

Alternatives Committee Minutes for May 3, 2011

May 3rd Meeting Agenda:

- I. Call To Order
- II. Bond Funding Review
- III. Alternative Solution Review
- IV. Review new alternatives identified
- V. Deep Dive review of alternatives
- VI. Alternative Prioritization Discussion
- VII. Next Steps and Action Items Review
- VIII. Adjournment

I. Call To Order

Alesha kicked off the meeting and reviewed the agenda and objectives for the day. The main objective out of the current meeting was to review all open options and detail research as well as bring any new options forward to discuss with the committee. Once reviewed then make additional cuts as needed.

Another point addressed is that Alesha Breite, as the committee chair will not be voting in the final decision of which options to bring forward to the board. To ensure fair representation across the schools her role is strictly to facilitate and organize all action items and discussion topics across the committee and prepare updates and final presentations to the board.

Penny was also stepping in for Emerita for the day and Fox did not have any representation for the second meeting in a row.

Attendees:

Penny Weaver
Cathy Wright
Charles Velschow
Central /Cori McKenzie
Cipriani/Maria LangGavidia
Nesbit/Kathy Kelley
Sandpiper/Linda McDaniel
Redwoodshores/Cherie Ho
Nesbit/Mindy Shelton
Ralston/Dawn Graves
Central/Lisa Conley
Central /Mike Rothstein
Cipriani/Amy Sue Lombardi
Cipriani/Jeff Selman
Nesbit/Alanna ShawFillippi
Nesbit/ Jason Tolu
Redwoodshores/Kris Binasik
Redwoodshores/Kerri Macha

Alesha Breite

II. Bond Funding Review

The committee expressed a lot of interest of how much money is available within the bond and how the funds can be applied. As decisions are being made about solutions to bring forward to the board, implementation costs are important to highlight within the proposals. Knowing how bond funds can be applied is crucial to understand i.e. School Expansions.

Cathy was able to bring some information about the bond funds forward including:

Bond Total	35 M
Sold in two series	30M
	2017 5M

Action Item and tabled topic for next week is to ensure we have an overview:

- General Overview of the Fund allocations and maturity model
- Timeline of when the funds will be available to district for spend
- Bond Utilization and how it will be leveraged across the district
- For the state December matching program how much is available and what is the criteria for receiving funds and how much and when would it be made available

III. Alternative Solution Review

Attached below is a summary of the solutions currently being evaluated by the committee from last week:

- 1. Language Immersion Program/Special Programs (Long Term)**
Committee Voted: Yes
Committee Lead: Courtney/Penny/Kathy
- 2. Purchase Additional Land/Space (i.e. Serendipity or Barrett) (Long Term)**
Committee Voted: No on Barrett Option. Move portable classroom option to Option 3. and yes to review expansion options with Cipriani.
Committee Lead: Amy
- 3. Current School Expansion (Short Term and Long Term)**
Committee Voted: Yes
Committee Lead: Chuck/Mike
- 4. Elementary School Programs – 4-5 and 5-8 Schools (Long Term)**
Committee Voted: Yes
Committee Lead: Jason and Jeff
- 5. Move Administration Building (Short Term)**
Committee Voted: Yes
Committee Lead: Alesha
- 6. Priority Enrollment**
Committee Voted: Yes
Committee Lead: Lisa/Alanna/Cathy

IV. New Alternative Solutions

One new solution was introduced to the committee:

Specialized Afterschool Program

Concept included creating a magnet program within the specialized afterschool program at the afterschool program and implement at Nesbit. The idea is that it would be a K-5 program implemented at Nesbit that would have either technology specialization, language, etc built into the afterschool program itself. The afterschool program could leverage open space at the school and draw families to Nesbit. Third party agencies or programs could be leveraged to implement and maintain program.

Some concerns highlighted included:

- Afterschool programs in existing schools such as Central/Barrett and Cipriani already offer language choices within the existing programs today
- Once established at Nesbit what is to prevent the program from expanding at other schools as well.

After discussions the group agreed to keep the solution open for evaluation next week however no one volunteered to look into the option.

V. Alternative Solution Deep Dive

1. Language Immersion Program/Special Programs (Long Term)

Committee Lead: Courtney/Penny/Kathy

Penny provided an overview of last year's research and results when an immersion program was reviewed as a viable option for implementation.

Overview:

- Need state adopted programs (Roughly a 3 Month Implementation)
- Additional funding to kick start the program is required around 60K (this does not include salary requirements for staff)
- Initial requirements for K would include
 - 10 English first language students
 - 10 Spanish first language students
- Current staff includes 3 Spanish speaking teachers (However unknown if they are wanting to take job on)
- Need to hire a director to run the program
- Enrollment last year included: 11 First grade, 12 Kindergarten, 2 second graders

Pros:

- Great program. Wonderful results with proven track record
- Long term students outscore all other children that do not participate in the long term. Estimated middle school.

Cons:

- The solution will not draw students fast enough and would they be pulled from the schools where capacity issues exist
- Could not implement next year based on current timeline
- Language options already exist in afterschool programs
- Short term test score impact

GATE programs:

Overview:

- 131 students enrolled in the program
- Used to receive 20K a year for summer programs. Funding no longer available.
- Need to apply for new certification because the program implemented in school would differ from existing summer program one.

Overall teachers felt that creating in just one school would create segregation. The committee felt in general that GATE programs should be implemented within all of the schools instead of just one.

Other Magnet and specialized programs were brought up and the committee was not interested in pursuing.

Final vote was to leave immersion as a long term solution to continue to research and review. If it is not one of the final solutions brought to the board the committee still would like to present as a proposal to eventually implement outside of the current capacity solutions.

2. Purchase Additional Land/Space (i.e. Serendipity or Barrett) (Long Term)

Committee Lead: Amy

Amy spoke to several people regarding the land purchase options for Cipriani to support expansion.

She spoke to individuals from:

- Park and Recreation
- Director of Community Development
- City Council

Based on conversations she conducted she received the following opinion and information about the city selling the dog park/field behind Cipriani:

- The city loves dog parks. There are a few of them currently and the city is already planning to make enhancements to the existing one this summer. In general it would not be a popular idea for selling.
- In general there are a few parks and the city does not want to sell based on the current numbers

After reviewing the information from Amy the committee decided to not move forward with this option.

3. Current School Expansion (Short Term and Long Term)

Committee Lead: Chuck/Mike

Chuck and Mike presented two options for reviewing for expansion. Both options looked at both spectrums of full build out and minimized build expansion across all schools. They presented the proposals to the committee

with detail building overviews, estimated costs, and associated class enrollment numbers.

Please review the proposals attached.

The committee felt this was a good option to leave on the table. The general concern is how much money outside of the \$9.1M used for required construction will be used on modernization vs. new build. Bond overviews will be required to deep dive more into this option. Chuck and Mike would like to meet with the contractor to review some of the detail information in the master plan.

Current site visits are being conducted by parent groups, classified staff, and admins to help review Priority A items.

Moving forward Alesha is going to review with Emerita that all building questions go through Mike and Chuck moving forward given the general public questions all going to the contractors.

4. Elementary School Programs – 4-5 and 5-8 Schools (Long Term)

Committee Lead: Jason and Jeff

Jason and Jeff presented several proposals around other schools that have implemented middle schools or partner school programs.

Please refer to attached document for more information.

In conclusion the committee voted to not to move forward with this option. Even though building a new middle school east of el camino or potentially splitting existing school programs might be attractive, the costs associated to building or splitting schools are too high.

5. Move Administration Building (Short Term)

Committee Lead: Alesha

Currently researching on whether land is proposed as commercial property or not. Difficult to sell in residential area. Need to follow up with realtors on land value. Also required building costs to build out at Nesbit to house district.

The committee decided to not to move forward with this option given the practicality of implementation and the fact that new construction would still be required to build out at Nesbit to house the district.

6. Priority Enrollment

Committee Lead: Lisa/Alanna/Cathy

Lisa and the team reviewed some of the prioritization options for implementation across the district. The goal is eliminate boundary changes by implementing a sister school program to handle overflow.

Overall feedback is that lottery systems are not popular and contain a negative connotation associated to it. Priority enrollment is a better term for the program. It allows flexibility around stability and moving neighborhoods together instead of one of student enrollments.

No costs for implementation and is considered both short term and long term option.

Committee expressed concern in that if this is implemented there needs to be some structure enforced to ensure neighborhoods are moved together to help promote community and carpooling.

Action Item captured to map out a variety of different proposals within this option to discuss in the next meeting to visualize more.

VI. Committee Calendar and Meeting Objective Review

Alternative Committee Meeting Schedule:

May 10th 4:30 – 6:30 pm

May 17th 4:30 – 6:30 pm

Meeting Agenda for May 3rd:

Call To Order

Bond Funding Review

Deep Dive review of four remaining alternatives

Alternative Prioritization Discussion

Finalize Board Options for Proposal

Next Steps and Action Items Review

Adjournment

VII. Next Steps and Action Items

- Post Minutes and Meeting Schedule

VIII. Adjournment