

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE GOVERNING BOARD
SCOTTSDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 48**

February 12, 2008

A Regular Meeting of the Governing Board of the Scottsdale Unified School District, #48, Maricopa County, was called to order at 5:38 PM, at the Scottsdale Unified School District Education Center Board Room, 3811 North 44th Street, Phoenix, Arizona. President Beckvar called upon Mrs. Holzer to lead the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Board Members in attendance were Karen Beckvar, President; Dr. Eric Meyer, Clerk; Molly Holzer; Jennifer Petersen; and Dieter Schaefer. Superintendent John M. Baracy was also present. A quorum was present. Ms. Beckvar welcomed approximately 30 visitors.

Ms. Beckvar noted that the Administration wished to table Action Item IX. A. Approval of Expansion of Phased Retirement Program (Smartschoolsplus).

Amendment to Agenda

Mrs. Petersen moved to approve the Agenda, as amended. Mr. Schaefer seconded the motion.

Motion #68
Approval of Agenda as Amended

The motion was approved with a vote of 5 – 0.

Superintendent's Comments

Dr. Baracy called upon Katy Cavanagh, Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning, to introduce a new employee, Mrs. Dawn Ewan Thompson. Mrs. Thompson is from the State of Florida, most recently as principal of a school whose focus was on Instructional Technology. Mrs. Thompson will be working closely with the District's Informational Technology Department, as well as with Mrs. Cavanagh helping to design the District's Professional Development program. Mrs. Thompson thanked the Board for the opportunity to come to Scottsdale. Ms. Beckvar, on behalf of the Board, welcomed her aboard.

Superintendent's Comments

Public Comment

There was no Public Comment.

Public Comment

Consent Agenda

- VII. A. Acceptance of Gifts - \$78,877.13
- VII. B. Accounts Payable Vouchers – 1/11/08-1/25/08
- VII. C. Payroll Vouchers – 1/8/08-1/28/08
- VII. D. Personnel Action Items – 1/8/08-1/28/08
- VII. E. Approval of Minutes of January 8, 2008 Regular Board Meeting
- VII. F. Approval of Minutes of January 22, 2008 Special Board Meeting
- VII. G. Approval of Minutes of January 22, 2008 Regular Board Meeting
- VII. H. Auxiliary Operations Statement for December 31, 2007
- VII. I. Student Activities Statement for December 31, 2007
- VII. J. Tax Credit Statement for December 31, 2007
- VII. K. Approval to Award RFP #8186, Food Acquisition & Distribution Service
- VII. L. Approval to Award RFP #8188, Security Master Plan
- VII. M. Approval to Increase Prior Board Authorization for Electrical Services through Maricopa County S.A.V.E. Contract
- VII. N. Approval to Lease/Purchase Equipment through Mohave Educational Services

Consent Agenda

Consent Agenda Continued

- VII. O. Approval to Purchase Buses through MOHAVE Contract
- VII. P. Approval to Purchase Vehicles through State Contract
- VII. Q. Award of Bid #8197, Boom, Lift & Trailer
- VII. R. Increase to Guaranteed Maximum Price for Chaparral HS
- VII. S. Approval of Minutes of January 31, 2008 Work/Study-Math

Mrs. Petersen moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Schaefer seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with a vote of 5 – 0.

Information/Discussion Items

Dr. Baracy stated that since Dr. Peterson has taken over the budget process, he has received comments that the budget process is very transparent. Dr. Baracy also shared that the budget being presented is balanced in very tough economic times. There is a small amount of dollars available for an increase to employees, there are no proposed Reductions in Force (RIFS) due to budget considerations, and it is proposed to save all programs.

David Peterson, Assistant Superintendent for Operations, presented Information/Discussion Item VIII. A. Fiscal Year 2008-09 Budget Discussion. Dr. Peterson stated that a lot of time and work by the Learning Leadership Team (LLT), principals, and staff went into preparing this initial budget. The budget projection is based on a decrease of 210 Average Daily Membership (ADM), on an increase to the base from the State of 2%, and on the Teacher Experience Index (TEI) of 1.0132. The projected M&O Budget is \$165,106,538, an increase of \$737,328 from last year. Additional revenue sources totaled \$727,180. This included an additional \$100,000 from Nutritional Services beyond what that department normally contributes to the District, and \$100,000 from Community Schools. Dr. Peterson reviewed proposed budget cuts from various departments in the amount of \$4,843,036. The proposed budget cuts include a proposal to move the Copper Ridge Math & Science Academy to Saguaro HS for a savings of \$180,000. Further proposed budget cuts are the reduction of five Administrative positions, \$325,000; and the reduction of 30 Certified FTE positions, \$1.35 million, both of which will be done through attrition and the combining of positions, not people. The total available budget, as adjusted, is \$6,307,544. Also reviewed were budget impacts totaling \$5,972,341, leaving a FY 2008-09 budget balance of \$335,203. Further Department reductions of \$161,107, and an additional \$275,000 in fuel costs, leaves a final budget balance of \$221,310. Dr. Peterson also reviewed projections for employee salary adjustments for FY2008-09.

Discussion followed. Mr. Schaefer asked how the District would save \$180,000 by moving the Copper Ridge Math & Science Academy to Saguaro HS. Dr. Peterson responded part of the savings would be in Administration costs and by having teachers at a comprehensive high school who can teach other courses to larger number of students. Ms. Beckvar interjected that at this time, there has not been any decision made on moving the Academy; however, when those discussions take place, the Board would like further information showing what the impact would be on such a move. Mr. Schaefer commented that in light of the current economic situation, Administration should review the cost of current programs and also be prepared to address lower ADM scenarios by having different models of the budget. Dr. Peterson responded that the Finance Department is already using models for different ADM projections. In regard to Community Schools, Mr. Schaefer asked if a business plan for Community Schools

Consent Agenda Continued

Motion #69
Approval of Consent Agenda

Information/Discussion

•Fiscal Year 2008-09
Budget Discussion

could be prepared for the Board's review when they meet on March 4th.

Mrs. Holzer asked if after moving \$500,000 from CORL (Capital Outlay Revenue Limit) to M&O, the CORL account would be empty. Dr. Peterson responded that the only money left in that account would be the carry-over CORL of a little over \$1 million. This will be very sparingly used for Capital. Mrs. Holzer also asked what the balance is in Fund 500 (School Plant Fund). Dr. Peterson responded that Fund 500 has just under \$3 million. A small percentage of these funds are allowed to be spent and the District will be utilizing those funds to pay for both liability insurance and Workers' Compensation insurance. Mrs. Holzer stated that her concern is what the District will do in the following year, that this is a reoccurring cost and that there should be an alternate plan, perhaps a three-year plan. Ms. Beckvar stated that the District will not have access to Fund 500 for the seven years the Capital Override will be in effect. Typically, this Administration has tried to use Fund 500 for non-recurring costs. Mrs. Holzer asked about the proposed FY2008-09 budget cut of minimum class size of 18 for electives in middle and high schools, if this was also a minimum for core classes. Mrs. Cavanagh responded that in reviewing costs, Administration will have to determine what number of students would be necessary to establish a class to utilize staffing effectively. This is done much more consistently with core classes. Ms. Beckvar added that there are some classes that will be smaller, such as band and string class; these types of classes will not be eliminated.

Dr. Meyer stated that Administration shared a number of issues that will negatively affect the District's budget next year, including Workers' Compensation, Liability premium, Medicaid, fuel costs, and the potential loss of Excess Utilities funding (unfunded utility costs). At the March 4th Board Meeting, he would like to see a plan on how the District is going to address all those items. Dr. Meyer stated that the State of Arizona has painted schools in this State into a box and have continued not to fund education even at the rate of inflation. Further, it is a tragedy that our state legislators do not value educating children for the future; however, as there is an election coming up, we should use our votes wisely.

Mrs. Petersen stated that she agrees with Dr. Meyer, the outlook is very depressing. Her question was in regard to attrition. Mrs. Petersen asked if the proposed number of certificated reductions would be accomplished by those people leaving the District by retiring or some other reason. Dr. Peterson responded that Administration is continuing to review those numbers and anticipates that the proposed number of reductions through attrition or by eliminating positions, not people, will be met. Mrs. Petersen stated that in regard to the Board Meeting on March 4th, the Board would be looking at the budget with an eye to the District Goals and the goal of 33 Excelling Schools. She agrees with Mr. Schaefer's request to look at all programs; she would also like to see a cost benefit analysis on all programs.

Ms. Beckvar also would like to look at the effectiveness of the District's current programs and if they are accomplishing what it was intended for those programs to do by moving students forward, or should other programs that are working more effectively be expanded. Ms. Beckvar also commented that the Board has added a lot to the Administrator's duties and that the Board should see if there is anything that can be eliminated that would free up more time for them to spend on teaching and learning in the classroom. Further, this type of continuing budget situation is why the District is looking at its facility usage to see if there is a more effective way of using facilities and saving money.

Ms. Beckvar, on behalf of the Board, thanked Dr. Peterson and the entire staff of the

District for their hard work to bring this proposed budget to the Board. It makes their job easier in determining what the Board's options are.

Jeff Thomas, Executive Director of Human Capital, presented Information/ Discussion Item VIII. B. Employee Evaluation Procedures and Instruments. Mr. Thomas presented an update on the current status of the employee evaluation process and a clear indication of what the next steps will be. District Goal #3, Improving Employee Relations, states that the District shall perform fair and adequate evaluations of the job performance of the employees and develop standardized objective evaluation instruments no later than July 31, 2008. Human Capital has been in the process of revising the job evaluations for all the employee groups. The evaluations for School Administrator and Classified will be piloted in the Spring 2008. The Certificated evaluation will be piloted in the Fall 2008. The evaluation for Administrators will be revised Summer 2008. Full implementation for Classified and Administrative evaluations will be in the 2008-09 school year and the Certificated evaluation will be fully implemented in the 2009-10 school year.

•Employee Evaluation Procedures and Instruments

Mr. Thomas introduced Susan Cole, Director of Human Capital Operations, to review the Classified evaluation. The Classified evaluation committee members reviewed evaluations from other districts and agencies. The committee established ten core evaluation factors, down from the 21 core evaluation factors on the current instrument. The committee defined those factors and identified a rating scale to differentiate levels of performance. The committee also included a section for employee comments to their supervisor as to their evaluation. Building Services has been piloting the new evaluation instrument. Training for supervisors who will be using the new instrument will be Spring/Summer 2008. Full implementation of the new evaluation form is expected Spring/Summer 2008.

Classified Evaluation

Clay McAllester, Employee Relations Administrator, and Dr. Steve Nance, Principal of Pima Elementary School, School Administrator committee members, reviewed the new evaluation for School Administrators. The committee initially met in March 2007 to discuss guidelines and the purpose of the committee in support of 33 Excelling Schools. They looked at other evaluations using the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards. A rubric was introduced and shared with Principals in December 2007 to elicit feedback. In January 2008, the committee met with the Scottsdale Affiliated Administrators (SAA) Executive Board for their input. Dr. Nance reviewed what standards were used in the evaluation instrument. They incorporated 21 responsibilities that Robert Marzano, the foremost researcher in this area, had developed. The ISLLC Standards bring all of those 21 responsibilities together into the six areas that are on the School Administrator evaluation instrument. Mr. McAllester continued, stating that the evaluation will be piloted Spring 2008 with all assistant principals, new principals, and any interested veteran principals. Based on the feedback received, the instrument will be revised with full implementation beginning August 2008.

School Administrator Evaluation

Ms. Beckvar stated that she liked the new instrument.

Mrs. Petersen asked what has been the response from principals. Mr. McAllester responded that the response has been very good and the instrument has received support from principals. Veteran principals have also expressed their support.

Mr. Schaefer stated that he would recommend in regard to the Evaluation Process, as outlined in the evaluation instrument (page 6), the Criteria for acceptable Performance,

that the number of marginally accomplished scenarios allowed for the *Experienced administrator* (B and C), should be looked at very critically. He thinks that if Administrators, after one year, have even one marginally accomplished goal, they might not be the right person for their position. Mr. Schaefer commented that, in his opinion, the level of rigor needs to be increased. Mr. Thomas responded as the instrument is piloted, the committee will get a sense of what would be the norm and that might be one of the adjustments made.

Dr. Meyer asked for an example of how the instrument would be used. Mr. Thomas responded that the committee had the principals help them create a list of artifacts or exhibits to help demonstrate the ability to meet the standards. What is fundamentally different in this instrument is this instrument evaluates as a process as opposed to as an event. By the nature of the standards and the intensive dialoguing and mentoring that needs to take place between the evaluator and the evaluatee, this instrument gives a much better idea on a daily basis of what the performance looks like.

Mrs. Holzer asked about the date of the completion of the evaluation, listed as March 1, with goals to be completed by October 1. Mrs. Holzer stated that she felt another timeline was needed, that waiting until the following March to be re-evaluated was too long. Mr. Thomas responded that the committee has actually moved up the goal-setting process to much earlier in the Fall. Also, there is nothing to preclude any of the evaluators from establishing additional goals. The actual instrument has yet to be updated and will be revised. Mrs. Holzer also asked if there is a section addressing the attendance of a Principal who does not appear on his campus as often as he should. Mr. Thomas responded that there is not a specific place for attendance; attendance is not used as any single evaluative criteria. It is made very clear as a fundamental District belief that attendance is part of their performance. Absentee issues would be reflected in all of the measures; one cannot perform appropriately in any of the standards if one is not there. Mrs. Holzer asked if a section on absenteeism could be added to the instrument. Mrs. Cavanagh added that on an on-going basis, Dr. Allen, Executive Director for Middle and Secondary Schools, and Mrs. Rivera, Executive Director for Elementary Education, work closely with principals to identify strengths and challenges. A principal must request leave and be approved by either Dr. Allen or Mrs. Rivera. If there is a trend of poor attendance, there would be interaction on an on-going basis.

Mrs. Petersen added that she would hope that besides assistant principals and new principals, veteran principals would participate in piloting this instrument. Dr. Allen responded that the principals she supervises have all stated that they will participate.

Andi Furlis, Director of Recruitment and Professional Development; Suzanne Armstrong, a lead peer evaluator from Career Ladder; and Fran Prather, Teacher/Librarian at Saguaro High School, presented the Certificated (Teacher) Evaluation Instrument. Ms. Furlis reviewed the committee work that began in April 2007 to review District Goals and best practice research. The current Teacher Evaluation (Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument – TPAI) and Guide for Implementation was found to be 20 years old. The committee analyzed evaluation systems in high performing districts across the nation and also compared the current TPAI to the Arizona Professional Teacher Standards. The committee determined that the primary objective of the teacher evaluation is to assess quality of instruction and promote dialogue to encourage continuous teaching improvement and student learning. Ms. Armstrong, as a point of privilege, recognized Board President Karen Beckvar, past member, and Board Member Jennifer Petersen, standing member, for their

Teacher Evaluation
Instrument

Point of Privilege

diligence in serving on the Career Ladder Steering Committee for Career Ladder. Ms. Armstrong discussed the changes the committee would like to recommend. The strongest revisions to the current TPAI would be in structure and format, making the instrument more user friendly for both administrator and teacher. The instrument would be updated to better align with Arizona Professional Teaching Standards. Currently, the TPAI includes an optional area for teacher reflection and collaboration. The committee would like to see those areas instilled as a compulsory part of the evaluation. Rubrics would be created to define expected performance for novice teachers as well as continuing and master teachers. The committee would like to see a more efficient use of administrator time and Career Ladder resources. Another recommendation would be aligning the Teacher Evaluation philosophically with the Administrator evaluation process. Ms. Prather discussed the committee's reasons for changes to the TPAI. Current research recognizes the quality of the classroom teacher as the most significant school-based contributor to student learning. Purposeful and embedded professional goal setting, collaboration, and reflection positively impact student learning. In order to be authentic and reliable, the committee feels the instrument needs to recognize the development of the teacher and also needs to foster an environment of continuous improvement. Ms. Fourlis continued, stating that in the Spring of 2008, the committee will continue to learn more of how the Career Ladder processes already in place can support the goals of the revised TPAI. A draft version of the revised TPAI and rubrics will then be shared with administrators and teachers to receive feedback. In the Fall of 2008, the revised TPAI will be implemented by a pilot group. Any further revisions will be incorporated into the TPAI with full implementation in Fall 2009.

Discussion ensued. Ms. Beckvar, on behalf of the Board, thanked staff for their hard work. Ms. Beckvar stated that it is always hard to shift the philosophy on how one is being evaluated, but it is essential that it be done.

Mrs. Petersen stated that she especially liked the focus on reflection. She also stated that she would love to see seasoned teachers involved in the pilot group. Ms. Fourlis responded that the pilot would be implemented with veteran and new teachers, so that the mentors would be helping and learning with the new teachers.

Dr. Meyer asked if there was going to be some kind of "check-list" for the teachers. Ms. Fourlis responded that what will be looked at are five categories of teacher performance aligned to the nine Arizona Professional Teachers Standards, and then rubrics for each of those five categories about what competency sounds and looks like. Dr. Meyer asked how a teacher would be evaluated on absenteeism. Ms. Fourlis responded that professional responsibilities will be one of the five categories. Mr. Thomas added that one of the additions to the District's technology provides real-time data around teacher attendance. Dr. Meyer asked what the expectation is when teachers should be arriving on campuses and how that will be addressed. Mr. Thomas responded that the professional expectation is when children are ready to learn, teachers and all employees should be ready to learn. Dr. Meyer feels this is an issue and would like to see it addressed. He also asked how data on the teacher's performance will be used. Mr. Thomas responded that it is part of the collective approach around making sense of student achievement data to make sound decisions to help students improve their learning. If there are situations where employee performance is not at the level it should be, whether it's based on student achievement data or attendance data, tardiness data or some other data that is part of the professional indicators in the evaluation instrument, it is the responsibility of the evaluator to make sure that the employee is paying attention, documents appropriately and reflects

accurately in the summative evaluation that this is the performance of the employee. Over the last two years, Mr. Thomas feels that the District has made a significant inroad in supporting administrators around those issues. Dr. Meyer asked if student and parent input will be taken into account in the evaluation. Mr. Thomas responded that such input is “tough.” Part of professional responsibilities should be reflected in how teachers interact with student and parental communities. Ms. Furlis added that there is a 360 degree feedback process that students and parents can use to help provide formative assessment and feedback for teachers. Dr. Meyer stated that he would like to see the evaluation instrument include a component that addresses teacher communication with parents and use of technology. Ms. Furlis responded that another of Arizona Teacher Standards is communicating assessment results with families and the component will be incorporated into a rubric for the instrument.

Mrs. Holzer asked if the rubrics have been developed as yet. Ms. Furlis responded that the committee is waiting for the Administrator Evaluation rubrics to be completed as they would like to use a similar format and structure. Further, Mrs. Holzer added that she would like to see something measurable in the rubrics, including benchmarks, Average Yearly Progress (AYP) and, if possible, a student survey. Ms. Furlis responded that teachers use multiple forms of data and assessment to design student learning and cautioned against using student achievement data such as benchmarks to evaluate teachers as this can create competition instead of the collaborative environments that are proven to increase student learning.

Ms. Beckvar commented that the primary objective of the Teacher Evaluation is to assess the quality of student learning, not necessarily teaching. This possibly should be part of the District’s belief statement.

Katy Cavanagh presented Information/Discussion Item VIII. C. Comprehensive Professional Development Plan. Board Member Dieter Schaefer had asked Administration to present to the Board a comprehensive Professional Development plan. Over the last three years Andi Furlis and members of the Excelling Teaching and Learning Team have completed needs assessments with teachers, completed research of national standards and models for professional development, collaborated with a Districtwide committee of parents and professionals, and worked with members of the Governor’s P-20 Council in order to develop this Professional Development Plan. Mrs. Cavanagh, Ms. Furlis and Janey Kaufmann, Science Curriculum Coordinator, will present budget information and possible timelines needed in order to implement this plan.

•Comprehensive Professional Development Plan

Ms. Beckvar, as a point of privilege, stated that the Board Members had received and read the copy of the PowerPoint to be presented and asked Ms. Furlis and Ms. Kaufmann to just review the highlights of their presentation. Because of the lateness of the hour, the Board then decided that the information that was to be provided was extremely important and would need a good deal of time to present and to answer questions from Board Members; therefore, the item was tabled and a separate Work/Study Meeting on Professional Development was called for on February 26, 2008, at 4:00 PM – 6:00 PM in the Education Center Boardroom.

Point of Privilege

Tabled to a Work/Study on 2/26/08 at 4:00 PM

Action Item

Action Item IX. A. Approval of Expansion of Phased Retirement Program (Smartschoolsplus). This item was tabled by Administration.

Action Item

•Approval of Expansion of Phased Retirement Program (Smartschoolsplus) – Tabled

Governing Board Reports

Molly Holzer reported that on February 11, she and other members of the Administration were at the State Capital. Senator Leff and Representative Reagan introduced bills to address Excess Utilities, SB 1446 and HB 2770. She is very excited and hopeful about the proposed bills.

Dr. Meyer reported on the District’s first All-City Sports Banquet that he attended recently. It was a great success. The next Banquet is scheduled for March 24th.

Ms. Beckvar reported that also on March 24th, SUSD is hosting the East Valley Consortium at Coronado High School Media Center from 6:00 PM – 8:00 PM. This event was scheduled prior to the setting of the All-City Sports Banquet. Janice Palmer from ASBA and Keith Russell, the Maricopa County Assessor, will be presenting. The East Valley Consortium is comprised of Board Members in the East Valley.

Dates of Upcoming Board Meetings

Tuesday, March 4, 2008 – 5:30 PM – Regular Board Meeting

Tuesday, March 18, 2008 – 5:30 PM – Regular Board Meeting

At 8:05 PM, Mr. Schaefer moved to adjourn the meeting. Mrs. Petersen seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with a vote of 5 – 0.

Dated this 12th day of February 2008.

The Governing Board of the Scottsdale Unified School District #48

Karen Beckvar, President

Eric Meyer, Clerk

Molly Holzer

Jennifer Petersen

Dieter Schaefer

Governing Board Reports

Dates of Upcoming Board Meetings

Motion #70
Adjournment