

**AMPHITHEATER PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
Tucson, Arizona**

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGARDING HIGH SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL TIME**

**Place, Date and Time of Meeting**

Wetmore Center, 701 W. Wetmore Road, Leadership and Professional Development Building, Tucson, AZ  
85705, August 30, 2016 at 5:00 PM

**Committee Members and Facilitators Present**

Joe Paddock, Director of Interscholastic Activities  
Mike Robinette, AEA Representative  
Tassi Call, Facilitator and Co-Chair  
Wendy Biallas-Odell, Facilitator and Co-Chair

**Canyon del Oro High School:**

Paul DeWeerd  
Carol Trejo  
Sandy DuPlain  
Nina Godlweski  
Stephen Rothkopf  
Sarah Stuart (*new member*)

**Ironwood Ridge High School:**

Kersten Kremer  
Hope Goldsmith  
Paul DesJarlais  
Susan Williams  
Jenny Een

**Committee Members and Facilitators Absent**

Mike Bejarano, Chief Academic Officer for Secondary Education

**Amphitheater High School:**

Jon Lansa  
Deborah Ingram  
Marian Johnson  
Lisa Millerd  
Vanessa Ruiz  
Eric Rossi  
\* Due to AHS Open House

**Ironwood Ridge High School:**

Natalie Burnett  
Christian Sandoval

**Canyon Del Oro:**

Tina Mehren  
Mitch Bohenkamp

### **Others Present**

Karen S. Gardiner, Administrative Assistant to the Governing Board  
Dr. Steve Duley, Student Services  
Scott Little, Chief Financial Officer

**NOTE:** Due to technical problems with the audio system that day, the microphones were audible in the room, but were inaudible on the recording. Minutes were taken from Ms. Gardiner's notes and a cell phone recording where speakers at the podium were clear; however, not all committee members asking questions could be heard due to lack of hand held microphones.

### **Call to Order**

Ms. Call called the meeting to order at 5:03 PM and asked all in attendance to rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag**

Facilitators and Co-chairs Ms. Tassi Call and Ms. Wendy Biallas-Odell

### **Welcome and Roll Call**

Facilitators and Co-chairs Ms. Tassi Call and Ms. Wendy Biallas-Odell

Ms. Biallas-Odell welcomed guests and Advisory Committee Members. She introduced herself and Ms. Biallas-Odell as the Facilitators and Co-Chairs of the committee. Ms. Gardiner led roll call to verify attendance.

### **Announcement of Date and Place of Next Advisory Committee Meeting**

Tuesday, September 13, 2016, 5:00 PM - 7:00 PM, 701 W. Wetmore Road, Leadership and Professional Development Center

Ms. Call announced that the date and place of the next Advisory Committee meeting is Tuesday, September 13, 2016, 5:00 - 7:00 PM, here in the Leadership and Professional Development Building. The meeting schedule, as well as information regarding the Committee and meeting minutes, are available on the Amphitheater website at [www.amphi.com](http://www.amphi.com), under Quick Links, Advisory Committee Regarding High School Instructional Scheduling.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

Ms. Biallas-Odell announced some housekeeping before getting started. Whenever a Committee Member has the floor to speak or ask questions, please assure the microphone gets passed down to the speaker. Speakers, please use a microphone. Today there are no handheld microphones so please speak up so you can be heard for the official recording of the meeting, for the minutes notes Ms. Gardiner is taking and so that you can be heard by everyone.

## **2. AGENDA**

### **A. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50213562>, Item 2.A.] (Exhibit 1)

Ms. Biallas-Odell introduced the first item, Approval of Meeting Meetings. For approval tonight are the minutes of the August 16, 2016 meeting. She asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the minutes.

Kersten Kremer of IRHS questioned the section of minutes on Mr. Burns' presentation page 5, paragraph 3 where he responded to one of her questions. Ms. Kremer stated that she did not recall Mr. Burns comparing our district with other districts in regards to bus ridership and the last sentence regarding Wilson K-8 School. Ms. Gardiner stated that is what is on the recording. Mr. Burns was asked if that was what he said and he confirmed it was.

Joe Paddock moved to approve the meeting minutes; Susan Williams seconded the motion and the motion passed 13-0. Meeting minutes will be posted on the Advisory Committee webpages.

**B. Staff Presentations, Questions and Answers to Include:**

- 1. Budget**
- 2. International Baccalaureate Program (IB)**
- 3. English Language Development (ELD)**
- 4. Food Service**
- 5. Student Services and Special Education**

Board Book Information: *District staff members will present information about the District budget, International Baccalaureate (IB) program, English Language Development (ELD) program, Food Service and Student Services/Special Education. This information is provided for the Advisory Committee's orientation to and understanding of how funding and the District budget, special programs, Food Service, Student Services and Special Education are affected by and work in conjunction with master schedules and instructional hour considerations. Presenters will be:*

***Budget** - Scott Little, Chief Financial Officer*

***International Baccalaureate (IB)** - Stephen Rothkopf, IB Diploma Coordinator, Canyon del Oro High School*

***English Language Development (ELD)** - Jayne Huseby, Federal Programs English Language Acquisition Support*

***Food Service** - Jim Burns, Executive Manager of Operational Support*

***Student Services and Special Education** - Steve Duley, Ph.D., Executive Director of Student Services*

*Staff is also available to answer any questions Advisory Committee members might have.*

<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50213562>, Item 2.B.] (Exhibit 2)

Ms. Biallas-Odell introduced Item 2.B. and asked Mr. Little, Chief Financial Officer, to present information on the budget in regards to instructional time and funding.

**Budget**

Mr. Little said he was asked to focus primarily on where the instructional time requirements come from and so probably just to make it go as smoothly as possible, and address questions as they come up, I would prefer to go ahead and address questions if they come up during the course of a slide, [by] saving them to the end. Contained in the A.R.S. 15-901 are the definitions for all things school finance. What is presented on the screen are the definitions for instructional time. What you will actually see there is that the restrictions that are placed upon school districts is placed by grade, they set forth the number of days and of course this being State law and our legislature being involved, it is never as straight forward as it actually appears. So what the law provides for is an 180-day school year; however, there are other provisions in law that allow school districts to actually do fewer days or more days provided it equals the equivalent of the 180 days times the instructional time. This is where the actual statute comes from that sets forth the instructional time. And what it does is it sets forth what is a full-time student. And it does that for the purposes of funding. It defines what a full-time student is and specifically if you look at the last sentence of it, it says, "A full-time high school student is taking at least four classes and meeting at least 720 hours over the course of that 180-day school year. The real meat of what is defined is actually defined by Arizona Revised Statutes. As part of the handout the policy is provided.

GE-18 is actually the governing requirements. Statute sets forth some requirement, the actual implementation is defined by the Arizona Department of Education. The intent of the document is to take that one sentence that is provided in Statute and clarify it for the business practices. They've actually defined what instructional time is. For the purposes of our conversation things like lunch breaks, recesses, assemblies, there are things that are non-instructional time. The policy says what instructional time is and what counts towards meeting the requirements. Then the legislature modified the instructional requirements many times over the years, but most recently in 2012-2013 they modified the instructional times. The big change that came in that year was an increase in the instructional time required for online programs (AOI). If you look in details you'll find that online instruction has higher time requirements than actual physical school seat time. What it defines is for a 9th to 12th Grader, a minimum of four subjects that count towards credit, as set forth by the state and meet for the required number of days, 180 or equivalent.

One piece started here is the 123 hours. Many years ago when the State's graduation requirements were lower, the legislature went to increase the graduation credits and the school districts said but you are not giving us any more resources. So the legislature allowed school districts to have some discretion in offering more classes as long as they met a minimum of 123 hours, they would let them teach five classes or six classes as full-time provided each of those classes met the minimum of 123. Further complicating the issue is the JTED requirements. Originally when the JTED came in place, and it was specifically a Pima County problem, it was quickly discovered by most districts and Amphi was not one of those districts. Most districts had already had a problem in that they didn't have enough time in their bell schedules to meet the core funding requirements for JTED. School districts went to the legislature and said they needed to give districts more flexibility. That flexibility in funding let them teach five classes and still get the quarter funding and that's where the 123 hour piece comes into play. They took an average number across the state of what was being done and said 123 was the minimum [hours per class] and districts could not teach below that in a class and you can still keep your quarter funding for JTED.

It is a mathematical formula. Keep in mind it is a mathematical formula for determining the full-time status of a student which is necessary to determine what a school district gets for funding. Ultimately from what he has been able to find out, in Arizona Amphitheater is the only school district that is actually operating on 178 days. When Prop 301 came into place there was a phasing in of additional days into the calendar and the legislature said they would give some flexibility provided districts could meet the annual requirements. Amphitheater chose to stay on 178 days versus adding days to its calendar. Whenever we look at the calculations we look at the annual requirements and divide it by 178 days instead of 180. The guidance is that whenever students are not carrying the appropriate load the funding starts getting reduced as far as what the District receives in funding. If a student is taking fewer classes we can only collect for a portion of the funding in quarter increments. These are the current instructional hours per year on what is required by grade with our 7th and 8th Grade having the higher number. At one point the 7th and 8th Grades were actually as high as 1,080 but a couple of years back that went back down based on the request of school districts who couldn't consistently meet the requirements within their communities because of other issues.

This is a little hard to see because the conversation that has come up multiple times on this subject is why Amphi doesn't consider five classes full-time instead of four classes full-time like some other school districts do. What happens for us right now is that the students only carrying three classes we get 75% funding for, if they are carrying two classes we get 50% funding, if they are carrying one class we get 25% funding. Going to a five class full-time model like Catalina Foothills, which is one that is actually doing a five classes as full-time formula, when a student does not carry the full load they start losing funding. This shows percentage wise what the funding level produced would be in each of those scenarios. When looking at what it would take for us to go to a five period full-time model, we have to look at how the students have progressed through high school. If we chose to change magically next year and go to a five period full-time we will have numerous students who would have more than sufficient credits to graduate and will not generate full-time funding for us during their senior year. Based upon the students right now this semester we have 195 students who only need 4 credits to graduate. If this was transformed to next year and we were in a five period full-time model the loss to the District in funding would be about \$221,000.

Mr. Little took a question from Sarah Stuart of CDO. Ms. Stuart asked for a point of clarification and said maybe it was because she is new, but if four classes right now is full-time within X amount of hours, it's the seat time we are concerned about, and if we said five classes but within that same timeframe there's still...I answered my own question. Mr. Little said he thinks we are going to what it is Ms. Stuart wants to hit upon.

Mathematically if the District was operation on a five period full-time model the funding loss for us would be \$221,000; that is an annual amount that would be lost in the funding stream.

Mr. Little took a question from Nina Godlewski of CDO. She asked if that was going under the assumption that there would be no fifth class for those 195 students that they would be interested in taking. Mr. Little said correct because by law we cannot require students to take classes that they do not need to graduate.

Looking at the issue, if you want to compare us to Catalina Foothills the first notable thing you have to look at is Catalina Foothills requires two more graduation credits than we do which is how they are able to have students in a full-time basis in their Senior year. And when they actually increased those credits it took multiple years for them to have that class get all the way to Seniors without impacting the funding formula. In order to not impact the funding formula in a five period model we would have to increase the graduation requirements for the next Freshman class coming in, so we would say with them that they would be subject to this. We wouldn't be able to go to the five period model until they got to their senior year, everyone else would still sitting in four periods.

Mr. Little took a question from Mike Robinette of IRHS. Mr. Robinette said he has been involved with this for a long time and still doesn't understand it completely so bear with him if he doesn't sound like he knows what he is talking about, it wouldn't be the first time. What he is confused on when talking about a mandate of 4 to 5, his understanding is that currently, basically we have a 6/6/6/4 [6 Freshman, 6 Sophomore, 6 Junior and 4 Senior Year]. Are you saying that if we were to strictly adjust the 4 at the Senior level to a 5 and maintain a 6/6/6/5 that then would affect funding. Is that accurate? Mr. Little said that is not accurate. Mr. Robinette interjected to help him understand why that is not. Mr. Little said because the class that is this year's Juniors who are going to be Seniors next year have already taken their Freshman, Sophomore and Junior years based on the number of credits they need to graduate in their Senior year a certain portion of those students are set to only need 4 credits. So if we are in a 5 period model next year we'll lose \$221,000 worth of funding assuming that class is similar to what we have as this year's class. Again, the way that it is avoided is you have to increase the graduation credits requirement, then wait the number of years necessary for those students to get to their senior year and have an impact. Mr. Robinette asked if instead of increasing the graduation requirement we could go to a 5/6/6/5, which is 22 credits, and maintain the same credit requirement we currently have versus Foothills which uses 24. Isn't there some flexibility, for example, some ideas that were discussed, maybe requiring Freshman to only do five classes so that the 6th class for Freshmen could be some kind of mentoring program or something. Or for that matter do a 6/6/5/5. Is there any reason why we can only examine the Senior class mandate of 4 to 5 or do we have flexibility to maybe studying the effects of 5/6/6/5 or for that matter of 6/6/5/5 where we maintain the 22 credit requirement that Amphi does but at the same time we just alter kind of year to year the requirements that students take. Mr. Little replied that they are free to look at anything within the scope of what the charge of the committee is, but it doesn't change the issue in that if you want it to work you've got to start with the upcoming Freshman class, it's not something you can magically change to in 1 year. If we went to a five period full-time model next year and students only need four classes to graduate there will be a funding issue next year. You could look at alternates as to how you schedule 5/5/5/6 or any number of things you could choose to do, but you would have to allow for the fact that until that is fully implemented you could potentially have a funding shortfall. Mr. Robinette then asked Mr. Little if from his perspective funding wise is there no way to implement something other than a 4-year turn around without funding losses. Mr. Little said the formula is the formula. Going to a 5 period model for immediate impact next year will produce funding loss. Mr. Robinette asked if in essence what Mr. Little is saying is that change just immediately 6/6/6/4 to 6/6/6/5 which would up our graduation requirement to 23 credits because you are keeping the 6/6/6 the same, so that's 18 + 5 which is 23. Mr. Little said correct, but you will have a funding loss each and every year until that new freshman class catches up in their senior year. You are faced with a funding loss because you can't impose an extra graduation requirement on a student who is already a Junior, (Mr. Robinette interjected that he understood that) it would have to be imposed on the incoming Freshmen. Then you can change the parameters by which you schedule and everything else. Mr. Robinette asked Mr. Little if from his financial perspective in essence if any change were to happen, from his expertise, it would have to be where you start with Freshmen coming in and track them for 4 years and then implement a year by year change. Mr. Little responded that if you want to make a neutral impact to the budget then you can only do it by beginning with the next year's Freshman class; you can't make it revenue neutral any other way.

Mr. Little took a question from Jenny Een of IRHS. Ms. Een said she teachers Seniors and currently right now she has students that only need 2 credits, like English and Government, because some of the students come in with credits from middle school, so they can come in with as many as three for both Math and Spanish. We require the students to take four classes so she has students taking you know, sport class or elective classes, and they already have their graduation requirements, but we are saying you have to take four classes to be enrolled in our school. Mr. Little replied that there are a lot of situations within our District where students are taking less than four classes in their Senior year of high school. We do not have the ability to mandate that a student take a

class that they do not need to graduate. Whether they are being guided that way by Counselors is another matter. If a parent chose to question it we have no legal basis to require students to take classes they do not need to graduate. This is why the other districts that are operating on a five period model having increased their credits to get around the issue.

Mr. Little took a question from Sarah Stuart of CDO. She asked how they meet their instructional hour requirements, are they considered a fulltime student just taking two classes? So we are losing money on those students. Mr. Little replied correct, we are losing money on those students. Ms. Stuart said and again if we have requirements, you know, is there a real negative impact to say [to students] if you want to take 4 years of a language and not 2 years and be done, or is there a negative impact if students choose, and what she is assuming is Ironwood's case to take four classes, even though they only need the two. From an educational standpoint she doesn't think that there is a negative impact and so there then, she is assuming because the instructional hours are all the same, that they are full-time and so they get the full State budget, so that we are losing money with all those students, however many there are, at 2 credit-hours for two classes as Seniors and if we make the switch and we lose what she is assuming, she knows that every job counts, with that said, a very small percentage of the entire Amphi budget, we could make up money maybe in terms of shifting things, that there are...that we encourage our children to take another academic class, or a class that might enrich them as opposed, as we are seeing at Ironwood, as opposed to losing funding and just having students in school for just two periods a day. Mr. Little said there are always options - \$221,000 regardless of a percentage basis is a pretty significant number and you want to equate it to teachers, we are probably talking five teachers worth of funding. So, is it a big percentage, no it's not, but in the reality the loss of that kind of money results in the loss of jobs.

Mr. Little said the other thing is to talk about how the other Districts deal with it relative to teaching load. Ms. Stuart requested to ask a question about the previous discussion. She asked if Mr. Little he had the number of students who are actually less than full-time at the high school level. Mr. Little pointed out that the number of students was on the previous slide; there are 95. Ms. Stuart said so there are 95 students. Mr. Little said there are 95 students this semester who would be in that situation if we changed it. Ms. Stuart said no, right now how many high school seniors in Amphi are not taking full-time students taking two classes, because earlier you said... Mr. Little said he would have to go look at that. For the purposes of lost funding its looking at the average class of what students take. This year we have 95 students who have four classes, last year we had 86 students who had four classes. He doesn't think there are that many students who are taking one, two or three classes... Ms. Stuart asked if we could find out. Mr. Little said he could go tell them that but the thing is it doesn't matter if they are taking two classes or they are taking four classes. The changing of the model to a fiver period full-time results in a 25% loss of funding for each of those students. Ms. Stuart said okay, but she thinks if they are not full-time students then we are not getting full funding for them; if they were full time students we would increase our funding, so she does think that it is important in terms of the money. It might be nominal, she is not saying that it's not, but if there are 95 students that are part-time and they became full-time that would then increase funding for the District. And you are looking at \$100,000 - \$200,000 again from an FTE standpoint that is a couple of teachers. Mr. Little said correct, but you can't get that until years from now. Getting kids to take classes that they don't require to graduate...some do. A graduation class of all Seniors last year was about 850 to 900 probably, so 95 out of 900 only represents 10% and that 10% still has a material loss associated with it. Ms. Stuart said yes, but the Senior class is not leaving Ironwood in droves because they have to take four classes. She is just asking how many students are part-time and what that funding would look like if they were full-time. Mr. Little said he can get the number we are probably talking less than 10 students District-wide probably. Most of those students are carrying the 4 credits they need to graduate and not carrying any more. He can look and see. We have students like that and students who graduate at the end of the first semester because they have sufficient credits and then we lose second semester funding.

The other thing that Mr. Little wanted to point out to the Committee was the staffing issues associated with a five period fulltime model. Because, when you look at district's like Catalina Foothills who is operating with a five period full-time load, they have a seven period day, teachers teach six periods and have one period of planning. Right now we have teachers teaching five periods, isn't that correct Mike, five periods as a full load. So the model that we are being compared to actually increases the workload on teachers. Sue Williams of IRHS interjected saying we wouldn't have to follow that model; we wouldn't have to increase to seven periods. She

stated she wanted to go back to... Mr. Little said you have to consider that if you create the need for additional sections you have to have teachers to staff those additional sections. If you don't spread the existing work across the load you have to hire more people which is an added expense. Ms. Williams said she would like to go back to the full-time funding because right now we are not getting any additional money for students taking a sixth class. Mr. Little said correct, we receive the full funding at four. Ms. Williams said we receive the full funding at four, so if we were to require a 6/6/5/5 we would actually save money because we are not getting additional funding for students who are taking a sixth class. Mr. Little replied that you have to look at it this way, there is also the JTED that is out there so within the funding stream we have our four classes that generate full-time funding and then there's a 0.25 worth of funding that goes to the JTED for generally the fifth class. If there are students who are taking six classes, yes, there is a sixth class out there that doesn't generate any more in funding. Ms. Williams said but they are required for 3 years. Mr. Little said if they take five credits for their first 3 years they are only at 15 credits and are nowhere close to what they need their Senior year. Ms. Williams said she is just saying if for 1 year they didn't take six classes that would actually save us money because we are not being funded for that. If they took five classes that would be (*unintelligible*) and the staffing. Mr. Little said that you would have to deal with what are the costs associated with putting off those classes to a later year. One of the Principals could talk about load balancing, scheduling and 4-year plans and there are impacts associated with pushing off what classes students take when; he can't really answer that question.

Mr. Little took a question from Jenny Een of IRHS. Ms. Een had a question about the loss of the money (*unintelligible*) staffing and teachers teaching in additional areas. She asked Mr. Little if he knew right now, like she knows right now at Ironwood a lot of their 6th period classes like (*unintelligible*) has very low numbers so there would be room. We looked at what are the numbers of student in classes now during those later classes, (*unintelligible*) don't know if we would need additional teachers, we could just move students into the existing classes that have smaller numbers. Mr. Little replied that he cannot really speak to how individual schools build the bell schedule, and there are a lot of dependencies that go on relative to those classes. He can't address that, it is a Principal issue about whether there is sufficient load. But generally on the average, any place you've got a section with low count, someplace else there is a section with higher count. It's how the formulas work.

Mr. Little took a question from Nina Godlewski of CDO. Ms. Godlewski said back to the issues of requiring additional teachers, if we are shifting a load like Mike (Robinette) suggested, it's still the same total credits, the same number of courses, so she doesn't understand why we would need additional teachers. Mr. Little said we are talking multiple issues. Going from a four period model to a five period model is one issue. Going to how you structure that they take it over the course of 4 years is a separate issue. If in fact you can change how you schedule people, that in fact could deal with the issue in the Senior Year, but it still takes many years to get that. You are not going to get that. If you started with next year's Freshmen, you have to wait till they are Seniors until you get the benefit of no loss. During those years that you made those changes you will have a monetary loss because those students already have taken that class that you're delaying now for the incoming Freshmen. The monetary loss is real. Once the new schedule fully works itself out and those Freshmen get to be a Senior then there won't be a loss in that year. But for that transition period there will be a monetary loss for those years. It will happen.

Mr. Little explained that the other trend that we are seeing is that students have more options now for classes. There are students who are taking classes from Charter Schools and all sorts of other things, and so if a student wants less than a full day their Senior year they are going to find ways to get there whether it is an online class or a Charter School, the students have options. To think that we can force them into taking our model, we can try, but they are going to pick and choose what they want. On an average basis every year we have about 80 students who go take classes from online Charter Schools in order to free their schedule up to do something else. Ms. Williams asked then if it would be best to organize ourselves to make it attractive for those students to want to get their credits from us to retain that funding? And by doing that if what they want is to spend less time doing things and get the most out of it then we need to figure out how to offer that. She was just reading these 20 hours a week and she thinks we need to look at more creative ways of structuring our credit offerings because the students are taking their money elsewhere. Mr. Little noted that is an issue beyond the scope of his presentation. He said the thing they have to look at, and he can speak personally as a parent who has worked with his students in one of these other Districts we are being compared to; he can tell them that the work, whether it is done in the

classroom during the day, if it is not done there, then it is done at night on the part of the students. He can tell them from someone who has had a student in one of those programs, that they were spending a lot of nights until 2:00 or 2:30 am doing homework because there wasn't sufficient time in the classroom to cover the material. There are tradeoffs that come with it, but that is not really what he is presenting on. He can tell everyone that as the perspective of a parent who wishes there were more instructional time in the day because what doesn't get done in the classroom gets done at home. That's his experience with his students in a school with a five period full time model. Mr. Little asked if the teachers on the Committee were comfortable with teaching the same material in less time. Mr. Robinette said the sense he gets from polling and conversations is yes [that teachers would be comfortable teaching the material with less time.] Ms. Een commented that the sense she's gotten from studies is that teachers would like more time to collaborate with each other, so she would say yes. Mr. Little asked them if that was to the point that teachers would be willing to carry the extra class load like the other districts. *(Ms. Een commented, but it was not intelligible.)* Mr. Little said that monetarily that is how the other districts are making it work is that the students are carrying 6 credits every year for 4 years to get to their 24 credits and their teachers are teaching one more class, one more section every day or every semester than we currently are. Ms. Godlewski said if we don't increase the requirements, then Mr. Robinette interjected and said that is what he doesn't get, Ms. Godlewski said we wouldn't have an issue with staffing. Mr. Little replied that if we don't increase then you would have no way to guarantee that the students will actually take the classes and you will deal with the funding loss. The only way that you guarantee the avoidance of the loss of funding is to increase the credit requirements which is how all of these districts we are comparing ourselves to [as listed by Ms. Mehren in her presentation to the Board] are doing it. They increase their credit requirements. Mr. Robinette says he still doesn't understand how if we go, as we discussed, if we look and examine models that still have 22 credits, how are we increasing graduation requirements. Mr. Little said because the Districts we are comparing ourselves to [which are said to have less instructional hours] are all requiring 24 credits, and those students are carrying 6 classes day in and day out all 4 years of school. Mr. Robinette gave an example, if we do 6/6/5/5 that is no change in credit hours and no change in the credits required to graduate, which is 22. How does that increase FTE requirements at the same time. If all we are doing is redistributing, in essence minutes and credits, how does that then, why would we need to 24, correct him is he's wrong, but if we go to 24, that is 6/6/6/6. Mr. Little said correct. Mr. Robinette said but if we don't do that, if we don't follow let's say what Catalina Foothills is doing and do our own thing then and we suggest a 6/6/5/5 that maintains 22 credit hours. Mr. Little said it is more complicated than that because if you look at that model for our students who are carrying that load, they are taking five classes their senior year, one of those classes may be JTED which means it only leaves four classes for us to gather funding from which is reduced funding. So in that model it only works if you tell the students they can't take a JTED class in those years in order to keep them at their five. Mr. Robinette asked if 6/6/5/5 would only work if we *(unintelligible)* JTED. Mr. Little said no, for students to take JTED classes, which they are commonly doing in their Sophomore, Junior and Senior years, that one class [out of five] doesn't count for the District, so for most students taking JTED, and he can say the percentage maybe Mr. DeWeerd could give some input, it's a pretty big percentage taking JTED which means if one of their classes is a JTED class in a five period model, we are now only dealing with four classes counting [that can count] towards funding which will only generate 75% funding for us. We just went from students generating 100% funding to students that generate 3/4 funding. Mr. Robinette asked if that also applies in essence when we have 4 periods if one of the periods is JTED, does that mean we are only generating 75%. Mr. Little said in a five period model *(Mr. Robinette said no, in a four period model)* if they are carrying 4 classes [and one was JTED] they would only generate half funding because we are not making the mathematics and the numbers work. *(A female member of the committee began talking while Mr. Little was still talking.)* Ms. Williams of IRHS said they have 105 [JTED] students this year and in the last 4 years it's been between 90 and 120 students and it would be 0.25 we'd lose. *(The next sentence regarding 4 and 5 classes was unintelligible.)* Mr. Little asked if that was a question. Ms. Williams said no, someone asked in the course of discussion how many students IRHS had and they have 105 so they would lose 0.25 of the fulltime funding if they took their fifth class as JTED. Mr. Little said correct. It is roughly \$221,000 of funding we'd lose that year and each year until the new scheme kicked in. Ms. Godlewski asked if right now with the Senior that takes four classes [if one is a JTED class] we are only getting 75% funding. Mr. Little said if a student is taking four classes that are District classes we are getting full funding. If they are taking 3 classes that are ours and a JTED, we are only getting 75%. *(An unidentified female committee member said we could already be losing money.)* Mr. Little said the students that would be impacted are exactly what he presented earlier; 95 students based upon the current year, and if next year looked just like this year, which has been a steady trend for



the past couple of years, those are the number of students we would get a financial debt on. Ms. Godlewski asked if in the long run if we have a five period model and a student took a JTED class we'd be getting 75%. In the long run if we have a four period model we'd still lose 75% if one class was a JTED. So it is the same regardless if it is five periods or four periods. Mr. Little said there is our portion of funding and JTED's portion of funding. The average student is carrying at least one JTED class, there are some that are carrying more. So if the average student is carrying six classes or five classes right now, one of those is a JTED and four of those are ours. Monetarily the numbers are there. Ultimately the Principal has to work out what is possible within a bell schedule. That's a scheduling issue within the school.

Mr. Little took a question from Sandy DuPlain of CDO. Ms. DuPlain wanted to contribute the information that from the last meeting the JTED CTE portion was presented to the committee. There were 105 students participating and it outlined the JTED requirements, so maybe that would help. The Facilitators said it was in Ms. Greenleaf's PowerPoint presentation. Ms. DuPlain noted it was on page 6 of the presentation. Mr. Little asked how many JTED students it listed. Ms. Du Plain replied 105 was what Ms. Greenleaf said at the last meeting. Mr. Little said that seemed entirely too low and asked where that came from as we have more than 105 JTED students. Committee members interjected it was Ms. Greenleaf's presentation. A committee member said it was Central JTED. Mr. Little clarified that they are Central JTED classes which aren't ours, that money goes directly to JTED. Those are JTED Central campus. The students we are talking about that take JTED on our campuses are called Satellite JTED students of which those numbers are considerably higher than 105. Ms. Godlewski said that it listed about 861 students enrolled in the satellite CTE programs at IRHS. Mr. Little said that basically about 1/3 of all students are taking a JTED class. Ms. Williams of IRHS asked where we get the funding to pay for those classes and teachers. Mr. Little explained that funding goes to the JTED and the JTED returns a portion of the funding to us that pays for those teachers and those sections. A committee member said that then the funding is not completely lost, it get reimbursed. Mr. Little said we don't get back every dollar that we generate into the system. JTED keeps a big piece of the money that supports its central campus programs. Mathematically what is does is really a question for Patti Greenleaf. Mr. Little said he would get the information on how many students are carrying less than 4 classes in their Senior year right now, he suspects it is less than 20 students.

Ms. Gardiner pointed out that the JTED CTE information is in the August 16th minutes that were approved tonight if the committee would read Ms. Greenleaf's portion which was taken from the recording. It talks about the split of funding, each type and how many classes.

### **International Baccalaureate Program (IB)**

Mr. Stephen Rothkopf of CDO, IB Diploma Coordinator, presented information on the International Baccalaureate Program. The PowerPoint presentation included: the history of the IB program, programs worldwide, the diploma program's content, emphasis, and core courses; program options, details on instructional minutes, bell schedule, assessments, university recognition and research, the IB mission statement and learner profile. The IB Program consists of a primary years program, middle years program and diploma program. If all three levels are offered it is considered a continuum school. There is also a career-related program. The high school IB program includes students 16-19 years of age studying in six subject groups. Spanish, French and Mandarin are offered. Seventh period is important because IB students have to take Theory of Knowledge (TOK), interdisciplinary and true philosophy. It consists of only 100 hours but has to be concurrent according to IB. Students have to complete an essay of 4,000 words. IB is holistic with all subjects connected; creativity, activity and service components. Mr. Rothkopf compared the Arizona State requirements for instructional time to the IB requirements. All Three parts of the IB core are compulsory. IB student are assessed both internally and externally. IB moderates and IB gives the final grade. Mr. Rothkopf offered to answer any questions.

Mr. Robinette asked how many students were in the IB program and of those students how many were open enrolled. Mr. Rothkopf said there were 46 students in IB currently and they would have to pull the information on how many are open enrolled. Mr. Robinette asked if a later start time would attract more open enrollment students. Mr. Rothkopf replied that he believes it would.

### **English Language Development Program (ELD)**

Jayne Huseby, AZELLA District Testing Coordinator & ELD ISA presented information on English Language Acquisition Services and the English Language Learners (ELL) program. Ms. Huseby pointed out forms used by the state SEI classroom observation. She also highlighted ELL success stories. Our refugee students are primarily at Prince Elementary, Amphitheater Middle School, and Amphitheater High School. When students are reclassified from the program, they have to be monitored; they have to take the AZMerit test which can affect the school score card ratings. The District identifies ELL students with the Primary Home Language Other Than English Survey (PHLOTE). PHOLTE is a survey about the primary language used in the home and by the student. If any of the three questions are answered with a language other than English, the student is tested using the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZELLA) and the test must be taken within 30 days. More students are tested than there are students who become enrolled in the program. If not proficient services are offered. Parents can remove their student from the program, but the District is required to inquire every spring. The requirements have changed to where it is easier to get in the program, but harder to get out. Once a student is proficient in AZELLA, they are reclassified as Fluent English Proficient - first year monitoring (FEP1) They are retested each spring to monitor progress. If there are more than 20 ELL students across a three grade span, the four class block has to be offered. AMS and AHS have so many ELL students that classes have to be offered by proficiency level. At IRHS and CDO they have individual language plans. In the 4 hour block lesson plan in ILLP at CDO and IRHS, mainstream teachers write what they want to work with the student on. At AHS there are 80-100 ELL students and they are still testing. CDO and IRHS have 1 ELL and the mainstream teachers help. Monitoring from the State is grueling. The monitors came for a week, visited seven schools, looked at every lesson plan, monitored the class and if the performance objective was incorrect told them about it. They looked at the books for testing, looked to see if the hours were correct, etc. It was difficult but the District passed. The ELL program is highly watched by the Office of Civil Rights, Federal agencies, Department of Justice. They come for the AZDDE. Ms. Huseby offered to answer any questions. There were none.

### **Food Service**

Mr. Jim Burns, Executive Manager of Operational Support, presented information about the Food Service program. Mr. Burns explained that the Food Service program was revenue neutral. Everything is paid for through reimbursements and the Free and Reduced Lunch Program. For capital expenditures you have to make a profit and the revenues can only be used for Food Service functions. We serve 20 sites and have 147 employees. 1, 906, 386 meals have been served in school year 2016. Mr. Burns reviewed the statistics regarding revenue and expenses listed on the presentation. The Arizona Department of Education National School Lunch Program states that students should be provided a "plate time" of 20 minutes to eat, not including the time in line getting their lunch. This is suggested to slow down their eating for better health. Designated meal time is required by law and is between 10:00 am and 2:00 pm with breakfast optional. All meals apply to guidelines, calorie counts, sodium and sugar amount and portions. A dietician was hired to try herbs and spices for meals and taste testing is done with students. Salad bars were added last year. There is standard breakfast when students eat in the cafeteria and buses arrive 20-30 minutes before the bell and are served only if they choose. For breakfast in the classroom students eat in the classroom. The bus arrives 10-15 minutes before the bell and where there is breakfast in the classroom all students eat in the classroom as a business decision as it is less expensive than staffing a line. Teachers are entitled to a 30 minute lunch. Site capacities are of importance to the Advisory Committee in regards to scheduling. Mr. Burns went over Site Capacities slide on page 65 of the BoardBook. Mr. Burns offered to answer any questions.

Ms. Kersten Kremer of IRHS asked if Food Service is revenue neutral why the District can't serve what they want. Mr. Burns explained that funding comes from the federal government under the Free and Reduced School Lunch program. The District has a choice to be enrolled in the School Lunch program or not. It cannot be done school by school. If 45 to 50% of students are eligible and enrolled, we have to follow the guidelines.

### **Student Services**

Dr. Steve Duley, Director of Student Services presented information on Special Education and Student Services. Mr. Duley showed the committee the Amphi SE 19(d) form used for special education services to be provided. The form documents and accounts for special education services provided within the regular classroom and outside the regular classroom. Instruction is provided in the least restrictive environment possible and teachers co-teach in the

mainstream classroom. Every Special Education student has an Individual Education Plan (IEP). We account for the percent of time spent in general education versus special education. We want our students to be in general education as much as possible. We are required to count the minutes spent by school day and week in general education and special education. It is reported on an IEP the percentage of time spent in each. The way time impacts Special Education students is we have teachers assigned; a teacher, teacher's aide and program aides. Program aides are spread across three campuses. They are compensated for the length of time they spend. If there were changes made to instructional hours we would need to recalculate the minutes on IEPs. Time impacts students and teachers. Dr. Duley offered to answer questions.

Ms. Sarah Stuart of CDO asked if there is a time requirement for Special Education and General Education or is it based on the IEP. Dr. Duley said it is based on the needs of the student.

Mr. Robinette of CDO asked if the schedule changed from 6/6/6/ and a reduction of instructional time, if each IEP would have to be modified. Dr. Duley said yes, that there is no way around it. Mr. Robinette asked how hard that would be. Mr. Duley said it would be clerical and an addendum to additional document. They would have to petition the Arizona Department of Education (AED) for a blanket letter to be sent to parents regarding the changes. He said he was optimistic that parents would be understanding. Mr. Robinette asked then if it was not a negative effect. Dr. Duley said they would have to amend all IEPs and it would have to be accurate. Mr. Robinette asked what would be required to amend the IEPs. Dr. Duley said it could be down with excusals. Parent and LED agree not being dicusses. AED says an IEP amendment short of minor is needed.

Jenney Een of IRHS asked who would modify. Dr. Duley said the case manager for each student would modify for all the students in their caseload.

Mr. Robinette asked if this was minor and would not result in massive lawsuits. Dr. Duley replied that he has been in the field for 38 years and he doesn't think so. Want what is best for the students and this would be minutes and a clerical correction. He is not worried by it.

Nina Godlewski of CDO asked if it would reduce pay for aides. Dr. Duley said he doesn't know at this point. They are compensated for time spent with the children, 37.5 hours per week. The structure is they get paid for amount of time spent with the students.

Jenny Een asked if part of their clock time is before and after school with buses. Dr. Duley said sometimes. Not every school is the same. We can maneuver with the aides. Some go with students to class. They are considerate to the student first, but want people to truly have gainful employment. Ms. Een asked if there was more collaboration time for teachers, would their role change. Dr. Duley said in an ideal world would be wonderful to build into the days. As more students got to General Education the aides would help.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ms. Call asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

Ms. Call reminded the Advisory Committee that the next meeting is Tuesday, September 13th, 5:00 to 7:00 pm. The Committee was asked to email Ms. Call and Ms. Biallas-Odell with any further questions about the presentations they would like answered.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Call adjourned the meeting at 6:44 PM.

---

Respectfully submitted,  
Karen S. Gardiner,  
Administrative Assistant to the Governing Board

Advisory Committee Regarding High School Instructional Time Meeting Minutes  
August 30, 2016

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tassi Call, Facilitator and Co-Chair      TBD  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Wendy Biallas-Odel, Facilitator and Co-Chair      TBD  
Date

Approved: TBD