

MINUTES OF THE ANCHORAGE SCHOOL BOARD
REGULAR MEETING OF JANUARY 12, 2009

The Anchorage School Board met in Regular Session on Monday, January 12, 2009, 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: Jeff Friedman, Crystal Kennedy, Pat Higgins, Macon Roberts, Tim Steele, John Steiner and Chris Tuck.

Others Present: Carol Comeau, Rhonda Gardner, Ed Graff, Leslie Vandergaw, Mike Henry, Enid Silverstein, Jerry Sjolander, Jane Berglund, Eric Tollefsen, Heather Sawyer, Janet Stokesbary, George Vakalis, Jose DelReal, Col. Shutt, Ray Amsden, Marie Laule, Chad Stiteler, Pam Chenier, Johanna Lee, the press, and other interested people.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Friedman indicated that he would like to add ASD Memorandum #203 to the Consent Agenda. This memorandum is a recommendation to nominate and approve a new School Board Treasurer. With no objection the item was added to the Consent Agenda by unanimous consent.

The agenda was approved as amended by unanimous consent.

C. AWARDS/RECOGNITIONS/PRESENTATIONS

The Begich Middle School Jazz Band, under the direction of Don Cosgrove, performed several numbers for the entertainment of the board and others prior to the start of the meeting.

ASD Memorandum # 170 - Recognition of 2008 National Teacher Certification Recipients

Mr. Steiner read that last month, four Anchorage School District teachers achieved a milestone in their lives - national board certification, the most prestigious credential a teacher can earn. Like board-certified doctors and accountants, board-certified teachers have met rigorous standards

through intensive study, expert evaluation, self-assessment and peer review.

National board certification is a voluntary program. While state licensing sets basic requirements for teachers, board-certified teachers successfully demonstrate advanced teaching knowledge through a rigorous, performance-based assessment that typically takes one to three years to complete.

The following teachers have received their certification: Carol Bartholomew of Polaris K-12 School, Traci Caves of Chugach Optional Elementary School, Margaret Donnelly of Kasuun Elementary School, and Galina Tomisser of Muldoon Elementary School

The Anchorage School Board was pleased to recognize the dedication of these outstanding professional educators and their lifetime achievement.

ASD Memorandum # 176 - Recognition of Janet Levin for Distinguished Service to Homeless Children and Youth

Mr. Steele read that Janet Levin of the ASD Child in Transition/Homeless Program has earned national recognition for her dedication to the education of homeless students in the Anchorage School District. The National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth recently bestowed its Distinguished Service and Leadership Award on Janet at its annual conference in Washington, D.C.

Levin was honored for her leadership on homeless advocacy and her accomplishments on behalf of the more than 2,700 homeless youth in Anchorage. Levin was recognized for building a task force to provide emergency shelter to homeless families and youth, and helping to redefine and simplify state housing policy to expedite the qualification process for homeless families.

"Thanks to Janet's leadership, housing and homeless services in the state of Alaska are more family-friendly than ever. Janet has tirelessly moved her community closer to providing safety and stability to its homeless families," said Patricia Julianelle, who sat on the selection committee and is the interim state director of homeless education for Washington state.

The Anchorage School Board offered their congratulations and gratitude to Janet for bringing honor to the district for her award, but to also

acknowledge her passionate pursuit of ending homelessness in Anchorage for our youngest citizens and their families.

Language and Cultural Liaison Program Presentation

Ms. Comeau explained that the district has had a wonderful program in place for over a year that is beginning to address the serious question of how to better connect with parents who come from different cultures who may or may not have a language barrier. It is well known that children do better when their parents feel connected to their school. She noted that the Alaska Parent Information and Resource Center is a partially grant funded program that is showing a great deal of success thus far. Ms. Gardner introduced Ms. Julie Jessal, project coordinator, who presented an overview of the program. Ms. Jessal introduced three of the four Language Cultural Liaisons, Ms. Rose Roaehl, Yupik LCL at North Star Elementary, Ms. Lee Vue, Hmong LCL at Williwaw Elementary, and Ms. Karim Ortaegui, Latino LCL at Tudor Elementary. The fourth member of the team, Candie Saena, Samoan LCL at Fairview Elementary, was not able to attend the meeting.

Ms. Jessal explained that the Alaska Parent Information and Resource Center is in year three of a five year federally funded grant. The Center provides school linked resources and support to districts and schools statewide. This also includes the school based Language and Cultural Liaison program in three partner districts, including the ASD. The goals of the LCL program including addressing parent involvement in four highly represented communities within the district. The challenges that often create barriers to parent involvement include cross-cultural communication, language, the need for information, and the fear or mistrust of the school system. In addition, the LCL program seeks to promote greater understanding of our diverse communities in our schools. The LCLs help build relationships between the school staff and the families. They are also able to provide timely and relevant cultural insights to teachers. Ms. Jessal briefly reviewed the structure of the LCL program and the activities that the LCLs are involved with in their schools and communities. Each LCL has enrolled around 20 families for whom they provide ongoing support. They provide support for all of the children within the family, from birth through grade 12, for the duration of the grant period.

Mr. Steiner asked whether the LCLs were able to reach out to the community in addition to supporting the limited number of families they have enrolled in the program. Ms. Jessal explained that when individuals

are spread too thin they end up working in crisis mode. The idea for limiting the number of families assigned to each LCL was an effort to move from crisis to maintenance mode. As families become more integrated in their schools the LCL becomes more available to respond to situations for other families and students on an as-needed basis. Ms. Karim Otaegui added that there are always more families that could benefit from the program than there are LCLs to go around. Mr. Steiner wondered whether there are opportunities for the LCLs to provide workshops that can be opened to people from different schools even if they can not be provided individualized services. Ms. Otaegui explained that the monthly workshops that the LCLs provide are open to everyone. She explained that transportation can be an issue in the ability for families from different schools to attend those workshops. Ms. Vue indicated that she publicizes her workshops to other area schools in order to reach out to the greater community. She noted that she had tried to hold workshops in other schools but found it difficult to secure space.

Mr. Higgins asked whether the program has interfaced with the MECAC. Ms. Jessal reported that she had given a presentation on the program to the MECAC last year. Mr. Higgins asked if there was any evidence on the effectiveness of the program. Ms. Jessal explained that the program evaluation is currently based on parent and teachers surveys. She would like to see more analysis of information such as attendance rates, dropout rates and discipline issues where comparisons could be made to past data. She noted that they have hesitated to go with actual academic achievement because it is difficult to ferret out which program or initiative was responsible for changes in outcome.

Mr. Roberts asked what the program would need in order to improve the positive impact they are making with their families and communities. Ms. Jessal felt that the program is working well and that they have a good training program for the LCLs. The greatest need is simply having more LCL positions within the district.

Ms. Comeau asked Ms. Roehl if the large number of students moving into the district from rural Alaska has helped her reach out to those families and assist in that transition. Ms. Roehl explained that even though a lot of families have come in enrollment in the program has not gone up very much. She also noted that some of the families who came into the district and were enrolled in the program have since moved back to their villages. Overall she has not seen an increase in her numbers.

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS

E. SPECIAL ADVISORY REPORTS

1. Student Advisory Board

Mr. Jose DelReal reported that the last time the Student Advisory Board met there had been discussion on lunch times at the high schools across the district. In particular, Chugiak High School has recently changed their lunch times and the students are not happy with the change. The SAB also began to discuss school start times but have shied away from the topic. People seem to want to start talking about it but don't quite know how to approach the whole issue.

2. Military Delegate

Col. Shutt voiced his appreciation for the opportunity to serve in this capacity again. He also thanked the board and the administration for their ongoing support for military families across the district. Col. Shutt noted that there are small groups from both the Air Force and the Army leaving on deployments almost daily. In February there will be close to 3,800 troops pulling out of Fort Richardson at one time for a year-long deployment.

Col. Shutt announced that Ursa Minor Elementary School which is located on Fort Richardson recently won the National Distinguished Title One School Award. He noted that they were very proud of that school and the work being done there.

Ms. Comeau indicated that there has been a noticeable uptick in numbers on the military bases. Col. Shutt noted that, while he cannot provide any hard data, the district should anticipate continuing increases in students at the schools on Fort Richardson as well as Gruening Middle School and Eagle River High School.

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

The representative from MECAC was not able to attend the meeting.

F. PUBLIC TESTIMONY

1. Public Testimony Regarding Upcoming Bus Negotiations

There were no requests to testify on the topic of the upcoming Bus Negotiations.

2. Public Testimony Regarding Upcoming Food Service Negotiations

There were no requests to testify on the topic of the upcoming Food Service Negotiations.

G. PERSONS TO BE HEARD NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Ms. Tamara Kosusnik explained that her daughter was the pedestrian struck by a vehicle on Bragaw and Northern Lights near the end of the last school year. She testified to the need for more pedestrian safeguards around district facilities particular at the East High School location. Ms. Kosusnik shared the ongoing impact that the accident has had on her daughter and her family. She urged the board to take action so that other students and their families would not have to endure what her family has gone through.

Ms. Mary Jones, a close friend of the Kosusnik family, voiced her concern that many promises were made regarding how the traffic situation at East High School would be corrected and yet nothing at all has been done to deter students from crossing against traffic and outside of the pedestrian walkways. She suggested that fencing should be put up that would funnel students to the proper crossing areas. Ms. Jones pointed out that the students should not be allowed on the private property across from the school engaging in the activities that they are engaging in. She urged the district to take some kind of preventative action before more children are injured or killed.

Ms. Comeau explained that, Mr. Steve Kalmes, director of transportation, worked with the municipality to address the traffic concerns in that location. Several ideas have been discussed including lowering the speed limit, installing flashing lights and numerical signaling. The district has no jurisdiction over the roadways. Ms. Comeau indicated that she would be happy to find out where things stand regarding those discussions. In addition, she noted that staff at the schools work with the students on an ongoing basis to reinforce safe behaviors but it is a constant battle.

Mr. Friedman suggested that traffic concerns around school facilities could be placed on the agenda for the next joint Anchorage School Board/Assembly meeting. Mr. Steiner suggested that it may be worth looking into the possibility of revoking open campus privileges for students who violate the crosswalks or engage in other dangerous behavior. He acknowledged that it may be difficult to enforce but might be worth consideration. Ms. Comeau noted that this issue would be a great topic for discussion by the Student Advisory Board.

Mr. Jose DelReal, who is a student at East High School, reported that the administration at the school actively reminds students to cross at the crosswalks. He noted that the East High School Student Government does a Buckle Up Campaign every March or April. He indicated that, as student body president, he would be happy to incorporate safe crossing into that campaign to address road safety in general.

Mr. Friedman suggested taking testimony on ASD Memo #145, General Obligation Bond Recommendations, at this time as a number of people, including several students, had signed up to testify. There were no objections to this suggestion.

Ms. Joi Rhoades, Senior Class President at Service High School, spoke in support of the proposed Service High School Addition and Renewal on the 2009 General Obligation Bond Recommendations. She reviewed many of the areas in the school that she felt were in dire need of renewal. She noted that delaying the project would likely result in an increase in the cost.

Ms. Gwen Quigley, a sixth-grader at Girdwood School, reviewed several issues of concern at Girdwood. She also listed a number of needs that the school has in terms of facilities and program support and explained the positive impact that the changes would have on both the students at Girdwood and other community members who use the school.

Mr. Steele noted that the Girdwood School was built as a K-3 school and has since expanded to be a K-8 school. In response to questions from Mr. Steele it was explained that there are currently about 150 students enrolled at Girdwood and that they have a multipurpose room but no gymnasium.

Mr. Adam Ahonen, a teacher at Service High School, spoke in support of including the next phase of renovations for Service on the 2009 General Obligation Bonds. He indicated that the school has substandard areas in

Theatre, Music, Physical Education, the cafeteria, and the Special Education areas. Renovations would also include much needed mechanical and safety upgrades. He noted that the most disabled population at Service spends all day in the classrooms and that their environment is so important for these students and their success. Special needs students can not advocate for themselves and therefore others must advocate for them and for their needs. These students are currently in substandard facilities and Mr. Ahonen felt that it would send the wrong message to leave their classroom areas out of the renovation cycle.

Mr. Steve Pifer with *School Bonds Yes!* noted that he has had some very positive experience with renovated schools. He indicated that the facility needs in the district are very well known. As the bond propositions come up year after year for whatever school is up for the current bond the general public might get the impression that the district does not take of its property. That is simply not the case. The vast majority of the facilities in the district are in very good shape. When you have 7.5 billion square feet of space over 93 facilities everything that needs to be done can not be done all at once. Mr. Pifer reiterated the importance of the level of reimbursement available for the bonds. He noted that 60 percent debt reimbursement on the \$66.7 million Service High School proposal equates to an actual cost to the voters of \$26.6 million. That is a great rate of return on an investment. Mr. Pifer stated that *School Bonds Yes!* is ready and committed to do their part to educate the voters and support the bonds.

Mr. Rob Timmins encouraged the board to think in terms of needs not in terms of wants. In his opinion these bonds will start a dangerous trend of adding to the bond indebtedness even as some of the bond indebtedness is retired. He sees wants, not needs in the bonds. He believed that there are more niceties included than the necessities required for higher test scores and more readiness for life after graduation. He did not believe that enough consideration is being given to the fact that we are in a major recession. He was confident that students at Service High School will fair very well until we get through these trying financial times. The two bonds are not zero sum bonds. He also felt that the debt growth is unsustainable on the backs of ordinary taxpayers. He felt that available funds and efforts should be put toward parental involvement to raise student's test scores and futures rather than toward an ambitious renovation program that raises ASD real estate valuations.

Mr. Jose Vicente spoke on the General Obligation Bond for the Eagle River High School Water & Sewer Line Extension. It was his understanding that

the request is for a \$2.5 million bond in addition to the \$1.1 million amount left over from Chugiak High School and Birchwood Elementary School projects. He was dismayed at the \$3.6 million projected cost of a project that will construct 800 feet of water line and 2100 feet of sewer line. He believed that a huge mistake had been made. Either these are the wrong figures or there are more improvements to be constructed in conjunction with the project. He noted that he is a civil engineer and a land developer and, as such, he assured the board that the cost to construct 800 feet of water line and 2100 feet of sewer line is closer to 15 percent of the figure in the proposal. He asked for additional information regarding the proposal and how such costs can be justified. Even with what he considered to be exorbitant overhead costs that can be expected from AWWU Mr. Vicente did not believe the cost of the project should be over \$700,000. Ms. Comeau indicated that the district would provide the information requested to Mr. Vicente.

Ms. Leola Rutherford spoke in support of the Girdwood School Design on the bond proposal. She explained that Girdwood truly understands the need for schools in a community. The school in Girdwood is used by everyone. They know that the issues being dealt with at the school are more than just wishes, they are really needs. The school needs an upgraded electrical system, a gym, and a science lab. There is not enough space at the school. It is two-thirds the size of other elementary schools and only half the size of other kindergartens. The community is growing and more families are moving into the community. The Girdwood community has supported the bonds in the past and will continue to support the bonds in the future because they know the value of this for their children and for the community. Ms. Rutherford voiced her appreciation to the administration for putting Girdwood School Design on the bond proposal and encouraged the board's support for the proposal.

Mr. Pat Price spoke in support of providing bond funds for the design work for the Girdwood School renovations. He noted that the Girdwood School has been too small almost since its completion. Mr. Price reviewed the numerous needs at the school including addressing the space limitations and several safety issues. He noted that he could not stress strongly enough how valuable the school is to the Girdwood community. The school is heavily used by the Four Valleys Community School as well as the community at large in the evenings and on weekends. In addition, the school has proven to be a critical resource facility during emergencies because of the remote geographic location of the town. Mr. Price urged the board to give favorable consideration to providing design funds to the renovation of the Girdwood School.

H. EVALUATION OF SIX YEAR PLAN

1. ASD Memorandum #127 - Evaluation of the 2007-2008 Six-Year Instructional Plan

Ms. Comeau commended the Instructional Departments who put this plan together, completed the evaluation and provided the information to the board and the administration. This document is the blueprint for the district's instructional program over the next six years. Board members have had quite some time to read over the evaluation and it was suggested that the floor be open to their questions.

Ms. Kennedy noted that the recent Dittman Survey indicated that 75 percent of respondents indicated that they never watch Channel 14. Ms. Kennedy wondered whether Channel 14 is something that we are trying to build up and develop an audience for when it is not really the kind of forum that people want to get their information from. She asked whether or not the station is effective enough to put as much money toward or if there was a way to reduce some of the use of the station so that less money could be invested there since it is not quite the service to the community that we had hoped it would be. Ms. Comeau explained that Channel 14 is a public access channel. The people that do watch the station really appreciate the programming and information available through that venue. Ms. Heather Sawyer briefly reviewed plans for a follow-up survey that will probe into why people do or don't watch the station. They hope to determine if low viewership is a programming issue or an awareness issue. She noted that people who do use the channel rely on it, particularly for board meetings. Most of the costs associated with the channel are fixed costs. Most of the programming is either developed in-house or is provided to the district free of charge. There would be very minimal savings in scaling back the amount of programming or effort put into Channel 14. It is pretty much an all or nothing solution.

Mr. Steele believed that supporting Channel 14 is an accountability issue particularly with the broadcast of school board meetings. He was more inclined to try to figure out how to better share information about the district.

Mr. Steiner asked whether Channel 14 was used for instructional materials and if there are opportunities to make use of it for that

purpose. Ms. Sawyer explained that Channel 14 does provide a great deal of instructional programming but most of it is not internal. She indicated that we could probably do more. The difficulty in providing instructional programming for students is tying a set program schedule to the varied class schedules around the district.

Ms. Kennedy asked whether the station can go off the air at times when nothing substantive is being broadcast rather than simply broadcasting 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Ms. Sawyer indicated that only a small dollar figure could be attached to not airing certain programs just in the staff time that it takes to obtain and manually input the program. The majority of the cost for Channel 14 is in equipment which is necessary whether the station is being broadcast or not. She also noted that the staff associated with Channel 14 do much more than simply broadcast programming.

Ms. Kennedy explained that she brought this question forward because the Six-Year Plan discusses how much of the Channel 14 programming is available on the website. She was trying to figure out if it were more appropriate to focus on making more things available on the website and whether there is redundancy in broadcasting things on the Channel 14 when so many people indicate that they do not make use of that station. Mr. DelReal indicated that the information on the website is available on demand as opposed to the set programming available through Channel 14. He asked whether Channel 14 has been used to educate voters regarding the bond propositions. Ms. Comeau noted that the station is used to communicate bond information.

Mr. Steiner commented that there is so much information in this evaluation that it is difficult to focus on any one area. There is a lot of good information in the evaluation that would really warrant some discussion with each department about their activities. He suggested that the information be parceled out two or three departments at a time over a long period. He felt that doing the review in that manner would allow board members to better focus on specified areas. Ms. Comeau indicated that it was up to the board to provide the direction on how they would like to review this information. The administration is happy to present the information in whatever way it would be most meaningful to the board.

Mr. Steiner noted that he appreciated the fact that, through the Six-Year Plan, the departments put a lot of conscious thought into what

they are going to do over time. It shows intentionality and a long-term planning concept. Dr. Silverstein noted that this is the sixth year for the Plan. There have been five evaluations, two sets of revisions and one three-year extension. The danger of having a document like this is that it stagnates. She noted that she had done some research into the concept of the organizations and organisms. She focused on questions that would be valuable in determining if this tool as viable and useful now as it was when it began. She believed that looking at the Six-Year Plan provides a means to focus on continually improving processes along with providing accountability for the end products. It drives the district by a strategic vision. It strives to bring organizational variables into alignment, be self-regulating, self-organizing, proactive, interactive and dynamic. It allows for open boundaries within the organization and to create and share knowledge and experiences. On top of all these benefits, it is documentation of what has been accomplished in terms of student achievement.

Mr. Friedman voiced his opinion that he would not like to see the document parsed out over a year. He believed that there is value in having one date for the review. If the evaluation is stretched out over a six-month period over what is essentially a ten-month school year Mr. Friedman felt that the momentum would be lost. He noted that he had reviewed this evaluation over the past couple of weeks and had been able to ask questions to individual departments. He didn't feel that it was necessary to ask detailed questions about a long evaluation report at a public meeting. Certainly there are times and questions that are appropriate for this forum. However some of the detailed things on individual objectives and measures can be asked individually and the answers can be taken into account by the individual board member at budget time.

Ms. Kennedy noted that the Six-Year Plan Evaluation is the document that she uses to tell her what is going on and helps her understand the philosophy behind some of the things that are being done across the district. She noted that when she has a question she often prefers to save it for this format as one question often generates others. She indicated that she would prefer to deal with this evaluation either broken into sections over two or three meetings or to address it at a single meeting dedicated completely to the review in order to give the document the attention that it deserves.

Mr. Higgins noted that this was the first time he was able to participate in this review and indicated that it was difficult for him to identify key

issues in the document that would indicate the need for particular attention. He would like to see how the objectives are prioritized. He hoped that a document such as this would influence decisions and he was unsure how it was going to do that. He would like to see better identification of key things in the document that should not be overlooked such as areas of particular success or areas that need additional resources. Ms. Comeau asked for direction from the board on how they would like the administration to approach this evaluation.

Mr. Steele voiced concern about the number of items in the evaluation where something was not accomplished due to budgetary problems. This document is very insightful in that it shows synergistic relationships between departments. He indicated that he would prefer to review the evaluation in one session dedicated solely for that purpose.

Mr. Steiner commented that, while this is called the Six-Year Plan Evaluation, it really is just a scorecard of whether specific objectives were met including a certain degree of detail as to what extent they were met. It does not really evaluate whether meeting the objective was useful, determined to be not so useful, or to what extent the ability to meet the objective impacts student achievement. In other words, it does not evaluate the perceived effectiveness of the items from the department's point of view and how important the items are one way or another. He believed that it would be useful to add that evaluation component if possible. Mr. Friedman believed that that information is available in the process just not in this document. When the plan revisions are presented there is a great deal of information provided to explain the reasons for the revisions. It takes time to cross reference the Six-Year Plan, the Six-Year Plan Evaluation, the Profile of Performance and the Board Goals but those four documents taken together provide the information needed in order for board members to determine if the district is making the progress necessary.

Mr. Steiner noted that board members often ask individual questions of particular interest in response to the various items that come before them but there is a lot of value to the board as a whole discussing things together. That process allows board members to listen to each other's questions and hear the answers to those questions providing each board member a more comprehensive understanding of items being discussed. Having most questions answered individually limits the opportunity to do the work as a board. He continued to think that

it would be very useful to spread review of the Six-Year Plan Evaluation over time.

Mr. Steiner asked about the dropout rate referenced at the bottom of page 91. Mr. Henry indicated that there was a typographical error. The statement in the evidence of progress section of the 5 percent reduction in dropout rate objective should read "Dropout rates have been reduced **by** 18.9% to 4.17% as compared to the 06-07 dropout rate of 5.78%".

Mr. Roberts suggested that staff be extended the opportunity to comment on the Six-Year Plan Evaluation. Ms. Bev Thornberg took the opportunity to comment. She noted that everyone worked very hard on these evaluations. The data has been vetted. It is both credible and reliable. Mr. Roberts believed that it would be wise to invite the staff to make suggestions on how to best review this evaluation. Ms. Comeau indicated that she would seek that input for the discussion on how best to proceed with this review in the future.

I. 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. Regular Meeting - October 27, 2008
 - b. Joint Meeting - October 30, 2008, Revised
 - c. Regular Meeting - November 10, 2008
 - d. Regular Meeting - December 1, 2008
 - e. Special Meeting - December 15, 2008

2. ASD Memorandum #145 - 2009 General Obligation Bond Recommendations

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve a Bond proposal package totaling \$97,360,000, comprised of Proposition 1 - School Addition/Renewal/Design in the amount of \$69,880,000; and Proposition 2 - Districtwide Building System Renewal Projects in the amount of \$27,480,000.

3. ASD Memorandum #174 - Resolution in Support of Martin Luther King Day

The Administration recommends the Anchorage School Board adopt the attached resolution in support of the Martin Luther King Day of Service set for January 19, 2009.

4. ASD Memorandum #196 - Appointment of Minority Education Concerns Advisory Committee Members

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board appoint Mildred Miller and Jonathan Larson to the Minority Education Concerns Advisory Committee (MECAC).

5. ASD Memorandum #173 - Bond Information Program

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board authorize the Superintendent to expend up to \$45,000 for the April 2009 school bond information campaign.

6. ASD Memorandum #171 - Approval of School Board and Superintendent Out-of-State Travel for Third Quarter 2008-2009

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

7. ASD Memorandum #178 - School Board Policy Revision and Additions: Section 100 (First Reading)

It is the Policy Subcommittee's recommendation that the school board approve on First Reading the proposed revisions and additions to School Board Policy Section 100: Board of Education.

8. ASD Memorandum #179 - School Board Policy Addition: Section 450.3 Age of Majority (First Reading)

It is the Policy Subcommittee's recommendation that the school board approve on First Reading the proposed addition to Anchorage School Board Policy of Section 450.3, Age of Majority.

9. ASD Memorandum #180 - School Board Policy Revisions: Sections 725.4 - 725.46 Conflict of Interest (First Reading)

It is the Policy Subcommittee's recommendation that the school board approve on First Reading the proposed revisions to Anchorage School Board Policy sections 725.4-725.46, Conflict of Interest.

10. ASD Memorandum #175 - Award of Contract: 43-Passenger Type C School Buses

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract to purchase two new 43- passenger Type C school buses to TrailerCraft, Inc. in the amount of \$199,958.

11. ASD Memorandum #156 - Approval of Schematic Design for Sand Lake Elementary School Renewal

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve the Schematic Design for Sand Lake Elementary School Renewal project and authorize the Superintendent to proceed with design development and construction documents, contingent upon Municipal Assembly approval of the "revised" (schematic) design.

12. ASD Memorandum #161 - Approval of Alternate Master Plan for Service High School

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve the Alternate Master Plan for Service High School Renewal project and authorize the Superintendent to proceed to base future funding for Service High School renewal project(s) upon this master plan, pending Municipal Assembly approval of the alternate master plan.

13. ASD Memorandum #159 - Approval of Funding for Capital Projects Using Interest Earnings

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the use of Capital Projects Fund interest earnings and redirection of project balances in a total amount of \$3,058,681 for projects identified in this memorandum.

14. ASD Memorandum # 169 - Personnel Report

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

Mr. Friedman requested that Memorandum #145, 2009 General Obligation Bond Recommendations, and Memorandum #173, Bond Information Program, be pulled for discussion.

Mr. Steiner requested that Memorandum #178, School Board Policy Revision and Additions: Section 100 (First Reading), Memorandum #179, School Board Policy Addition: Section 450.3 Age of Majority (First

Reading), and Memorandum #180, School Board Policy Revisions: Sections 725.4-725.46, be pulled for discussion.

Mr. Steiner also requested that Memorandum #159, Approval of Funding for Capital Projects Using Interest Earnings, be pulled for discussion.

Ms. Kennedy requested that the minutes of the Regular Meeting of December 1, 2008 be pulled for discussion.

Mr. Steele requested that Memorandum #167, Treasurer's Report/ Financial Recap: November 30, 2008, be pulled from the Superintendent's Report in order to make a comment on the item.

ACTION:

Moved by: John Steiner
Seconded by: Macon Roberts

To approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 27, 2008, the Joint Meeting of October 30, 2008 Revised, the Regular Meeting of November 10, 2008, and Special Meeting of December 15, 2008 and Memoranda #174, #196, #171, #175, #156, #161, #169 and #203.

VOTE:

Ayes: Friedman, Kennedy,
Higgins, Roberts,
Steele, Steiner, Tuck

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

The board went into recess at 8:47 p.m. The meeting was called back into session at 9:00 p.m.

ACTION:

Moved by: Chris Tuck
Seconded by: Tim Steele

To approve the minutes of the December 1, 2008 Regular Board Meeting.

Ms. Kennedy referenced the Persons to be Heard section of the minutes and the paragraph regarding the testimony of the Heritage Christian

School student who spoke to the board on the issue of textbook selection. She indicated that the testimony as she recalled was more on the question of textbook selection with regard to teaching the theory of evolution as fact. She asked that the minutes be amended to include more specificity on that testimony.

With no objections, the minutes were amended to read "Mr. Joshua Holland, a student at Heritage Christian School, spoke to the board on the issue of textbooks teaching the theory of evolution as fact."

VOTE on MINUTES as AMENDED:

Ayes: Friedman, Kennedy,
Higgins, Roberts,
Steele, Steiner, Tuck

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

ASD Memorandum #145 - 2009 General Obligation Bond Recommendations

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve a Bond proposal package totaling \$97,360,000, comprised of Proposition 1 - School Addition/Renewal/Design in the amount of \$69,880,000; and Proposition 2 - Districtwide Building System Renewal Projects in the amount of \$27,480,000. Proposition 1, School Addition/Renewal/Design Projects: Service High School Addition and Renewal; \$66,700,000, Girdwood School Design, \$680,000; and Eagle River High School Water & Sewer Line Extension, \$2,500,000 for a Proposition 1 total of \$69,880,000. Proposition 2, Districtwide Building System Renewal Projects: Districtwide Code/Sprinkler Project, \$1,165,000; Districtwide Roof Replacement Projects, \$2,155,000; Districtwide Building Renewal Projects, \$725,000; Districtwide Electrical Projects, \$3,520,000; Districtwide Mechanical Projects, \$3,320,000; Districtwide Traffic Safety Projects, \$6,550,000; Districtwide Field Renewal Project, \$2,380,000; Districtwide Security System Upgrade Projects, \$1,165,000; and Districtwide Site Acquisition, \$6,500,000 for a Proposition 2 total of \$27,480,000.

ACTION:

Moved by: Crystal Kennedy

Seconded by: Tim Steele

To approve a Bond proposal package totaling \$97,360,000, comprised of Proposition 1 - School Addition/Renewal/Design in the amount of

\$69,880,000; and Proposition 2 - Districtwide Building System Renewal Projects in the amount of \$27,480,000. Proposition 1, School Addition/Renewal/Design Projects: Service High School Addition and Renewal; \$66,700,000; Girdwood School Design, \$680,000; and Eagle River High School Water & Sewer Line Extension, \$2,500,000 for a Proposition 1 total of \$69,880,000. Proposition 2, Districtwide Building System Renewal Projects: Districtwide Code/Sprinkler Project, \$1,165,000; Districtwide Roof Replacement Projects, \$2,155,000; Districtwide Building Renewal Projects, \$725,000; Districtwide Electrical Projects, \$3,520,000; Districtwide Mechanical Projects, \$3,320,000; Districtwide Traffic Safety Projects, \$6,550,000; Districtwide Field Renewal Project, \$2,380,000; Districtwide Security System Upgrade Projects, \$1,165,000; and Districtwide Site Acquisition, \$6,500,000 for a Proposition 2 total of \$27,480,000.

Ms. Comeau explained that the administration has taken a very long time to come to this recommendation. She acknowledged that the recommendation is controversial and voiced her appreciation for the testimony given on both sides of the issue. She believed that it is her responsibility to bring forth what is in the district's Capital Improvement Plan and the greatest needs of the district. That is the recommendation before the board.

Ms. Comeau called the board's attention to the Districtwide Code/Sprinkler Project that is part of Proposition 2. The project is for the district-owned facility that is occupied by Aquarian Charter School. The administration is still trying to meet with the municipality's bond counsel regarding the ability to upgrade the facility. The bathrooms in that facility must be repaired. The Fire Department has told the district that, in order

to do that the necessary work on the bathrooms, the sprinkler system must be upgraded. The former municipal bond counsel had ruled that the district could not use bond funds to upgrade a Charter School. As has been discussed in the past, the district does not agree with that ruling and is working to meet with the new bond counsel before the Assembly meeting. If they continue to rule in that manner the district would remove that project from Proposition 2. Ms. Comeau explained that this recommendation is for the upper limit of the tax cap. The bond recommendation is due to the municipality tomorrow for introduction at the February 3, 2009 hearing. If the Code/Sprinkler Project has to be removed an S version of the recommendation can be submitted prior to that public hearing.

Ms. Comeau reported that the Capital Request Advisory Committee has met twice on these bonds and has brought forth a recommendation. The administration did make some modifications to their recommendations particularly in the packaging of the proposals. Ms. Comeau reminded the board and the public alike that there are 59 schools in the district that are 20 to 50 years old. Twenty-nine of those have had no significant renewal and the remaining schools have had only partial renewals. There is quite a backlog. The district has over \$20 million in the General Maintenance budget as well as additional maintenance projects in other areas of the budget and some legislative grant funding for maintenance. There is a lot of funding put into the district's ongoing maintenance program. The ongoing effort put toward maintenance are often misunderstood.

Ms. Comeau noted her belief that the debt reimbursement is absolutely essential. The Dittman Survey clearly showed that there is more support for these two bonds with the debt reimbursement than there is without it. She believed that these bonds are an investment in our community, our schools and in protecting our assets. Ms. Comeau acknowledged that these are difficult economic times but she believed that this is a responsible proposal. She urged the board's support for the projects in this package.

Mr. Steiner asked whether the project at the Aquarian facility would be equally eligible for reimbursement if the bond counsel rules that it is alright to bond for that project. Ms. Comeau noted that the objection has always been by the local bond counsel; the state has never voiced a concern. Mr. Steiner asked whether Aquarian Charter School would be asked to pay for the debt reimbursement should the bond pass. Ms. Comeau indicated that there has not been any thought given to that. The

administration will be bringing forth a recommendation in the budget to deal with the rent issue at the Aquarian Charter School facility.

Mr. Steiner referenced the earlier testimony regarding the cost of water and sewer line along the Eagle River High School property. He noted that a representative from AWWU was in attendance and asked for information about the cost of that project. Mr. Amsden introduced Mr. Curt Voss, the director of engineering at AWWU. Mr. Amsden explained that the utility has entered into agreements with the district in the past to provide for these kinds of projects which involve water and sewer lines. In those projects, AWWU basically takes over responsibility for delivery the improvement. AWWU does a very good job on underground projects and they do them expeditiously and cost effectively. Mr. Voss explained that the AWWU has prepared a preliminary budget level estimate for the two projects. One project is to extend a water main approximately 800 linear feet. The second project is to extend a sanitary sewer main approximately 2100 linear along the Yosemite Drive road corridor. They have not yet done detail design. They have referenced the last year's budget pricing on projects both smaller and larger than these projects as a basis to develop a realistic level planning estimate for the school district. In review of six projects that were bid between April 2008 and December 2008 the average bid price to the utility ranges from \$400 to nearly \$1,000 a linear foot to install pipe. The variance depends on a number of factors including the amount of existing interfering utilities, the size of the pipe installed, the soil conditions and the presence or absence of suitable materials to refill the trench. AWWU will refine the preliminary estimate during the design process. Mr. Voss explained that there are three levels of estimating; one at a budget level, one at a preliminary design level, and one near the completion of a final design. Mr. Steiner pointed out that using the average cost of \$700 per linear foot should only result in a project cost of \$2,030,000 yet the proposed amount for the bonded project is \$2.5 million and there is apparently another \$1.1 million from another source for a total of \$3.6 million requested for the project. Mr. Voss noted that the \$400 to \$1,000 per linear foot figures are construction bid prices. They do not include planning, project management, construction administration, contingencies or other factors that go into a project. The budget figure that AWWU provided to the district includes all cost not just the bid price of a contractor.

Mr. Steiner wondered whether the current economic situation could result in price reduction. Mr. Voss indicated that anything is possible but it would be impossible to predict whether the bidding conditions will be more favorable when the project goes to bid.

Ms. Kennedy asked how this project would impact the trails that are already in place near the high school. She also wondered if there is any part of this that works with future upgrades to the road itself. Mr. Voss indicated that it is possible that the utility would have to temporarily disturb the trail that is at the bend in the road leading to the school but not right at the school property. If there is a disruption alternative means of getting around the construction will be provided and anything that was disturbed will be replaced in kind. In terms of future road upgrades the idea is to try to keep the utilities as close to the edges of the 100 foot corridor so that if the road does expand they will not be impacted.

In response to a question from Mr. Tuck it was explained that the project involved only drinking water and waster water. The project does not include any storm drains.

Ms. Kennedy wondered why there was already a need to replace the auditoria bleachers at South High School. Mr. Amsden indicated that the administration is also disappointed by the performance of the bleachers that were installed at South High School. They have not served very long but there have been operational issues that have caused the structure to be distressed and distorted. The maintenance department has implemented several levels of improvements to try to rectify the problem including a recent and fairly costly adjustment to that structure. He noted that it is working quite well today but the long term outlook is unknown. The original product simply was not heavy-duty enough to serve the needs of a high school. The current situation with the bleachers will be monitored and if new bleachers are not necessary the district will not purchase them. Mr. Amsden noted the need to be precautionary with a situation that is a safety issue involving an important part of the school program.

Ms. Kennedy noted that that district is installing artificial turf fields that often can not be used for varsity sports. She noted her desire to be able to use these fields to their fullest extent. Mr. Henry noted that the actual playing surface is only a part of a stadium. For it to be a safe place, particularly for football games, there needs to be some sort of visitor and home school seating. It was never the intent to build stadiums at all of our schools. The purpose of the fields is primarily for physical education classes during the day and then to use them for practice facilities. The desire is also to use them for competitive activities for as many events as possible.

Mr. Steele voiced concern regarding the plans to upgrade the sprinklers at the Aquarian facility. He wondered at what point the upgrades would reach 50 percent and require bringing everything up to code at that facility. He also wondered if the district is really extending the useful life of the structure by putting in a new sprinkler system and new bathrooms. Mr. Amsden explained that the sprinkler system is a stumbling block to any further improvements and protection of structure. Ms. Comeau explained that if the decision is made to not include the sprinkler project then Aquarian will have to be informed that they will need to find a new school within a timeframe relative to the continued usefulness of the bathroom facilities as they are now. She believed that with the sprinkler upgrade and the bathroom fix the Aquarian facility will be viable for many more years. Mr. Steele noted that he continued to have a concern that the district is putting a lot of money into that facility.

Ms. Kennedy commented that she is also concerned because a decision has not made as to how the district is going to look at that facility. It is not yet clear what responsibility the district has toward the facilities of charter schools. There is a real question of equity for the charter schools across the district. Ms. Comeau noted that the administration will be coming to the board with a recommendation regarding charging Aquarian some kind of rent during the budget process. It really is a policy call on the part of the board.

Mr. Steiner asked whether the district would still want to make the upgrades to this facility if the charter school were no longer going to be located there. Ms. Comeau indicated that the administration has not had a discussion on what would be done with that building should Aquarian leave the facility. Mr. Steiner believed that having the district complete this project for Aquarian's use would be dependent upon Aquarian paying for it in their rent. If they are not interested in doing that he seriously questioned going forward with the project. He didn't have any problem putting it on the bond proposal but did not believe the bonds should be sold for the project until a decision is made regarding reimbursement of the funds. Mr. Steele asked about the funding source for the bathroom upgrades. Mr. Petersen explained that the bathroom upgrades would cost \$120,000 and would come out of the Maintenance Projects budget. Ms. Kennedy noted that the district is really at a crossroads with Aquarian Charter School and that facility. She believed that further discussion is certainly needed including input from Aquarian before deciding to put money into the facility.

On a different topic, Mr. Friedman raised the question of how the two propositions were packaged.

AMENDMENT:

Moved by: Jeff Friedman
Seconded by: Crystal Kennedy

To move the Eagle River High School Water & Sewer Line Extension out of Proposition 1 and into Proposition 2.

Mr. Friedman felt that Proposition 2 covers the operational needs of owning property whereas Proposition 1 is basically the renewal of Service High School. While the district has tried, in the past, to put forth bonds that balance geographic areas of the community, we have seen in the last couple of years that voters are making their decisions based on more than just whether the bond contains something for their particular neighborhood school. Voters are more likely to vote based on the impact the bond will have on their taxes and whether or not the need has been justified. He noted that the district is required to put in that sewer line extension, it is not an option. Along that line, he believed that it would fit much better with the other projects in Proposition 2.

Mr. Steele disagreed with the suggestion to move the sewer line project. He noted that it would fit in Proposition 2 but believed that increasing the size of that bond may make it undesirable. He also noted that the Dittman survey was based on the packages as they are presented.

Ms. Kennedy voiced her support for the motion to move the Eagle River High School Water & Sewer Line Extension project. She believed that the project falls nicely under the districtwide building system renewal projects. She also voiced her desire to revert back to recommendations presented by the Capital Requests Advisory Committee and, along that line, would also be making a motion to move the site acquisition from Proposition 2 into Proposition 1.

Mr. Higgins asked why the bond propositions were packaged the way they are. Ms. Comeau noted that much of the decision was the geographic balance. She noted that the placement of the Eagle River project had been discussed administratively and that she was comfortable with moving it into Proposition 2. She was, however, strongly opposed to moving the site acquisition from Proposition 2 to Proposition 1 due to her concern that it would increase Proposition 1 to over \$70 million which she did not believe would be supported by the voters.

Mr. Steiner noted his belief that the geographic balance does help and voiced his support for the original motion. He also believed that having all of the districtwide items in one bond is better.

Mr. Friedman noted that the Amendment on the table was to move the Eagle River High School Water & Sewer project out of Proposition 1 and into Proposition 2.

VOTE on AMENDMENT:

Ayes: Friedman, Kennedy,
Roberts

Nays: Higgins, Steele,
Steiner, Tuck

MOTION FAILED

AMENDMENT:

Moved by: John Steiner
Seconded by: Chris Tuck

To add the following language to the original motion: "The \$1,165,000 in Proposition 2 for Aquarian Charter School sprinklering is subject to prior School Board approval of terms for Aquarian Charter School to pay the District's portion of debt service for that amount.

Mr. Steiner explained that the debt service amount could be incorporated into a lease. Ms. Comeau clarified that the amendment would be added to the motion so that the bond proposal could move forward but that the bonds for that project would not be sold without prior board approval.

Mr. Higgins wondered whether the amendment would have to be included or explained as part of the bond proposition. Ms. Comeau indicated her belief that it would have to be explained in the language of the proposition. Mr. Higgins voiced his concern that explanations and restrictions would distract from the purpose of the bond. He agreed that there is an issue about whether the project should ultimately be authorized but for the purposes of the bond it would be cleaner to decide today whether it will be allowed on the bond or not and put restrictions on it later. Mr. Friedman echoed Mr. Higgins' concern particularly in light of confusing the issue for the bond council who might then recommend that the Assembly not approve the bonds. He felt that there is plenty of

time between now and when the bonds would ultimately be sold for the projects on the proposition to make a well informed decision on the Aquarian project. He also agreed that the board needs to have the discussion about what the district is going to do with the building he just did not want to lock it into the bond vote. Ms. Stokesbary noted that the meeting with bond counsel is scheduled for January 26 so their ruling will be known before the work session with the Assembly. Mr. Steiner understood the concern with making the bond approval vote too complicated. The fact is that even if the board approves the bond recommendations without any stipulations the project will not proceed without specific board approval.

Following discussion, Mr. Steiner indicated that he was comfortable letting this decision be made at a later date. He was confident that the board will be having a very serious discussion about the project. With that, the AMENDMENT FAILED by unanimous consent.

Mr. Steiner asked about the warranty on the bleacher system at South High School. Mr. Amsden explained that the school has been open since 2004. Construction of this nature typically comes with a one year warranty from the contractor that does the work. Mr. Amsden did not recall the specific warranty period for the equipment but believed that it was also a one year warranty. There were some operational issues that resulted in the racking problems that may have lead to the current issues of concern. Mr. Peterson reported that the bleacher system is out of warranty and that they had received an estimate of \$35,000 to do the needed repair. That was a temporary repair that was completed this past summer. It was Mr. Peterson's opinion that the repair will not last. The current system simply is not up to the wear and tear that it is experiencing. Mr. Amsden explained that the district did pay the manufacturer to repair the parts that were broken, realign the system and restore it basically back to their factory condition. Even after that event we have continued to suffer issues and have had to do several bandaid repairs.

Mr. Tuck referenced the Districtwide Security Systems Upgrade Projects on Proposition 2. He noted that his understanding that the district has gone into a closed architecture system with GE and wondered if there were any updates on when the district might go to an open architecture. Mr. Price indicated that there has not been any discussion regarding moving to an open architecture system. Mr. Tuck noted that the last study that was done by the district was in 2006 and asked if there were any intention in doing another study just to make sure that the district is

headed down the right path. He asked if all of the pertinent projects on the bond are intended to go to the original GE DVR closed architecture system. Mr. Price explained that a decision has not yet been made as to how the district will proceed. There is a significant project underway at this time. The evaluation of that project needs to be completed and assessed in relation to changes in technology and other factors before a determination can be made on the direction the district will take at that point. Mr. Tuck asked how soon these projects will get started if the bonds pass. Mr. Price indicated that these projects would not be starting design until late 2009 at the earliest for installation sometime in 2010 at the earliest.

Mr. Steiner noted that he had considered trying to reduce the size of the bonds but it had occurred to him that the current economic situation may make it difficult to pass the bonds but doesn't really make it more difficult to pay for them over the long term. These projects need to be done and most of the time during which the bonds will be paid we will not be in the current economic situation. He believed that the future of our economy is very positive. He also noted that we don't want to stop spending money in bad economic times as that would likely hurt our economy. He believed that it is wise to proceed with the bonds as they are proposed. He indicated that while we would enjoy the relief for a brief period if we didn't pass or reduced the bonds now; we will enjoy the benefit from the facilities for having done them over the next several decades.

Ms. Kennedy indicated her belief that the district needs to do more than just be cognizant of the economic situation in our community, we need to be responsive. One of the ways to do that is to make sure that more demands are not made of the taxpayers than they can handle right now. She noted that the superintendent was absolutely correct in presenting the bond propositions and outlining the true needs of the district. What the board now has to determine is if the community can afford the cost at this time. She noted that she had supported moving the Eagle River project into Proposition 2 because she is more confident that there will be support for those items that are absolutely crucial. She had very serious doubts, however, about whether the community would support a major construction bond.

Ms. Kennedy made a request to divide the question. In light of the request, Proposition 1 and Proposition 2 will be taking up as separate actions.

Mr. Steele noted his personal concern with increasing taxes however he believed that these bonds are necessary. The district needs to keep with the program in terms of trying to build capacity and upgrade facilities for safety and student achievement purposes. The district is falling behind in the projects that are on the Capital Improvement Projects list. In terms of the current economic issues Mr. Steele voiced his belief that investing in infrastructure creates jobs and keeps the economy moving. Mr. Steele reviewed the huge benefit the debt to value ratio for the building projects has for local taxpayers, particularly when factoring in the state reimbursement.

Mr. Tuck noted that ultimately the voters will get to decide whether or not to support the bonds. He believed that it is important to keep moving forward with our schools. He explained the advances in energy efficiency and technology that are brought into the schools when they are renovated. He noted his support for both of the bond propositions.

Mr. Roberts acknowledged the concerns voiced by Ms. Kennedy and noted that he does not take those concerns lightly. He also acknowledged that it will be difficult to garner public support for the bond propositions but he believed that it could be done. Mr. Roberts agreed with previous speakers that the district can not afford to get too far behind and that the district needs to continue to take advantage of the legislative reimbursement while it is available.

Mr. Higgins voiced his appreciation for the work that was done to prepare these bond propositions. He also thanked the *School Bonds Yes!* organization for their willingness to do the work necessary to educate the public on the bonds. He noted his belief that it is incumbent on this board is to go forward with the recommendation on what is needed to get the job of educating our students done. There are going to be some tough decisions to be made by the public and the legislature on funding and support for education. Having adequate schools and quality schools contributes to student success. He believed that the bonds should not be held up and that the public should have an opportunity to vote on them. He indicated that he intends to support the bonds and also intends to do what he can to help get them passed.

Mr. Friedman recalled that the bond survey that was completed in November in the midst of the collapse of the national economy found that the public was very supportive of these bonds. Certainly there were some strong negative feedback but, overall, it was far more supportive than he had expected given the economic situation. It will be the voters, not the

school board, who will make the decision on these bonds. He believed that voters who receive adequate information generally make good decisions. The board's responsibility is to look at the proposal to determine whether these are responsible projects and that the amounts are reasonable in light of our needs and the ability to pay. He indicated that he would be supporting these bond proposals.

Mr. Steele noted that the district would be retiring \$47 million worth of bonds this year which will offset some of the new indebtedness.

Mr. Friedman reminded board members that the question had been divided. The first question was for ASD Memorandum #145, 2009 General Obligation Bond Recommendations, Proposition 1.

VOTE on Proposition 1:

Ayes: Friedman, Higgins,
Roberts, Steele,
Steiner, Tuck

Nays: Kennedy

MOTION PASSED

The second question was for approval of ASD Memorandum #145, 2009 General Obligation Bond Recommendations, Proposition 2.

VOTE on Proposition 2:

Ayes: Friedman, Kennedy,
Higgins, Roberts,
Steele, Steiner, Tuck

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

Ms. Kennedy commented that she respected the vote of the board. Her thoughts were never a reflection about how she personally feels about Girdwood or Service High School. Her vote was a reflection of what she believes the public is saying. She indicated that she will be part of the bond information program.

ASD Memorandum #173 - Bond Information Program

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board authorize the Superintendent to expend up to \$45,000 for the April 2009 school bond information campaign.

ACTION:

Moved by: John Steiner	To authorize the Superintendent to
Seconded by: Tim Steele	expend up to \$45,000 for the April
	2009 school bond information
	campaign.

Mr. Friedman noted that he had asked for this item to be pulled in case the recommendation for the bond propositions themselves had not passed.

VOTE:

Ayes: Friedman, Kennedy,
Higgins, Roberts,
Steele, Steiner, Tuck

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

ASD Memorandum #178 – School Board Policy Revision and Additions:
Section 100 (First Reading)

It is the Policy Subcommittee's recommendation that the school board approve on First Reading the proposed revisions and additions to School Board Policy Section 100: Board of Education.

ACTION:

Moved by: John Steiner	To approve on First Reading the
Seconded by: Chris Tuck	proposed revisions and additions to
	School Board Policy Section 100:
	Board of Education as attached to
	Memorandum #178.

Ms. Kennedy noted that there are apparently several revisions or amendments so she suggested that those be introduced however, in light of the number of changes, it may mean that most of this policy will be remanded back to the Policy Subcommittee. She commended a number of people that have worked on the revisions that are presented in the recommendation.

Mr. Friedman indicated that he would like to get the suggested revisions on the table but pass the policy as it is presented on First Reading. Policy

Subcommittee would then be able to look at the revisions before bringing it back for Second Reading.

Mr. Friedman distributed a prepared list of proposed changes to be considered by the Policy Subcommittee. He noted that the only major change from the recommendation was a revision to Section 121.4, Filling Vacated Seat, subsection (d). He explained that there is a real policy question on whether pre-determined questions are asked when filling a vacant seat or if board members can ask questions on-the-fly that are sparked by the testimony and comments. The Policy Subcommittee made one change with respect to that policy which Mr. Friedman suggested should be changed back. He indicated that the other proposed changes that he would like to be considered are more for clarification purposes rather than particularly substantive.

On the topic of the change outlined by Mr. Friedman, Mr. Steiner noted that the applications and the testimony of the applicants may raise questions that board members may feel that they need to probe before the first vote. To limit the board to pre-set questions does not allow for more pointed questioning to provide the information needed to make a decision. He felt that it was important that board members are able to ask individualized questions of the individual candidates.

Mr. Steele voiced his agreement with Mr. Steiner's position. He noted that he would not mind having developed questions as a sorting mechanism if there are a large number of applicants. He also believed that the ability to probe further based on individual responses is necessary.

Ms. Kennedy asked whether it was felt that the language as presented in the recommendation precludes asking other questions. She explained that the recommended language was an attempt to provide some guidance within the questions that is fair to all applicants and to steer away from inappropriate questions. Mr. Friedman stated his belief that the language in the recommendation does preclude any question that has not developed in advance. He believed the issue needs to be further discussed at the Policy Subcommittee.

Ms. Kennedy asked if there was any agreement that there should be some kind of pre-determined questions or should it just be a free-for-all. Mr. Tuck pointed out that the danger in not having any pre-determined questions is the risk of inconsistency. He believed that the interview should begin with pre-determined questions and follow-up questions

should be limited to and focused on the topic of the original question and response.

Mr. Steiner noted that these are not normal job applicants. These are people who are going to exercise judgment on board policy. The scope of what will be asked may be a little different. While it is imperative not to ask inappropriate or illegal questions, Mr. Steiner did not feel that board members should be limited in the scope of their questions.

Mr. Steele noted that the policy states that the district will announce the names of the applicants and then send them for validation. He wondered whether it was appropriate to announce the names before they are validated. Ms. Comeau indicated that it has always proceeded in that manner and that it has never been a problem.

Mr. Steiner indicated that he had a number of suggestions that he would be forwarding to the Policy Subcommittee for consideration before Second Reading. In a brief review of some of his concerns Mr. Steiner pointed out that current policy does not allow for board vacancies to be advertised until the seat is vacant. He did not understand why that is necessary if it is known that a vacancy will be coming up and the person who will be vacating the seat agrees. The current policy requires a gap during which there is an empty seat. Mr. Steiner did not believe that is necessary at least to the extent that the gap is so long. In addition to that issue, Mr. Steiner did not see a reason to require multiple applications if there were multiple seats vacant at the same time as opposed to simply indicating an interest in more than one seat on the application.

Mr. Steele noted that Policy 173.5, Board Committees, shows that the Audit Committee is the only committee left in the language. He believed that the Policy Committee should also be included as it is referred to in the Policy Manual. Ms. Kennedy thought that the Policy Committee was in that language and indicated that the language would be looked at again.

Mr. Steiner referenced Section 112, Primacy of Collective Bargaining Agreements, and raised the issue of a collective bargaining agreement that violates a current, existing policy that pre-existed the bargaining agreement. It was his belief that in that case the bargaining agreement should not supersede policy but should, in fact, be subject to policy. The bargaining agreement should only have priority in cases of new policy. If a bargaining agreement consciously intends to change an existing policy it should be brought before the board for approval by a two-thirds majority. Every contract the district has should say that it is subject to board policy.

Ms. Comeau noted that any conflicts would be brought to the board during the bargaining process.

Ms. Kennedy referenced Section 121.4, filling of Vacated Seat, subsection (e) which allows board members to vote for as many candidates as they choose. She suggested that in cases where there are more than six (6) candidates that board members should be allowed to vote for no more than half of the applicants. This suggestion was made in an effort help expedite the process. There was general support voiced for that suggestion.

Mr. Steiner referenced Section 114, Non-Discrimination & Harassment, and noted that adding "Harassment" to that title was on the recommendation. He seemed to him that Section 114.1, Display of Prejudice, was about harassment so adding the term to the title of Section 114 winds up being redundant and makes it confusing. He believed that the pre-existing policy which addressed discrimination in one section and display of prejudice, harassment, in another was an appropriate way to do it. Mr. Friedman suggested that Mr. Steiner speak with Ms. Bellamy prior to the Policy Subcommittee meeting as there have been extensive discussions with her about the formatting and arrangement of these sections and how she uses it in the execution of her responsibilities.

VOTE:

Ayes: Friedman, Kennedy,
Higgins, Roberts,
Steele, Steiner, Tuck

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

Mr. Friedman requested that ASD Memorandum #159, Approval of Funding for Capital Projects Using Interest Earnings, be taken out of order as it must be voted on this evening.

ASD Memorandum #159 - Approval of Funding for Capital Projects Using Interest Earnings

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the use of Capital Projects Fund interest earnings and redirection of project balances in a total amount of \$3,058,681 for projects identified in this memorandum.

ACTION:

Moved by: John Steiner
Seconded by: Tim Steele

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the use of Capital Projects Fund interest earnings and redirection of project balances in a total amount of \$3,058,681 for projects identified in this memorandum.

Mr. Steiner explained that he had pulled the memorandum in part to get information regarding the cost of the Water & Sewer Line Extension and Eagle River High School. He remains concerned about the cost but understands that the district does not yet know the cost. He also understands after earlier discussion on the bond that the district will get whatever benefit from any cost reductions there might be in the design.

Mr. Steiner also had some concern about the scoreboard at West High School. He did not want that to be taken as an indication that the district would be building a stadium for that school. He does understand, however, that even JV teams like to have a scoreboard. He also noted that the scoreboard itself was donated and the cost for installation does not seem unreasonable.

Ms. Kennedy asked whether there is a contingency plan for the Water & Sewer Line Extension at Eagle River High School should the bond fail. Mr. Amsden noted that this memorandum would provide \$1.1 million toward the project. With the board's approval this evening the district expects to enter into an agreement with AWWU so that they could expedite the design and further develop the cost estimates for the project. It is a very serious commitment and obligation that the district has to the utility. If the project does not pass on the bond there would need to be serious discussions about how to make up that money.

Mr. Steiner asked whether the utility would be able to do the project and assess the district for the cost of the project over time rather than bonding for it. Mr. Vakalis reported that he had discussed that possibility with the utility when this project first came up. In this particular instance for this particular purpose in their tariff the money has to come up front. They would have to seek a modification of their tariff in order to be able to proceed with the project and bill the district over time.

VOTE:

Ayes: Friedman, Kennedy,
Higgins, Roberts,
Steele, Steiner, Tuck

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

ASD Memorandum #179 – School Board Policy Addition: Section 450.3
Age of Majority (First Reading)

It is the Policy Subcommittee’s recommendation that the school board approve on First Reading the proposed addition to Anchorage School Board Policy of Section 450.3, Age of Majority.

ACTION:

Moved by: John Steiner
Seconded by: Macon Roberts

To approve on First Reading the proposed addition to Anchorage School Board Policy of Section 450.3, Age of Majority as attached to Memorandum #179.

AMENDMENT:

Moved by: John Steiner
Seconded by: Crystal Kennedy

In Section 450.3, Age of Majority, subsection (b) add to the beginning of the first sentence “Except as required by law,” and delete the words “have an obligation to” from the first sentence. In addition, add the language “In the event of the consent form contains a waiver or release of liability, that form will need to be signed by the parent/guardian for students under 18 or by the student if 18 or older” to the end of the paragraph.

Mr. Steiner explained that it is one thing to say that the district will honor a consent form; it is another to say that what is signed is legally valid and binding. He noted that this language was proposed by district counsel.

Mr. Higgins asked whether a waiver of liability expires when the student reaches the age of 18 because it is not signed by the student. Ms. Comeau noted that the schools do not track birthdays. District counsel has advised the administration that we are not required by statute or policy to track those birth date changes.

VOTE on the AMENDMENT:

Ayes: Friedman, Kennedy,
Higgins, Roberts,
Steele, Steiner, Tuck

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

VOTE on the MOTION as AMENDED:

Ayes: Friedman, Kennedy,
Higgins, Roberts,
Steele, Steiner, Tuck

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

ASD Memorandum #180 – School Board Policy Revisions: Sections 725.4 – 725.46 Conflict of Interest (First Reading)

It is the Policy Subcommittee's recommendation that the school board approve on First Reading the proposed revisions to Anchorage School Board Policy sections 725.4-725.46, Conflict of Interest.

ACTION:

Moved by: John Steiner
Seconded by: Chris Tuck

It is the Policy Subcommittee's recommendation that the school board approve on First Reading the proposed revisions to Anchorage School Board Policy sections 725.4-725.46, Conflict of Interest as attached to Memorandum #180.

Mr. Steiner reviewed two concerns that he had with these recommendations. The first concern was in Section 725.42, Prohibited Acts, subsection (d) which indicates that a board member or employee may not engage in business or accept employment where the activity is incompatible or will impair availability or productivity. Mr. Steiner did

not believe that it was appropriate to apply that to board members who are not full time employees. He had posed the question prior to this meeting and it was also confirmed with district counsel that the provision on impairing availability and productivity applies to employees and not elected officials. While he did not have language to propose an amendment he wanted to point out the need to change that language before Second Reading.

The second concern raised by Mr. Steiner was in Section 725.43, subsection (b) which relates to employees or members of their household acquiring an economic interest in a district or municipal contract or engaging in business with the district or municipality unless the contract is competitively solicited. His concern related to employees who have other household members who are part of a collective bargaining agreement with the district. Those individuals have an economic interest in a district contract that is not competitively solicited and would therefore technically violate this term. He did not believe that was the intent and felt that the item needed some wording that says that the contracts that are being referred to in this policy do not include collective bargaining agreements.

Mr. Steiner noted that he was highlighting these issues for the Policy Subcommittee to review prior to the Second Reading of these revisions.

VOTE:

Ayes: Friedman, Kennedy,
Higgins, Roberts,
Steele, Steiner, Tuck

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

I. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

1. ASD Memorandum #168 - Project Status Report

This is a report of activities and project status changes in Major Capital Projects during the period of December 4, 2008 through December 19, 2008.

2. ASD Memorandum #191 - One Percent for Art - Selection of Artwork for Government Hill Elementary School and Clark Middle School Renewal

This memorandum is to inform the Anchorage School Board that an additional piece of artwork has been selected for Government Hill Elementary School, and new artwork selections have been made for Clark Middle School for commission and acquisition in accordance with AMC 7.40, Funds for Works of Art in Public Facilities.

Mr. Steele noted that he did not want to approve any additional One Percent for Art until there is some solution to the maintenance issue. Ms. Comeau reported that she had talked to Ms. Jocelyn Young about this and that they would be setting up a meeting with Ms. Mary Jane Michael to address the concerns with maintenance and safety on the One Percent for Art projects. This is also something that can be discussed at the Joint Assembly/School Board meeting. There needs to be some way to establish a maintenance fund for public art.

3. ASD Memorandum #166 – Out-of-District Travel – Second Quarter Report FY 2008-2009

The attached Travel Report summarizes the travel taken by District employees and School Board members during the second quarter of FY 2008-2009 for both in-state and out-of-state travel.

4. ASD Memorandum #183 – Operating Budget Transfers November Monthly Report FY 2008-2009

The attached report of budget transfers for the time period of November 2008 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 2008 and related information are available in the Budget Department office for review by the School Board and members of the public.

5. ASD Memorandum #167 – Treasurer’s Report/Financial Recap: November 30, 2008

The attached report consists of two parts: the Treasurer's Report and the Financial Recap. The Treasurer's Report and Financial Recap are presented monthly. Both sections include year-to-date information as of November 30, 2008.

J. PERSONS TO BE HEARD ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

K. COMMUNICATIONS & SCHOOL BOARD COMMENTS

Mr. Tuck shared that it has been an honor, a privilege and a true joy to serve on the Anchorage School Board. He noted that it has been a very rewarding experience to serve the public working with the board and the administration. He believed himself to be a better person for having had the opportunity to serve side-by-side with the other board members.

On behalf of the Anchorage School Board and the Anchorage School District Mr. Friedman presented Mr. Tuck a Gold Pan recognizing his service. Mr. Friedman noted that it had been a pleasure serving with him. Other members of the board expressed their congratulations to Mr. Tuck on his election to the state legislature and their pleasure at having had the opportunity to serve with him.

Mr. Higgins reported that he would be traveling to Washington, D.C. to attend the Inaugural next week and would, unfortunately not be able to attend the Financial Plan Work Sessions scheduled for January 20 and 21.

Ms. Kennedy reported that the Policy Subcommittee will meet at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, January 14, 2009 in Conference Room 150.

L. EXECUTIVE SESSION - PERSONNEL/FINANCE/NEGOTIATIONS
LITIGATION

M. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of January 12, 2009 was adjourned by unanimous consent at 11:50 p.m.

Jeff Friedman, President

Crystal Kennedy, Clerk

Johanna Lee, Recording Secretary

Date Minutes Approve