

MINUTES OF THE ANCHORAGE SCHOOL BOARD
REGULAR MEETING OF JANUARY 9, 2006

The Anchorage School Board met in Regular Session on Monday, January 9, 2006, 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: John Steiner, Macon Roberts, Crystal Kennedy, Jeff Friedman, Jake Metcalfe, Mary Marks, and Tim Steele.

Others Present: Jan Christensen, Enid Hunter, Mike Henry, Patricia McRae, Jerry Sjolander, Leslie Vandergaw, Janet Stokesbary, George Vakalis, Dr. Enid Silverstein, Ray Amsden, Mark Mew, Pam Chenier, Stan Syta, Jim Utter, Michelle Egan, Larry Wiget, Ralph Feriani, LTC David Jones, William Johnson, Johanna Lee, the press, and other interested people.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Friedman noted that the Board had received additional revisions to ASD Memorandum #90, Revision of the Six-Year Plan. He also reported that there is a revision to ASD Memorandum #11, Policy Revisions to Section 332.3 - Lottery Procedures, replacing all references to the month of April in section f (5) with March.

Ms. Comeau noted that there was also a revision to the ASD Memorandum # 170, the Facility Change Order Report.

The agenda was unanimously approved.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Comeau reminded students, staff and the community that the District has been working closely with the Municipality and the Martin Luther King Foundation to plan a celebration to honor Dr. King. The celebration will be held at 4:00 p.m. on Sunday, January 15th at the Egan Center. She further noted that Monday, January 16th is a school holiday celebrating the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Ms. Comeau reported that the ASD Communication Department has recently received a number of awards. They earned First Place recognition in the "News and Features Story" category for the Russian Immersion Program feature. This feature has received national coverage. They received Third Place recognition in the "News Conference" category for the District's Annual Yearly Progress coverage. In addition, they received Second Place recognition in the "Special Public Relations Campaign" category for the way the District approached the recent calendar changes. Ms. Comeau acknowledged the members of the Communications Department team, thanking them for their outstanding work and acknowledging their winning efforts.

Ms. Comeau and Mr. Friedman presented a certificate to Ralph Feriani, Student Advisory Representative to the Board, in recognition of his participation in the fifteenth annual youth leadership conference at the November AASB conference.

D. AWARDS/RECOGNITIONS/PRESENTATIONS

The Eagle River High School Choir, under the direction of Ms. Andrea Lang, entertained the Board and others present with a number of musical selections.

ASD Memorandum #150 – Recognition of 2005 National Teacher Certification Recipients

National Board Certification, offered by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), is a demonstration of a candidate's teaching practice as measured against high and rigorous standards. It is a symbol of commitment to excellence in teaching. Once National Board Certified, a teacher holds a credential attesting to the fact that he or she has been assessed by their peers as one who is accomplished, makes sound professional judgments about student learning, and acts effectively on those judgments.

While reading the memorandum, Ms. Kennedy reported the Anchorage School District now has 29 National Board Certified teachers. Mr. Friedman distributed awards to the four most recently certified teachers, Pearl Theonnes of Gladys Wood Elementary, Ingrid Lindberg of Susitna Elementary, Alta Collins of Chester Valley Elementary, and Annette Durbin of Williwaw Elementary. An award was also presented to Anchorage's first National Board Certified Teacher, Joellen Solmonson of Bear Valley Elementary, who completed the renewal process last year and

is successfully recertified. The School Board recognized these 5 individuals for their professional teaching excellence.

Ms. Comeau acknowledged the accomplishments of these individuals. She noted that it is a testament to the high quality of teachers in the District that more and more of them are applying for and receiving recognition under the National Teachers Certification program.

E. SPECIAL ADVISORY REPORTS

1. Student Advisory Board

Mr. Feriani reported that the Student Advisory Board (SAB) met this morning at King Career Center (KCC). The next meeting will be held on February 6, 2006 at 11:30 a.m. at KCC.

There were two speakers at today's meeting. Victoria Blakeney, Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Coordinator, spoke on new SEL program standards. Ms. Comeau spoke to the group about the Green Star, Middle School Boundaries and the budget.

Mr. Feriani, voicing some concern about the low turnout at the meeting, requested that principals make sure their school representatives attend the next meeting.

2. Military Delegate

LTC Jones thanked the public for their continued support of Anchorage's military community. As more Alaska-based soldiers and airmen are deployed we will face the inevitable losses that occur. The military community appreciates the prayers for those who have lost loved ones and those who are separated from loved ones. The support through the schools received by students who are effected by deployments is critical to their well-being.

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

Mr. Johnson reported that the next business meeting of the MECAC is scheduled for January 19, 2006 at noon in Room 320 of the Administration Building. As always the public is welcome to attend.

F. PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Dan Loring spoke on behalf of the upcoming AEA negotiations. He requested that emphasis be placed on how to contractually create incentives to get more participation from and advocacy for students, especially minority and low-income students, and their families. He believes that it is important to engage teachers, parents and students more than we currently are in order to create a world-class education system here in Anchorage.

G. PERSONS TO BE HEARD NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Shirley Tuzroyluke, Chair of the South Central Native Educators Association (SCNEA), distributed copies of a proposal to create an Ombudsman position in the Anchorage School District to the Board. She acknowledged all of the efforts currently in place to serve the needs of Alaska Native students. She noted that there are approximately 6500 Alaska Native students in the District, making the indigenous population the largest ethnic minority group. Despite social, political and demographic changes in the Alaska Native community, the one constant in the educational sphere seems to be the exodus of Alaska Native students from the system prior to successful completion. She identified that some students and families who lack resources such as knowledge of how the system works, awareness of services available, outreach, and a bridge to assist in crossing the communication gap are often frustrated and sometimes give up.

In response to a recent forum organized by the Anchorage Faith and Action Congregation Together (AFACT), SCNEA reached into the diversity of the Anchorage community to discuss the issues presented. In approaching this challenge, a wide representation of Native professionals and other concerned community members discussed ways to address those issues. SCNEA members supported the creation of an Ombudsman-type office in the District. She asked for the Board's support of this proposal.

Ann Haddox, Chair of the Native Advisory Committee (NAC), described her teaching credentials and her own unsuccessful experience in securing a position with the District. She explained that one of the purposes of the Alaska Native Community Liaison would be to locate and promote the hiring of Alaska Native educators. She noted that Indian Education is doing a wonderful job but there is still work to be done. The NAC scope is to support and make recommendations regarding the Indian Education

program. On a personal note she explained that her daughter is an at-risk student, short 2.5 credits and needs help. She indicated that Bartlett High School has been very supportive in helping her to help her daughter, but not all Native families are as fortunate. Many do not know the school system. They come from outlying areas, don't know who to talk to and don't always feel welcome in the schools. On behalf of those families she strongly encouraged the Board to support the Alaska Community Liaison position.

Ms. Marks thanked the speakers for their time and information. She wondered whether either speaker had talked to the Director of the Indian Education Department to bring to her attention the need for a Native Liaison or Ombudsman. She noted that the same problems have been identified at a national level. She believes that something of this magnitude needs to be brought to the main headquarters of the Department of Indian Education in Washington, DC so that an Ombudsman position can be established, not just in our district but in districts across the nation. Ms. Tuzroyluke explained that they have not had a discussion with the Indian Education Program here in the District. They had not envisioned the position coming from the Indian Education Program but were looking for other sources of support. Ms. Haddox added that, in her role with NAC, she has reviewed the finances and that there is not enough money in the Indian Education budget to support the position. Ms. Marks clarified that she was looking at this from a much larger perspective than the Anchorage School District. She indicated that it was her hope that a resolution could be developed to go to the National School Board Association that would start lobbying efforts at that level to address these issues. Ms. Marks voiced her appreciation to Ms. Tuzroyluke and Ms. Haddox for their time and efforts on behalf of their organizations.

Mr. Metcalfe asked the Administration what the Governor's proposal will do to the District's budget. Ms. Comeau indicated that, if the Legislature approves that proposal, Anchorage will probably receive an additional \$28 million. We anticipate a gap of about \$30 million just to keep all programs intact, so cuts of about \$2 million will still be needed. She noted that there is a long way to go to get to the point where we can fund everything that we want to. Addressing the speakers, Ms. Comeau noted that she had seen a copy of their request. She assured them that the Administration will look at the request carefully during the budget development process over the next few months.

Mr. Willie Templeton, Vice-Chairman of the SCNEA and the Director of Native Student Services at UAA, explained that the discussion which resulted in this proposal brought to light that there are a lot of people in the community who believe that there is a need for someone who is in contact with the District Administration. The distinction between this position and the MECAC is that the MECAC is a committee to the School Board for policy-making issues. This position would be toward the administration of policy, rather than involved in making policy. The one thing that was very clear at the meetings and during discussions is that there are people in the community who feel somewhat frustrated with the system, they feel that the system is foreign and would like a stepping-stone or a way within the Administration. The position will provide a much needed means of access for the Native students and their families.

Mr. Steiner indicated that this is an intriguing concept and having people to perform that function might be good for all groups of students who are not succeeding or parents who are having trouble interfacing. He wondered whether this issue could be addressed by having individual schools each designate a "go-to" person for Native concerns, bringing access even closer to the parents. Mr. Templeton indicated that having the position at the level of the Administration building would be a visible symbol to the Native community that this district takes Native achievement seriously. The position is also conceived to be a resource for Native educators and as such should be centrally located.

Mr. Metcalfe noted that he has heard a lot of the same concerns regarding access from other minority groups. He wondered whether a position like this could be funded by grants or private entities such as Native Corporations. Ms. Comeau indicated that the District could approach the Native Corporations and some of the agencies that directly support Alaska Natives and American Indian students, as well as the Federal Government. She informed the Board that Representative Les Gara has put forth a piece of legislation that she believes could go a long way in addressing not only this issue but also similar issues across the very diverse student population in the District. Rep. Gara's proposed legislation would allow up to two liaison positions such as are being described here for the District and additional positions at the school level, based on population. The sole purpose of these positions would be family outreach. These positions would be funded outside of the formula so they would not come out of the base student allocation. In Ms. Comeau's opinion that particular piece of legislation would go a very long way toward addressing a number of issues for all of the families in Anchorage. Ms. Comeau reiterated that the District is very diverse and focusing one

administrative position solely on one particular cultural group could very likely lead to challenges from other groups. She indicated that while we can certainly approach the Native Corporations we also need to look at the Indian Education allocations and work through the Native Advisory Committee to see if there are ways to find other funding sources. Mr. Templeton indicated that SCNEA is very interested in being in dialogue with the Board and the District to find a way to make this happen.

Mr. Friedman explained that although Mr. Templeton saw MECAC as a policy advisory group, one of the missions of the MECAC is to act as an advocate to guide people through the process. He suggested that SCNEA might want to talk with them, at least as an alternative while other solutions are being sought.

Mr. Roberts reported that he and the Superintendent had attended the AFACT meeting. He noted that the District has heard the people and is actively working toward meeting their needs. Mr. Templeton felt that the term "Ombudsman" may not be the best choice as it may imply that there is a problem. The position is meant to help mediate, so the title "Liaison" is really more fitting.

Ms. Marks wanted to assure the speakers that the Board and the Administration is very aware of the achievement gap in Native student academics and is working strenuously to find solutions. She reported that our legislators are back in session noting that the Board will repeatedly be requesting the assistance of the public to lobby those legislators. The legislators really do want to hear from our community, especially our students. They know what the Board is approaching them about, but hearing from individuals in the community about what they are going through and what their needs are provides added impact to the message.

Mr. Steiner echoed Ms. Marks, noting that the Board sees the gap and is very committed to reducing and eliminating it. Trying to figure out how to do that can be frustrating as we try to determine how to allocate limited resources to the areas where they will have the most positive effect. He noted that this suggestion is really worth looking at, particularly as it comes from grassroots experiences of people who are saying that this liaison position would help.

Mr. Dan Loring thanked the SCNEA for putting together a wonderful and well thought out proposal. He expressed his hope that the Board and the Administration will support the proposal. Mr. Loring, addressing the budget issues discussed here, explained his belief that it is a matter of

prioritization. He encouraged the Board to prioritize innovative programs like this into their budget.

G. CONSENT AGENDA

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

1. 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.

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

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

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

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

4. ASD Memorandum # 173 - Approval of Proposed Changes to the Highland Tech Charter

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve the proposed revisions to the graduation requirements of the Highland Tech High School Charter for the Class of 2006.

5. ASD Memorandum # 151 - Approval of Schematic Design for Chugiak High School Renewal Phase 4

It is the Administration's recommendation the School Board approve the Schematic Design for the Chugiak High School Renewal Phase 4 and authorize the Superintendent to proceed with the Design

Development and Construction Documents, pending Municipal Assembly approval of the Schematic Design.

6. ASD Memorandum # 74 - Award of Contract: Basketball Officiating Services

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract to Anchorage Sports Officials Association for providing Basketball Officiating Services in an estimated amount not to exceed \$208,200 for a two-year period with an option to renew for an additional one-year period.

7. ASD Memorandum # 139 - Award of Contract: West 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 West High School Generator Installation and Electrical Service Upgrade to the lowest responsive bidder, City Electric, Inc. for the base bid amount of \$188,610, and Assignment A in the amount of \$316,364 for a total award of \$504,974.

8. ASD Memorandum # 159 - Award of Contract: Romig Middle School Generator Installation

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract for the Romig Middle School Generator Installation and Electrical Service Upgrade to the lowest responsive bidder, Bering Sea Eccotech, Inc. for the base bid amount of \$296,667 and Assignment A in the amount of \$18,632, for a total award of \$315,299.

9. ASD Memorandum # 138 - Award of Contract: Bartlett 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 Bartlett High School Generator Installation and Electrical Service Upgrade to the lowest responsive bidder, Marsh Creek LLC for the base bid amount of \$255,953, Bid Alternate #1 in the amount of \$10,000, Assignment A in the amount of \$4,000, and Assignment B in the amount of \$319,710 for a total award of \$589,663.

10. ASD Memorandum # 158 - Award of Contract: Nine School Boiler Conversions

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract for the Boiler Conversion at Girdwood Elementary School, Goldenview Middle School, Gruening Middle School, Hanshew Middle School, Mears Middle School, Romig Middle School, and West High School to the lowest responsive bidder, Consolidated Contracting and Engineering for the base bid amount of \$894,444, Assignment A in the amount of \$89,253, Alternate No. 2, Bartlett High School in the amount of \$191,111, and Assignment C in the amount of \$11,499 for a total of \$1,186,307.

11. ASD Memorandum # 154 - Award of Contract: Riding Snow Blowers

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract to Craig Taylor Equipment Company to furnish RIDING SNOW BLOWERS in an amount not to exceed \$146,750.

12. ASD Memorandum # 164 - Professional Services Selection for Dimond High School Gym/Pool Building Code Upgrades and Renewal

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve the selection of AMC Engineers, as the Designer of Record for Dimond High School Gym/Pool Building Code Upgrades and Renewal, and authorize the Superintendent to negotiate and enter into a contract with AMC Engineers for design services.

13. ASD Memorandum # 166 - Recommendation for Clark Middle School Renewal Construction Delivery Method

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board authorize the Superintendent to utilize the General Contractor/Construction Manager (GC/CM) project delivery method for the Clark Middle School Renewal, contingent upon approval of the method by the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development.

14. ASD Memorandum # 167 - Recommendation for Hazardous Materials Professional Consulting Services

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve the selection of Environmental Health Sciences-Alaska, Inc. as the consultant of record for the Hazardous Materials Professional Services and authorize the Superintendent to negotiate and enter into a contract with the firm for these services as addressed in the Request for Proposals dated October 17, 2005.

15. ASD Memorandum # 168 - Mt. View, Birchwood, Rabbit Creek Elementary Schools Alternative Asbestos Abatement Procurement

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board authorize the Superintendent to utilize the modified two-step Invitation to Bid process for Asbestos Abatement Projects at Mt. View, Birchwood, and Rabbit Creek Elementary Schools.

16. ASD Memorandum # 160 - 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. Ms. Kennedy requested that ASD Memorandum #90 and ASD Memorandum #139 be pulled for discussion. Mr. Steiner requested that ASD Memorandum #63 be pulled for discussion.

ACTION:

Moved by: John Steiner
seconded by: Macon Roberts

To approve ASD Memoranda #173, #151, #74, #159, #138, #158, #154, #164, #166, #167, #168, and #160.

VOTE:

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

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

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.

ACTION:

Moved by: Crystal Kennedy
seconded by: Mary Marks

To approve ASD Memorandum #90, Revisions to the Six-Year Instructional Plan.

Ms. Comeau reminded everyone that discussion on these revisions had been postponed from the December Board meeting at the request of Board members to allow more time for review. She noted that the most important thing to remember about the Six-Year Plan, as is stated in the pertinent facts, is that it is a fluid, living document. As such, when new information comes forward, if there are challenges with budget or if there is new funding found from different sources, the plan will need to be revised. Ms. Comeau turned the floor over to Ms. Christensen and Dr. Silverstein to field questions from the Board.

Ms. Christensen expressed her appreciation for being able to bring these revisions to the Board. She reported that the various departments, supervisors and coordinators have worked hard at looking at what has been accomplished this far and where we would like to go from here. She noted that she, along with Dr. Silverstein and Ms. Gardner had met with Mr. Kronberg, AEA president, to discuss the plan. They have since been able to respond, in writing, to questions that he had presented.

Ms. Christensen explained that Dr. Silverstein has information regarding items that were added in the culturally responsive aspects of the plan. There was also information added under the Indian Education Department on the work being done with the faith-based community and the pilot programs at Romig Middle School and Willow Crest Elementary. These have been added since the plan revisions were initially presented in December. Dr. Silverstein noted that the data-driven math evaluation has also been added to the revisions since December.

Ms. Kennedy commented that she was struck by how important the student information system is beginning to be in a lot of different departments, noting that the Board needs to address that issue as soon as possible.

Ms. Kennedy indicated that she had recently heard a report that raised some concern with Alaska state standards. Noting the significant work in the plan to align with state standards, she wondered what impact those concerns might have on the plan. Ms. Comeau explained that the report

Ms. Kennedy spoke of referenced the old science content standards which were revised in June by the State Board of Education. The performance standards that are now being developed, which we are actively participating in, are much more stringent. She further assured the Board that those standards are being tracked through the District's Curriculum and Instructional Divisions.

Mr. Steiner commented that he appreciated that a parenthetical was included each time an item was crossed out in the plan revisions. He wondered whether the Six-Year Plan should be a rolling plan that adds time to the end of the plan as time goes on and goals are met or added. Mr. Steiner, referencing page 13, questioned the rate at which plans are being made to expand the middle schools to include sixth grade. The plan indicates a phase-in such that by year six, to the extent that our building capacity allows, the District would be switched over to sixth grades in middle schools across the District. Ms. Vandergaw explained that the intent of having that notation in the plan is to provide tracking of a long-term process. They were trying to be clear that even though the notation in the plan does not go out further than 2008 this item will continue to be looked at as building capacity allows. Ms. Comeau added that she has requested that the idea of sixth grade in middle schools be part of the discussion as middle schools boundaries are being reviewed and recommendations developed. The public will then have opportunities to comment on that issue as the process proceeds. Mr. Steiner acknowledged that his concern deals with the opportunity for public comment. Having been through the process on this very issue when Mirror Lake Middle School became 6th, 7th, and 8th grade, he noted how important it was to allow input from the public. He wanted to make sure that everyone understands that this plan is a work in progress and that the shift toward moving the sixth grades into the middle schools is still in the planning stages and is not locked in.

Mr. Roberts voiced his appreciation of the fact that the plan does such a good job of keeping in line with the District goal of preparing students for life. Referencing the anti-bullying, anti-harassment program on page 14, Mr. Roberts wondered where we stand in the training process for this program. It was explained that all of the middle schools were trained about two years ago on positive schoolwide discipline. Mr. Roberts also noted that he was impressed, on page 63, with the computerized languages program. He saw efforts to increase the language usage with technology. He noticed and appreciated how well this supports our goal of preparing students for life as we move toward a more global, multilingual society. Mr. Roberts requested additional information

regarding notation on page 21 which indicates that the Special Education department is moving toward becoming paperless. Mr. Sjolander explained that this move is indicative of the desire to get away from having to rely on the typical paper files. This doesn't mean that there will be any less documentation (IEPs will still require multiple pages of information). It simply means that the information will be digitized rather than in the form of paper copies.

Mr. Friedman requested that the Board consider whether they want the Six-Year Plan to be something we approve and potentially make amendments to, or if we should just set a policy that a Six-Year Plan be created and reported on each year. Mr. Steiner felt that to be a great idea. One of the things that concerned him about adopting something so massive is that it contains details that may prove to be unworkable and need adjustments. If the Board has approved the document, the question is raised whether the Administration can vary from it or if they have to follow that target even when it becomes obvious that some aspects are no longer appropriate. In light of those comments, Ms. Comeau requested that the Board discuss using the Six-Year Plan like the Profile of Performance such that once a year the Board would receive a report. She noted that the report could be done early enough in the school year that information regarding areas where good progress is being made through particular programs would be known prior to working through the budget process. The Board would also know if something in the plan has not been approached or has not been dealt with because of budget or other constraints. The Board would then be able to look at all of that information in a comprehensive way, much like the Profile of Performance. She suggested that the Board may want to think about that and talk about it, perhaps at the Policy Subcommittee.

Mr. Roberts expressed his opinion that he likes the idea of sticking with the initial six year time frame for the first time through this plan. This would provide ample opportunity to adjust and fine-tune it. Then, as we approach the end of the initial six-years, we would know where to go in terms of making the plan a rolling plan. But, at this time, he advises to stick with the initial time period.

Mr. Steele acknowledged the huge amount of time that goes into developing the plan, revising the plan and for the Board to review the plan but noted that its value is immense. He pointed out that there were many areas in the plan where things were not able to be done because of budgetary constraints. He did note that it gets better each time that we go through it. He doesn't feel that the District is in a position to make this a

rolling plan, adding a year each year, because of the realities of the budget, the way we get funding, and the amount of changes and progress we are attempting to make.

Ms. Kennedy expressed her belief that this document needs to be fluid enough to change as things change. She noted that just looking at the items that have been deleted, either because they have been accomplished or maybe they just are not necessary anymore, shows that we need to remain flexible. She also indicated that she feels it is important for the Board to see the plan every year, to see the evaluation every year so that we are readjusting as needed, and then to adopt it every year. It may be found that the plan needs to be a two- or three-year plan because that may prove to be a manageable time frame while six years out may not be as workable.

Ms. Kennedy, when comparing the plan evaluation to the plan revisions, noticed in the Elementary Education evaluation that a year after the anti-bullying curriculum was completed the student report card surveys indicated that there were fewer students who felt safe at school. In light of that information, she wondered about the effectiveness of the anti-bullying curriculum. Ms. McRae began by clarifying that the vast majority of elementary students feel safe at school. She also noted that the anti-bullying curriculum is an excellent curriculum. It helps students to learn how to be assertive, how to go for help and how to deal with the issues they face everyday. It is more difficult to show improvement in the number of students who feel safe at school when the vast majority of students already do feel safe at school. So this may not be an adequate measure of the success of the anti-bullying curriculum. Ms. McRae noted that she feels everyone would agree that students need to be taught strategies to deal with bullying in their lives. From her experience in the high schools, Ms. Christensen added that when focus was placed on a particular topic like harassment the perception that there was more harassment went up after students were trained what to look for. She indicated that there could be some of that effect here, bringing to student's awareness more of what is going on so that they realize that they are being bullied.

Ms. Kennedy, again comparing the plan revisions with the earlier evaluations, noticed in the No Child Left Behind section of the evaluation that goals had not been met in Migrant Education or Indian Education. So, looking the plan revisions for Migrant Ed and Indian Education she wondered why they were taking such different approaches to addressing this. Migrant Ed seems to be emphasizing teachers, parents and services

compared to Indian Ed, which seems more student oriented and academic achievement oriented. Ms. Marsha Robbins, Director of Migrant Education, responded by explaining that the Migrant Education program is a support program developed with an eye to meeting the needs of migrant students which were not already being met by the District in some way. Ms. Kennedy indicated that if the purposes of the two programs are very different that would explain why the approach is also very different.

Mr. Steele, referencing the 21st Century program on page 170, noted that this program is doing a good job and the revisions indicate that the desire is to continue and even increase the program. The question is how to find a way to fund the program. Ms. Comeau indicated that Mr. Steele has identified the challenge with this document. The 21st Century program is a wonderful program, as are many other programs. However, they cannot be sustained if their grant funding goes away, without cutting funding in another area. The Administration will continue to lobby for federal funding to be reinstated. Ms. Christensen noted that the plans, first for increasing the number of 21st Century sites and then, in later years, decreasing the number of sites is linked to the anticipated level of funding. This item reflects the original plan for the program and has not yet been revised.

Mr. Steele indicated that he thought the document was good and that the changes were realistic. Mr. Steele reminded the group that several years ago the Board had discussed the need to upgrade Channel 14 such that it would be compatible with digital technology. Ms. Egan explained that the District has some limited digital capability and is looking expanding but at this time the focus is on the GCI cable feed. The goal is to ultimately be able to go forward as the community goes digital.

Mr. Steiner explained that it is difficult to determine by reading the document whether reductions are planned because a program is no longer needed or because of funding issues. For example, he wondered whether the planned future reduction in the 21st Century program is indicative of the Administration's view is that those items should not be supported by District funds once the grant money is gone. Ms. Comeau indicated that the document needs to show which programs are grant-funded. Every year as the budget process proceeds, there are some positions or programs that are moved into the general fund because it is felt that their continuation is valuable. She noted that the Administration has not made that decision prospectively about the 21st Century program. As was noted, this program has not been revised and when it was put into the

plan there was still the hope that it would continue to be funded at the federal level. There are a number of programs that are federally funded which will now have to be revised based on the recent cuts in funding made by Congress. In response to a question from Mr. Steiner, Ms. Comeau clarified that, in some cases, what is shown in the plan reflects what is aspired to even if the funding sources is not known, while in other cases it reflects the results of evaluations showing that resources need to be used in a different way.

Mr. Steiner, referencing the high school drop out rate on page 17, noted that there had been a target to reduce the rate by 50% every year. While he understood that this was a very aggressive goal, he wondered why the goal was dropped all the way to a 10% reduction each year. Mr. Henry explained that the change was based on mathematics. As the number becomes lower it becomes harder and harder to reduce it by 50%. He felt that 10% is still a lofty goal but one that is more attainable. A higher number was felt to be unrealistic based upon the progress that has already been made.

Ms. Kennedy wondered whether all schools, including charter schools and alternative schools, are included when reference is made to schools in the plan. To clarify, she had noticed that the graduation rates and related items appear to apply to all schools but that the goal of training all first grade teachers in phonics may or may not apply to all schools. Her question was whether there is any way to identify when the plan refers to all students and all schools and when some are exempt. Ms. Comeau explained that the charter schools are invited to attend any training offered by the District but they have the choice as to whether they want to participate. This is because, while their curriculum has to be approved by the Board and has to conform to State and District standards, it doesn't have to be the same as other District schools. So for instance, schools that have chosen a different approach to reading would not need to attend training for phonics-based reading. In a follow-up, Ms. Kennedy questioned how the District handles teachers who move from a charter school into another school in terms of their training. Ms. Comeau indicated that teachers in that situation would receive their training in the year they move back into another school. She explained that the charter schools have far more autonomy in the curricular area. The teachers are encouraged to attend District training, and most of the time they do, but they are not required to use the same approach as other schools. They do have to meet Alaska standards, their students are assessed through all of the standard assessments and they are a part of the District's Profile of

Performance, but decisions on staff training requirements are determined by the Academic Policy committee at the individual charter school.

VOTE:

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

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

Ms. Christensen thanked the Board for their approval and also thanked all of the staff who worked on these plan revisions. It is a very comprehensive plan that required hundreds of hours of work, both on the evaluation and these revisions. Dr. Silverstein noted that this document can probably generate as many questions as there are pages in it. The most important thing it has accomplished is causing individuals to check themselves against a list of items they have committed to do. It has taken the process one step further than "I think I'm doing well" to the point of being able to measure whether goals have been met. It has also eliminated a lot of duplication and strengthened interfacing between different departments. Dr. Silverstein noted that while ASD has been very open and people generally have easy access to one another, this process has allowed those activities to be acknowledged and solidified.

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

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

ACTION:

Moved by: Jake Metcalfe
seconded by: Macon Roberts

To adopt on second reading the recommended School Board Policy Revisions to Section 332.3, Lottery Procedures - Open Enrollment.

The first speaker, Jane Asay, identified herself as the current president of TMK, the parent group that supports the Japanese Immersion program from Sand Lake Elementary through Dimond High School. She voiced

her appreciation to the Policy Subcommittee for listening to her organization regarding the sibling preference issue and for considering their input while making the decision to support the revision to look at the program as a K-12 program. She noted that TMK members support the revisions to the policy and would appreciate the Board's support and vote for the revisions.

Dr. Katz voiced his appreciation for the amount of access he has had to the Board regarding this issue. Having spoken to the Board about these policy revisions in December he wanted to clarify a couple of items that came to light after his presentation at that meeting. Regarding the concerns raised about transportation issues, Dr. Katz indicated that he believes that many people in the District have transportation issues. Japanese Immersion program students come from all over the district and most utilize carpools. These carpools are generally organized on the basis of cooperation. Socio-economics don't play a role in that process. He believes that car-pooling is the only practical solution to getting program students to Sand Lake Elementary. The other issue that had come up was the stigmata of one child in a family being left out of the program. He related a personal experience from his childhood where one of his own siblings was unable to get into a special academic high school that he and another sibling attended. He related that the stigma remains with that sibling to this day. It is his belief that families in the Japanese Immersion program are so immersed in the culture that if a child were left out it would significantly impact the entire household. Dr. Katz asked the Board for their support in approving the revisions to the policy as written.

Mr. Roberts thanked both of the speakers for attending the Policy Subcommittee to provide their insight on this issue. He noted that the Board is truly honored to hear from parents, students and other members of the public.

Mr. Metcalfe reported that both speakers as well as representatives from the Administration and the District's attorney were in attendance when the Policy Subcommittee met in December to discuss these policy changes. They were able to discuss the intent of the sibling preference, especially for schools like Sand Lake Elementary, and worked out what he believes is a good solution to the issues surrounding the sibling preference. Participation by the families whose children attend the schools helped the Subcommittee to get a clear understanding of what needed to be done as far as policy changes are concerned. Mr. Metcalfe indicated that, as the Board discusses these proposed changes, they should take into account what was done at the subcommittee level, the fact that the District's

attorney was there and that staff were involved in the discussion. He explained that these policy revision recommendations were developed through the typical process where the Subcommittee discusses the issue, the staff is normally present, in some cases the unions are there, and families often have the opportunity to participate. Because of the participation of all of those parties the Subcommittee is able to develop good policy. It is not something that the Subcommittee throws together and decides at a meeting without outside participation. He asked the Board to support the changes as they are presented and urged the members to pass this memorandum tonight.

VOTE:

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

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

The Board stood in recess for ten minutes.

ASD Memorandum # 63 - School Board Policy Revisions: Sections 524 and 617 Nepotism and Sections 524.1 and 617.1 Fraternization (Second Reading)

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

ACTION:

Moved by: John Steiner
seconded by: Jake Metcalfe

To approve on second reading the recommended policy changes for Nepotism, Sections 524 and 617 and the new policy on Fraternization, Sections 524.1 and 617.1.

Ms. Comeau reminded the Board that this policy change had been approved on first reading at the last Board meeting. The Administration believes that the policy makes an important statement to ASD employees and provides clear expectation of behavior.

Mr. Metcalfe noted that this policy has come to the Policy Subcommittee a number of times. The process has included the participation of staff, ASD legal counsel, and bargaining unit representation. After considerable work this policy was unanimously passed out of Subcommittee. He asked the Board to support these policy changes and additions.

INTERIM MOTION:

Moved by: John Steiner
seconded by: Tim Steele

To refer the policy changes and additions back to the Policy Subcommittee for reconsideration.

Mr. Steiner apologized for the late request for reconsideration but indicated that he felt it more appropriate to return the policy to Subcommittee than attempting to propose changes be made at the Board table. He explained that his proposed changes, which were emailed to Board members earlier today, are extensive and have some policy implications. He believes that his suggestions would make the policy do what the Subcommittee intended it to do. Mr. Steiner noted that one of his main concerns is that the policy, as proposed, only addresses direct subordinate-supervisor relationships, indicating that they should not have a romantic relationship. The policy then goes on to address what would happen if there is a marriage. This appears to be inconsistent as employees would have been in misconduct by having a romantic relationship prior to the point of marriage. The policy provides for reassignment if they marry without recognizing that they are in misconduct in the first place and should be subject to disciplinary action. He also noted that the new Fraternization policy is beyond a direct supervisory relationship and goes to anyone who is in a position of authority. This, too, appears to be inconsistent when compared to the Nepotism policy which addresses only direct supervision. Mr. Steiner identified these issues along with a couple of other items as reasons to return these policies back to the Subcommittee for further evaluation.

Mr. Metcalfe reviewed the procedural history detailed under the Pertinent Facts section of this memorandum, noting that it had been approved on first reading being referred back to Policy Subcommittee for reconsideration. He noted that the Policy Subcommittee had done that, the meeting had been posted, there was participation, and revisions were made with the attorney present. Mr. Metcalfe indicated that his position is that all of the appropriate steps have been taken to develop these policy revisions. If the Board continues to send this back to the Subcommittee

then the people who request the changes need to be involved at that level. There is no way to ascertain the intent of the Subcommittee without attending the meeting and being part of the discussion with all of the involved parties. He noted that he is very much in opposition to sending the policy back to the Subcommittee.

Ms. Comeau confirmed that this policy revision has been reviewed with all of the bargaining units and with all of the different supervisory personnel. Review of the policy began at the request of the Ms. Bellamy of the EEO office and Mr. Tollefsen in the Labor office based on some issues they had identified. Ms. Comeau briefly reviewed the need for a policy which includes language that makes it abundantly clear that it is not appropriate for a supervisory relationship to exist between two people involved in a personal relationship, even if there is not a marriage. She believes that this language addresses that need. As Mr. Metcalfe said, this policy has been reviewed for months and the Administration feels that it gets the District where it needs to be and that the policy gives the District the tool that is needed to deal with these situations. Ms. Comeau is personally comfortable with this recommendation moving forward as it is presented.

Mr. Roberts voiced his opinion that this tool is appropriate to deal with the problems in the workplace. He doesn't feel that it is appropriate to fine tune it to the point that the District becomes involved in employee's personal lives. The policy has been approved by the people who deal with these types of issues when they come up. The policy has been looked at several times and has been reviewed by the District's attorney. Mr. Roberts believes that the Board should approve the policy revisions as presented.

Ms. Kennedy voiced her understanding of the frustration of trying to look at these revisions again and the Policy Subcommittee's frustration in having spent so much time with it and not being able to have the approval process completed. She did, however, question the statement in the policy requiring written notification from employees in a subordinate/supervisor relationship who marry. She wondered about the significance of requiring written notification of a marriage when the policy already state that persons involved in romantic relationships are not to be in any kind of subordinate/supervisory relationship?

Mr. Metcalfe called for a point of order as the motion before the body is whether or not to send the policy revisions back to the Subcommittee and the current discussion goes to the substance of the original motion. Mr.

Friedman ruled that on a motion to refer back it is appropriate to go into a discussion on the merits.

Ms. Comeau explained that she has had personal experience with having to deal with employees in this type of situation, resulting in appropriate disciplinary action and the transfer of one of the parties involved. She noted that any kind of romantic relationship in a subordinate/supervisory relationship absolutely negates the validity of an employee's evaluation. It sets both parties up for allegations of favoritism and can contribute to a potentially hostile work environment. The language requiring notification in the event of a marriage is important due to the fact that some individuals marry without changing their name, so the District would not necessarily know until something occurred. The request of the EEO and Labor offices was to clearly define the rules and giving the District the tools needed to take the necessary actions. This language is just to protect the employees, so that they know what the rules are.

Ms. Kennedy noted that the explanation leaves her questioning the real effectiveness of the policy. For example, there is no notification requirement for employees living together but not married. She wondered whether, with this language, there would have to be an actual marriage certificate in order to act on a situation. She suggested that leaving the language more open would offer the leeway to act on either situation, whether a romantic relationship or a marriage. Ms. Margo Bellamy, EEO Director, responded to Ms. Kennedy's question noting that the focus is on subordinate/supervisor relationship because that is the relationship that creates an imbalance in power and raises allegations of discrimination. There are many instances of that and the District has had no policy governing what is appropriate for subordinate/insubordinate relationships. The Nepotism policy only looked at family relationships. When a supervisor engages in an amorous relationship with an employee who they directly supervise it sets the District up for risk. So in revising the policy the Administration wanted to clearly define the rules and provide notice to employees who are engaging in relationships with co-workers. She reported that, since 2003, the District has struggled with how to address the issue internally. This policy will also help protect supervisors by giving them guidance and helping them create balance in the workplace. She indicated that she is absolutely pleased with the policy, noting that it is long overdue. Mr. Tollefsen, Human Resources Director, added that the District's attorneys had been involved in discussions regarding this policy and that they had cautioned against retroactively taking action against people who were already in a relationship. That is the reason for what might seem like a difference in

the policy. Ms. Kennedy commented that she wants to assure that this policy, as written, provides the ability to do what needs to be done in the situations directly addressed in the policy without limiting that ability in situations which are not directly addressed. Ms. Comeau voiced her appreciation for Ms. Kennedy's concern. She noted that the people who have reviewed this policy have asked that very question. That is why the wording remains very simple. The policy can be used to train all District supervisors and will become part of annual training. It is very important to have something in writing to address the situation. Being silent on the issue has caused some very difficult situations in the past.

Mr. Steiner explained that he strongly endorses the intent of the policy, that he understands the reasons for it and believes it to be a good idea. He acknowledged that there may be some items in his proposed changes that might not be acceptable. That is one of the reasons why he asked that the policy go back to the Subcommittee for review rather than seeking changes at the Board table. He continues to believe that many of his suggestions would solve some problems and would make the policy much stronger. He indicated that he also continues to believe that the potential problems identified in the communication sent to members earlier today justify further review by the Subcommittee before adopting these revisions.

VOTE ON INTERIM MOTION:

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

INTERIM MOTION FAILED

Mr. Friedman directed the Board back to the main motion of approving on second reading the changes to the Nepotism policy and adoption of the new Fraternalization policy, calling for any further discussion.

Mr. Steele requested clarification on the issue of Board members as persons in supervisory positions. He interprets the Nepotism policy to indicate that should the child of a Board member want to work for the District, permission of the Commission would be required even though the Board only has direct supervision of the Superintendent. Ms. Comeau explained that the directive in question is state law. This situation has occurred in the past and the issue has gone to the Board and then on to the Commissioner in a public meeting. The issue is purposely handled in a very public manner. Ms. Comeau further clarified that this process is

followed in cases of paid employment, not volunteer positions or internships.

VOTE:

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

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

ASD Memorandum # 139 - Award of Contract: West 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 West High School Generator Installation and Electrical Service Upgrade to the lowest responsive bidder, City Electric, Inc. for the base bid amount of \$188,610, and Assignment A in the amount of \$316,364 for a total award of \$504,974.

ACTION:

Moved by: Crystal Kennedy
seconded by: Macon Roberts

To approve the recommended
Award of Contract for the West
High School Generator
Installation.

Ms. Kennedy requested a review of the process of putting in these generators while still trying to plan for renovations at West High and the schools addressed in the other memoranda approved on the Consent Agenda this evening. She wondered if the generators are being installed in locations where they may have to be relocated in the future. Mr. Amsden explained that the District is, to the best of its ability, taking into account future plans for school buildings when locating generator sites. He indicated that future plans for West High School and Romig Middle School are under consideration. The thinking relative to West High is that the generator will be able to be incorporated into the work that will be done without having to have it relocated or having to rework the connectivity issues. Ms. Kennedy asked whether the installations will be done to the best of our ability with a possibility that they will have to be moved later or will there be a delay while the plans are developed at West and Romig. Mr. Amsden clarified that the District is moving ahead with the installations based on the best information available. He indicated that all efforts will be made to not have to move the generators in the future but that possibility remains. Should a future move be necessary, it

would be minor. While trying to avoid additional cost, it is recognized that the development work at West High is down the road and it is felt that the installation of a generator should not wait until there is absolute knowledge of all future plans.

In response to a question from Mr. Steele, Mr. Amsden explained that the challenge with large complexes like West High is that most of the larger facilities are fed power through a multitude of electrical service entrance points. The generator being installed at West High will not necessarily be located adjacent to the current power plant.

Ms. Comeau asked Mr. Mark Mew to describe the process that has been taken to identify which specific sites are getting these units and where they are going to be located on those sites. Mr. Mew explained that, as far as the location of the generators and tanks, part of the decision is determined by the size. Some of the current generator sites are too small to handle the additional units so they have to be located somewhere else. Sometimes that location is suggested by where the service enters the school from the utilities loop and, while there may be more than one choice, the location options are limited. Generally, District staff, along with the help of architects and designers, determines where the equipment could be located and then the site principals are brought into the discussion. This same process was used when determining the location of the containers, the slabs, the septic vaults and the other pieces of the larger issue. He indicated that, in some cases, installation of some of the equipment was put off until construction was complete. He noted Service High School, for instance, where it was determined that the footprint of the facility was going to change and other things were planned for the originally chosen location for the container. Because of that, the container at Service is sitting on the ground and will be permanently placed at another time. There is a similar situation in Girdwood that will be resolved this summer. As much as possible, planned changes were accounted for.

Mr. Metcalfe wondered whether the District has had good buy-in from the utility companies on the utility loops. Mr. Mew reported that there has been good buy-in from both Chugach Electric and Municipal Light & Power (ML&P). There are, however, some challenges with Matanuska Electric Association (MEA) that are being worked through at this time. Mr. Vakalis explained that MEA seemed to be pretty supportive at the staff level including their engineering people. In fact, the initial impression was that the recommendation was going to be allowed to proceed in a similar fashion as with ML&P and Chugach Electric.

However, the person in authority to make that decision at MEA disagreed and the District was told that it could not proceed. Mr. Vakalis reported that he has discussed the issue with the MEA General Manager to try to figure out exactly what the concerns are. One of the biggest concerns is safety. If there were not some type of shut-off and the building connected to their grid loses power, starting up the building generator produces a tremendous feed of electricity that would not only go in to the facility but would also go back through the line where there could be workers working. The concern was to be able to establish a protocol and system to assure that would not happen. The District has been able to establish a protocol through a separate Memorandum of Agreement with both ML&P and Chugach Electric to address the safety issue but there is still concern on MEAs part regarding that protocol. The other issue is a difference of opinion as to what is good for the community and what is good for the Utility and whether the two can come together. Mr. Vakalis explained that the bottom line is that this is perceived as a major problem by persons at MEA who believe that this would be establishing some type of precedent, where other organizations would then be able to come in and petition to do the same thing resulting in the ability to re-sell the power in the grid. Although Mr. Vakalis assured MEA that the District has no intention of that, it appears to be the issue of most concern. It was noted that Mr. Mew and Mr. Amsden and a few others will be speaking to the Eagle River Chamber of Commerce in the next week. Also, the Eagle River Star has interviewed Mr. Vakalis for an article about this issue.

Mr. Roberts requested that Mr. Mew explain to the public the need for the stand-by generators and how they would be used in the unfortunate event that they are needed. Mr. Mew explained that the District is outfitting many schools with stand-by generators, fuel storage, and dual-fuel boilers. The generators allow the schools to power-up and stay lit in the event of a power outage. The dual-fuel boilers allow the schools to be heated in the event that they would become separated from natural gas. That could be the result of a regular power outage or a natural gas issue. It could also happen in the event of a large emergency. Either way, this equipment allows schools to remain operational when they are separated from the city infrastructure. Additional work is being done with Student Nutrition in terms of the ability to deliver water. There is also dry septic at these locations so that water is not required for other things besides washing and drinking. Supplies have been staged at these sites as well. He noted that there are a number of reasons for having this equipment and these supplies in place, but a natural disaster is the big one.

VOTE:

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

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

H. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

1. ASD Memorandum # 161 - Project Status Report

This is a report of activities and project status changes in Major Capital Projects during the period of November 28, 2005 through December 15, 2005.

2. ASD Memorandum # 170 - Facility Change Order Report and Completed Projects for the Month of November 2005

The monthly Facility Contract Modification Report for the month of November is attached. There are no exceptions to report this month.

3. ASD Memorandum # 171 - Treasurer's Report/Financial Recap: November 30, 2005

The attached report consists of two parts: the Treasurer's Report and the Financial Recap. The Treasurer's Report and the Financial Recap are presented on a monthly basis. The Treasurer's Report and Financial Recap are year-to-date information as of November 30, 2005.

4. ASD Memorandum # 172 - Operating Budget Transfers November Monthly Report FY 2005 - 2006

The attached report of budget transfers for the time period of November 2005 that were processed in the Integrated Financial Accounting System (IFAS) includes the following:

Attachment A: Report of Budget Transfers Over \$5,000 - Report for individual transfers of more than \$5,000, which includes summarized justifications.

The schedule of monthly budget transfers processed for the month of November 2005 and related information are available in the Budget

Department office for review by the School Board and members of the public.

I. PERSONS TO BE HEARD ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

J. COMMUNICATIONS & SCHOOL BOARD COMMENTS

Ms. Comeau reported that the Board will meet Wednesday at 9:30 a.m. to begin the Administrative presentations on the budget. The meeting will be taped and broadcast. A copy of the tape and the information distributed at that meeting will be provided to the Municipality's Education Work Force Advisory Committee.

Ms. Kennedy commented that she is very proud of the Six-Year Plan and she appreciates the fact that the District has a strategic plan. She indicated that she knows the District is on the right track and that more needs to be done to promote this to the public. She noted that she often references the Six-Year Plan and she hopes that the District will stay focused on it.

K. EXECUTIVE SESSION - PERSONNEL/FINANCE/NEGOTIATIONS LITIGATION

L. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of January 9, 2006, was adjourned by unanimous consent at 9:00 p.m.

Jeff Friedman, President

John Steiner, Clerk

Johanna Lee, Recording Secretary

Date Minutes Approved