

Board Retreat (Friday, February 26, 2016)

Generated by Shelley R Shelton on Monday, February 29, 2016

Members present

Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Marsha Judkins, Michelle Kaufusi, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray

Staff members present

Keith C. Rittel, Superintendent; Gary Wilson, Assistant Superintendent; Stefanie Bryant, Business Administrator; Jason Cox, Executive Director of Human Resources; Dr. Gary Wall, Director of Human Resources; Alex Judd, Executive Director of Elementary Education; Shelley Shelton, Executive Assistant

Meeting called to order at 8:09 AM

A. 8:00 - 9:40 a.m. Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel. Utah Code 52.4.205

B. 9:40 - 9:50 Break

C. 9:50 a.m. Study Session

2. Roll Call

Guests: Jarod Site, Dixon Principal; Charity Williams, After School Programs; Jennifer Partridge; Karen Brown, Provo High Principal; Dr. Todd McKee, Timpview Principal; Lani Quisenberry, Independence Principal; David Walter, Director, Provo City Redevelopment; Mayor John Curtis

Staff Members:

Keith C. Rittel, Superintendent; Gary Wilson, Assistant Superintendent; Stefanie Bryant, Business Administrator; Jason Cox, Executive Director of Human Resources; Dr. Gary Wall, Director of Human Resources; Alex Judd, Executive Director of Elementary Education; Shelley Shelton, Executive Assistant; Chad Duncan, Technology Director; Caleb Price, Communications & PR Coordinator; Mark Wheeler, Facilities Director; Mitch Swenson, Construction Building Principal

Member Michelle Kaufusi arrived at 11:00 a.m.

3. Gifted/PUPs: Anne-Marie Harrison, Executive Director, Teaching & Learning

Note: Supt. Rittel: "As an introduction to the gifted program discussion, the administration based decisions regarding gifted programs on best practices: what the research says and aligning with the research. That may be different from how people feel about a program itself, a particular location, or how things exist right now. There will be some tension between the information in the following presentation, which is based on best practices and research, and what other people say, which is based on their preferences. This will be important to remember if the ultimate decision is to move PUPs to the middle school level. It will be an issue."

The discussion is continuing from the September 2015 board retreat; staff received feedback and direction from the board, is now looking at the next steps, again seeking board input and direction.

Background: At the last board retreat a discussion took place about district gifted services.

- Two immediate issues were identified
 - PUPs location
 - Additional CAS location
- Considerations for possible changes in services were presented.
- Students, parents and teachers involved in gifted programs participated in surveys relevant to their roles within the programs; a summary of survey data was presented.
- Overall response rates were relatively high.
- Surveys measured perceptions, preferences, parent rationale for placing in/removing from services, suggestions, etc.
- Respondents were asked to consider perceptions of current services and preferences for potential changes in services.
- One seventh of parents with students in PUPs/GT responded to survey. Approximately 50% of students participated; 75-80% of educators participated.
 - High overall satisfaction of parents/students with CAS
 - Almost Always: Parents: 50%; Students: 69%
 - Often: Parents: 47%; Students: 24%
 - Occasionally: Parents: 0%; Students: 5%
 - Almost Never: Parents: 3%; Students: 2%
 - High overall satisfaction of parents/students with PUPS
 - Almost Always: Parents: 51%; Students: 48%
 - Often: Parents: 45%; Students: 36%
 - Occasionally: Parents: 0%; Students: 9%
 - Almost Never: Parents: 4%; Students: 7%
 - Overall satisfaction parents/students with PALS
 - Almost Always: Parents: 32%; Students: 57%
 - Often: Parents: 40%; Students: 34%
 - Occasionally: Parents: 24%; Students: 6%
 - Almost Never: Parents: 4%; Students: 2%
 - Many parents chose not to participate in the program even though their student qualified.
 - Students come together district-wide for field trips/activities.

The Board feels very comfortable with the satisfaction levels.

Preferred Service - CAS

- The vast majority of parents preferred a district magnet school. There is a huge number of gifted students/parents who may not be receiving gifted services. Some parents chose gifted programs because their child is so gifted they don't fit in socially in their neighborhood school.
- CAS parents' preferences, in priority order:
 - District magnet school
 - Neighborhood school, in groups
 - Whatever research supports
 - Neighborhood school, in class
 - District, monthly field trips
- CAS students' preferences, in priority order:
 - District magnet school
 - Neighborhood school, in groups
 - Neighborhood school, in class
 - Whatever research supports
 - District, monthly field trips

2016-2017 CAS Expansion

Dr. Gary Wall reviewed the pros and cons

- Pros:
 - Facility/space will be available at Sunset View. Think of CAS as part of a program that would follow the feeder pattern to either high school
 - CAS at Provo Peaks would remain; Sunset View would be the second location, doubling the program.
 - A second location would increase diversity, which is extremely important
 - Student achievement/behavior results are good; the program is working
 - Transportation costs may decrease for Sunset View/west side students
 - Gifted population would increase to 5% by doubling the program
 - Non-verbal testing is used
 - A good system is in place for identifying students of poverty who qualify but don't necessarily test well on standardized testing
- Cons:
 - Parent concerns about changes
 - Recruiting and training qualified teachers
 - A new administrator (biggest concern)
 - Articulation of complete gifted services is not yet complete
 - Timeline to:
 - Communicate changes
 - Plan for change to parent transportation (no bussing provided)

Questions/concerns can be mitigated because we have a successful program that works.

Preferred Service: PUPs

- PUPs parents' preferences, in priority order:
 - District magnet school
 - Whatever research supports
 - Neighborhood school, in groups
 - Neighborhood school, in class
 - District, monthly field trips
- PUPs students preferences, in priority order:
 - District magnet school
 - Whatever research supports
 - Neighborhood school, in class
 - Neighborhood school, in groups
 - District, monthly field trips

PUPs Move from PHS to Middle Schools

Dr. Gary Wall reviewed the pros and cons:

- Pros:
 - Increase number of students receiving services
 - Size of school for students
 - Allows age appropriate interaction
 - Participation in all school activities (i.e., clubs, student government)
 - Pressure off high school to support middle school services
 - Decrease in transportation costs
- Cons:
 - Cost of space at Centennial (portables)
 - Parent and student concerns about changes
 - Timeline to:
 - Recruit and train qualified teachers

- Communicating changes
- Articulate curriculum (i.e., math strand)
- Transfer staff/FTEs from PHS to middle schools
- District Administration is particularly concerned about being able to accomplish this on such a short timeline

Feedback:

Jarod Sites, Dixon Principal:

- Feels he and Gaye Gibbs, Centennial principal, have worked very hard with Provo High principal Karen Brown and that they could pull this off in a short time frame (Fall 2016). They will have a rigorous and appropriate program at both middle schools, including a pre-AP program and other advanced opportunities for those who go past a traditional honors track.
- The principals have had discussions on how the state is now allowing high school credit to be earned in 7th and 8th grade. Students could complete both 7th & 8th grade English courses in 7th grade and take English 9 during their 8th grade year. Students would be able to do the same thing with Social Studies. PUPs students in 7th grade have typically taken Secondary Math I and Math II as eighth graders. Staff is currently in place to accommodate that. Jarod has gifted-endorsed teachers on staff but would like to hire one additional gifted-endorsed teacher who could absorb the PUPs students in a way that would meet their needs.
- Both schools would keep the PUPs cohort together for a couple of classes and integrate into other classes, allowing students to maintain their connection with their PUPs peers while also associating with peers outside the PUPs realm.

Board feedback:

- The biggest concern is that parents are extremely concerned about any change to the program. He would like to be able to announce the program will remain as is for an additional year, let parents know what the process will be, and give them the opportunity to support the move. Parents are fearful of losing what they currently have within the program. It will take time, communication and outreach from the district. Just the uncertainty this year about what was going to happen has been very difficult for these parents.
- Teachers have been telling parents the program "is going to be at the middle schools." Where did that come from?
- Is there any equal divide between students who would attend Centennial and those who would go to Dixon?
- Some parents are enrolling their gifted students in other districts because they don't want them going to high school.
- To increase the number of gifted students receiving services, the pre-AP classes should still be offered next year regardless of when the move takes place.
- We need to tell parents the change is going to take place, but we should ask them via survey if they would prefer it take place next year or the following year.
- Remember the next group of students to enter PUPs are the same CAS students who were moved from Grandview to Provo Peaks last year.

Jennifer Partridge, parent:

- Some parents are going to be unhappy regardless of the decision. The rumors are that the change is already happening. It would be wise to hold a parent meeting sooner rather than later; communication is key.

Staff feedback:

- The current survey overwhelmingly indicates parents are concerned about any change.
- Supt. Rittel:
 - The program would be a two-year phase-in if and when the decision is to move the program; anyone currently in the PUPs program at the end of next year at PHS would be allowed to finish

there. The last PUPs class entering PHS would be this fall; during year one of the phase-in, only the new seventh graders would be brought into the program.

- We can communicate that we're going to put the move off for a year for many logistical reasons. We could still get it done next year, but the abruptness of a move in the fall would leave staff scrambling, with the concern every day that we're not going to do this right.
- Parents will have the choice to enroll at middle school next year instead of Provo High to take advantage of the pre-AP program.
- An additional push for direction stems from the fact that high school schedules for next year are being built right now but have been stopped pending a board decision on this move.

Board consensus:

- Expand CAS for 2016-2017; delay PUPs move for one year
- PUPs move: The board will follow Supt. Rittel's recommendation to delay the move for an additional year; put everything place and structure the program to accommodate students when they do move. Articulate what's happening at the middle schools (pre-AP program) next year for parents who may choose to take advantage of that.
- Staff will work on a communication plan.

4. 10:35 - 11:45 Budget Planning & Priorities/Capital Projects/Potential Tax Levy

Facilities Director Mark Wheeler reviewed the capital projects, emphasizing the following (see attached):

- In past years the total capital projects budget has been about \$2.5M; this year it's \$1.7M. It was backed off for several reasons, 1) to provide a cushion for the Provost rebuild; 2) to help with transportation and whatever is decided about the Timpview softball field project. Everything on the list represents the most urgent projects (rating of 1), or it has to do with timing. Items with a "1" rating include:
 - Canyon Crest: backup emergency generator system: \$35,000
 - Dixon: boiler replacement and accessory equipment (summer project): \$275,000
 - Provo High: roofing repairs/HVAC and electrical maintenance costs: \$50,000
 - Spring Creek: replace A/C system: \$135,000
 - Sunset View: remaining asbestos abatement: \$45,000
 - THS: install VCT flooring in common hallway leading to library: \$35,000; upgrade main floor academic restrooms: new tile and plumbing: \$42,000
 - Wasatch/Oakridge: install new common area flooring in Oakridge building: \$46,000

Reserve Capital Projects:

- Technology: replace obsolete phone system with IP phone system (\$200,000)
 - Stef will determine if it has to be delayed for a year after evaluating the fund balance.
- THS softball property purchase & field construction - \$3,200,000.00 \$2.2M would be to purchase the property. Supt. Rittel is going to propose a lease option.
 - Consensus: THS will use one of the softball fields on Fox field for 1 year; leave baseball field where it is.
 - Supt. Rittel will visit with THS Principal Todd McKee about the use of the football field for band practice.
- Transportation: Transportation facility construction: \$2,700,000; 2 new buses: \$225,000

Total capital Improvements: \$1,772,100

Total building improvements: \$6,325,000

Business Administrator Stefanie Bryant reviewed the following budget information with the board (see attached):

- Board goals

- Board direction needed
- Current FY Approved Budget (bond costs extracted)
 - Federal Revenues
 - Ten-Year Assumptions
 - Current Year Assumptions
- State Revenues
 - Ten Year Assumptions
 - Current Year Revenues
 - Amount from WPU
 - Assumed WPU increase (3.5%)
 - Utah Association of School Business Officials (UASBO) is pushing for 4%
- Local Revenues
 - Ten Year Assumptions
 - Current Year Revenues
 - Property Tax Portion
 - Local Fees Portion
 - Assumed Annual Increase \$900K (includes GO debt) Expired RDA (NuSkin) \$600K (will see in 2018)

Expense Assumptions

- Three Year Assumptions
 - Utah State Retirement - no increase expected for FY17
 - Savings of \$500K annually in unassigned funds
 - Minimum of 2% salary increase plus related benefits
 - Maintenance saving for rebuilds begin FY17 - largely realized only after school are built and in use
- Five Year Assumptions
 - Curriculum needs \$750,000
 - IT needs \$900K annually for replacement cycle
 - Transportation needs to purchase 16 buses in the next 5 years
- Ten Year Assumptions
 - Annual medical inflation of 10-12%
 - Expected annual energy increase 10% (partially offset by Cynergistic savings)
 - IT, Transportation and curriculum needs will continue

Current Year Increase/Priorities

- Annual salary and related benefits (4%) - \$3.2 million
- Annual medical inflation - \$1.1 million
- Annual curriculum needs - \$400K
- Annual Tech needs - \$500K
- Learning Initiative Need - \$500K
- FTEs/Professional Development/Leave buy back - \$600K
- Annual Bus Replacement from General Fund - \$135K

FY17 Budget Priorities \$6.55M

How are FY17 Increases & Priorities Paid for:

- Budget Increases:
 - Annual salary and related benefits (4%) - \$3,200,000
 - Annual medical inflation - \$1,100,000
 - FTE/Professional Development/Leave buy-back - \$600K
 - Annual bus replacement from General Fund - \$135K
 - Total: \$5,035,000
 - State funding increase - \$2,500,000
 - Local funding increase (includes expired RDA) - \$1,300,000
 - Fund balances/built in buffer - \$1,250,000

- Total - \$5,050,000
- Priorities recurring from FY16 budget
 - Annual curriculum needs \$400,000
 - Annual tech needs \$500,000
 - Learning Initiative: 35 classrooms - \$615,000
 - Total recurring priorities - \$1,515,000

Other Ongoing Budget Assumptions FY17

- Utility increases are expected to be minimal
 - Cynergistics Energy Program resulted in about \$200,000 of avoided costs in FY15; expect \$400K in avoided costs in FY16. Savings offset by Cynergistics fee of \$270,000
- Food for Child Nutrition expected to increase 10%
 - CN has fund balance/revenues to cover
- 1% inflation built remainder of budget

Overall budget (needs scaling back/no bond expenditures)

- Revenues by Source
 - State
 - Local
 - Federal
- Objects by Type
- Excess (deficiency) of revenues over (under) expenditures
- Other financing sources (uses) and other items
- Net change in fund balance
- Fund balance: beginning (from prior year)
 - FY16 Working budget: \$90,289,672
 - FY17 Preliminary budget: \$92,663,861
- Fund balance: ending
 - FY16 Working budget: \$92,663,861
 - FY17 Preliminary budget: \$91,849,070
- District Needs for Next 5 Years
- Other Financial Needs
 - Three additional buses - PHS West routes: \$365,400
 - West side land for future elementary: \$1.2M
 - Technology infrastructure: \$250K
 - Replenish Building Reserve Fund/Other Fund Balance: \$4M
 - THS softball field: \$3M
- Levies
 - Basic School Levy
 - GO Bond payments
 - Capital local levy
 - Voted local levy
 - Board local levy
- Provo Levy History
- Levy Available
- Local Revenue/Property Taxes
- Increase Examples
- Use of Increased Revenue
- Truth in Taxation Process
- Discussion/Direction
- Fund Balance 6/30/15

Stefanie will talk to the county about a potential board levy.

5. 11:45 - 12:15 Community Development Areas (CDAs): Mayor John

Curtis & David Walter, Provo City Redevelopment Agency

David Walter reviewed the current proposed CDAs that had been previously discussed with the board. The downtown CDA Resolution will be added to Tuesday's Municipal Council agenda and will subsequently be forwarded to the board. Items reviewed included (see attached):

- The new downtown community development areas in their existing condition
- The new downtown community development areas and proposed property transfers
- Architectural rendering of new courthouse
- Duncan Aviation (at Provo Airport) update
- Architectural design of proposed Temple View Apartment complex

Member Michelle Kaufusi was excused at 11:45

6. 12:15 - 12:45 Lunch

7. 12:45 - 1:45 Dual Language Immersion (DLI) Proposal

Note: The following proposed plan is for board information only. It does not constitute policy or procedure.

Gary Wilson, Executive Director of Student Services, reviewed the proposed DLI plan and enrollment procedure for 2017-2018. District staff worked for a year to refine both the proposed plan and enrollment process for DLI as a result of related issues. In addition, the DLI committee consulted with principals, a parent group and others, and with board president Julie Rash to review and gather feedback on the document, which addressed the following:

- English class sizes, which were getting way too big as the years went by - from a first grade through sixth grade perspective
- Staffing
- The selection process
- Priority settings

A. PLAN IMPLEMENTATION YEAR AND SELECTION TIMELINES:

1. Implementation Year = 2017/2018
2. Dual Immersion Application Opening = Dec 1 each year (unless this date falls on a Saturday or Sunday)
 - The application process for school choice will be aligned with the application process for DLI so both are occurring simultaneously. Enrollment for both will take place at the district office rather than school choice enrollment taking place at the district office and dual immersion enrollment taking place at individual schools. It will be a random selection based on priority groupings, and consistent across the district.
3. Application Deadline = Third Friday in February, according to state law
4. District Information Meetings = November each year

B. NUMBER OF STUDENTS / NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS IN A DUAL IMMERSION SCHOOL

- The time progression shows that the number of dual immersion students decreases and the number of English students increases. Based on the data, the following proposal was developed.

1. Number of Students in a Beginning Dual Immersion Grade 1:
30 Students (exceptions will be approved by agreement between the Executive Directors of Human Resources and Elementary Education)

(Please note that it is necessary to begin DLI classrooms at a higher number of students so that as the years progress the numbers between DLI and English will be more balanced than what they are currently showing.)

Number of Classrooms of Dual Immersion:

2 Classrooms (exceptions will be approved by agreement between the Executive Directors of Human Resources and Elementary Education)

1. Number of Students in a Beginning English Grade Level 1:

22 Students (exceptions may be approved by agreement between the Executive Directors of Human Resources and Elementary Education)

Number of Classrooms of English:

2 Classrooms (exceptions may be approved by agreement between the Executive Directors of Human Resources and Elementary Education)

2. If a school has additional classrooms to support additional classes they may add these classes and long as the school can provide space for the additional years and possible classrooms that may follow. The school must maintain the minimum of two English classrooms.

3. If a school can only support three first grade classrooms, the following patterns are allowed:

a. 2 Dual Immersion

1 English

- To have one dual immersion classroom and two English classrooms would eventually be the demise of the dual language program by about the third grade due to natural attrition: students leaving the program for whatever reason and not being replaced with new students.
- If English classrooms get too large, the district would have to support the school with an additional English classroom/teacher.
- Currently Canyon Crest is the only DLI school that can not support more than three first grade classrooms. There is not enough space to accommodate two DLI classrooms and two English classrooms in each subsequent grade level.

C. STAFFING RATIOS

1. Dual Immersion (30 to 1) (Target Ratio)

1 Teacher

2. English (22 to 1) (Target Ratio)

1 Teacher

3. The Human Resources Department in cooperation with the principal will look at other supports as needed based on enrollment throughout the beginning of the school year and beyond.

D. SELECTION OF STUDENTS FOR DUAL IMMERSION (Grade 1), Listed in Priority Order

Note: Priority selection of students would only be used if the growth of the DLI program in a particular school makes it necessary.

1. Siblings of students, whose brothers or sisters are currently enrolled in a dual immersion program, and who live within the boundaries of the Provo City School District will be given first priority for admission into a dual immersion program.

2. Native Language speakers of the language taught in the dual immersion program, and live within the boundaries of the Provo City School District, will be given second priority for admission into a dual immersion program.

Native Language Speaker Definition:

A native language speaker is someone who has spoken the immersion language as their primary language

from earliest childhood. A heritage speaker will also be considered as a native speaker. A heritage speaker is someone who was raised in a home where the immersion language was spoken, who speaks or at least understands the language, and who is to some degree bilingual in that language and in English (Valdés, 2000 as cited by Kelleher, 2010). Heritage speakers have a family cultural connection to the immersion language. A child that was born to a native speaker parent is considered a heritage speaker. A child who has been adopted from a setting where the immersion language is spoken is considered a heritage speaker. A native speaker is not a child of two native English speakers, even if one or both of the parents has spent considerable time acquiring the immersion language. A native speaker is also not a child who has learned the language through a classroom or similar learning environment.

3. Siblings of students, whose brothers or sisters are currently enrolled in a dual immersion program, and live outside of the Provo City School District, will be given third priority for admission to a dual immersion program. This priority will end after the current students enrolled in first grade during the 2017/2018 school year leave the elementary at the end of 6th grade. After this time, all additional siblings will be considered Out-of-Boundary students. If a non-district resident enters a dual immersion program in the first grade during the 2018/2019 school year and thereafter, siblings of these students will not be given a priority status.

4. Children of teachers who teach in the dual immersion program (English or Immersion Language) will be given fourth priority status as long as they attend the same school where the parent is a teacher.

5. In-Boundary Special Education students will be given special consideration by the school principal and the Executive Director of Elementary Education. This consideration will include the promotion of special education students to be part of Dual Language Immersion programs and to closely look at the individual service model needed to meet both special education requirements and Dual Language Immersion requirements.

6. In-Boundary ELL students will be given special consideration by the school principal and the Executive Director of Elementary Education. In accordance with the national definition of two-way immersion, neither native language group may exceed 2/3 of the program. Therefore, in a two-way immersion program, e.g. Timpanogos, a minimum of 1/3 of the dual immersion students must be native Spanish speakers and a minimum of 1/3 of the dual immersion students must be native English speakers.

7. In-Boundary Students Selected for Dual Immersion will be determined on a yearly basis by the principal and the Executive Director of Elementary Education. Determining factors will include the number of priority students choosing to enroll:

Priority 1 = In-District Siblings

Priority 2 = Native Language Speakers

Priority 3 = Out of District Siblings

Priority 4 = Children of Teachers

Priority 5 = Special Consideration for Special Education and ELL Students

In general, the formula will be 85% of the slots after priority acceptance will be given to in-boundary students.

8. *In-Boundary Definition – A student is considered "in-boundary" if they either live in the neighborhood boundaries of the school or if they were accepted as a choice student in a prior year and have attended that school for at least one year.*

9. Out-of-Boundary Students Selected for Dual Immersion will be determined on a yearly basis by the principal and the Executive Director of Elementary Education. Determining factors will include the number of priority students choosing to enroll and the overall space available. In general, the formula will be 15% of the available slots after priority acceptance will be given to out-of-boundary students.

10. *Out-of-Boundary Definition – A student who lives in the Provo City School District and resides in a neighborhood other than the school they are applying to attend and have not met the minimum one year attendance requirement.*

11. *Non-District Resident Definition – The family lives outside of the Provo City School District Boundaries.*

12. Non-District Resident Students Selected for Dual Immersion = 0% (unless space allows)
(Exceptions may be made for siblings of current Non-District Residents based on #3 above, additional exceptions may be made where FTE is needed to fill classrooms)

13. Non-District Resident Students may be accepted into English classes if space is available.

14. Students applying after enrollment deadlines will lose all priority and boundary status (exceptions may be made by the Assistant Superintendent and the Executive Director of Elementary Education).

15. If space is available after the first lottery selections in the Spring, then additional lotteries will be held as needed to complete the formulation of classes prior to the start of the new school year. If additional lotteries are held there will be no priority status given unless an exception has been made by the Assistant Superintendent or the Executive Director of Elementary Education.

E. PROCESS FOR SELECTING IN-BOUNDARY STUDENTS INTO DUAL IMMERSION

1. In-Boundary Students - the school accepts DLI applications for all interested in-boundary students. Application deadline is the third Friday in February.

2. The in-boundary list will then be sent to the IT Department. The IT department will do a "random generated" list ranking for the number of students being allowed into the program.

3. All in-boundary students not accepted into the DLI program will automatically be put into an English class at their boundary school.

F. PROCESS FOR SELECTING OUT-OF-BOUNDARY CHOICE STUDENTS INTO A SCHOOL THAT OFFERS DUAL-IMMERSION

1. Out-of Boundary students must come to the Student Services Office and complete a choice application. If they wish to be considered for dual immersion they must also complete a Dual Immersion Form.

2. Out-of-Boundary Students - the District accepts DLI applications for all interested Out-of-Boundary students. Application deadline is third Friday in February.

3. Out-of-Boundary – lists will then be sent to the IT Department. The IT department will do a "random generated" list ranking for the number of students being allowed into the program.

4. Out-of-Boundary students not selected into DLI will then be eligible for English classes based on space availability.

5. If an out-of-boundary parent is offered either a DLI or English class slot the following options are available to the parent:

a. Accept the choice: Acceptance will then eliminate choices from other schools the parent may have also requested "choice".

b. Deny the choice: If denied the parent will then be eligible for other school requests that were made with the original application.

G. PROCESS FOR SELECTING OUT-OF-DISTRICT CHOICE STUDENTS INTO A SCHOOL THAT OFFERS DUAL LANGUAGE IMMERSION

1. If a school needs out-of-district students to meet class load requirements then the procedure for selecting these students will be the same as the procedure for selecting Out-of-Boundary students (see "F" above).

Example: Snapshot of DLI enrollment numbers at Wasatch, 2014-2015:

- Three DLI programs
- Enrollment cap should have been 90; 99 were enrolled, 33 in each class

- Under this proposal, schools that reach their enrollment cap must turn over additional requests to Gary. Decisions would be made in conjunction with Human Services and based on staffing considerations.
- In-district siblings: 65
- In boundary: 42
- Out-of-boundary: 23
- Native/heritage speakers: 3
- Out-of-district siblings: 3
- Total: 71
- 28 spots left over, filled by:
 - In-boundary: 20 (71%)
 - Out-of-boundary: 6 (21%)
- Overall enrollment
 - In-boundary: 63% - every in-boundary student that wanted to get into the Chinese program got in.
 - Out-of-boundary: 29%
 - Out-of-district: 5%
 - It's anticipated that enrollment at all DLI schools would be close to the same percentages.

Board/staff feedback:

- It should be a district program rather than a boundary program; struggling with the 85%/15% enrollment breakdown.
 - Take the 85/15% off altogether to avoid confusion from year to year. The process will still run in a fair process. Keith recommended making an adjustment to wording so people know it's a soft percentage, or remove it.
 - Adjust to 75/25%; two English classrooms.
- Number of classes: 2 English classes; support should be portables for immersion classes.
 - Gary and committee will discuss further. Gary would prefer portables to accommodate 2 English classes.
- Exceptions can be made to enrollment deadlines for extenuating circumstances.
- Requests have been received for German and Korean. Are we interested in expanding DLI to other schools? Do we leave it to the principal's discretion, or do we force it on them?
 - Having a DLI program at RC would make it necessary for a parent to choose their student into a west side school if they didn't want their child in a DLI school.
 - It would create another problem for middle schools to add more language programs at the elementary level.
 - The state has issued a "stop" on adding additional language programs due to the difficulty of getting language teachers
 - Bring elementary school principals together who don't currently have a DLI program, explore their preferences for adding language program; secondary tracking according to language. (If you take this language you'll go to this school...)
 - Depending on the superintendent's conversations with principals, the board will/not explore additional programs.

8. 1:45 - 2:15 "D" Grade Discussion

Member Michelle Kaufusi arrived at 2:00 p.m.

This has been an on-again/off-again issue over the past few years. This is a high school (credit) issue.

D grades became a de facto practice in the district about 15 years ago after the PHS math department felt that students were not learning enough with a D grade to be advanced to the next level of math. Utah Administrative Code R277-700 (The Elementary and Secondary School General Core) is rife with terms "mastery", "competency", and "proficiency" when describing desired levels of student learning.

Attached is some data related to a lack of D grades issued in relation to impact on graduation rates at district high schools. While many teachers seem to intervene for such students, some of the students are indeed penalized in progressing through high school and ultimately to graduation.

The superintendent recommended the board discuss this issue and consider three options:

1. Remain with current approach of issuing no D grades,
2. Return D grades to the grading scale (need to determine a start date),
3. Consider a compromise position of issuing D grades with a reduced credit value and immediate enrollment in a credit retrieval course for core courses (see attachment)

District administration requested clear guidance regarding the board's preferences on how to proceed. If a change from current practice is directed, we will want to be clear and consistent regarding the rationale.

D Grade Issue: A New Approach

Background Information

- State Rule R277-700 states that students should demonstrate proficiency and mastery in their courses.
- The "no D grades" approach (note it is not in board policy) was created about 15 years ago in response to concerns (notably from PHS math teachers) that students were not learning enough when they received D grades.
- A D grade represents learning at an approximate level between 60% and 69.9%. A D grade is not an F.
- In a study of D grades from our high schools in early 2014, it was shown that hundreds of students each year are earning D-range grades, and earning no credits.
- With an increasing emphasis on graduation, we must consider whether our current practice of no D grades is justifiable, or if different considerations might be merited.

The New Approach

- Since D grade students have learned *something*, it can be argued that some credit could/should be granted.
- At the end of a semester, instead of granting a .50 credit for passing work (>D) a D could generate a partial credit of a .25.
- Students earning a D would be allowed to continue to the next semester of the class (if they earned a D for 1st semester). They would be subsequently enrolled in an online course to help them complete the full credit from the previous semester.
- D students in the second semester would be automatically enrolled in summer school.

Yet to Finalize/Resolve

- Would this apply to core courses only? If so, how to deal with D grades in electives?
- Would this require a change to the current system where grades are posted to transcripts every quarter? In other words, how would we resolve that issue?

Board/Staff/Principal Comments

- What are we grading? What do grades mean as far as skills, knowledge learned? Are we grading behaviors, other circumstances in a student's life that impact student learning?
- Is this a decision that needs to be made way of a motion in a business meeting?
- A D grade is an early sign to check grades regularly to make sure intervention systems are taking place. All principals agreed.
- Grades are nothing more than a reporting tool. Student learning and credit accumulation are two different issues. Can adjust to add grades to allow credit accumulation; track students not ready for next level in course. A student receiving a D in middle school is ten times more likely to fail a course first term in high school.
- What % of students got D or F grades and for what reasons? Some know the materials but don't want to jump through the hoops. Again, what are we grading? Would be good with giving credit for D.
- Kids who get D grades have more of a tendency to give up/drop out, feeling they're a failure.

Summary: District administration will pursue the change, but for next year. The Board directed Supt. Rittel to work with district staff to draft a plan to make a D grade more meaningful.

9. 2:15 - 2:45 High School Start Times Study Process

The board has shown interest over time in exploring a shift in daily high school start/end times.

This introductory discussion centered on the process for studying the issue, along with a review of pros and cons. A timeline for gathering information and then making a decision was also discussed.

Considerations:

1. Transportation - high school goes later; elementary goes earlier. It's a big PR issue as well as a day care issue.
2. After school support, jobs, activities
3. Relationship with neighboring districts

The Board gave Supt. Rittel direction to study pros and cons and make a recommendation.

- Staff will come back with an initial concept at the board's Sept. 2016 retreat.
- A follow-up discussion would take place before Christmas 2016.
- A draft would be presented to the board in mid-January 2017.
- The board would take any needed action in early February 2017
- Supt. Rittel will share research with board members.
- Charity Williams will share research on the impact to before/after-school programs.

10. 2:45 - 3:00 Graduation and Other Upcoming Policies & Processes

Superintendent Rittel reviewed the following draft policies:

Draft 4410 Graduation policy

- Senior staff has had several graduation committee meetings to draft this policy. Supt. Rittel will share all policies with high school faculties next week.
- Board members will send feedback to Supt. Rittel.

Draft Policy 4425 Credit and Transcripts

- Some e-School parents pressured Asst. Supt. Gary Wilson and Supt. Rittel to change a transcript; neither would do it. A transcript is a legal document that will follow a student throughout life.
- The policy clarifies what "credit" means and what "transcripts" mean.
- It was suggested the policy could include the process for requesting a transcript through the school registrar.
- Transcript requests from too many years in the past must go through Student Services.

Draft Policy 4420 Grading and Progress Reports

- Supt. Rittel wants to have one consistent standard district-wide, beginning with high schools and ultimately expanding to K-12. The procedure is drafted for high school; middle school and elementary school will be drafted at a later date.
- Supt. Rittel stressed the need to make grade reporting to parents simpler. Reports should be updated every other week. Every teacher must have online grade book up to date every week. Parents should be able to print a report at the end of every quarter/term. The District could print reports for parents lacking internet access. (Add to policy/procedure.)
- Line 15 - change to "for high schools..."

Considerations for elementary policy:

- Include more elementary-friendly language.
- Should there be an elementary rubric from 1-4 or letter grades?
- Should elementary teachers issue syllabi?

Supt. Rittel indicated he would like to see the creation of professional development and alternative education policies.

11. 3:00 - 3:45 Bolstering the Secondary Program

In recent years, with specific supports in place, the district's elementary schools have been achieving at a high rate. In Fall 2015, the district and board were all pleased to learn that all of our 13 elementary schools received an A or B via the new state school report card process.

The 5 secondary schools have not achieved similarly in that time. In Fall 2015, only one of the secondary schools received a B grade (Timpview). All others received C grades, along with two whose grades decreased from a B to a C.

There is no simple, single, quick fix for the challenges at the secondary level. Rather, staff is recommending a multi-pronged approach to this complex challenge. The goal is increase student achievement, measured by state assessments, graduation rates, pre-university tests, etc. The aim statement guiding the new district improvement plan should also assist.

Additional options that have been considered, listed in no priority order, were discussed.

- If the budget allows, increasing counseling services at the secondary level: .5 FTE at each middle school, and 1.0 FTE at each comprehensive HS. Prior to receiving this allocation, the schools will have to submit (and have approved) a plan that denotes how the addition of this counseling support will positively impact graduation rates and overall services to students/parents
- If possible, some additional social worker support to Independence HS
- Study and possibly pilot AP prep Springboard at the middle school level
- Could pilot as PUP program initially; eventually expand to all middle schools
- Study and possibly pilot AP Capstone at the high school level.
- The district removed the seminar and research approach when the International Baccalaureate program was discontinued at PHS. Two additional courses could be added: AP seminars; AP Capstone research. There are no prerequisites to enroll. AP Capstone research points to a culminating project a student must defend.
- District administration is receptive to other approaches that have evidence behind moving students in greater numbers toward academic improvement, including graduation.

Additional items of discussion:

- Centennial principal Gaye Gibbs is welcoming any additional feedback from board members regarding the pilot schedule.
- Dixon principal Jarod Sites is studying how to bring in a different schedule and accommodate fine arts electives
- Implement schedule changes as a five-year pilot to see if the desired changes are realized.
- PHS/THS principals were asked to collect data for the past 5 years on the block schedule in preparation for a future discussion next year.

12. 3:45 - 3:50 Upcoming Google Calendar Items

- Add: District elementary choir next Thursday @ THS 6:30 - 8:30

D. 4:00 p.m. Adjourn

1. Motion to Adjourn

I move we adjourn.

Motion by Jim Pettersson, second by Michelle Kaufusi.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Marsha Judkins, Michelle Kaufusi, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray

The retreat was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.