

DRAFT v2.

**AMPHITHEATER PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Tucson, Arizona**

MINUTES OF SPECIAL PUBLIC MEETING OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

Place, Date and Time of Meeting

Wetmore Center, 701 West Wetmore Road, Leadership & Professional Development Center, January 26, 2016
at 5:00 PM

Board Members Present

Deanna M. Day, President
Jo Grant, Vice President
Kent Paul Barrabee, Member
Julie Cozad, Member
Scott A. Leska, Member

Central Administrators Present

Patrick Nelson, Superintendent
Todd A. Jaeger, J.D., Associate to the Superintendent and General Counsel
Monica Nelson, Associate Superintendent

Call to Order and Signing of Visitor's Register

Ms. Day called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM and invited any visitors who had not already signed the register to do so.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

Mr. Patrick Nelson

Announcement of Date and Place of Next Regular Governing Board Meeting:

Ms. Day announced the next Regular Meeting of the Governing Board on Tuesday, February 9, 2016 at 6:00 PM, at the Wetmore Center, 701 W. Wetmore Road, Leadership & Professional Development Center.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment at this time.

1. CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Day asked if there were Board Member requests to have any items addressed separately. There were none. A motion was made by Dr. Barrabee to approve Consent Agenda Items A-J. The motion was seconded by Ms. Grant and passed unanimously 5-0. Appointment of personnel is effective provided all district, state, and federal requirements are met.

A. Approval of Appointment of Personnel

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

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50178588>, Item 1.A.]

B. Approval of Personnel Changes

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

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50178588>, Item 1.B.]

C. Approval of Leave(s) of Absence

Leave(s) of Absence were approved as listed in Exhibit 3.

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50178588>, Item 1.C.]

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

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

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50178588>, Item 1.D.]

E. Approval of Vouchers Totaling and Not Exceeding Approximately \$1,635,375.55 (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 payment authorized:

FY 15-16

Voucher #290 \$254,549.48	Voucher #291 \$115,349.49	Voucher #292 \$150,455.32
Voucher #293 \$790,130.20	Voucher #294 \$306,065.95	Voucher #295 \$18,825.11

F. Approval of Parent Support Organization(s) - 2015-2016

The following Parent Support Organizations were approved as submitted pursuant to District Policy KBE-R:

**IRHS Men's Basketball Boosters
Canyon del Oro Project Graduation**

G. Receipt of Monthly Status Report for the Fiscal Year 2015-2016

The December 2015 Monthly Status Report was received and approved as submitted.

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50178588>, Item 1.G. attch] (Exhibit 5)

H. Approval of Out of State Travel

Out of state travel was approved for students and/or staff (source of funding indicated).

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50178588>, Item 1.H. attch] (Exhibit 6)

I. Approval of Post-Retirement Employment Opportunities During the 2016-2017 Fiscal Year for Staff Retiring in the Current Fiscal Year

Board Book Information: *This item is presented for the Board's consideration and action. The administration recommends the Board approve continuation of post-retirement employment opportunities for District retirees, under the foregoing terms and conditions.*

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50178588>, Item 1.I. attch] (Exhibit 7)

J. Approval of Reclassified Position - Benefits Specialist

Board Book Information: *The District recently conducted a review of the Human Resources Specialist position within the Benefits Department. The job description was reviewed and compared to current duties and responsibilities of the position. To ensure accurate representation and classification, the position was retitled and reclassified to reflect the current responsibilities and functions of the position. Attached is the revised job description. Although a revised job description was needed, a salary modification was not warranted. The nature and complexity of the position remained essentially the same and therefore did not require a change in compensation. Consequently, the District will not incur a monetary expense increase.*

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50178588>, Item 1.J.] (Exhibit 8)

2. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Motion to Recess Open Meeting and Hold an Executive Session for Student Disciplinary Actions:

1) Consideration and Decision Upon Expulsion Hearing Officer's Recommendation, Pursuant to A.R.S.

§15-843(F)(2), Regarding:

- a. Student # 30016825;
- b. Student # 30003924;
- c. Student # 30023419;

- d. Student # 30020565;
- e. Student # 30026557;
- f. Student # 30033167;
- g. Student # 30037913; and
- f. Student# 30046738.

B. Discussions or Consultations with Designated Representatives of the Public Body in Order to Consider its Position and Instruct its Representatives Regarding Negotiations with Employee Organizations Regarding the Salaries, Salary Schedules or Compensation Paid in the Form of Fringe Benefits of Employees of the Public Body for the 2016-2017 Fiscal Year, Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(5)

C. Discussion or Consultation for Legal Advice with the Attorney of the Public Body Regarding Governing Board Policies, Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3)

D. Motion to Close Executive Session and Reconvene Open Meeting

Mr. Leska motioned to close the Open Meeting and go into Executive Session for Student Discipline. Ms. Cozad seconded the motion and the motion passed 5-0. The time was 5:04 PM.

Upon return to the Board Room Mr. Leska motioned to close Executive Session and reconvene the Open Meeting. Ms. Cozad seconded and the motion passed 5-0. The time was 6:25 PM.

3. **STUDY/ACTION**

A. Study and (or) Determination of High School Instructional Time

Board Book Information: *At its meeting of January 12, 2016, the Governing Board studied a parent's proposal that the high school instructional day (class time) be reduced from their current levels. The Administration recommends the Governing Board continue to study whether and how a change in the instructional time in the District's high schools should be affected. However, the Administration recommends that the Governing Board direct that a formal study be conducted of three potential changes to instructional time to be effective for the 2017-2018 School Year:*

1. Reduction to 170 Hours
2. Reduction to 160 Hours
3. Reduction to 150 Hours

The Board should require such study to examine and ultimately report to the Board on the impacts each specific change would have upon such factors as: class schedules, bus routes, food service programs, staffing levels, student achievement levels, programmatic design and offerings, student workloads, staff workloads, and District funding. The Board should mandate that the study include surveys of a broad cross-section of the entire high school parent, student and teacher communities. If so directed, the Administration would propose that it provide several updates to the Board on the progress and status of the study, with a timeline that would ensure the presentation of both the study results and a final recommendation to the Board no later than November 2016, to allow sufficient time for students, parents, staff, schools and departments to prepare for any resulting change in the 2017-2018 school year.

<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50178588>, Item 3.A.] (Exhibit 9)

- Ms. Day read the Item Specific Call to the Audience.
- Lorelei Sole addressed the Board regarding Item 3.A. Lorelei stated she is an open enrolled Sophomore at CDO. She was accepted into University High School in her freshman year, but chose to come to CDO for the International Baccalaureate (IB) Program. Lorelei said she starts the IB Program next year - if she gives up Club Soccer. If IB could start at 8:00 AM instead of 7:00 AM it would be easier for her and other student athletes in the IB Program. IB is a rigorous program and with an extra hour she could catch up on

lost sleep or do homework. Condensing the schedule would be extremely beneficial and she hopes it will be considered.

- Mike Robinette spoke on behalf of Amphitheater Education Association (AEA). He thanked the Board for their willingness to consider the concerns that have been brought forth by both parents and teachers regarding discrepancies in high school instructional minutes. In a communique to AEA membership 2 weeks ago, AEA leadership was adamant that they could not support, nor advocate for any mandate that could adversely affect the employment of their members, diminish funding to the District, or have a negative effect on the District from a legal perspective. The issue relative to high school instructional minutes is both complex and intriguing. However, they do not believe that an expedited decision on the issue without a careful consideration of the systemic effects and unintended consequences is prudent at this time. AEA fully supports the administration's recommendation to study the issue thoroughly and present the results of the study to the Board not later than November 2016, with changes being implemented in the 2017-2018 school year.
- Robin Kool addressed the Board regarding Item 3.A. Ms. Kool thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak in support of the proposal to condense the school day at CDO and other high schools in the District. Ms. Kool said that both of her graduates worked very hard, were very active in high school, and both in their Junior year had experiences that were devastating to them. She wonders if a reduction in the stress they experienced during the school day over the years, by condensing the time spent in class and giving them more time for other human activities they need to engage in, might have helped them avoid the experiences giving them more space and energy to process their changing lives and to embrace more thoroughly and mindfully the absolutely essential growth that high schoolers require before they leave home and go into the world.
- Mr. Nelson introduced the item asking Mr. Jaeger to summarize the points briefly and explain the administration's recommendation. Mr. Jaeger directed the Board's attention to a comparison chart between Amphitheater and one of the high schools. The passing minutes have been taken out of the instructional minutes on an equal basis for an "apples to apples" comparison. What the chart shows is yes, there is still a disparity between the instructional hours of our schools, as a group, compared to Catalina Foothills High School which has been referred to a number of times. Additionally there is disparity among our own schools to some extent. Also very important are workloads for our teachers and our students that flow as a consequence of instructional time. However, there are other considerations we need to think about and, as mentioned in the item, also range the gambit of anywhere from the impact that less time may have on student achievement and its consequential, potential impact on measures such as overall weighted average, and its impact on staff as well. Such things as the change that one group of schools schedules would have upon another group of schools and the bus transportation issues that would come from that. The issues in terms of Food Service programs, the scheduling of food service programs within individual schools and between them as well. As Mr. Little mentioned there are some financial implications. The issues we don't know because we haven't heard from all factions, all interested parties, not to the degree we need to before we make such a significant change. It is for that number of reasons that we believe this issue deserves and needs further study. Will the change intended produce the results intended? The administration therefore recommends that a committee be formed to study a number of proposed changes, a reduction on three different levels. And by those numbers I mean actual instructional hours excluding passing period. That the committee review three potential changes; the reduction down to 170 hours across the board, 160 hours and 150 hours across the board between and amongst the high schools, examining of course the impact and needs for each of those three schools. To look at the things mentioned: class schedules, how the schedules would be arranged, the impact on our bus routes and other schools schedules, our food service programs, our staffing levels, our student achievement levels, the programmatic design and offerings and the impact that a change in schedule has on those offerings if any, student workloads and staff workloads and District

funding. Examining all those issues and presenting the impact in an impartial way would be the charge of that committee to make a recommendation to the Governing Board.

- The Board engaged in discussion. Ms. Cozad asked if besides reduction of instructional time, the committee will also study sleep patterns, high school start later, elementary earlier, flip schedules District-wide? Mr. Leska asked why the study should be completed by November (2016) and not further out; is there a sufficient amount of study that it can provide. Mr. Jaeger responded that administration would need to make a recommendation to be decided on in a reasonable amount of time to implement any changes for the 2017-2018 school years.
- Mr. Nelson said that if the Board approves a committee, they would propose some ideas and a cross section of representatives for the committee.
- Dr. Barrabee commented that the issue is new to him and the more he looks at it, the more complex it seems. Considerations between schools would concern mobility rates, immigrant impact and the diversity of needs in that group based upon previous schooling and English as a second language. We agree that the interest of students should be our highest priorities, the students interests are also tied to teachers and staff, the stressors they are under and the readjustment burden the changes would impose.
- Ms. Day called on the remaining public speakers. Lawrence Mehren addressed the board regarding Item 3.A. Mr. Mehran said he runs scientific companies and they sequenced the entire human genome in the same period of time that it will take this Board, not this Board, this issue, from the first point this issue was raised to the end. People have sequenced the entire human genome more quickly. Mr. Mehran opined that it is a straightforward issue that it is not really as complex as people are making it out to be. He believes that study of this issue could be completed very, very quickly. Certainly, more quickly than it took to sequence the entire human genome. Mr. Mehren urged the Board not to allow the study to go on for another year, to not allow this decision to continue to go on, to consider it more quickly, or to limit the time of study.

Board Book Note: *The \$3 billion Human Genome mapping project, led by the U.S. Department of Energy and the National Institutes of Health, began in 1990 and was completed on April 14, 2003, a total of 13 years. Sequencing technology has vastly improved in recent years. Sequencing the human genome today takes just one to two days.* Source: <http://www.livescience.com/28708-human-genome-project-anniversary.html>

- Tina Mehran addressed the Board regarding Item 3.A. Ms. Mehren said the Board has a proposal to redistribute credit hours and condense the school day like a wide array of schools across the state. Some excelling, some more heterogeneous. We have University High School, Catalina Foothills, Tanique Verde School, Tucson High, Scottsdale Unified School District, Mountain View, Mesa, Marana and Flagstaff; all offering courses of 150 to 160 hours per period while Amphitheater's average is 187. Why? Our students and faculty are burdened with 300 extra class hours each year - 7 weeks. To clarify we [Ms. Mehren and a group of constituents] recommend an optimization floor of 150 hours, not lower. In Ms. Mehren's opinion a total resolution time frame of 2.5 years is objectionable. She said the Empire State Building was built in 1 year and 40 days. They want change for the 2016-2017 school years. The District is wonderfully diverse and there is valid concern that reduction might not be good for all schools given this diversity.
- Nick Powers addressed the Board regarding Item 3.A. Nick asked the Board if they were teachers and said there are teachers here. Kids sleep in class. They'll sleep in class because they stay up late the night before and kids will be kids; you can't really avoid that too much. But they'll also sleep in class because they are outstanding students. That might sound contradictory. A kid will tell you first period, zero hour, like the 6:00 AM class, they'll have all these challenging classes then go do a sport after. Then they get out of

practice, do their homework, then they'll have to wake up at 4:30 AM. There are all the positives for sleep. He said he graduated from CDO last year. He's fairly intelligent, if he does say so himself. He was open enrolled and lives a little far away. He actually couldn't go to Academic Decathlon, he couldn't be there for IB and so he didn't. If starting later gives more people more opportunities it's a must.

- Jennifer Powers addressed the Board regarding Item 3.A. Ms. Powers introduced herself saying she is a long time Kindergarten teacher in Amphitheater, a parent of a Freshman at CDO and Nick's mother. She said her primary concern is for the stress levels of her own children. Both suffer from anxiety. She wants happy, healthy children who achieve the highest levels academically, socially and emotionally. She believes that a small reduction in instructional time in each class will go a long way in helping reduce our students' stress level. She believes a small reduction in instructional time will go a long way to help improve instruction as well as reducing teacher stress levels, which would lead to a reduction in student stress levels. If the research tells us that student and teacher stress levels are far too high, and if there is no data telling us that additional instruction time is beneficial, then why aren't we taking immediate steps to do what we can to fix this?
- Sarah Stuart addressed the Board regarding item 3.A. Ms. Stuart said she is the mother of an 8th Grader at Cross and a Sophomore at CDO. In addition to being an Amphi parent she is also a 21-year veteran teacher at the New York City Board of Education and completing her 15th year at TUSD. She fully supports the implementation of the proposal offered on January 12, 2016 for the 2016-2017 school year. Another example for immediate action is the inflexibility and unsustainability of the current schedule, especially in light of the fast approaching Arizona Merit testing. The present testing schedule, although not finalized, does not allow for late in or early out scheduling that Amphi has implemented in the past. Ms. Stuart thanked the Board for their time and urged the implementation of the January 12, 2016 proposal without delay.
- Yumi Wong addressed the Board regarding Item 3.A. Ms. Wong said she is the parent of Erik Wong, a Junior and IB student at CDO. She said she has nothing but praise for the IB curriculum. They are extremely dedicated and competent teachers, administrators and staff. Her only concern is Eric's level of fatigue which she has noticed happening more frequently since the beginning of his Junior year. For Eric the IB program is challenging, fun and meaningful. Balancing IB classes and sports, especially daily assignments requiring a next day submission though few and far between, do take its toll. Ms. Wong said she has allowed him to miss 1st period a few times fearing he would get into a car accident. He thoroughly enjoys both IB and after school basketball. Not playing basketball is not an option for him. She believes the changes should be made that includes reducing instructional time. She would appreciate the Board considering this for implementation this for the 2016-2017 school year.

Ms. Grant had a question for Ms. Wong. She asked if IB classes started at zero hour and regular classes were an hour later. Ms. Wong said her son leaves at 6:45 AM every day for the 7:00 AM class. Ms. Grant then asked Mr. DeWeerd, CDO Principal for clarification. Mr. DeWeerd said 1st period is really zero hour. There are a number of IB classes and electives are offered at that time. There are also a number of other classes that start at zero hour as well at 7:00 AM.

- Sarah Hom addressed the Board regarding Item 3.A. She introduced herself as Dr. Sarah Samoy Hom, a Board Certified Pediatrician. She and her husband have four children and their oldest daughter, Rachel, graduated from CDO last year and she was in the IB Program. She is now a Freshman in Barrett, the honors college at ASU. Dr. Hom said the IB program is an excellent program that prepared her well for college. Their second daughter Emily is in 9th Grade at CDO. She is involved in Band which is her 1st period at 7:00 AM. In August of 2014 the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) issued a press release and research publication that high schools should not start before 8:30 AM. The AAP recognizes that sleep deprivation is a public health issue. Insufficient sleep can lead to physical problems such as increased risk

for obesity and hypertension, mental problems including depression, and safety issues such as car crashes secondary to drowsiness. Dr. Hom said she has seen the adverse effects of lack of sleep in her own children and her patients through the years. They are tired, stressed and I have seen more adolescents with mood disorders, anxiety and depression. She strongly supports the AAP recommendation of a later start time for high schools and asked that the Board make the change for the 2016-2017 school year.

- Randi Weinstein addressed the Board regarding Item 3.A. Ms. Weinstein said she has two children, a 7th Grader at Cross Middle School and a 4th Grader at Harelson Elementary. She also has PhD from the University of California at Berkley and has been a faculty member in the Department of Physiology and the College of Medicine at the University of Arizona since 1998. Dr. Weinstein said she is here because she thinks 7:00 AM is too early for high school students to start their school day. Many districts in Tucson, across the state of Arizona and across the country are shifting to later start times in a response to recent studies. She was told that about 20% of CDO students take a zero hour class. Her understanding is that the 7:00 AM start time is a result of an Amphi policy that requires a minimum of 4 courses per year for Seniors. Adjusting the policy would bring them back in line with the teaching loads handled by other high performing schools. They'd still teach the same number of courses but could do so more efficiently.
- Board Members engaged in comments and discussion. Dr. Barrabee asked that the committee consider that students in competitive sports programs get credit for PE, as well as other ideas that might reduce the burden on students' time. Ms. Cozad said she is in favor of flipping the start times because she has experienced it in the District she works in. Ms. Grant said we are talking about two different things. The committee on instructional hours and we have two separate issues and she has two suggestions. We set up a Study Committee to change to later high school start times, let's just talk about it. We can't do that for the 2016-2017 school year, but to start looking at it. Let's have a committee separate from the other committee to look at later start times. She asked if it is possible for the IB program to start an hour later, the administration could look at that for the 2016-2017 school year, or does it have to start at zero hour.
- **MOTION** - Ms. Grant moved that they set up a committee to study high school start times, separate from and in addition to the other committee. Mr. Leska seconded the motion.
- Discussion continued. Mr. Leska said he appreciates everyone's input and time, but the Board received this only 3 weeks ago, he didn't know anything about this, and the board is being asked now to push this really fast. Had we gotten it 6 months ago it would have been a different story. In regards to the comment on the genome and politics, politics can range as thin as paper to wide as the Grand Canyon. Science measures physical things. With politics you measure emotion, thoughts, feelings, a person's soul, not the person's physical attributes. With politics it takes longer, you are dealing with 75,000 constituents, 14,000 students.
- Ms. Day asked for a clarification on whether or not Ms. Grant planned on making a another motion, as they would like to know what that would be before voting on the motion currently on the table.
- **WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION** - Ms. Grant withdrew her motion to set up a committee to study high school start times separately, and let the board know that was her thought.
- Ms. Grant stated that her second proposal is that they go along with the administration's recommendation that a formal study be conducted to look at instructional hours with the provision that two Board Members be part of that committee. She understands that instructional hours and start times are going to have to come together, but she thinks that to keep it clean, to look at it, it needs to be studied separately, but that is up to the Board. Her suggestion is that two Board Members be part of the study of instructional hours.

- Ms. Day asked Ms. Grant for clarification if she is making a motion or just a recommendation that two Board Members be on the committee. Ms. Grant commented that obviously the Board wants to do it (instructional hours and start times) together.
- **MOTION** - MS. Grant moved, "That a formal study be conducted to look at instructional hours and the high school start time with the provision that two Board Members be part of this committee". Mr. Leska seconded the motion, but with a friendly amendment. Ms. Day asked Ms. Grant if she was willing to listen to his amendment. Ms. Grant agreed. Mr. Leska's stated his friendly amendment is, "Not have any of the administration be a part of this committee. However, the administration will be at the pleasure of the committee."
- Mr. Leska then commented about the State Board he sits on and how none of the State Education staff sit on that Board; they help the committee and give support and information. He thinks that the committee should consist of teachers, parents, students, AEA and etc. And the two Board Members would pick that committee through an application process.
- Ms. Day asked if Ms. Grant accepted the friendly amendment. Ms. Grant asked for clarification from Mr. Jaeger about how that process would take place as far as applications, who would review it. Mr. Leska said he thinks that the two Board Members who sit on the committee would review those applications and choose those individuals. Then the two Board Members would select those with the help of the staff to help them select, but the Board Members would have the final say. Ms. Day said that one thing she is not hearing with either the friendly amendment or the motion is a timeframe, so how many times are we going to vote? Do we have a second for the friendly amendment? Ms. Grant said she is waiting for clarification but will tell you that to set up a committee we are into January, if we are going to accept applications, which is going to be February; the earliest the committee can meet is March. So we are talking about March, April, May and I don't know about teachers and vacations and the summer then we are into August, September, and October. But nothing says this can't be done sooner as long as it's done by October. We aren't even going to be able to send out the requests (applications). Ms. Day noted that the other thing that they need to keep in mind is that a lot of groundwork has been done on this, so we are not starting from ground zero. So where are we? Dr. Barrabee said one of the questions that will come up is the nature of the research that has been done in terms of the groups who were involved in creating that information. He stated that he doesn't have a sense that there needs to be any one solution for the District as a whole. He doesn't understand why we are considering that there has to be one solution for the District. Ms. Day stated she doesn't believe that's the point that there is one solution. That is certainly the purview of the committee if such a committee is established. Dr. Barrabee said that it's important to realize is that what comes before us eventually are recommendations, and he is inclined to think that Board Members should not be on the committees. Our participation on the committees would perhaps distort the committees and subcommittees. Ms. Day said we don't have to decide on composition tonight. Mr. Jaeger gave some background on previous committees. Whether there are Board Members on the committee, or they choose the committee, it will be subject to Open Meeting Law. A quorum is required before the committee can meet, will need to publish an agenda in advance, the agenda would need to be adhered to. In the past District administration has never been a part of these committees, but requires support from the administration. Mr. Jaeger asked if the absence of administration was also to exclude our school principals, who obviously have a stake in this as well, or is it to be to the total exclusion of any administrators whatever. Mr. Leska stated he didn't give that much thought to it but would assume they (principals) would be part of the support to give the committee information. Mr. Jaeger noted that in the past the Board as a group solicited applications and then there was a meeting, or agenda item at a meeting, to determine. Ms. Grant said the principals have to be part of this, she can't support that. Mr. Leska clarified that was not part of his motion, it is his vision, but that would be at the pleasure of the two Board Members who sit on the committee.
- Ms. Day asked Ms. Grant to read her motion again.

- **MOTION** - Ms. Grant moved that, “A formal study be conducted to study the instructional time for the three high schools and the start date (start time) of high schools, with the provision that two Board Members serve on this committee and that a recommendation be made to the full Board in October of 2016.”
- Ms. Day said there was an amendment.
- Mr. Leska said he seconded that, and amended it, and he guesses that Mr. Jaeger just verified that maybe he doesn’t need to amend it. He just doesn’t want the administration to be part of that committee. Ms. Day said that Ms. Grant wants the high school principals on the committee. Mr. Leska stated the he withdraws his amendment. Ms. Grant asked if they were just on her clean motion. Ms. Day verified just on her motion.
- The Board engaged in further discussion. Dr. Barrabee noted that the school student organization/councils should be included. Ms. Day said that discussion needs to be focused on the motion that is on the table. Dr. Barrabee asked if the motion already makes specification as to who is on the committee. Personally he doesn’t want Board Members on the committee. Ms. Grant explained that there has been a lot of discussion on who did what and when it happened. For transparency for this particular issue they need to put two Board Members on it to move it along, so it doesn’t get stuck somewhere, there’s discussion as to whether it could have gotten done quicker or not. A Board Member on it to make sure it moves forward and doesn’t get stuck somewhere. Mr. Leska said it is not uncommon for Board Members to be committee members. It’s partly to keep connectivity between the Board and committee, transparency and expediency. Dr. Barrabee noted that the meetings are all open. He doesn’t like to make the comparison with the State Board as they are not elected; they are appointed, therefore there could be bias.
- Ms. Day called for a vote on Ms. Grant’s motion. Dr. Barrabee asked for clarification that the motion requires two Board Members sit on the committee. Ms. Day confirmed it does. Ms. Grant had moved that “A formal study be conducted to study the instructional time for the three high schools and the start date (start time) of high schools, with the provision that two Board Members serve on this committee and that a recommendation be made to the full Board in October of 2016.”
- **VOTE** - Casting Aye votes were Ms. Grant, Ms. Cozad, Ms. Day and Mr. Leska. Nay vote was cast by Dr. Barrabee. Motion carried 4-1.
- Mr. Leska asked if they could talk about the makeup. Ms. Day asked Mr. Jaeger if they could. Mr. Jaeger said it is in the purview of the item it included the formation of the committee, so the Board could do that tonight, but the composition could change based on who applies. Ms. Day said she would like more time to think about everything that was discussed tonight and ponder who should be on the committee and talk about it at the February 9th meeting.

BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Ms. Day asked the Board if there were any requests for future agenda items. Ms. Day requested the Study Committee composition be on the February 9, 2016 Regular Governing Board Meeting agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no further public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Grant moved that the meeting be adjourned and Ms. Day seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0. Ms. Day declared the meeting adjourned at 8:08 PM.

Karen S. Gardiner
Respectfully submitted,
Karen S. Gardiner

Deanna M. Day, Board President

TBD
Date

Approved: TBD