

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

August 12, 2008

A Regular Meeting of the Governing Board of the Scottsdale Unified School District, #48, Maricopa County, was called to order at 5:30 PM, at the Scottsdale Unified School District Education Center Board Room, 3811 North 44<sup>th</sup> Street, Phoenix, Arizona. President Beckvar called upon Dieter Schaefer 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 35 visitors.

Before asking for approval of the Agenda, Ms. Beckvar noted that Administration had pulled Action Item VIII. C. Approval of Scottsdale Affiliated Administrators (SAA) Employment Agreement for FY2008-2009. Mrs. Holzer requested that Consent Item VII. K. Ratification of Board Agenda Items Signed by Superintendent or Designee, be pulled to be heard separately.

Amendments to Agenda

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

Motion #11  
Approval of Agenda as Amended

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

Superintendent's Comments

Dr. Baracy reported on the first day of school, stating that it was one of the best in years. The trend in enrollment numbers is that we are holding our own; a good sign. Enrollment and ADM (Average Daily Membership) appear to be up for the first day of school over last year's numbers. Dr. Baracy stated, however, that he would like to caution everyone. There will be better data available at the end of next week.

Superintendent's Comments

Dr. Baracy recognized Sherry Celaya, Director of Finance. The District was presented with a Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting, with Ms. Celaya being presented an Award of Financial Reporting Achievement.

Dr. Baracy recognized Dr. David Peterson, Assistant Superintendent for Operations. Dr. Peterson was named as the Arizona Association of School Business Officials (AASBO) Member of the Year.

Dr. Baracy recognized Dolores "Dee" Kirby. Ms. Kirby was named the AAA School Crossing Guard of the Year.

Ann Achtziger, Service Learning Coordinator, updated the Board on Service Learning Activities. Ms. Achtziger also introduced Julie Gieringer, her replacement as Service Learning Coordinator.

Public Comment

Cindy Fennessy spoke in regard to open enrollment at Arcadia High School, asking the Board to restrict open enrollment and reduce the student-teacher ratio.

Public Comment

Paul McCauley acknowledged Dr. Peterson for his role in the District’s facility issues and how he has helped parents understand the data. Mr. McCauley also spoke in regard to the “over-enrollment” at Arcadia High School and the need for a better open enrollment process that would include a registration deadline, as well as a need for the creation of a marketing program for the District.

Consent Agenda

- VII. A. Acceptance of Gifts - \$241,347.47
- VII. B. Accounts Payable Vouchers – 6/9/08-7/28/08-FY08
- VII. C. Accounts Payable Vouchers – 7/1/08-7/24/08-FY09
- VII. D. Payroll Vouchers – 6/10/08-7/22/08-FY08
- VII. E. Payroll Vouchers – 7/10/08-7/24/08-FY09
- VII. F. Personnel Actions – 6/3/08-7/28/08
- VII. G. Approval of Minutes of July 1, 2008 Public Hearing/Special Board Meeting
- VII. H. Facility Rental-Lease Rate Increase-Apache Facility Only
- VII. I. Approval of IGA Annual Renewals with EVIT and MCCCCD
- VII. J. Approval of Expansion of Incentive Program for Nutrition Services Kitchen Employees
- VII. K. Ratification of Board Agenda Items Signed by Superintendent or Designee – **Amended (Was Pulled to Be Heard Separately)**
- VII. L. Approval to Increase Prior Board Authorization for Library Print and Non-Print
- VII. M. Approve the Purchase of Library Books, Printed Material, Maps and Globes through GPPCS
- VII. N. Approval to Purchase Buses through MOHAVE
- VII. O. Approve the Designation of Sole Source for AIA Membership
- VII. P. Approve the Designation of Sole Source for the Biography Resource Center Database
- VII. Q. Approve the Designation of Sole Source to JSTOR
- VII. R. Approve the Designation of Sole Source for Choice Software and Related Materials
- VII. S. Approve the Designation of Sole Source to Grolier Publishing
- VII. T. Approve the Designation of Sole Source to World Book
- VII. U. Approval of Minutes of August 5, 2008 Special Board Meeting

Mrs. Petersen moved to approve the Consent Agenda, as amended without Item VII. K. Dr. Meyer seconded the motion.

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

Mrs. Holzer pulled Consent Agenda Item VII. K. Ratification of Board Agenda Items Signed by Superintendent or Designee, for clarification. The Agenda Item listed the approval to purchase Special Educational Services through GPPCS (Tempe) three separate times (once on page 21 and twice on page 23), for a total of \$1.6 million. Mrs. Holzer asked what was being purchased and why they were listed separately. Mike Romanoff, Interim Director of Purchasing Services, responded that the second listing \$600,000 from GPPCS on page 23 was a duplicate of the listing for \$600,000 on page 21. The listing on page 23 for \$600,000 should be eliminated. They are listed separately because they are through two different school districts through GPPCS, which is a consortium. Therefore, the correct amount the Board is approving should be for \$600,000 and \$400,000, a total of \$1 million. Lois Healey, Director of Special Education, responded that although the total services being purchased are listed as \$1 million, it does not mean that the District will be spending \$1 million. The approvals to purchase are put in place so that the District will have those services available

Consent Agenda

Motion #12  
Approval of Consent  
Agenda as Amended

should they be needed.

Mrs. Holzer moved to approve Consent Agenda Item VII. K. Ratification of Procurement Items Approved by the Superintendent or Designees with Prior Board Authorization, as amended by the deletion of the entry on page 23, *Approve the Purchase of Special Education Services through GPPCS for an amount not to exceed \$600,000 for the fiscal year 2008-2009.* Dr. Meyer seconded the motion.

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

Action Items

Jeff Thomas, Executive Director of Human Capital, presented Action Item VII. A. Approval of Scottsdale Education Association (SEA) Employment Agreement for FY 2008-2009.

Mr. Schaefer moved to approve the Scottsdale Education Association (SEA) Employment Agreement for FY2008-09. Mrs. Petersen seconded the motion.

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

Jeff Thomas, Executive Director of Human Capital, presented Action Item VII. B. Approval of Scottsdale Support Personnel Association (SSPA) Employment Agreement for FY 2008-2009.

Mr. Schaefer moved to approve the Scottsdale Support Personnel Association (SSPA) Employment Agreement for FY2008-09. Dr. Meyer seconded the motion.

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

Action Item VIII. C. Approval of Scottsdale Affiliated Administrators (SAA) Employment Agreement for FY2008-2009 was pulled from the Agenda.

Jeff Thomas, Executive Director of Human Capital, presented Action Item VIII. D. Approval of Board-Set Salaries for FY2008-2009.

Mr. Schaefer moved to approve Board-Set Salaries for FY2008-2009 as presented:

- Recommendation: 2% = \$69,525
- Approval of 6 Doctoral Stipends: \$21,204

Dr. Meyer seconded the motion.

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

Before discussion began on Action Item VIII. E. Award of RFP #9066 Superintendent Search Consultant, Ms. Beckvar recused herself and left the room. Ms. Beckvar is an employee of Arizona School Boards Association (ASBA), one of the respondents to the RFP and the organization that was recommended for the award. Dr. Meyer, Board Clerk, chaired the meeting for this item.

Mike Romanoff presented a PowerPoint outlining the process and criteria followed in selecting ASBA as the Superintendent Search Consultant.

Motion #13

Approval of Ratification of Procurement Items as Amended

Action Items

•SEA Employment Agreement

Motion #14

Approval of SEA Employment Agreement for FY2008-09

•SSPA Employment Agreement

Motion #15

Approval of SSPA Employment Agreement for FY2008-09

•SAA Employment Agreement was Pulled from the Agenda

•Board-Set Salaries

Motion #16

Approval of Board-Set Salaries for FY2008-09

•Award #9066, Supt. Search Consultant

Ms. Beckvar Recuses Herself

Discussion followed. Mrs. Petersen remarked that her concern was that there were only four vendors with acceptable offers and asked what would happen if the District sent the RFP out for rebid. Mr. Romanoff responded that if the Board voted to cancel this award and gave permission to go out for a new RFP; his department would fine-tune the requirements of the RFP and add more vendors to the vendor list. It was clarified that Katy Cavanagh and David Peterson were named to the original selection committee prior to the Board's decision to name them as Co-Interim Superintendents. Additionally, Mrs. Petersen would like to broaden and restructure a new selection committee to include the employee group presidents and a Parent Council representative.

Mr. Schaefer stated that he would like to ensure that the timeline for the selection of a new Superintendent does not constrain the District. If the Board does give permission to rebid the RFP, he would like the timeline adjusted, even if that meant not selecting a Superintendent until October 2009. Additionally, Mr. Schaefer stated that he had some reservations regarding ASBA. In some ways, the selection has raised a question in his mind of a potential conflict of interest.

Mrs. Holzer stated that she has a lot of reservations with the selection of ASBA and will not support this award. She does not like the fact that the Board President, Ms. Beckvar, is unable to participate in this discussion; she would like every Board Member to participate in every discussion the Board has regarding the Superintendent search. She also feels that even the perception of a conflict of interest is undesirable. In regard to the evaluation committee, she, too, would like to see the presidents of the employment groups on the selection committee, as well as a staff person and a community member. Mrs. Holzer stated that her position has nothing to do with ASBA's track record, but with the aforementioned reasons she has stated. She would completely support issuing a new RFP and hopes that there would be more responses.

Dr. Meyer asked how often ASBA had been chosen by other state school districts to conduct a Superintendent search. Dr. Peterson responded that ASBA has done about 80% of searches and placements conducted in Arizona. Dr. Meyer stated that if ASBA conducted 80% of the searches in the state, he could not understand where there was a conflict of interest with the selection of ASBA. Mr. Schaefer stated that he sees a potential conflict; citing the private sector, an association that represents the Board of Directors of an organization would not select a CEO for that organization. The selection of a Superintendent is far too important to have any ambiguity associated with that selection. Further, he agreed with Mrs. Holzer that to have one member of the Governing Board unable to participate in these discussions was another aspect that he was not comfortable with.

Dr. Peterson responded that if the Board did ask for the RFP to be rebid, the charge to Purchasing would be to call firms and ask them to participate so that there would be more than four offerors. Mr. Romanoff stated that a new solicitation could be prepared by early the next week; the solicitation must be on the street for 14 days; during that process, a committee will be formed, and depending on how long it takes the committee to evaluate the offers, it could be September when a new award would be brought to the Board for approval. The Board agreed that they would like the evaluation committee to be comprised of representatives of the following categories:

- Three employee groups
- Parent Council
- Blue Ribbon Committee

Evaluation Committee  
Members

- Staff Person

Mrs. Petersen moved that the Governing Board cancel Award of RFP #9066 for Superintendent Search Consultant in its entirety. Mrs. Holzer seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with a vote of 4 – 0 with 1 recusal (Ms. Beckvar).

Mrs. Petersen moved that the Governing Board direct Purchasing Services to reissue an RFP for the Superintendent Search Consultant with the parameters originally stated and expand the selection committee to include:

- Three employee groups
- Parent Council
- Blue Ribbon Committee
- Staff Person

Mrs. Holzer seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with a vote of 4 – 0 with 1 recusal (Ms. Beckvar).

Ms. Beckvar rejoined the meeting.

David Peterson presented a PowerPoint for Action Item VIII. F. Facility Utilization Update – School/Student Capacity Review and Approval. The PowerPoint reviewed the development parameters and program constraints used to determine capacity at each school site. The Board received a notebook containing calculations, maps and floor plans for every campus. The Board also received a folder with Facility Utilization graphs, and prior to this meeting, Dr. Peterson presented a three-page final recommendation for elementary, middle and high school facility capacities.

Discussion ensued. Mrs. Petersen asked if other districts in the state and neighboring districts use 83% as a utilization figure. Dr. Peterson responded that most districts in the state and across the country use 85% as a utilization figure. This is based on overall facilities and what is entailed for each facility. SUSD uses 83% solely to ensure that there would not be traveling teachers and that each teacher was allowed a free period each day to conform to the SEA contract. That would equate to each teacher teaching five periods per day, or 5/6s, which equals 83%. Mrs. Petersen noted that the enrollment numbers for Arcadia and Chaparral High Schools seemed high, but that could be from construction. Dr. Peterson responded that Arcadia grew a total of 90,000 square feet. Significant square footage has also been added to Chaparral. Administration does not want these schools to be over-crowded; they were built to be big schools. Further, the classes are staffed at 30:1; but a number must be used to configure utilization that is consistent. The number used, from the Teacher Employment Agreement, is 33:1. Mrs. Petersen stated that she has heard lots of rumbling that there would be 3,000 students at Desert Mountain High School (DMHS). Dr. Peterson responded that his recommendation is for 2,518 students as the open enrollment cap. The only additional students that would be enrolled would be those moving into the actual DMHS boundaries.

Dr. Meyer asked for clarification on the open enrollment capacity numbers and if those numbers could be exceeded. Dr. Peterson responded that the open enrollment capacity could be exceeded and capacity would then be the facility capacity numbers as stated in his report. Dr. Meyer commented that Arizona has some of the largest class sizes in

Motion #17

Cancellation of Award of RFP #9066 – Supt. Search Consultant

Motion #18

Reissue RFP for Supt. Search Consultant and Expand Selection Committee as Directed

Ms. Beckvar Rejoins Meeting

•Facility Utilization Update

the country. Last year at the high school level, SUSD increased its student/teacher ratio to 30:1 from 29:1. However, there is a “Catch 22” where, if SUSD would increase the number of students on a campus and cover more of its fixed costs, the District could actually reduce class sizes because there would be a bigger pool of dollars. The fact that SUSD gets more students enrolled in the District in turn does allow keeping class sizes smaller and also protects programs. Dr. Meyer asked for clarification on how the open enrollment capacity number was calculated. Dr. Peterson responded that, at the high school level, the facility capacity number was multiplied by 90%, actually a 10% reduction from the facility capacity number to the open enrollment capacity. This calculation was arrived at after discussions with principals who explained that historically people have moved back into the neighborhood after school had started, so the 90% would allow for flexibility in those cases. The calculation used for middle schools was 5% off the School Facility Board’s (SFB) capacity number. The SFB number was used in the elementary schools for the open enrollment capacity, with appropriate adjustments at some of the elementary schools. Dr. Peterson stated that capacity numbers are truly just a “snapshot,” and that if the state gave school districts different funding, ratios could be lower.

Mrs. Holzer stated that she feels that part of the issue is semantics. Moving forward, to avoid confusion and to best utilize the District’s facilities and to keep things more simple, she would support having the facility capacity and the enrollment cap to be the same number and listed under a column entitled “enrollment cap.” She feels some of the facility capacity numbers are very high. Therefore, to avoid confusion with new Board Members and new Administration, she would like to just approve the enrollment cap/facility cap at the lower number. Those numbers are doable and realistic. She also feels the community would be more supportive of the lower numbers. She would be more comfortable just removing the facility capacity numbers from the report in its entirety and just renaming the open enrollment cap column “facility capacity/enrollment cap.” Mrs. Holzer, as an aside to Board Members, stated that on the District’s Open Enrollment Policy, that moving forward so the community and principals can better anticipate what the fall would look like, she would like to review the Open Enrollment Policy again and place firmer guidelines in it for better planning. Dr. Peterson responded that, again, the numbers are what are being recommended and that it is the Board’s decision. Administration will then staff accordingly. He did caution that, when a capacity number is set and met at a particular school, that would close the school, and if a student should move into that school’s boundaries, that student would not be able to attend the school in his neighborhood.

Mr. Schaefer asked if Dr. Peterson, when calculating the facility capacities numbers, had considered either the small amount or large amount of variation in student mix over the years, and could that cause a problem for some of the schools who are at or close to capacity and who have such classes as gifted or special education. Ms. Beckvar added that Mr. Schaefer was referring to the type of programs at individual schools. Dr. Peterson responded that Administration has done that and has looked at many of those variations. They have developed the facility utilization numbers based on discussions with principals and special education staff and in looking at the trends.

Ms. Beckvar stated that she does see a value to having an open enrollment cap that is different from what can actually fit into a school, because there should be a level where open enrollment is stopped before a school reaches its capacity. There is policy that allows the District to set a capacity for open enrollment; she feels that the Board should review that policy annually in October or November to see if it needs to be changed. Dr. Meyer stated that he agreed with Ms. Beckvar’s comments. However, he asked if

open enrollment at the elementary level at certain grades would be closed if capacity was met. Dr. Peterson responded that there would still be grade level closures where necessary.

Mrs. Holzer stated she felt that one number should be used and that she is very uncomfortable with the facility capacity numbers because they are so high. The enrollment capacity numbers are much more realistic. Having two numbers is going to be confusing moving forward.

Mrs. Holzer moved that the Governing Board accept the enrollment capacity numbers as the enrollment capacity/facility capacity numbers.

The Board discussed the formula used to determine capacity numbers for open enrollment and facilities. Mrs. Petersen stated that she understood Mrs. Holzer's motion, but felt that a problem would arise should a family move into a neighborhood and the school was at its open enrollment capacity/facility capacity limit. Mrs. Holzer responded that some schools were already starting with a higher capacity number than what had been calculated. Ms. Beckvar added that she realized that the difference is Dr. Peterson is using a slightly different multiplier for staffing; some classes were staffed at 25:1 and now the formula is 28:1. Dr. Meyer also thought that the numbers should be reviewed each year based on the District's staffing ratios and on how campuses are used. He further stated that the District should have a formula for each level that calculates the open enrollment capacity, and that would be the number that will be used that year for determining if the District will take open enrollment students. Students that move into the neighborhood would still be able to go to their neighborhood school. He would agree with using that one number.

Ms. Beckvar asked for a second on Mrs. Holzer's motion or if a Board Member had another motion.

There was no second.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Schaefer moved that the Board approve the open enrollment capacity numbers as modified annually. Dr. Meyer added "with the understanding that neighborhood children will be able to move into those schools if the school exceeds the cap and that the Board annually evaluates those numbers based on the District's facility capacities and staffing ratios and other yet-to-be-determined factors."

There was no second.

Motion died for lack of a second.

Discussion continued. Mrs. Holzer stated that was the same as her motion; it was a matter of semantics. Mr. Schaefer stated that the term used should be maximum facility capacity numbers. Ms. Beckvar added that the only thing that would change would be if the District moved programs in and out from one campus to another; adjustments would then have to be made. Ms. Beckvar stated that the question is if the Board is willing to accept these facility capacity numbers based on a staffing ratio of 33:1. There are two sets of numbers and, at least for the middle schools, the open enrollment capacity numbers are based on the facility capacity numbers.

Motion #19

Accept Enrollment Cap  
Numbers as Enrollment/  
Facility Cap Numbers

No Second

Motion Died for Lack of  
a Second

Motion #20

Approve Open  
Enrollment Cap  
Numbers

No Second

Motion Died for Lack of  
a Second

Mrs. Holzer repeated her motion that the Governing Board use the enrollment cap/facility cap as the District’s basis for holding open enrollment and remove the facility capacity numbers.

Ms. Beckvar asked if what Mrs. Holzer was saying was that the District’s published enrollment capacities would be the numbers used as facility capacities. Mrs. Holzer responded that the enrollment cap/facility capacity numbers should be the same number which would be the SFB cap numbers (the lower numbers). In cases of emergencies, the formula could be recalculated. She would like to approve only one set of numbers, call them the facility cap/enrollment cap numbers (which would be the lower numbers) and move forward with the Facility Plan.

There was no second to Mrs. Holzer’s motion.

Motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. Beckvar moved that the Board approve the open enrollment cap numbers that have been presented to the Board as open enrollment caps for all District schools.

Dr. Meyer seconded the motion.

Mrs. Petersen asked if what is being approved is “open enrollment” caps or “enrollment” caps. Ms. Beckvar responded that is going to be the target enrollment for the campuses because the open enrollment cap is based on looking at how the District is staffing and/or 10% under the 33:1 ratio. To her, an open enrollment cap is a simple number that says when the school reaches that number; it is not accepting open enrollment. Dr. Baracy responded in an effort to clarify. He asked Dr. Peterson if the open enrollment cap column means that when that school hits that number in that column, that school will no longer accept open enrollment children. Dr. Peterson responded that was correct. He then asked Dr. Peterson if the facility cap means that the school will stop accepting children from outside of its attendance area when the open enrollment cap number is reached. Then, the capacity would be any additional children that come in from within the neighborhood; that would be the facility cap number column. Dr. Peterson responded that is correct. This would be based on the current maximum staffing of the SEA Agreement and program constraints. Where these numbers would be fluid and/or change would be if at sometime the Governing Board changed the Agreement with the SEA. Mrs. Holzer asked if when they are doing the Facility Plan, will Administration use the facility capacity or the enrollment cap, two separate numbers. Ms. Beckvar added that the real crux of the question is which number should be used when talking about whether or not the Board should consolidate campuses. Dr. Peterson responded that Administration would be looking at several variables. They would be looking at the facility capacity because that is important. But also, they would be looking ahead because there is planning entailed in making a Facility Plan. It is hoped one of the factors would be calling for a Bond, which would then change some of the numbers because classrooms would be changed and look differently.

For clarification, Mrs. Holzer asked if the Facility Plan is being developed for the future; will there be an option for instead of building, for example, four very tiny schools, to perhaps build three somewhat larger schools. Dr. Peterson responded that Administration has been given directions from the Board, and Administration is taking all of those directions into account and will present various options for the Board’s consideration.

Motion #21  
Use Enrollment  
Cap/Facility Cap as  
Basis for Open  
Enrollment and Remove  
Facility Cap Numbers

No Second

Motion Died for Lack of  
a Second

Motion #22  
Approve Open  
Enrollment Cap  
Numbers as Presented

Second to Motion

Mrs. Petersen moved to amend Mrs. Beckvar’s motion to include an annual review of the open enrollment cap numbers and make adjustments based on programs or staffing changes. Dr. Meyer seconded the amendment to the motion.

Motion #23  
Amendment to Motion #22 Include Annual Review

Mrs. Holzer stated that she could not support this motion. She feels that Administration has a lot of other things it could be doing rather than reviewing this every year. Ms. Beckvar responded that this process would not be done every year, the only changes would be based on program changes or staffing changes.

The motion to amend was approved with a vote of 4 – 1 (Mrs. Holzer voted NAY).

The original motion, as amended (that the Board approve the open enrollment cap numbers that have been presented to the Board as open enrollment caps for all District schools to include an annual review of the open enrolment cap numbers and make adjustments based on programs or staffing changes) was approved with a vote of 4 – 1 (Mrs. Holzer voted NAY).

Approval of Motion #22 as Amended

Mrs. Petersen moved that the Governing Board use the open enrollment cap numbers as the facility cap numbers for the Facility Planning discussions going forward. Mrs. Holzer seconded the motion.

Motion #24  
Use Open Enrollment Cap Numbers for Facility Planning

Dr. Meyer asked for clarification. If the Board votes on that motion and approves it, does Dr. Peterson see any constraints placed on decisions discussed over the summer in the Board’s absence made over the summer. Dr. Baracy responded by asking Dr. Peterson if once a school hits the open enrollment cap this year, can that school take in any additional students from within that school’s home attendance area. Dr. Peterson responded “yes.” Dr. Baracy then asked what will be the cap that will be used to reach a new capacity; will Administration then use the facility capacity based on the current SEA staffing. Dr. Baracy noted that this motion is the same as the one the Board could not get a second on previously. Dr. Meyer stated that if the Board votes on this motion and has not yet heard the Facilities Plan, they may be undoing work that has been done over the summer without knowing it, because the Board has not heard the presentation as yet. Dr. Peterson added that the work that has been done on the Facility Utilization Plan was done using the facility cap numbers.

The motion failed with a vote of 1 – 4 (Mrs. Holzer voted YEA).

Motion Fails

Dr. Meyer recapped. All that has been done at this meeting has been to approve the open enrollment caps so that, as we move forward during the year, those are the numbers that will be used on each campus to determine how many kids are going to be there. That means, for example, at Hopi, if a child comes into the neighborhood, that child would be able to go there. Or, for an example, at Arcadia, the Administration will take no further open enrollment students at 1,688 students. After the Board hears the Facilities Plan, the Board may ultimately approve what Mrs. Holzer has suggested. Ms. Beckvar added that, by putting an open enrollment cap, it provides a target enrollment for each campus in terms of a maximum capacity. Ms. Beckvar also stated that as a planning number, she is okay with using the facility cap numbers as planning numbers, but that is not how she actually wants to have staff and students at the schools. Mr. Schaefer stated that a basis is needed to come up with any type of enrollment caps. Whether or not the Board will use those numbers will be decided after hearing the Facility Plan next month. Dr. Baracy added that the likelihood of getting to those maximum cap numbers is virtually nil. In the end, the maximum capacity numbers will probably be closer to the open enrollment cap numbers. What

Recap

the reality is, based on the numbers, is going to be very close. Ms. Beckvar concluded by stating that the target numbers for cutting off open enrollment have been established and there is a target maximum enrollment for the schools.

Governing Board Reports

In the interest of time, Mr. Schaefer stated he would save his report for the next meeting.

Dates of Upcoming Meetings

Friday, August 15, 2008 – 8:30 AM – Governing Board Retreat  
Tuesday, August 26, 2008 – 5:30 PM – Regular Board Meeting

At 8:11 PM, Mr. Schaefer moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Beckvar seconded the motion.

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

Dated this 12<sup>th</sup> day of August 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 Meetings

Motion #25  
Adjournment