

DRAFT Minutes

AMPHITHEATER PUBLIC SCHOOLS Tucson, Arizona

MINUTES OF REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

Place, Date and Time of Meeting

Wetmore Center, 701 West Wetmore Road, July 1, 2014, 6:00 PM

Board Members Present

Susan Zibrat, President
Deanna M. Day, Vice President
Dr. Kent Paul Barrabee, Member
Julie Cozad, Member
Jo Grant, Member

Central Administrators Present

Patrick Nelson, Superintendent
Todd A. Jaeger, J.D., Associate to Superintendent and General Counsel
Scott Little, Chief Financial Officer

Central Administrators Absent

Monica Nelson, Associate Superintendent

OPENING OF MEETING

Call to Order and Signing of Visitors' Register. Ms. Zibrat called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM and asked members of the audience to sign the visitors' register.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Nelson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Announcement of Date and Place of Next Special and Regular Governing Board Meetings

Ms. Zibrat announced the next Special meeting of the Governing Board: Tuesday, July 22, 2013, 4:00 PM and the next Regular meeting of the Governing Board: August 12, 2014, 6:00 PM Wetmore Center, 701 W. Wetmore Road.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no comments from the public.

1. INFORMATION² AND RECOGNITION(S)

A. Status of Bond Projects

Mr. Louth, Bonds Project Manager, was introduced to present this month's (PowerPoint) status update on the current Bond-funded Projects (as provided with Board book materials). Mr. Louth noted that the reporting format is listed within the five categories, as identified by the Blue Ribbon Committee, as areas of need. *[A Bond-election initiative to fund capital improvement projects was voter-passed on November 6, 2007; this is the monthly update, which began at the 12/11/07 Governing Board meeting].*

I. Instructional Space / Portable Replacement

A. Cross Middle School Addition / Remodel: Construction is 75% complete. Classroom renovations, PE building addition, and IT re-cabling are complete. Site work, which includes a new bus loop and site storm water evacuation, is 50% complete. Administration Building Health Office and Restroom renovations are 70% complete. Covered walkway roofing repairs are 75% complete. New roofing is installed and HVAC units are being re-installed. Sound attenuation in the MPR is in process. New security fence is being installed. The Cross project is on schedule and on budget.

B. Harelson Elementary School Addition /Remodel: Construction is 70% complete. The New Classroom Building is done. The New Music Room (attached to the Fun House) is dried-in, drywall is finished and interior finishes are in-process. Storm Water Evacuation Improvements are 50% complete. Renovation of the “G” Building is 75% complete. New IT pathways and fiber are installed. IDF rooms are being completed for new-system activation by the Amphi IT Department. New Security Fence is being installed. The Harelson Project is on-schedule and on-budget.

C. Wetmore Professional Development Building: Construction Documents that will be used for pricing, permitting, and construction are complete. BWS Architecture will present a virtual tour of the project at the conclusion of this update.

D. Donaldson Elementary School Addition / Remodel: Schematic Design is complete and Design Documents are being developed.

E. Mesa Verde Elementary School Addition / Remodel: Schematic Design is complete and Design Documents are being developed.

II. Health, Safety, and Safety

- A. Wilson K-8 Health Office: Renovation and Security Fencing Installation: Renovation work is in-process.
- B. San Joaquin Site Improvements: This project is complete. Portables have been removed and the site has been cleared.

Dr. Barrabee praised Mr. Louth and the project’s team for the success in (anticipated) the completion of the Storm Water Evacuation Improvements’ project at Harelson Elementary School before the onset of the rainy season.

Mr. Nelson expressed appreciation to the District’s voters and taxpayers for their continued support of the Bond Projects’ initiative; through their efforts the District continues to provide capital improvements for students and staff across the District.

Mr. Louth introduced Robin Shambach and Frank Slingerland from BWS Architecture. Mr. Slingerland was present to provide a video/virtual tour and renderings being planned for the Wetmore Campus. The project’s scope includes: the addition of a new professional development building with additional parking to support that facility. He stated that areas for renovations will include the following departments: the Benefits and Human Resources area, which will include modifications to the main, daytime campus entrance; and, the Information Technology, Student Services, School Operations, and Federal Programs. Enhancements to restrooms are planned. The new professional development facility is being designed to accommodate multiple uses and will be able to accommodate a capacity of up to 200 people; the facility will have new restrooms, office space, as well as, to serve as the new Governing Board room. The professional development building will provide rooms that can accommodate multiple groups or a larger group – to as many as 200 people. The greyed-out areas on the map displayed defined the parts of campus that will remain the same. Additionally, emphasis is on energy efficiency so that operationally, systems will exceed existing energy codes. Plans are to have adaptable security fencing features to accommodate the multi-uses of this campus. He described the landscape design scope to include landscape, hard-scape, and shade elements. Interior and exterior views with walkways were shown. He described

it as a fairly modest project. The construction documents are complete. He believes that ultimately, public access to the campus and its functionality will be improved.

Dr. Barrabee inquired about solar energy. Mr. Slingerland stated that the facility is appropriately oriented and could accommodate future solar enhancements; however, the current budget could not support these initial costs.

Mr. Nelson added that at this time the existing budget does not support this component; however, plans are to embark on this focus as a priority once the new Operational Support Executive Manager is on-board; he has a strong background in this area.

Mr. Louth replied to an inquiry made by Dr. Barrabee about foot traffic by parents and other visitors to Wetmore. Mr. Nelson added that the eastern side of the campus will be redone; visitors will be greeted with improved signage and multiple entryways to better direct visitors.

B. Recognition of 2014 State Division II Canyon del Oro Track Champion and Runners-Up

The following Canyon del Oro High School students and coaches will be recognized for their track successes; Students: Cameron Crandall, Division II, State Champion, High Jump; Bridgette Doucet, Division II, State Runner-Up, 1600 meters, and 3200 meters; and, Meredith Alarcio-Caldon, Division II, State Runner-Up, Discus; and, Coaches: Rick Glider and Michelle Gerard.

The Governing Board congratulated the students and coaches on their achievements, and presented each with a Certificate of Commendation.

C. Recognition of 2014 State Division II Girls Softball Runners-Up

The following Canyon del Oro High School students and coaches were recognized for being the 2014 State Division II Girls Softball Runners-Up; Students: Arianna Acedo, Jordyn Binnion, Carli Campbell, Carli Campbell, Monique Castillo, Arianne Felix, Sierra Gaskill, Arianne Felix, Dominique Gonzalez Brenna Griesser, Shelby Hotchkiss, Heather Knight, Randi Longville, Sammy Nettling, Kaci Russell, Ilena Santos, Makenzie Sullivan, Makenzie Sullivan, Rebecca Ziegler; and, Coaches: Kevin Glynn, Stephanie Nicholson, and Student Coach: Nikki Gonzalez

The Governing Board congratulated the students and coaches on their achievements, and presented each with a Certificate of Commendation.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Zibrat asked if there were Board member requests to have items addressed separately; there were none. Responding to a travel-related inquiry from Mrs. Cozad, Mr. Nelson stated that in general, staff return with the tools and knowledge to teach or coach at their sites.

A motion was made by Ms. Day to approve Consent Agenda items A-J. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Cozad, and it passed unanimously, 5-0. Appointment of personnel is effective, provided all district, state, and federal requirements are met.

A. Approval of Minutes

The Minutes of the June 24, 2014, Regular Governing Board meeting and Executive Session were approved, as submitted.

B. Approval of Appointment of Personnel (6.26.14)

Certified and classified personnel were appointments were approved, as listed in Exhibit 1.

C. Addendum to Approval of Personnel Changes (7.1.14)

Certified and classified personnel changes were appointed, as listed in Exhibit 2.

D. Approval of Leave(s) of Absence

Certified and classified personnel Leave of Absence requests were approved, as listed in Exhibit 3.

E. Approval of Separation(s) and Termination(s)

Certified and classified personnel separations were approved, as listed in Exhibit 4.

F. Approval of Vouchers Totaling and Not Exceeding Approximately \$1,402,481.72 (Final Total)

A copy of vouchers for goods and services received by the Amphitheater Schools and recommended for payment has been provided to the Governing Board.

The following vouchers were approved as presented and payments authorized:

<u>2013-2014 Encumbered</u>	<u>2014-2015 Fiscal Year</u>
Vo. 847 \$ 56,003.96	Vo. 900 \$ 11,537.96
Vo. 848 \$ 100,888.79	
Vo. 849 \$ 980,388.97	
Vo. 850 \$ 253,662.05	

G. Acceptance of Gifts

Donations were accepted by the Governing Board, as listed in Exhibit 5.

H. Approval of Out of State Travel

Out of state travel was approved for staff (source of funding indicated): from District Offices to attend the 2014 National Council of Local Administrators (NCLA) of CTE Best Practices and Innovations Conference in Cape Cod, Massachusetts, September 16-20, 2014 (federal funds designated for staff development); from La Cima Middle School and Coronado K-8 School to attend the Project Lead the Way Design and Modeling Training in Stillwater, Oklahoma, July 21-25, 2014 (federal funds designated for staff development); from Coronado K-8 School to attend the Staff Development for Educators National Conference in Las Vegas, Nevada, July 9-10, 2014 (federal funds designated for staff development).

I. Approval of Oro Valley Police Department, Tucson Police Department and Pima County Sheriff's Department Special Duty Program Agreements for Special Duty Law Enforcement Services.

Board Book information: *On June 3, 2014, the Board approved sole source procurement for police services rendered within the City of Tucson, the Town of Oro Valley and the Pima County Sheriff's Department as appropriate within the separate jurisdictions.*

Therefore, specific approval is now sought for these entities' Agreements for the 2014-2015 fiscal year, attached for the Board's review.

The Governing Board approved the Agreements for the Tucson Police Department, Oro Valley Police Department; and, the Pima County Sheriff's Department. (Exhibits: 6a, pp. 1-4; 6b, pp. 1-2; and, 6c, pp. 1-2).

K. Verification of Desegregation Funding Matters and Submission of Desegregation Funding Report, Pursuant to A.R.S. §15-910(J)(3)

Board Book information: *A.R.S. § 15-910 permits Arizona school districts to:*

"... budget for expenses of complying with or continuing to implement activities which were required or permitted by a court order of desegregation or administrative agreement with the United States department of education office for civil rights directed toward remediating alleged

or proven racial discrimination which are specifically exempt in whole or in part from the revenue control limit and the capital outlay revenue limit....”

During the 2004-2005 legislative session, the above-quoted statute was amended to mandate annual school district reporting and verification of data and other information concerning desegregation expenditures made by any school district pursuant to the law. This requirement of verification has continued since and, each year, the District submits the requisite verification to the Department of Education.

This agenda item will provide some history of the bases for the District’s desegregation funding and also detail the verifications now required under the desegregation statute quoted above. The Board’s approval of the attached verifications and reporting, to be submitted under the Board President’s signature, is also required.

Desegregation Funding, Generally

The purpose of the desegregation funding mechanism is to enable school districts to comply with court orders and U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights (OCR) administrative agreements. Compliance with court orders and compliance agreements typically represent new and sometimes substantial expenses for school districts, because by their very nature, they mandate doing things differently from, and in addition to, those things already being done and funded under existing district budgets.

Without the funding made possible by A.R.S. §15-910, districts would have to fund the supplemental programs and activities required by applicable court orders and OCR agreements, by diverting funds from their regular capital and maintenance and operations budgets. With other programs services already dependent upon already limited (and in recent years, reduced education budget funds), funding of desegregation activities through the diversion of other funds would jeopardize the ability of districts to just maintain the status quo in terms of educating students. The resulting and proverbial “borrowing from Peter to pay Paul” would result in a dilution of existing services or the quality thereof, perhaps even exposing districts to further claims of inadequate service like those that led to desegregation complaints in the first place.

While there has historically been some degree of legislative criticism of the desegregation funding mechanism as extraneous or unnecessary, the legislature has notably taken a different posture with regard to state programs which are subject to new mandates. For example, during the 2002-2003 legislative year, the legislature passed HCR 2022. HCR 2022 placed a referendum on the 2004 General Election Ballot which would have required any new initiative or referendum proposing a mandatory expenditure of state revenues or allocating state funding for any specific purpose also provide for the increased revenues necessary to cover the new costs.

In the case of HCR 2022, the legislature determined that new programs which go beyond the level, type and form of existing state programs should have their own funding source, so as not to burden the state and its current and continuing programs. In the very same way, the cost of new programs or services mandated or permitted by OCR agreements or desegregation court orders should have their own source of additional revenue, rather than burdening the existing and continuing programs and services of a school district. Presumably, the legislature agreed when it originally placed A.R.S. § 15-910 into law.

The Bases for Amphi’s Desegregation Funding

Amphi’s desegregation activities, and consequently its expenses under the statute, arise from two administrative agreements between Amphi and OCR. These agreements are known as “Corrective Action Agreements”.

Amphi’s Lau Corrective Action Agreement

The first of the OCR agreements requiring or permitting desegregation activities as contemplated by §15-910 followed an extensive OCR investigation of Amphi educational programs and services in Compliance Review No. 08925002 (“the Lau Review”). This review initiated in November 1991 and concerned issues not too dissimilar from the allegations raised by the plaintiffs in the Flores litigation against the State of Arizona. In short, the

inquiry of this OCR review was whether Amphi provided students who are Limited English Proficient (“LEP”) with sufficient educational services to allow them educational opportunities which were equal to non-minority students.

The Lau Review lasted for more than two years and resulted in findings in January 1994 from OCR that Amphi had denied LEP students an equal opportunity to meaningfully participate in District programs, in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act. OCR therefore required corrective action by Amphi. Failure of Amphi to take corrective action would have potentially subjected Amphi to loss of federal funds and civil penalties for civil rights violations. Consequently, the District entered into a Corrective Action Agreement in January 1994 (“the Lau Agreement”).

In summary, the Lau agreement required the District to ensure that LEP students and students whose primary home language was other than English (“PHLOTE” students) have equal access to educational programs and services. There were three main components in the Lau Agreement. The first component was the development of a comprehensive plan for providing specific programs and services to all LEP students. The agreement required that the comprehensive plan include specific procedures for consistent, reliable and timely identification and assessment of students whose language is other than English. The plan was also required to include:

- *Timely provision of ESL services for Limited English Proficient students at the appropriate level, i.e., beginner, intermediate or advanced;*
- *A method for collecting and recording follow-up data on students who have left the ESL program*
- *A provision for students who re-enter the program, if necessary;*
- *Program evaluation to determine its effectiveness;*
- *Elimination of barriers which might exclude LEP students from receiving gifted education services; and*
- *Expansion of gifted education identification and assessment process to ensure access of LEP students.*

The second component of the Lau Agreement was a requirement that Amphi develop a plan to ensure appropriate placement of special-needs LEP students, whether enrolled at the time of the Lau Agreement or thereafter. The third component was mandated development of plans to improve services to LEP students. Also required by the Lau Agreement was translation of parental notices into home languages.

As required by the Lau Agreement, the comprehensive plan described above was developed and implemented in the years that followed. Implementation continues today and takes many forms required or permitted by the Lau Agreement. Implementation strategies include:

- *Sufficient levels of specially trained teachers to provide specialized instruction to LEP students, in Sheltered English Immersion classrooms in accordance with Proposition 203, to ensure timely provision of services to LEP students.*
- *Bilingual instructional assistants to assist teachers in Sheltered English Immersion/ESL classrooms.*
- *Additional special education teachers, placed at schools with high numbers of ESL students to ensure prompt access to special education services by ESL students and families.*
- *At schools with significant LEP populations, regular classroom teachers and administrators also play key roles in the provision of educational services, monitoring of student success, and assurance of LEP student access to other District services including special and gifted education.*
- *An ESL department, staffed by a director and support staff, operates to coordinate ESL programs and services, collect and record data regarding student participants and their families, monitor student success, and improve program performance.*
- *Bilingual clerks are hired to assist in data collection necessary to evaluate program effectiveness and student success. Bilingual clerks also enable the District to comply with the requirement to translate parental notices and other important district materials.*
- *Some district central office administrators monitor continuing compliance with the Lau Agreement and remain responsible for supervision of those efforts.*

- *An Equal Opportunity Office has been established to ensure that parents and other members of the public can raise complaints and concerns about educational opportunities for LEP students within Amphi, including gifted and special education.*
- *Recurring staff development, through both “in-house” and external means takes place to maintain and improve program effectiveness.*
- *Provision of necessary supplies and other support materials for the mandated or permitted services.*

Amphi’s Student Discipline Corrective Action Agreement

The second of the two OCR agreements requiring or permitting Amphi’s desegregation activities as funded by §15-910 followed an OCR investigation of Complaint No. 08925002 which concerned, among other things not relevant here, a parent’s complaint that the District engaged in disparate treatment of minority students through its disciplinary policies and actions (“the Discipline Investigation”). The Discipline Investigation began in September 1992. After several months of investigation, OCR concluded that it was unable to make any substantive determination on the merits of the parent complaint because Amphi’s student discipline record keeping at the time was so substandard that OCR was simply unable to investigate.

OCR required corrective action in Amphi record keeping practices that would ensure OCR’s ability to investigate and determine district compliance with pertinent civil rights laws in the future. Failure of the District to take corrective action might have subjected Amphi to loss of federal funds and/or civil penalties for civil rights violations. Consequently, the District entered into a Corrective Action Agreement on or about April 5, 1993 (“the Discipline Agreement”). The Discipline Agreement required Amphi to substantially improve its student record keeping practices with the obvious goal of documenting and ensuring equity in student discipline matters.

Desegregation activities required or permitted by the Discipline Agreement consist of the following:

- *Maintenance of a computerized student information system that provides timely, complete and accurate disciplinary records for students, particularly with regard to disabled or minority students.*
- *Retention of personnel and service providers responsible for ensuring accurate, timely student data which can be examined and evaluated on race, national origin and disability status.*
- *Placement of behavioral intervention monitors and in-school suspension personnel at schools to implement disciplinary programs and services to ensure equitable and lawful treatment of minority, national origin and disabled students.*
- *Maintenance of internal student discipline record audit staff to monitor Amphi student disciplinary practices, confirm timely and accurate record keeping,*
- *Monitoring, by certain district central office administrators, of continuing compliance with the Discipline Agreement.*
- *Operation of an Equal Opportunity Office to enable parents and other members of the public to file complaints or report concerns about District disciplinary practices.*
- *Recurring staff development, through both “in-house” and external means to maintain compliance.*
- *Provision of necessary supplies and other support materials for the mandated or permitted activities.*

Progress Since OCR Agreements

Both aspects of Amphi’s desegregation activities described above have been highly effective at resolving the issues that gave rise to them. One very clear indication of their success is the fact that OCR has ceased monitoring Amphi compliance under both corrective action agreements. This reflects OCR’s determination that Amphi is compliant, i.e., that Amphi provides the requisite programs and services for LEP student and that Amphi evidences demonstrable proof of equitable disciplinary practices. Despite having attained compliance status, however, the District cannot simply terminate the programs that enabled compliance. Thus, the District’s continuing desegregation expenditures are necessary to ensure continuing compliance with federal mandates.

The Required Verifications

Pursuant to A.R.S. §15-910(J)(3), the Governing Board must now provide the following data and verifications concerning the above described desegregation program on or before July 15, 2013:

- (a) A district-wide budget summary and a budget summary on a school by school basis for each school in the school district that lists the sources and uses of monies that are designated for desegregation purposes.*
- (b) A detailed list of desegregation activities on a district-wide basis and on a school by school basis for each school in the school district.*
- (c) The date that the school district was determined to be out of compliance with title VI of the civil rights act of 1964 (42 United States Code section 2000d) and the basis for that determination.*
- (d) The initial date that the school district began to levy property taxes to provide funding for desegregation expenses and any dates that these property tax levies were increased.*
- (e) If applicable, a current and accurate description of all magnet type programs that are in operation pursuant to the court order during the current school year on a district-wide basis and on a school by school basis. This information shall contain the eligibility and attendance criteria of each magnet type program, the capacity of each magnet type program, the ethnic composition goals of each magnet type program, the actual attending ethnic composition of each magnet type program and the specific activities offered in each magnet type program.*
- (f) The number of pupils who participate in desegregation activities on a district-wide basis and on a school by school basis for each school in the school district.*
- (g) A detailed summary of the academic achievement of pupils on a district-wide basis and on a school by school basis for each school in the school district.*
- (h) The number of employees, including teachers and administrative personnel, on a district-wide basis and on a school by school basis for each school in the school district that is necessary to conduct desegregation activities.*
- (i) The number of employees, including teachers and administrative personnel, on a district-wide basis and on a school by school basis for each school in the school district and the number of employees at school district administrative offices that are funded in whole or in part with desegregation monies received pursuant to this section.*
- (j) The amount of monies that is not derived through a primary or secondary property tax levy and that is budgeted and spent on desegregation activities on a district-wide basis and on a school by school basis for each school in the school district.*
- (k) Verification that the desegregation funding will supplement and not supplant funding for other academic and extracurricular activities.*
- (l) Verification that the desegregation funding is educationally justifiable.*
- (m) Any documentation that supports the proposition that the requested desegregation funding is intended to result in equal education opportunities for all pupils in the school district.*
- (n) Verification that the desegregation funding will be used to promote systemic and organizational changes within the school district.*
- (o) Verification that the desegregation funding will be used in accordance with the academic standards adopted by the state board of education pursuant to sections 15-701 and 15-701.01.*
- (p) Verification that the desegregation funding will be used to accomplish specific actions to remediate proven discrimination pursuant to title VI of the civil rights act of 1964 (42 United States Code section 2000d) as specified in the court order or administrative agreement.*
- (q) An evaluation by the school district of the effectiveness of the school district's desegregation measures.*
- (r) An estimate of when the school district will be in compliance with the court order or administrative agreement and a detailed account of the steps that the school district will take to achieve compliance.*
- (s) Any other information that the department of education deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this paragraph.*

A substantial portion of the required information listed above is provided to the state through the budget forms for the District. Items (d) and (k) through (s), however, must be submitted as individual documents, together with a verification form to be executed by the Governing Board president. These requisite submissions, including the verification form to be executed by President Zibrat, are included as attachments to this item.

The Governing Board approved the Desegregation Verification Reporting Fiscal Year 2014 report; and authorized the signature by the Governing Board President on behalf of the Board and Amphitheater Unified School District No. 10 of Pima County Arizona, CTD: 10020000 pursuant to A.R.S. §15-910(J)(3) to the ADE, School Finance department (Exhibit 7, pp. 1-11).

3. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Public Hearing on the FY 2014-2015 Proposed Expenditure Budget and Truth in Taxation Hearing

Board Book information: *The Governing Board proposed a budget for the 2014-2015 fiscal year at the June 3, 2014 meeting. The Governing Board is required by Arizona Revised Statutes §15-905 to hold a public hearing on the proposed budget and a Truth in Taxation Hearing is required by Arizona Revised Statutes §15-905.01.*

Mr. Nelson introduced the item and invited Mr. Little to provide a brief overview about the requirement for a public hearing and the protocol for budget-adoption (see next agenda item below, 5.A.) by the Governing Board as stated above.

Mr. Little stated that the need for a public *truth and taxation* hearing stems from A.R.S. §15-905.01, which provides the public an opportunity to comment on the District's proposed expenditure budget. A roll-call vote is required to satisfy an Adjacent Ways proviso because the District utilizes these funds (Levy - 2% of the primary tax rate) specifically for the improvement of public property directly adjacent to District property (i.e. partially funding the bus loop at Cross Middle School).

The expenditure budget submitted for Board approval is essentially the same as that budget document reviewed at the June 3rd Board meeting with the addition of the mandated desegregation form documents.

There were no Board member questions.

Ms. Zibrat declared a public hearing at 6:50 PM concerning the 2014-2015 proposed expenditure budget and truth in taxation pursuant to A.R.S. Statute §15-905.01 and invited anyone wishing to address the Board to come forward.

There were no public comments.

Ms. Zibrat closed the public hearing at approximately 6:51 PM.

[A letter to the Property Tax Oversight Commission affirming this action was sent on July 5, 2014. Exhibit 8.]

4. ACTION

A. Study and Approval of the Adopted Expenditure Budget for Fiscal Year 2014-2015

Board Book information: *The State of Arizona requires governing boards to formally approve and adopt an operating budget for the school year immediately following the hearing on the budget. The budget being submitted for adoption is identical to the budget proposed on June 3rd with the exception of the additional Desegregation pages required by state law.*

Desegregation - These budget pages detail desegregation expenditures on a school by school basis and are required by Arizona Revised Statutes §15-910(J). The Desegregation Budget total is unchanged from the prior year at \$4,025,000.

Adjacent Ways - The increase to the Adjacent Ways budget as detailed in the Proposed Budget will require an approximate 2 cent tax levy increase. Arizona Revised Statutes §15-905.01 requires a roll call vote to maintain the tax levy for the Adjacent Ways fund.

Mr. Nelson restated the need for a roll-call vote.

There were no additional comments or questions by the Board. Ms. Zibrat stated that a motion is necessary for the adoption of the proposed expenditure budget. Ms. Day moved to approve the Expenditure Budget for the fiscal year 2014-2015. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Grant. On roll-call vote, the motion in favor of adopting the proposed budget for 2014-2015 carried with all members voting yea, as follows: Dr. Barrabee – yea; Mrs. Cozad – yea, Mrs. Grant – yea; Ms. Day – yea; and, Ms. Zibrat– yea. The final vote carried (Exhibit 9a, pp. 1-18; 9b, pp. 1-74).

BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

There were no new Board Member requests.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mrs. Cozad that the Board Meeting be adjourned; Mrs. Grant seconded the motion; and it passed unanimously, 5-0. Ms. Zibrat declared the meeting was adjourned; the time was approximately 6:54 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Margaret Harris

Susan Zibrat, President

Date

Approved: TBD