

**SANTEE SCHOOL DISTRICT
SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

MINUTES
January 13, 2011

Douglas E. Giles
Educational Resource Center
9619 Cuyamaca Street
Santee, California

A. OPENING PROCEDURES

1. Call to Order and Welcome
President Ryan called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
Members present:
Barbara Ryan, President
Dan Bartholomew, Vice President
Dianne El-Hajj, Clerk (arrived 7:15 p.m.)
Ken Fox, Member
Dustin Burns, Member
Administration present:
Dr. Patrick Shaw, Superintendent and Secretary to the Board
Karl Christensen, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services
Minnie Malin, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources/Pupil Services
Kristin Baranski, Director, Educational Services
Linda Vail, Executive Assistant and Recording Secretary

B. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

There were no requests from the public to speak at this time on items not on the agenda.

President Ryan asked to hold comments on items on the agenda to allow Administration to present their review of historical data and current information. Public communication regarding items on this agenda would follow item C.5.

C. BOARD WORKSHOP ON THE SANTEE SCHOOL DISTRICT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION ITEMS

1. Overview of the Capital Improvement Program-Phase II

Dr. Shaw presented an overview of the CIP program. In October 2010, Administration came to the Board hoping to get some money to move forward with Modernization. Prior to that, the District obtained the BAN, paid off Phase 1, and installed the infrastructure at three non-modernized schools.

2. Phase I and II Modernization Scope and Bond Language

Administration provided the Bond Language for information about the school needs and priorities.

3. Capital Improvement Program Funding Sources and Uses

Karl Christensen shared the funding sources for the Capital Improvement Program. The District will receive \$35 million in State grant funds and will have an additional \$5.9 million in April when GO bonds are issued. First, the BAN must be paid off, which will leave approximately \$34.3 million remaining. These limited funds of \$10.4 million are enough to modernize the three remaining Phase II schools, complete the ball field project at CFH (which is a necessity), and provide some other limited work, which may include one 10-classroom building.

4. Highlights of Previous Board Meeting Minutes and Documents (2008-2009)

Dr. Shaw reviewed the history of the Capital Improvement Program since February 2008. At the February 2, 2008 Board workshop, Administration brought the conceptual design recommendations for Phase II schools (Chet F. Harritt, Hill Creek, and Prospect Avenue), and discussion of the new classroom building at Chet F. Harritt, which was in the original plans as a 5-classroom building. Chet. F. Harritt staff and parents came forward and the Board approved the conceptual designs of Phase II schools and moving forward with 10-classroom addition at Chet F. Harritt, Hill Creek, and Pepper Drive, noting in the action that a Chet F. Harritt 10-classroom design would require an additional \$2.5 million and directed Administration to seek the additional \$2.5 million in funding.

At the November 17, 2008 Board meeting, there was discussion about Prospect Avenue's enrollment concerns. At that meeting the Board approved Prospect Avenue administration and staff to move forward to develop a plan to increase enrollment with a focus in technology

At the March 17, 2009 Board Meeting the Board approved the PRIDE Academy program with development of a plan in the future to move the 7th and 8th grade students from Prospect Avenue to attend another school if enrollment did not either stabilize or increase.

On May 2, 2009 the Board held a CIP workshop where the schedule for Phase II was approved by the Board including the plan for a location of the building at CFH. The locations of the Learning Resource Center and Multi-Purpose room were not finalized. Christina Becker continued working with the CFH staff to determine the best location. The Board also approved moving forward as planned for modernization at Chet F. Harritt, Hill Creek, and PRIDE Academy, and summer work at Pepper Drive,

On May 22, 2009 another workshop was held because State apportionments were not being sent which created funding issues and the Board changed the plans to move forward with only Phase II construction options which included the PA modernization, summer work at PD and the infrastructure work at Chet F. Harritt, PRIDE Academy, and Hill Creek (Options E, F, and G)

On June 10, 2009 the Board took action to halt all modernization due to the funding concerns which included the uncertainty of receiving the BAN and State apportionments being stopped. When the BAN materialized in July 2009, we were able to move forward with infrastructure only at Chet F. Harritt, PRIDE Academy, and Hill Creek and one ballfield at Chet F. Harritt, as well as paying off of Phase I costs.

In December 2010, the District was notified The State would be funding \$35 million in joint use and modernization funds. This set the stage for moving forward with modernization at Chet F. Harritt, PRIDE Academy, and Hill Creek.

Administration requested the Board determine if new construction could move forward and where that new construction would be. Because of uncertainty in State apportionments for the future, Administration believes it is best if the District does not get in the position needing to borrow money again.

5. Cost and Impact for 10 Classroom Additions at Each Site

Administration provided a chart showing the cost of each 10-classroom addition. Ten-classroom buildings at Hill Creek and Chet F. Harritt cost \$6.8 million. Pepper Drive cost \$7.3 million because of some anomalies. Each school is eligible for grant funding which would lower the net cost of the buildings, although they are currently unfunded. Hill Creek is eligible for \$2.2 million in grant funding. Chet F. Harritt is eligible for \$1.1 million and Pepper Drive for \$2.1 million. Providing a 10-classroom building at Chet F. Harritt does not provide the Multipurpose Room which will be an additional cost of approximate \$2.5 million. Pepper Drive is not eligible for State modernization funding until approximately 2017.

Member Burns asked if the \$6.8 million cost compares to the cost of the previous buildings. Karl Christensen said costs should be very close but material costs are increasing.

Dr. Shaw shared the impacts to classroom availability at each school after modernization, considering maximum anticipated enrollment and based on the past 7-year enrollment trend. With a 10-classroom building addition, Hill Creek would have no empty classrooms, Chet F. Harritt would have 7 empty classrooms, and Pepper Drive would have 6 empty classrooms after modernization.

In the 2010-11 school year the Superintendent requested the Board approve an integrated instruction model in 7-8 grades at PRIDE Academy. It has been very successful and at this time would not recommend moving 7th and 8th grade students out of PRIDE Academy. Last year when the principal presented her plan there was a net loss of 9 students. Most parents kept their students at PRIDE Academy even with the opportunity to leave and transfer to schools of their choice. If PRIDE Academy moved 7th and 8th graders in the future, Dr. Shaw would recommend moving them to Carlton Hills, where there is adequate space and a merged junior high program in place.

Following Administration's presentation, President Ryan invited members of the audience to address the Board.

Helen Toma-8th grade teacher at Chet F. Harritt: Ms. Toma said she appreciates the difficult choices the Board needs to make that will impact the future of students. She shared the strengths of Chet F. Harritt and how they rank competitively with the other schools in the District. Chet F. Harritt has a strong parent community and students with high goals. Environment makes a difference and she believes their students will excel with modernized classrooms, science labs, and technology.

Gabriel Pina- Chet F. Harritt PTA president, parent, and business owner: Mr. Pina believes there is potential for Chet F. Harritt with classroom modernization. He has seen the modernized schools and believes modernization of Chet F. Harritt will keep students there, enhance what Chet F. Harritt is, and what it could become.

Dr. Shaw said all three schools, Chet F. Harritt, Hill Creek, and PRIDE Academy will be modernized this summer.

Member Bartholomew asked what the enrollment at PRIDE Academy looks like now that the Academy has been in place. He also mentioned that in the past there was discussion if the small program there jeopardized the education of the students and asked at what point the decision would be made that it is not a viable program.

Dr. Shaw said the enrollment of 507 general education students at PRIDE Academy is the highest in the past 5 years. There were 460 students at their lowest point. There was a drop of 9 students when the integrated junior high program was started. He has been very interested in their program this year and has visited often. He has seen remarkable growth. Mrs. Baranski said she has been impressed with teacher and student collaboration and the excitement in the classrooms.

Member Bartholomew would like to understand the programmatic issues in order to make a decision about the 10-classroom building at Chet F. Harritt. He said other junior highs have opportunities that are supported by staff and asked at what point do we determine if the program is working and make a decision on what is best for students. He considers equity for students at all school sites important.

Stephanie Southcott, principal at PRIDE Academy, said the drop of 9 students was mostly in 8th grade. Some parents were nervous, not knowing what the new program would look like. The results are very positive and it offers a very different type of program. Mrs. Southcott anticipates 120-125 students for next year and believes this has been a good program for the PRIDE students.

Member Bartholomew asked what kinds of electives were available. Mrs. Southcott said electives are offered through the Project Based Learning approach, but it is difficult to achieve because of time. Teachers offer drama within the Language Arts and Social Studies curriculum. There are also many opportunities available for students through ASES.

6. Considerations for Options for Chet F. Harritt School

Dr. Shaw presented three options for Chet F. Harritt for Board consideration.

1. Build the 10-classroom building at a cost of \$6.3, plus \$2.5 million for a Multipurpose room. This would provide more than ample classroom space for the school. This has an indefinite funding timeline and an additional \$3 million in funding must be procured. Locker rooms could be laced in the Multipurpose Room, which will be closer to where students have PE.
2. Build a 6-classroom building with a Multipurpose Room on the bottom floor for a cost of \$7.5 million. This option would fit the middle school structure Chet F. Harritt has today and could hold up to 740 students. Funding is indefinite and the locker location would be on upper playground which is a ways from the lower playground.
3. Build a new Multipurpose Room to include lockers with no new 6-8 classroom structure. Transform current lockers into classrooms. Science classrooms would be provided through modernization. This option provides space for up to 650 students.

Administration invited the Board to submit options they would like to consider and requested to hold staff and parent meetings to solicit stakeholder input on the options.

Helen Toma: Ms. Toma asked about square footage for 8th grade classrooms. Christina Becker said Chet F. Harritt was designed and built in 1968. The larger rooms are in the administration wing for junior high classrooms. The interim plan for modernization was to put science classes in that wing and provide a work room.

The classrooms in the 10- classroom buildings are 950 sq. ft., with science classes a little larger. Wing C rooms are adequate for those classrooms. They are as big as or bigger than a relocatable but not as big as a 10-classroom building design.

Lori Rush-a parent and employee: She was very disappointed that Hill Creek is going to get a new building and Chet F. Harritt may not. She believes the Board should follow through with their promises to modernize all schools equally. She is disappointed and would like to see equality.

Gabriel Pina: Asked clarifying questions about the options: When a building would be completed, where a 6-classroom structure would be located, and when the community would be solicited for input. President. Ryan said the community would have an opportunity for input soon.

Member Burns said building a new building at any school is a win for students and modernization will touch everyone. The round schools were a bad design and there is a difference in spacing between the round schools and the older schools. It is important to address parity at each school and to talk to the school population. Member Burns said he would support building now at Hill Creek because if Hill Creek is modernized there will not be enough classrooms to house the students. It will also be affecting a larger population of students.

Member Fox asked what Hill Creek would receive if a 10-classroom building was built at Chet F. Harritt. Dr. Shaw said Hill Creek would be modernized but students would remain in portables, share with Project SAFE, or use the multi-purpose room.

Member El-Hajj believes the Board needs to get input from the community. If the Board decided Chet F. Harritt needs a 10-classroom, the District would need \$9.3 million. She does not want to build classrooms that would sit empty if a 6-classroom building would suffice. Member El-Hajj asked how much more assessment value would have to be realized to get an extra \$4 million dollars. Mr. Christensen said the growth would need to be at 7%. Christina Becker said the State is running out of money and we are at the bottom of the future unfunded list.

President Ryan believes looking at the demographics and enrollment it would be irresponsible to build a 10-classroom building at Chet F. Harritt. The student population does not support it. If a 6- classroom can work and provide the program it

should be considered. The hope for additional State money is not responsible. The Board made a promise but has to do it sensibly. She wants to hear from the Chet F. Harritt community. If a case is made and shows that the classrooms with be filled she would support it at that time.

Andy Johnston, Principal of Chet F. Harritt, in response to the Board, said staff will need to provide information about what would be different between a 10-classroom and 6-classroom building.

7. Request for Decisions from the Board

a. Allocation of Funding of the Ten-Classroom Building at Hill Creek School

President Ryan shared Administration is recommending allocation of funding for the 10-classroom building at Hill Creek as part of Phase II. Member Bartholomew asked about the impact of a BAN. Mr. Christensen said it must be paid off in five years and puts the general fund at risk if we can not issue bonds by then.

Member Burns said he cannot forget the District vision and not just focus on one school's vision. He must think about what teachers need to do their job teaching kids.

Member Bartholomew said he is being asked to make a decision about what school will get a new building and what school may not. As Dr. Shaw shared, the Board originally anticipated the possibly of moving PRIDE Academy's 7-8 students when deciding on a 10-classrooms building. That scenario no longer exists. There is also the option to go for a \$4 M BAN, which may not be the wisest thing to do at this time. The Chet F. Harritt school community has already spoken and they wanted a 10-classroom building.

President Ryan said both schools would get a building. One will have to wait until the funding is available. She believes the Board is committed to fulfilling its promise to provide a new classroom building at Hill Creek and Chet F. Harritt. The choice is which one we build first.

Member Burns said we do not have enough room at Hill Creek to house students following modernization. There would be a need to keep 5 relocatables and not close out the permits for modernization because they do not comply. We would have to move YALE or share with Project SAFE.

Member El-Hajj will support this recommendation but is also willing to take a risk on a BAN. She wants to find funding to do Chet F. Harritt now too. The pressing issue is the need to begin right away with the money we have. She is also concerned about the 10-classroom versus a 6-classroom and how it will be used.

Member Bartholomew confirmed that if both schools received a 10-classroom addition it would incur \$3.3million of debt and asked if there is the potential to go out for a BAN to bridge the gap to allow a 10-classroom additional at both sites. Mr. Christensen said yes, but the debt would not include the cost of the Multipurpose Room at Chet F. Harritt and that a BAN adds additional risk in an uncertain economy.

Member Bartholomew said he would not support building a classroom building at one school. He wants to provide them at both schools.

Member Burns moved to allocate funding at this time for the 10-classroom building at Hill Creek as part of Phase II modernization.

Motion: Burns Second: Ryan Vote: 4-0 (Bartholomew, no)

b. Approval for Administration to Seek Stakeholder Input on Options for Chet F. Harritt Capital Improvement

Dr. Shaw requested the Board provide direction to Administration to take the Options 1, 2, and 3 with renderings, to the Chet F. Harritt community to get their feedback on what option may be viable in the future. He would like to get the information within the next couple of weeks.

Member El-Hajj said it would be helpful to give staff time to mull over the options. Member El-Hajj moved for Administration to seek stakeholder input on options for Chet F. Harritt.

Motion: El-Hajj Second: Bartholomew Vote: 5-0

Member Burns said he does not believe option 3 fulfills the promises made in the Bond language. He hopes that teachers and administrators take time to celebrate the great modernization that will be occurring at their schools.

Member El-Hajj asked Mr. Christensen to get more information about a BAN for \$4 M or \$6 M and where would we be in the hierarchy waiting for State funds.

Ms. Toma asked if teachers will be able to talk about the things they would like to see fixed or different in their modernization, based on comments from teacher at modernized schools. Mrs. Becker said the post occupancy list will need to be resurrected and staff will be encouraged to share any concerns or ideas with their site administrators. District administration will meet regularly before, during, and after modernization and construction.

8. Proposed Actions for Board on January 18, 2011

Dr. Shaw shared a list of items that will be coming to the Board for approval at the next regularly scheduled meeting, based on the decisions made at this meeting.

C. CLOSED SESSION

President Ryan announced the Board would go into closed session to discuss:

1. Conference with Legal Counsel-Existing Litigation

(Subdivision (a) of Gov't Code §54956.9)

Case # 37-2009-00083936-CU-CO-CTL

The Board entered closed session at 8:47 p.m.

D. RECONVENE TO PUBLIC SESSION

The Board reconvened to public session at 9:15 p.m. No action was reported.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The January 13, 2011 special meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.