibling preference.

Mr. Johnson identified himself as a benefactor of just such a program and of the sibling preference. He noted his appreciation to the Board for making the effort to discuss and weigh the issue. From a parent's point of view he would like for the Board to wrestle with the question and come up with a definitive answer. He listed several advantages of sibling preference for the Board to keep in mind as they make their decision. He noted that sibling preference brings program advocacy, diversity and family cohesiveness. He indicated that the result of the discussion may benefit both those who are and those who are not successful in the lottery by finding a way to expand the programs and by educating the community about the need for more of these types of programs.

Ms. Kennedy questioned whether the preemptive provision for documented hardship (332.3 Section e.3.b) would adequately address situations where the sacrifices families are required to make become too much. She requested clarification as to how that process works and whether it could be applied in situations such as the Katz family is experiencing. Ms. Comeau explained that, in her experience, she probably would have overridden the lottery policy, after consultation with the Instruction Division Executive Director, based on the same issues being discussed here this evening. She noted that she absolutely believes in the family issue and also believes that the provision for a hardship exemption needs to remain in the policy. There definitely needs to be a means within the policy to allow program directors and the Administration to make that type of decision on a case-by-case basis. She acknowledged that this is

tough question and that even though the numbers are not large, as was indicated by Ms. Gullickson, the policy definitely impacts families on both sides of the issue. Ms. Comeau indicated that, with the current lottery policy, a family could probably make the case for a hardship preemption based on time invested in the program and transportation issues in the case of a younger sibling not getting in through the lottery. She reiterated that resolving this issue is very important so that there will be consistency throughout the immersion programs.

On the topic of designating the immersion programs as K-12, members of the Board indicated agreement that once students are in the program they can remain in the program K-12 without requiring re-lottery at the seventh and ninth grades. There continued to be no clear decision on how to address the issue of sibling preference.

INTERIM MOTION:

Moved by: Jake Metcalfe
seconded by: Mary Marks

To return School Board Policy Revisions: Section 332.3 Lottery Procedures - Open Enrollment to the Policy Subcommittee specifically to address the question of sibling preference.

Mr. Steiner indicated that he has been persuaded that the problem Mr. Katz raised can be adequately addressed by the hardship provision in the policy and, having not heard a lot of discussion about getting rid of the sibling preference entirely, he suggested that the Board approve the Policy Revision on first reading and allow the Policy Subcommittee to take up the questions raised this evening prior to the second reading. In light of this suggestion, Mr. Metcalfe withdrew the Interim Motion.

Mr. Friedman called for a vote on the original motion, which was to accept the changes recommended by the Policy Subcommittee on first reading.

VOTE

Ayes: Steiner, Roberts,
Kennedy, Steele,
Metcalfe, Marks

Nays: Friedman

MOTION PASSES

The Board recessed at 8:45 p.m. for a fifteen minute break. The meeting was called back to order at 9:00 p.m. by Mr. Freidman.

ASD Memorandum # 115 - Adoption of the District Improvement Plan for the 2005-2006 School Year

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve the Anchorage School District's *District Improvement Plan* for implementation and submission to the Department of Education and Early Development.

ACTION:

Moved by: John Steiner
seconded by: Mary Marks

To approve ASD Memorandum #115, the Administration's recommendation to adopt the District Improvement Plan for the 2005-2006 School Year.

Ms. Comeau asked Ms. Christensen to review the process that was used to develop the District Improvement Plan and the major focus of the plan. Ms. Christensen noted that the District is in Level III in terms of the District making Adequate Yearly Progress. The memo identifies where there are groups of students in which we have not made Adequate Yearly Progress as a District in both the Language Arts and Math areas. The intent of the District Improvement Plan is to address those specific areas. Ms. Gardner, Director of School Accountability and Improvement, has met with the Instructional Team to establish broad outlines in developing the plan. Much of this plan follows what was done last year and has been refined this year to better meet the targets, rather than rewritten. When we met with the State earlier this year they looked at some of the processes that were used to put together the District Improvement Plan and asked for more parents to be involved in the process. In response to that request the Instructional Team, along with several of the curricular areas, did request staff and parents to participate in writing this plan. The plan was then sent to MECAC for their review. Ms. Christensen also noted that much of the plan is also coordinated with the previously adopted Six-Year Plan, so there are specific timelines indicated as well as responsible person(s) identified for each strategy. Much of the plan is directed at increasing achievement levels in Math and Language Arts, particularly in those groups of students who have not met AYP.

Ms. Comeau emphasized how important it is to understand that, although people may think that we should add new things and change everything, we can't do real change in a district this size without continuing what we have been doing, refining it, and enhancing it over time.

Mr. Steiner commented that it seemed that there are too few classroom teachers involved in the process of developing the District Improvement Plan. He noted his belief that the plan would benefit by strengthening that component. He also noted that the parent component leaned heavily toward a specific interest in the gifted program, so it seemed like a broader scope of parental involvement would be beneficial. Mr. Steiner pointed out that the primary method for recruiting parents was the District's ad in the paper and wondered if there might be a broader method of soliciting parental involvement. Ms. Christensen clarified that schools that did not make AYP and are at Level II and above had to develop School Improvement Plans. There was much broader participation by teachers and parents at the individual site levels. It was a little more difficult to elicit parent and classroom teacher participation for the Districtwide Plan. She noted that many schools have turned in School Improvement Plans and the Superintendent has met with all of those schools, there was peer review on those processes and there were many parents and teachers involved in the development of those plans. She assured Mr. Steiner that efforts can be made to get a broader base of participation in the future.

Mr. Steele pointed out that this plan makes note that the 21st Century Program is an important and successful component in improving student achievement. He noted that indications are that these programs should continue and even increase. In light of the fact that the Six-Year Plan noted a decrease in grant funding for these programs, Mr. Steele indicated that efforts need to be made to find a way to support these afterschool and tutorial programs. Gifted is another program where there are goals to increase participation, but the plan doesn't have the funding and expertise to continue the growth over the last year. Mr. Friedman suggested that, as part of our legislative lobbying, Board members can use these items as examples of specific programs that we would like to be funded rather than just asking for more money in general. Ms. Comeau indicated that there will be a receptive audience for our funding requests if we can show how a program increases student achievement and parental involvement in schools.

VOTE:

Ayes: Steiner, Roberts,
Kennedy, Friedman,
Metcalf, Marks, Steele

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

ASD Memorandum # 132 - Adoption of Tentative Agreement: Anchorage Council of Education/ AFT, Local 4425, 2006-2009

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and adopt the collective bargaining agreement between the District and Anchorage Council of Education/American Federation of Teachers, Local 4425, which will establish terms and conditions of employment for ACE employees during the period between July 1, 2006 and June 30, 2009.

ACTION:

Moved by: Macon Roberts
seconded by: Tim Steele

To approve ASD Memorandum #132, the Adoption of Tentative Agreement: Anchorage Council of Education/AFT, Local 4425, 2006-2009.

Mr. Roberts expressed his appreciation to the Association as well as the Administration's bargaining team for working on this agreement. He was also pleased to note that it was ratified by ACE members. It was the desire of Mr. Roberts that ACE members know that the Board supports the Association, appreciates them and value what they do. Ms. Comeau noted that this agreement is an example of what can be achieved when people talk collaboratively about issues of concern, identifying the core issues and are not mired down in every word on every page. She added her kudos to the bargaining teams for their work. Mr. Tollefsen thanked ACE. He indicated that this agreement is result of the day-to-day relationship that has been established and maintained between the District and ACE.

VOTE:

Ayes: Steiner, Roberts,
Kennedy, Friedman,
Metcalf, Marks, Steele

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

H. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

1. ASD Memorandum # 142 - Project Status Report

This is a report of activities and project status changes in Major Capital Projects during the period of November 16, 2005 through November 28, 2005.

2. ASD Memorandum # 143 – First Quarter Parent/Teacher conference Report 2005-2006

The School Board and the Administration have long supported and encouraged opportunities for parents and teachers to meet to discuss student progress at various times during the school year. In many cases, students have been encouraged to be active participants in these conferences.

3. ASD Memorandum # 144 – First Quarter Suspension/Weapons/Expulsion Report 2005-2006

Information regarding suspensions and expulsions for various offenses, including weapons, is collected from the elementary, middle, and high schools each quarter. The information is shown in the narrative information below and as Attachments A-F. Suspension/expulsion information is also reported from the charter schools.

Ms. Comeau expressed her desire to celebrate the results of the First Quarter Suspension/Weapons/Expulsion Report. She gave credit to the leadership of the Instruction Division. They have taken the School Board Goals very seriously, doing everything they can to keep students in school while also keeping our schools safe.

Mr. Henry, Executive Director of High School Education, is pleased to report that suspensions are down. He indicated that he believes the reason for this is the ongoing effort being made to prevent fighting in the schools. He noted that the fights and the threats are down dramatically due to the fact that there is staff in the halls working to prevent fights. He also explained that, when a student is suspended for fighting the student comes back to school with a parent, sits down with an administrator, and signs a letter indicating that they understand that if they get into another fight they may not go to that school anymore. Mr. Henry indicated that one high school has implemented a method to impact drug and alcohol use by having an administrator meet with students who have previous drug and alcohol offenses. These meetings are conducted from a perspective of affirming any positive action taken by the student and letting the student know that the administrator is going to help them avoid a second offense in any way possible. That effort has resulted in zero recommendations for expulsions on the Drug and Alcohol policy from that particular school.

Mr. Steiner asked Mr. Henry whether he felt that the Continuation School has had an effect on the number of repeat offenders. Mr. Henry

indicated that the Continuation School has had a positive impact on these numbers. Mr. Friedman recalled that the numbers of fights and threats are down significantly over the past three to five years although there was a spike in those numbers last year. Mr. Henry affirmed that to be an accurate assessment of the report going back over the last seven years.

Ms. Vandergaw, Executive Director of Middle School Education, reported that there was also great news from middle schools. She reviewed the Aggressors, Victims and Bystanders Program which continues to be implemented across the District and allows for a pro-active stance toward particular behaviors rather than a reactionary/suspension mode. Ms. Vandergaw also mentioned the use of Teacher Coordinators (previously Drug and Alcohol Reduction Coordinators) to focus on early intervention with students, identifying early behaviors that will lead to more detrimental behavior and helping students with some of the social skills related to those behaviors. These coordinators provide specific lessons for identified students as to why the behavior isn't working and try to help them reach an understanding of possible results of that behavior. She also indicated that collaboration with the SROs has proven to be vital. Every school has reported that they have been able to deal with students in a pro-active fashion with students, not having to wait until situations escalate to a crisis level because of the strong support of the SROs. Ms. Vandergaw especially congratulated Clark, Mirror Lake, Romig and Wendler Middle Schools for their success.

Ms. McRae, Executive Director of Elementary Education, reported that there was a slight increase in the number of suspensions at the elementary level. She noted that 22 schools have seen increases, leaving 38 schools with no additional suspensions or a reduced number of suspensions. She did not identify any significant trends from this data, noting that increases can occur when only a handful of schools have only one more suspension than in previous years. Ms. McRae explained that the principals who are implementing Positive Schoolwide Discipline in their schools have reported a significant decrease in the number of referrals to the office, which is a common disciplinary action at the elementary level. It is pretty rare for an elementary student to be suspended. She noted that principals are reporting a significant decrease in the kind of infractions for which elementary students would receive disciplinary referrals resulting in disciplinary actions such as before or after school detentions. Ms. McRae indicated that she would be collecting that data so that the

Administration can look at how the Positive Schoolwide Discipline Program is working in the elementary schools.

Mr. Metcalfe asked the Administration whether funding of School Resource Officers (SROs) is an ongoing issue. Ms. Comeau reported that the Municipal Budget, which included funding for the SRO program, had passed 9-2. The program had strong support from both the Mayor and Assembly Members alike. She indicated that statistics presented by Lt. Cobb and Sgt. Jennings clearly demonstrated the effectiveness the SRO program has on crime prevention. Most people are beginning to understand that the SRO program is an investment in safety which benefits the entire community.

Mr. Steiner noted that an increase in the number of suspensions is not necessarily a bad thing if the numbers indicate the fact that the students are being carefully monitored in order to catch bad behavior early, thereby allowing earlier intervention to teach better behavior. He reminded the Board that many of the high schools are moving toward Small Learning Communities where students have more interaction with adults and are more apt to be seen which may account for the improved numbers in the high schools. Ms. Comeau indicated that it is important for students to know that adults know who they are. The ninth-grade Houses, Academies and Small Learning Communities are all working to make our schools more personalized. All of the efforts discussed this evening are working together to create a safe school environment.

4. ASD Memorandum # 147 - 2005-2006 Ethnicity Report

Today 45 percent of the students in the Anchorage School District are ethnically diverse, compared to 13 percent in 1976, nearly thirty years ago. Of today's ethnic minority population, the Alaska Native/American Indian (13 percent) category is the largest, followed by the Asian/Pacific Islander (11 percent), African American/Black (8 percent), and Hispanic (6 percent) groups. Since 1996-97, the fastest growing ethnic population, percentage-wise, has been Asian/Pacific Islander, followed by Hispanic. The Asian/Pacific Islander ethnic group grew by 53 percent and the Hispanic ethnic group grew by 42 percent.

I. PERSONS TO BE HEARD ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

J. COMMUNICATIONS & SCHOOL BOARD COMMENTS

Mr. Roberts reported that he had served as an usher for the recent production of the Jackie Robinson Story by the Anchorage Junior Theater. He indicated that approximately 7000 elementary students, from Girdwood to Wasilla, were able to see the program. He was touched by the level of enthusiasm, attention and appreciation that the students had for the production. He also reported that he had been on hand at Fairview Elementary School when the Cameronians visited the school. He enjoyed the opportunity to witness the group teaching and leading the students in African songs and dances.

Ms. Kennedy reported that the 42nd Street Dancers had been to Mirror Lake Middle School to do a workshop for the students, noting her appreciation that District students are able to participate in that kind of program.

Ms. Steele reported that the Optional Program at Susitna Elementary had a fundraiser for the homeless. He also reported that Fairview Community Council had a get-together to celebrate the progress that is being made in that community. Mr. Steele also reported that West High School recently presented a wonderful dance program. The public will be able to see the program as it is rebroadcast on Channel 14.

K. EXECUTIVE SESSION - PERSONNEL/FINANCE/NEGOTIATIONS
LITIGATION

L. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of December 12, 2005, was adjourned by unanimous consent at 9:35 p.m.

Jeff Friedman, President

John Steiner, Clerk

Johanna Lee, Recording Secretary

Date Minutes Approved