



Phoenix Elementary School District No. 1

Special Board Study Session – January 15, 2009

Dr. Ruth Ann Marston presided over the PESD #1 Governing Board Meeting in the Phoenix Elementary School District Governing Board Room.

Other Board members present at the meeting were:

Mr. Doug Allsworth Ms. Susan Bliss (absent) Ms. Liz Meza Dr. Louisa Stark

Also present were:

Ms. Myriam Roa Chief Executive Officer	Mr. Tom Lind Interim Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction	Mr. Kenneth Baca Assistant Superintendent for Business Services
Mr. Randy Dickason Executive Director for Human Resources	Ms. Eleanor Moyza Board Secretary	

A. Board Study Session – 8:00 a.m.

1. Call to Order – Dr. Ruth Ann Marston, President
2. Pledge of Allegiance – Tom Lind

Dr. Marston announced that Ms. Bliss' son, Eli passed away in an accident when he went over the handlebars of his bike and hit his head.

(This item was discussed out of the order of discussion)

4. Study and Discuss the Phoenix Preparatory Academy School Facility Options

Guests: Dr. Larry Pieratt, Executive Director of University Public Schools Inc., and Ms. Debra Gomez, Director for Centers of Educational Innovation

Ms. Myriam Roa described the Board Study Session to the audience and stated that it is an opportunity for the Board to discuss in detail and in depth, items of interest and that there is no action that the Board will be taking at today's meeting. She introduced two guests from the University of Public Schools, Dr. Larry Pieratt and Ms. Debra Gomez, who will be talking to us about a certain option that she'd like to start with today. She stated that we've had this year as a planning year and we've been doing some research and she will email the actual full-length Power Point Presentation that was developed under a grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation which is an Analysis and Recommendation Report, produced by Mass Insight Educational Research Institute, about what it really takes for high poverty urban schools to have some innovation. Ms. Roa stated that it's a challenge for school districts and states to work together with partners to help us with our urban schools. She stated that the new model is deeply-embedded, lead turnaround partners integrating the work of other providers and this is one of the reasons, that as we look at options for any of our schools that we want to reach out and have these partnerships. The partnership that we're looking at as an option today is with Arizona State University and the University Public Schools Incorporated. She stated that the

University Public Schools is a charter school that has been formed through an initiative from Dr. Crowe to reach out to elementary public schools and partner with them to help them do innovation and bring some real resources to urban schools and under-served students.

Mr. Pieratt showed a video about UPSI's Polytechnic Elementary School at the ASU Polytechnic Campus and then spoke about the school. He stated that they are also working with Osborn District at the same time and they're looking at opening a school in their district, just as Phoenix Elementary School District is looking at the possibility. They are also working with the Phoenix Union High School District and Roosevelt looking at constructing a school on the South Mountain High School site and will be Pre K-12 there. Those are the schools they hope to open downtown and it gives UPSI a variance of population to serve and they are excited about the opportunity. He stated that looking at this film, it's obvious that it isn't the under-served which is the focus of population; they went to Polytechnic because it had space on the campus and they hoped to find underserved there, but by the time they were able to really organize, most of the developers had moved those families out and he believes most of them have gone to New Mexico. They didn't have that population there, but they do believe that with the Phoenix Elementary School District Board's help and with the expertise that they have, that they can provide the same kind of program and it will be effective for those students in Phoenix Elementary District. He stated that Ms. Debra Gomez would talk about the curriculum and invited questions on the subject.

Dr. Marston informed Ms. Debra Gomez that one section that the Board wants to see is the English Language Learning Section, which the Board did not see on the film that they presented. Ms. Gomez stated that the ELL portion of the curriculum would be developed on-site to meet the needs of each community and they would be looking at the models that are currently implemented while bringing their ideas and innovations. Ms. Gomez stated that their curriculum, however as was seen on the video, is very integrated and they really focus on critical thinking skills, on problem-solving, on inquiry-based learning, question-based learning and collaboration, which is the basic tenets of what they do. She stated that the reason they do that is to go in-depth into Conceptual Learning, instead of covering the curriculum; they teach it. For example, she stated that one of their teachers, Mr. Steve McClellan, has half of those students in a 5/6 cluster and are already in Algebra I. They have to write in their Math Journals, they are not just taught the Alg Rhythms and apply it, they are given problems and they figure out which of the Alg Rhythms and why they would apply it and then explain that to the teacher. Their curriculum

Program and they do use Junior Grade Books for 3rd through 8th grade next year and the following year. They use a Basal Series for K-2 because they want to make sure their students receive that phonetic foundation, however they use the Critical Thinking Skills out of Junior Grade Books for comprehension; they take that down into the Primary Levels also, so the students begin to learn how to think and problem-solve. Their teachers are learning those questioning skills at the Primary Level and K-2 also. In their Mathematics Program for K-5, they're using Trailblazers Mathematics K-6 for students who qualify under that. It was developed out of the National Science Foundation. They chose that program because as they met with the ASU Faculty to develop curriculum and their must-knows, they believed that program would meet the needs of how they wanted to teach at Polytechnic Elementary. Along with that, their Algebra program is called Impact Mathematics, which has the same flow as Trailblazers so it takes them into that critical thinking, problem-solving type of atmosphere.

Ms. Gomez stated that the ASU Faculty were involved in developing how they were going to teach and what they were going to teach; the what is given to us and those are the state standards.

What they did with those standards, was identify, especially in Mathematics, the must-knows based off the new articulated standards.

Parents are very much involved in developing those individual learning plans at the beginning of the year for their children. UPSI has taken all those 'best practices' and use them every day.

Ms. Roa thanked Mr. Pieratt and Ms. Gomez for their presentations and stated she would like to continue with our communication plan on where we are on our planning year process. She stated that she knows that the Board has received this presentation through Board Updates in detail. She stated that Ms. Sara Bresnahan, with Community/Public Relations, is at the Board Meeting and would be happy to answer any questions about her experience as she went out and communicated to us and also stated that we had presentations that we conducted. Ms. Roa gave out informational handouts and stated that we had presentations in October and December at each school staff meeting regarding the options that we had talked about earlier in the year that were under consideration. We had Staff Surveys that were completed, we had information that was presented in the Community Newsletter and distributed to staff; we have had monthly updates that have been provided at our administrators' meetings and with Sara. We had some of the staff attend a Public Information Forum on November 20, 2008 that was held at the Phoenix Preparatory cademy and we had parents and children doing tours. In general, the vast majority of the results of the survey agreed that it is an excellent facility; the downtown location and the overall sizes of campus was viewed as one of the strongest attributes and we had about 560 respondents. The very first question was: "*How will this affect staff members at the Prep?*" The answer is framed, based on the general responses from parents at Shaw and Emerson School that there was some reluctance to move their school to the Prep. We wanted to give first choice to our internal schools to move their school to the Prep because it is our facility, but we didn't get that enthusiasm that we would want if we were going to make that kind of a recommendation. These answers are framed with the idea that we would choose a different option, a partnership with the University Public Schools. The very first question is a tough one and I don't say this lightly, but if we do choose a University Public Schools Partnership, staff members at the Prep would have to experience a Reduction in Force (RIF) and we would have to look to our policies and make sure that that was done properly and of course, we would want to make sure all of our staff members were given choices of our vacancies at all of our other schools. The teachers and support staff at the Prep who are interested will be given first choice to apply and be interviewed for the University Public Schools option. She stated that she understands that the teacher contracts for University Public Schools is a 12-month contract so if that's something that a teacher would not be interested in, then obviously, they would not be interested in applying. The employees have similar benefits as ASU employees and that might be something that might be attractive to either a Classified Staff Member or a Certified Staff Member.

Will the District children have first choice at the new school? Ms. Roa stated that these were questions that we were asked as we had our Communications Plan out to different schools. As a University Public School, it is a charter school so there is an open enrollment requirement for anyone in the state. If we have 6th or 7th graders that would be interested in enrolling at the University Public Schools, we would try to get to them first in our pre-enrollment process and then of course, our existing 7th graders who would be promoted to 8th grade would also be given that choice to pre-enroll.

She stated that one of the frequently-asked questions from the survey is: *How will other schools be impacted? Will it take money from those schools?* Ms. Roa stated that if we were to do this option with University Public Schools, would other schools lose some enrollment? She stated that she expects, because this is a choice and some parents might decide that they want to try the new University Public School, we might see some, but she finds in general, people are pretty comfortable where they are, she doesn't see a mass movement of enrollment from other schools but she thinks we might see interest from schools outside the district. If enrollment is limited to 100 students per grade level as a start, with the exception of our 7th and 8th grades who would normally go to the Prep, there will be closer to 200 students. Funding will not be taken from other schools and she wanted to assure that this model, if they were to move forward would not negatively impact our other schools.

Ms. Sara Bresnahan, the district's Community and Public Relations Representative described the extensive communication process beginning last October. She and Dr. Wendy Ong attended every staff meeting at every school, and also went to the Prep several times because they wanted to go back and connect the survey with them. They received over 500 responses from staff members and well over 500 parent-responses. She also communicated through the District Newsletter that goes out to 27,000 people and businesses. Staff was highly-respectful of the process, they certainly had their concerns and would certainly like in most cases for things to remain as they are in their buildings, etc. They were very insightful in terms of the questions and the comments that they provided and she listed them. They also had the forum at the Prep on November 20, 2008. University Public Schools was there, the architects were there with their drawings, and we conducted the survey with all of the folks that came to that. We had some Prep Staff members, and a few staff members from across the District, but 50 or more parents and they had the opportunity to tour the Prep too if they had not seen the facility. She stated that she thinks that most of the people who attended were from Shaw and Emerson Schools and had concerns about their school moving. She stated that she believes that as they toured the building and talked to different people, they became much more comfortable with the concept of change but generally speaking, probably would like to stick with the situation that they're in today. They saw a lot of interest in UPSI, there were lots and lots of questions for the UPSI Staff and a certain amount of enthusiasm for that concept as well. Their next step is to make sure that all the results of the communications get back to all staff members, all community members and to the Prep first and they will be doing that this afternoon.

Ms. Roa stated that implementation issues are framed around the idea that Shaw and Emerson parents want to stay in their schools so we are looking at this from the option of University Public Schools Inc. Partnering with University Public Schools Inc. through a collaboration agreement which is affiliated with Arizona State University, seems to gather the most excitement and interest. It's very important that we make sure that a partnership with expectations from either side are very clear. We certainly want to have some initial draft timeline requirements; we would have to close Preparatory Academy as a school and then immediately reopen it as a University Public School, a charter school. We are meeting with staff at the Prep Academy this afternoon because they are the most impacted.

Ms. Roa stated that the idea of a possible Reduction in Force (RIF) would really affect about 32 fulltime positions in Classified Staff and about 42 Certified positions. This is not something that she recommends lightly and certainly having the opportunity to interview first and transfer first would reduce the impact. We recommend also the retention of the Plant Manager. We certainly want to get some assistance from Dr. Prudence Lee, who's had this experience with our district and this year she's doing some special policy projects for us. If we move forward we'll be bringing all this information to you at the next Board Meeting for action. We would want to, as soon as possible, freeze all current vacancies to give the staff the most opportunity to transfer, we would like to give the opportunity for staff to interview with University Public Schools if that's the action that we've taken. Ms. Roa stated that they would expect to have an action item at the Jan 22nd board meeting. We expect to have at the January 22nd Board Meeting, all of our remodeling projects which includes the Prep. Sometime in February, we'd like to have a meeting with parents about their choices and we do this anyway for our 6th graders for all our choices that we have for our Magnet Schools and our 7th grade options. Typically, at the end of January, we ask staff to give us an intent as a courtesy to us of whether or not they're going to return.

Ms. Roa described the actions necessary to close a school and reopen as a charter school through a collaborative agreement. Ms. Roa stated that April 15th is an important deadline in statute to officially notify staff if we're going to have a RIF (Reduction in Force) and certainly a notice to any Interim Administrators of the deadline for non-renewal. We also want to keep the Board updated on a weekly basis. Ms. Roa stated that if we were to implement this option, a new school would be starting July 1.

Dr. Stark discussed the need for the Board to be in the loop and make a decision as to the grade configuration of the new school. Ms. Roa stated that today's presentation is framed on the option that seemed to be most accepted from the results of the survey, and is in no way a decision. Ms. Roa stated that she thinks that at a minimum in the Strategic Plan, we were looking at choices for our parents that form a Pre K-8. Mr. Pieratt stated that the University of Public Schools is interested in requesting a PreK-12 school because if its innovations are implemented, it's important that they know the systemic impact of those innovations. All too often they are isolated on an Early Childhood, middle school or high school without any consideration of the impact before or after and to truly do the research, it is necessary to say this is how it would work in a K-12 system, and that they need to have that opportunity. He stated that they have had opportunity to meet with Dr. Scribner and members from the Phoenix Union and with Ms. Roa and stated that they are very interested and willing to work with UPSI and cooperate as it moves into the high school level, so they would request a Pre K-12 opportunity at the Prep. Mr. Allsworth discussed his thoughts on Pre K-8 and asked about how PK-12 would be phased in. Dr. Pieratt stated that they would open Pre K-8 and the decision would need to be made in the first year as to whether it would extend to 9th grade the following year and so forth, but it would be phased in so the students within the K-9 Program can grow into that program and allow that to happen in a manner that best meets their needs and UPSI to continue the innovation.

Mr. Allsworth asked Mr. Pieratt about the school year and calendar. Mr. Pieratt explained that they currently have a 180-day school calendar and the Polytechnic calendar starts the last Monday of July and there's two weeks off for the students in October. The first week, the staff is off and the second week the staff is back planning. In December-January, it's a three week break; the students are off for three weeks, the staff is off for two weeks and they come back for a week of planning before the students return. In March, it's a two-week break and again, the staff is off for the first week and come back for a week of planning. He stated that they get out at about the middle of June and Staff actually have off the last week of June, and on the first week of July, they're back on the job for preparation.

Mr. Allsworth asked Mr. Pieratt about his concept of the intergovernmental agreement. Mr. Pieratt recommended a collaborative agreement, for legal reasons and encouraged the Board to look down through the affiliation agreement with ASU. He stated if the Board chooses to go with this option it will be drafted up as a legal document. Mr. Pieratt stated that we need to talk about the employment piece, the operations, the purposes, the roles of each organization, the facilities and grounds, the use, how that's shared, the equipment that exists in the school today and how that's shared. We're looking at a Transitional Year and we need to define that so that we have a year to build some funds if we're going to change furniture, etc. Mr. Pieratt is open about the Plant Manager and is interested in contracting with the District for other services. Mr. Allsworth asked Mr. Pieratt that if the decision was made to go to a high school level, would UPSI be partnering with Phoenix Union to which Mr. Pieratt replied yes. Mr. Allsworth asked Mr. Pieratt if they were thinking of doing a school at Osborn and a school at Phoenix Elementary if both districts are interested, and Mr. Pieratt stated yes and further stated that they've talked to them about that and they know the neighboring districts and they talked about the fact that they would not openly recruit from this district there or from that district here, but as parents come, by word of mouth or by advertising, they are certainly welcome because there are no boundary restrictions. He stated that they were originally focusing on two different populations; the Native American population at Osborn and the Hispanic or Latino population in this area. He assured the Board that they would handle it forthright and with total transparency and also stated that the Board would be fully apprised of what's happening there as they will see what's happening here. Mr. Pieratt stated that he doesn't believe the South Phoenix location would impact the District at all.

Ms. Meza asked about the enrollment of PESD students and the 100-student limit. Mr. Pieratt stated that the process would be that they have Open Enrollment, that they specifically invite the

lottery on
to District

parents and families of those students who'd like to be a part of the Prep or are currently part of the Prep setting and they would have orientations for them. They would then have a the first week of March with those people that have enrolled. They would market students first then give a public notice.

Dr. Marston indicated she was hearing some new information and had specific questions for Mr. Pieratt and she also discussed the idea of a PESD Interim Principal. Mr. Pieratt stated that they're restricted only with what direction the Board wants them to start with.

Phoenix
bring it to
would

Dr. Marston stated that the question of Contracted Services, of Transportation and Food Services is a big one for the Board. That they have a philosophical decision that we want to employ the parents of our children and she thinks we may have a philosophical understanding that we would want this school to contract for those services from our District. Mr. Pieratt stated that the only impediment would be their ability to pay for them and added that it could come through the negotiations, but that they certainly would like to see the Transportation, Food Services and even the Custodial services that PESD offers. They would prefer that be contracted with Elementary School District and if they are not financially able to do that, they would bring it to the table, they would present it to the Board and they would negotiate that out, but that would always be their expectation. Dr. Marston stated that the Board wants to be sure that the instructional strategies vary with the schools because she can tell him that the last time the Board discussed Junior Grade books, for example, they felt that they weren't necessarily culturally-adequate; there's a huge debate out there, as he knows, about cultural literacy. Dr. Marston stated that she needs to know that the unique needs of our population would be taken in and that we would be in a position to guarantee that. Mr. Pieratt replied, "absolutely", and that the curriculum that Ms. Gomez described is what works best for the students at Polytechnic. They recognize as they come in the culture those changes will be there and they're working hard to make sure the staff that understands that and look forward to working directly with the District and guidance for that area as well. He stated that these are things that will be developed together but it will be developed for the population they serve in each of the settings, which are uniquely different.

a
together
manpower
stated that
a whole lot of
would have to
willing to do that.

Dr. Marston stated that she has two questions and one is for Mr. Pieratt: She asked, "should we make the decision to close the Prep and reopen it would you be willing to move ahead in a partnership with us based on a Letter of Intent rather than a detailed contract so that either partner could withdraw, because I think a detailed contract is going to take us a long time?" Mr. Pieratt replied, "with sincerity of that Letter of Intent, yes." He stated that their intent is to work together to resolve the issues and added that they're putting a considerable amount of funds and manpower as the Phoenix Elementary District would, so he said they could do that. Dr. Marston stated that would trigger not only Capital Outlay funds for remodeling, it would also trigger a whole lot of staff changes for us and it would be a huge investment on the PESD's part and it would have to be an act of faith on both parts. Mr. Pieratt assured Dr. Marston that they are willing to do that.

Dr. Marston informed Ms. Roa that the other part for her is a budgetary issue because we had a budgetary issue in moving to our own charter school that we would lose on an annual basis one year's funding and asked Ms. Roa if that would happen gradually if we moved into high school. Ms. Roa explained the funding issues we faced and stated that impediment goes away. If we were to have 100 ninth graders they would be fully-funded through the UPSI charter. Dr. Marston stated that she knows Ms. Roa has this personal experience and asked Ms. Roa if she believes we could begin under a Letter of Intent and move to an operating agreement prior to the opening of the actual school year? Ms. Roa agreed and stated that the actual agreement in full form for the Board to do a final approval will probably be very late in the year in terms of planning for the actual transition and if we were to put together an interim agreement or a Letter of Intent, that might be in place, staff member or i.e. a principal in place to help hire and get everything going. Ms. Roa stated that when we closed Bethune and got ready to reopen Bethune, we had Ms. Pastor

hired on as early as we could so that she could plan and hire the staff. She stated that might be something that we would look at and bring it back to the Board as an Action Item fairly soon. She stated that last but not least, in her experience with Bethune and reopening it, there is a mechanism and she'll discuss it from a financial perspective, that when a school district is planning to open a school, they may put some M & O money into a new school fund and it's a very particular fund that has restrictions on what you can use that money for. Typically, schools aren't allowed to save money or bank money, and in this particular fund, you can build money up so that when you open a new school for all of your initial planning or operations requirement. If you don't open the new school, it has to return back to the General Fund, but one of the things she might recommend is to take some of the money that will be funded for today's 7th and 8th graders, and put it into a new school fund because we get funded in arrears. Today's 7th and 8th graders were funded from the kids that were there last year, so we would have sort of a contingency fund in case this didn't work out, we could bring that money back and do something else with our own schools and that's just something she would recommend to the Board if we were to move forward on that.

Dr. Marston stated that the plans that were given to the Board showed only 6th, 7th and 8th graders being involved in the pre-enrollment and we're talking about K-8. She asked if they are thinking of only a three-grade school for opening or are they thinking of K-9? Ms. Roa responded that she's thinking that as far as the pre-enrollment or the students that they would market to first as Mr. Pieratt said, would be our existing 7th graders today to be 8th graders in 09-10, and all of the 6th graders across the district that normally we talk to anyway about what their choices are for going to the Prep, so the 200 plus current 7th graders and then all of our 6th graders throughout the district and also the current 8th graders, 100 of them, that might want to stay into 9th grade, that would be at a minimum from our district perspective, but certainly as this grows, it would be marketed PreK-9. Dr. Marston asked Mr. Pieratt if he would be marketing in PreK-9. Mr. Pieratt replied yes, and that once the initial round goes through so they can ensure the enrollment of those in the district who want to be a part of it, they would market PreK-9. He stated that perhaps 9th grade would be full, if they have 100 per grade level, then there's no space, but they would also open up waiting lists. Dr. Marston stated that she understands perfectly but she just wanted to be sure because the slides that we just saw didn't indicate that. Dr. Marston asked Mr. Pieratt if he would be willing for the District to choose an Interim Principal for the first year and a half, even if he chose a co-principal and Mr. Pieratt stated that they are more than willing to work with the District in that process and define it and also stated that we're walking through this together, so he doesn't wish to give an absolute yes or no, but he thinks that's something they could sit down and talk about. He stated that to have a Principal or a Co-Principal from the District in the initial year certainly seems very appealing to him and they certainly would welcome any opportunity to share an administration in the school whether it's a role of a Principal or simply an advisor, whatever that would be. Dr. Marston stated that we need to have an administrator that's free to work with him and we can't have our current administrators pulled away from here. Dr. Marston also stated that that administrator needs to be coming back to the other administrators in our District and talking about, even initially, the forward-looking ideas that are going into this school so we can see if they should be implemented in our other schools and if it works as a demonstration school, we have to have somebody doing that. Mr. Pieratt stated that they have posted positions for Principal for possible schools in the downtown area and they have a number of applicants, but they have not initiated any interviews until they have a partnership to work with, so obviously their first move there would be to invite those interested within the District to interview just as Dr. Rowe illustrated in the slides.

Dr. Marston asked Mr. Pieratt if he would be willing to work with our District without a partnership with the Phoenix Union High School District in doing a K-12. He stated that it's difficult to answer that and also stated that he doesn't intend to be a party to any competition with any district and that decision should be made with conversation with the university and with Phoenix Union so they understand the reasoning behind that and they're supportive of that so he

cannot give an absolute yes or no and it is something that they need to sit down and work through.

Mr. Allsworth stated that there's no consensus on this Board about K-8 or K-12 and in fact, he feels that the Board needs to have a fair amount of dialogue on that. He feels very skeptical about K-12 as opposed to K-8 and if the Board should decide to put a K-12 school there, he likes the idea of starting with a K-8 making sure that is implemented correctly before we take on something larger, moving into the high school setting, whether we do that with a Phoenix Union partnership or more with a charter model. His perspective on that is that he doesn't want a great idea to fail because we tried to do too much, too soon, and he doesn't want to see it fail because it's a laboratory for new, untested ideas but rather an incubator for proven ideas. He feels that the idea of going K-12 is an intriguing one, but he thinks it's an ambitious one.

Ms. Roa stated that one of our strong points in this District is Assessment and we do a really good job with our assessment, how we manage our assessment, our efficiency in assessing through our internal Galileo system and we would invite UPSI to use that assessment and it would be interesting to see if we can compare apples to apples. She stated that she and Mr. Pieratt have talked about those as being possibilities and working with Ms. Gomez as well to see where some of the things we are doing really well might be something that we might share so it will be a mutually beneficial relationship and that they talked about having their team be part of our team and our administrative settings and we can all learn from each other.

(This item was discussed out of the order of discussion)

3. Study and Discuss English Language Development Model

Mr. Lind stated that in reference to the fact that it was requested that they form a committee, he felt that the best discussion could be framed around that organization and let the committee report back, more specifically to the Governing Board after they've had an opportunity to meet. He stated that Ms. Debbie Ortiz is in the audience to help facilitate any discussion or dialogue that they might have today. He stated that they have a suggested membership that their District committees are typically open to all employee groups, parents and community members and this committee could include Governing Board Members, administrators, teachers, parents, and any other interested employee or member of the committee.

Mr. Lind stated that he thought it was important that they review Arizona Revised Statutes in Arizona Department of Education Guidelines for ELD Classrooms. He felt it was important that they study the research on Language Acquisition and he felt it was important that they explore language models used in our school district as well as other Arizona school districts and perhaps states. He felt it was important that they review budget implications, allocations and requirements. He felt it was important that they study their enrollment in ELD Classrooms and regular education classrooms, including those students who are reclassified. It would be important that we study our student achievement data and it would also be important that we review practices for the possible instruction of a second language within our school district and then professional development. And as they begin to meet with Dr. Stark and Ms. Meza, they may need to revise these.

Dr. Stark stated that she thinks it's really important that we have input from the teachers who are at this moment participating in the program to let us know what their successes and their non-successes and their opinions of how well this program is working. She stated that we know there are problems because it's our ELD students, unfortunately, who are bringing down our AIMS scores, but there may be a few teachers who, with a little bending here, they are able to work well with these separate classrooms, and maybe their kids are doing okay and maybe there are other areas where we may need to be tweaking things, that are already in practice here. She stated that they may well find that this whole system isn't working in general and that they need to think

along some other lines. Mr. Lind stated that it's a very good suggestion and typically on their District committees they always survey staff so they can include that also.

Mr. Lind stated that he would schedule time with Dr. Stark and Ms. Meza to finalize the notice and they will share that with the Governing Board before submitting the notice. Dr. Marston requested of Mr. Lind that after he meets with Dr. Stark and Ms. Meza that he schedule this under Board Reports and Requests for an agenda for the first meeting in February.

Mr. Lind provided some preliminary information to the Board and to those in the audience. The first three pages beginning with Program Option A, Option B and Option C define the ELD Program that we have within our school district this year and it's based upon the guidance of the Arizona Revised Statutes as well as the Department of Education Guidelines. He stated that Option A is the program that discusses the details, the 4-hour ELD classroom. He asked Ms. Ortiz if she wanted to highlight on Option A. Ms. Debbie Ortiz stated that she is glad this is being discussed because it's long overdue. She stated that as for Program Option A, she mentioned that the Task Force is the group that was appointed by the governor to interpret the Arizona Revised Statutes and they were involved in quite a long process with them with an alternative model which was rejected. They had multiple meetings regarding that and the major point being that they didn't want ELD students mixed with the non-ELD students so everything we see here is a reflection of the task force model and one of the things in the Curriculum piece, that they are trying to do in their model where teachers feel they can do this, is teach the language through content, so they have had ELD Science training is not a component of the Task Force training. ADE has them in the spotlight and they have come out to one school already at the beginning of the year to make sure that they were not placing too many students in the ELD classrooms, and they did a monitoring. She stated that they called her, Ms. Ortiz, again for another monitoring they were going to do at another school because they thought we were encouraging 'refusal of services' forms and they are scheduled for their full monitoring on February 25th. At Dr. Stark's question Ms. Ortiz stated that a "Parent Refusal of Services" form, is when the parent requests that their student be placed in a mainstream classroom, a non-ELD classroom, the request needs to come from the parent and they have a right to do that. Mr. Allsworth asked which school it was regarding the Department of Education and Ms. Ortiz replied that it was Heard School.

Dr. Marston asked Ms. Debra Gomez if, as part of the University Schools Curriculum, they are using an Individual Education Plan and if that's a model that PESD could be using as well. Ms. Gomez stated that it is one of the approved models but it's only when you have so many students per grade level that you can use that model, and if they had had more students they would have had to go into the option that Ms. Ortiz is talking about, with grouping of students, but because they only have six, they qualified to do the Individual Plan.

Mr. Lind stated that Option C is the Individual Learning Plan Model that they were just discussing and that they are using that in several of our District schools where the student numbers allow us to do so. He stated that Option B is a two-way Bilingual Immersion Program that he believes supports the instruction that they have at Herrera.

Ms. Ortiz stated that currently we do not have any students on waivers. A student must have a waiver to be able to use Program Option B. The students at Herrera are not using the waiver; they are all on "Parent Refusal of Service" forms.

Mr. Lind stated that the next to be studied are all of the Arizona Revised Statutes that reflect the ELD Bilingual Education Model, which is Arizona Revised Statute 15-751 through 15-757 and he stated that he had suggested in the outline for the agenda that the committee study these guidelines as this is the Arizona Law.

Mr. Lind acknowledged that we're bringing board policies for approval at ten at a time and one that is still pending that is brought to the Board is Policy IHAA, which is the English Instruction Policy and he feels that it's important that the committee review that policy revision as well.

Regarding rejection of services, Mr. Allsworth asked if it's a different part of the law that allows for rejection of services and asked how it works. Ms. Ortiz replied that there are three ways to get a waiver. (1) The parent must fill out a document of 250 words or more that explains how the mainstream classroom is impeding the learning of the child and actually causing either a physical or psychological problem for the child, and it must be written by the parent. (2) There is also a waiver that can be obtained for the age of the child. If the child is under ten, they cannot use that waiver and the students must score proficient on a designated assessment in order to enter the dual-language program. Therefore, the students at Herrera who are in K-1, many of them would not score proficient on this assessment and the parents want them in dual-language, so they chose to fill out the "Parent Refusal of Services" form. Once a parent fills out the "Parent Refusal of Services" form, they are no longer considered ELL and they are not eligible for compensatory education instruction or any other component of the program according to the ADE Guidelines. If they are on a waiver, they are still eligible for everything else and you can even have a hybrid situation. The "Parent Refusal of Services" form, once filled out, the parent can elect, at any time, to have the student placed back into the program, and they have had that happen in a couple of incidents already this year. Ms. Ortiz stated that they are funded a year in arrears for ELL so all the students that they have in the program on the 3 census states are averaged and they get funded for them next year, so if they refuse services in August they won't be on the census for October, December and February, thereby not allowing them to be funded for the following year. Ms. Roa interjected that there is ELL Group B Weight that we would lose funding for when a parent elects to refuse services and Ms. Ortiz added that it also impacts our Title III funding. Ms. Roa stated that it's only \$364 dollars per student. Ms. Ortiz stated that we also receive no funding for the reclassified students. Ms. Ortiz stated that the Osborn model is not approved and is still being worked on, advice from John Stahler at ADE and an approved model can only be approved by the Task Force and once it is approved by them, the other districts may then use that model in their district. If in fact Osborn is approved by the Task Force, we could then use it, but at this point it is not an approved model.

B. Board Reports and Requests

1. Board Direction to the Chief Executive Officer (if necessary)

Dr. Marston asked that the staff come forward with a draft Letter of Intent so that they can have a framework for a real discussion and also the options that they would need to do for remodeling of the Prep to make it useful for little kids.

I. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Ruth Ann Marston
Board President

Positive comments from UPSI employees on video:

- *“University Public Schools is a school where kids learn about diversity and they learn how to live in the real world and they learn how to do it collaboratively. It is an initiative coming out of the office of Dr. Crowe, the President of the Arizona State University and it was part of his vision as he introduced it in 2002 at his inaugural speech, where he identified eight imperatives. One of those imperatives was the obligation of the university to be part of the community in solving and reflecting those problems and finding solutions and Pre K-12 certainly fits that”.*
- *I believed this was the place that was going to allow us to do things differently. All of those strategies and programs and things that you knew you could do differently in a public school, but for whatever reason, you couldn't get it done. We are multi-age and multi-grade, which in of itself is not new, but we do that consistently. We do teaming with our teachers; they're formed in cluster-groups, they plan together which is not new, but we do that consistently also. The way our schedule is based, we do Foreign Language and Physical Education, also not new. Our children receive that instruction on a daily basis for 45 minutes each. That provides a 90-minute block of time for Art Teachers to receive professional development and to plan and to debrief instruction and reflect on what they've done and how they can improve upon it”.*
- *“We were able to create the right space, the right environment for students, teachers and parents; learning is going to take place, what sets Polytechnic Elementary School apart and as it does set University Public Schools apart, is our commitment to develop a 21st Century learning environment”.*
- *“One of my things is really getting kids to learn, without knowing they're learning and enjoy that. Through the innovations, through the roundtables that we have, getting parents involved, the technology, it's everything I had hoped and more”.*
- *“Innovation doesn't have to be a brand new idea. Innovation could be putting together things that work. For instance, Team Teaching and project-base is not new, but when you put it together in a package to define how that package can be implemented in schools, then it becomes ‘innovation’.*
- *“Our classrooms are actually two classrooms; there is a wall that would normally separate the two classrooms, but our wall is not a complete wall. It goes about halfway to $\frac{3}{4}$. So we have the two sides in our classroom and they're 1st and 2nd graders immersed into each of the two sides, and so we call ourselves the “1-2 Cluster.” This entire room is composed of 1st and 2nd grade students”.*
- *“At Poly, the classrooms are Kindergarten, 1-2, 3-4, 5-6 and then you have the cluster for the Special Teachers, which is Physical Education, Spanish, Music and Special Education”.*
- *“This actually consists of the teachers' team and working hand-in-hand with each other. They are responsible for 56 students and not 28, but they also take different roles of lead or follow or help in the process of introducing each subject area”.*
- *“Our teachers are collaboratively working together along with our instructional assistants so we have three teachers also moving equally between sites depending on what's going on”.*
- *“It's in a cluster environment but the children are not just segregated by grade level. We do individualized learning plans and there are different parts that a team-player has. I think we do a really good job of that; taking the strengths in these children, taking the strengths in teachers and really allowing people to shine and to be their best”.*
- *“That's what this school is all about, the applications. It's all about the conceptual idea and it's not about memorizing the multiplication tables. It's about “why do these numbers work the way they do?” “How can I create an algebraic formula that would solve this problem?” Not, “here's the algebraic formula... solve it!”*

- *“This really gives kids an opportunity to find a group or a place that meets their specific needs”.*
- *“We have 5th graders that might be taking Algebra, high school Algebra. Well, there would be three or four of those 5th graders who would be doing that, so we can group them. And we bring the curriculum to the student; we don’t take the student and introduce that high school setting to get that Algebra.”*
- *“Our children need a well-balanced education. We feel that by providing them with Spanish, with P.E., that that’s what they’re getting....they’re getting a well-balanced education”.*
- *“We work very closely with the teachers to try to integrate what they’re doing in their classrooms, with what we’re doing in our special areas and be able to incorporate something from P.E. into their History lesson or their Math lesson. In P.E. they have a lot of measurements. We can talk measurements in the football field and measurements in a Math class, so we do a lot of the overlap, if you will, with special areas and academics.”*
- *“I immediately started thinking along those lines and how that was going to work for Music; how I was integrating Music in what they were already covering in the classroom. So when I sit with the teachers and plan with them, I’m really trying to take into account what direction their plans are going in.”*
- *“Not only are the ways in which we’re teaching kids, different, but also the way that we meet as teams and we collaborate. That just seems to be so much more of the backbone of this particular school and I think that really helps teachers become so dedicated at what they’re doing”.*
- *“I like the role with the Professional Learning Community we share at our meetings and our cluster time which I love and I had read a lot about it when I interviewed for the position and I’ve seen everything come through what I thought was going to come through. I think having teachers work together is essential and we learn so much from each other and I think that’s something that should definitely be carried out, but teachers are working in teams to meet the needs of various children.*
- *“We also want them to be open to say, “Hey, that works, but how can we make it better?””*