

**MURRAY CITY-SCHOOL COORDINATING COUNCIL
MINUTES**

The Murray City School Coordinating Council met on Thursday, October 10th, 2013 in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Board Members Present:

Murray City

Dave Nicponski – Chair
Darren Stam
Jim Brass
Brett Hales
Jared Shaver

School Board

Marjorie Tuckett – Vice Chair
Mitzie Huff
Belinda Johnson
Cris Longhurst
Darrell Pehrson

Others Present:

Dan Snarr
Jan Wells
Janet M. Lopez
Kellie Challburg
Ted Eyre

Dr. Steve Hirase
Richard Reese
Tim Tingey
Chief Fondaco

Welcome – Approval of Minutes

Dave Nicponski welcomed everyone to the Murray City School Community Council meeting. Mr. Nicponski asked for approval of the minutes from April 18th, 2013. Jim Brass moved to approve the minutes, and Jared Shaver seconded the motion. All were in favor.

2.1 Economic Development Update –

Tim Tingey

Mr. Tingey talked about the new development just north of Fashion Place Mall. The site plan isn't firm yet, but University of Utah Healthcare is looking to develop a campus facility, with several phases occurring over the next five to ten years. The first phase is a five story facility on 6100 South with additional buildings developing to the north. Mr. Tingey said although this facility will not help with property taxes for either the School District or the City, it will generate a lot of traffic and help with sales tax revenues. The Fashion Place Mall is excited about the potential that the building will create. Construction will begin in the spring of next year. Mayor Snarr added that demolition will begin shortly.

Dillard's is relocating to the old Sears location, and will be constructing a new building on that site. Negotiations haven't been finalized on the old Dillard's site, and may not be announced until next summer. The plans for the new Dillard's have already been through the Planning Commission process.

The ore sampling site located at 5300 South and 300 West has been sold. The individual that owned the lot was given two years to remove the junk vehicles. The deadline has passed, and the junk vehicles remain, so the site is being cleaned up now. After it is cleaned up, it is hopeful that it could be marketed for some type of use, hopefully office or retail type of use. Several of the property owners

have approached the Redevelopment Agency and are interested in creating a redevelopment area there. It would be a community development area that could be negotiated with the taxing entities if they wish to participate. If the site can be cleaned up it could be positive. There is a lot of underutilized land there. The Redevelopment Agency has directed staff to prepare reports and plans to move forward. Mr. Tingey toured the old building on the site, and said it is a very solid well-built building. Mr. Shaver compared the building to the old Redman building in Sugarhouse, as well as the old Salt Lake Hardware building.

Recently, the City has entered into a memorandum of understanding with Woodbury Strategic Partners. They are interested in partnering with the Redevelopment Agency to develop property in and around the Central Business District.

Woodbury Strategic Partners have also had conversations with IMC Hospital. They invited Mr. Tingey and Mr. Brass to Rochester, Minnesota to the Mayo Clinic. The representatives from IMC would like the hospital to be that type of future facility in the community. Mr. Tingey said the Mayo Clinic was an amazing facility with an amazing culture of care. They met with the prime developer for downtown Rochester, representatives from the Mayo Clinic, and City representatives also. Rochester has a population of 107,000. There are hotels and open space near the facility. Murray would love to create that kind of atmosphere in conjunction with IMC and Woodbury.

Ms. Tuckett asked if the Mayo Clinic was near the Mall of America. Mr. Tingey replied that it is about 80 miles away. Mr. Brass commented that the Mayo Clinic sits in the middle of cornfields. It has an international airport but with only six gates.

Mr. Tingey noted that the University of Minnesota at Rochester has a facility near the Clinic, as well as shops and retail establishments. There are skywalks and underground pedestrian subways due to the harsh weather in Minnesota. There were 19 parking structures in and around the Mayo Clinic. There are 30,000 employees at the Mayo Clinic, so it could still use more parking. Development consists of upper level residential and lower level retail.

There are exciting opportunities if Murray can partner with IMC and other good partners. The Mayo Clinic has entered into agreements with the City of Rochester and the State of Minnesota and other donors for a \$6 billion investment over the next twenty to thirty years, creating 40,000 more jobs for the Mayo Clinic. Rochester City would invest \$128 million into infrastructure, and the state would invest millions also. The Mayo Clinic needs the infrastructure to compete internationally.

Ms. Tuckett noted the difference between a non-profit hospital and a for profit hospital. Mr. Brass clarified that the Mayo Clinic is a non-profit hospital, even though they are the largest tax payer in Rochester.

Mayor Snarr noted that a Holiday Inn Express would be constructed in the ore sampling site area also. Mr. Shaver stated that there is a lot of interest in that property if it can be cleaned up. Mr. Tingey remarked that it isn't zoned for apartment buildings.

2.2 Police Report-

Chief Fondaco

Chief Fondaco distributed a sheet of statistics for the school year 2013-14. Chief Fondaco noted that the Police are seeing cyberbullying, and social media is being monitored, even in the elementary schools. There was a bullying case at Parkside Elementary. The schools also monitor twitter and other social media accounts.

E-cigarettes are a new problem and they are big in both the high school and the junior high. Riverview has had 4 cases already. He isn't aware of how the students are getting them. Some of the kids claim that they didn't know that they contained nicotine, but it does count as a tobacco arrest. Ms. Johnson has heard similar comments from her children that kids don't understand what is in E-cigarettes. The officers in both of the high schools still say that marijuana is very prevalent. There have been a few marijuana arrests, and the officers are keeping an eye on it.

Truancy is a bigger problem this year than last year. The schools are very helpful in tracking these students down.

There has been an increase in gang activity at Cottonwood High, not too much at Murray High. The enrollment area at Cottonwood High is so large, and has resulted in an increase in gang activity. Chief Fondaco noted that he doesn't know how many students are enrolled, but most of the students are bussed in from the west side.

Graffiti is also up at Cottonwood, but down at Murray. Parking is still a problem at both schools, especially at Murray High. Residents don't want the students parking in front of their houses.

2.3 School District Report-

Dr. Hirase

Dr. Hirase reported on the Common Core Standards. This program is not a national core curriculum, as it did not come from the Department of Education. It was developed by the Council of Chief States School Officers, which is comprised of State Superintendents, the National Governors Association, and the Center for Best Practices, with involvement from businesses as well.

College and Career readiness standards were evaluated in the summer of 2009. Those standards are what is expected of students after they leave high school. Based on those standards, the K-12 learning progressions were developed. They determined the skills that a student would need to go to college or start a career, and decided that a 12th grade student should have those skills. They then worked their way back to decide at what level that student should be in 11th grade, 10th grade, and so on, all the way back to kindergarten.

Mr. Shaver asked if the program would be updated on a yearly basis, with changing technology, etc. Dr. Hirase explained that the technology is a means to achieve the standards. There are regular modifications done at the state level. There was a lot of feedback considered from the teachers, researchers, and the general public.

This isn't a program that the states are required to do. Many states, including Utah have adopted the program. There are probably about six states that haven't adopted the program. The final core standards were released on June 2, 2010.

The standards are focused and coherent. In the past, the core standards were a little disjointed. Everything was based on a course, but not always integrated. Something learned in one course, was not necessarily reinforced in another course. The new language arts core isn't only addressed by the language arts teacher, but incorporated by other teachers as well. Rigorous content and application of knowledge is included through higher order thinking skills. The standards are internationally benchmarked so that all students can succeed in the global society. Comparisons are made between different countries, not only different districts and states. Previously, if a student graduated and entered an international marketplace, they would not have been ready to compete internationally.

Previously, every state had its own set of academic standards. This means public education students in each state were learning at different levels.

The new Language Arts standards align with best evidence on college and career readiness. They are built on the best standards works of the state. Focus was maintained on what matters most for readiness. The three main sections are:

1. K-5th grade- is more integrated, and science and social studies concepts are learned at the same time as reading skills.
2. 6th-12th grade- English Language Arts
3. 6th-12th grade- Literacy is combined with history, science and technical subjects.

Responsibility for the student's literacy development is shared among the teachers. It gives the teachers research and evidence base, reading text exemplar, and also includes writing samples. A teacher can compare a student's writing to a sample of a student at the same grade level. There are four strands:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Speaking and Listening
4. Language

Dr. Hirase noted that media and technology is integrated throughout the whole core standards, and can be economically driven or challenged. The state does provide a minimal level of support. Mr. Shaver asked how that was blended, either from a textbook or a teacher. Dr. Hirase stated that the District is focusing the professional development on instructional skills that this integrating requires.

Prior to the common core standards, the text books were written to California or Texas standards. Now the majority of the states have adopted the common core standards, and the text books are being written as such.

Dr. Hirase showed a sample of the core standards for grades K-2nd grade. It shows the end of year expectations and works through a progression of skills and understandings. The standards don't define how a teacher should teach, nor all that can and should be taught. The nature of advanced work is much more rigorous than before and isn't defined. Necessary interventions for students not performing at grade level are not defined either. The standards don't define what non-English, or special education students may need.

Math is the major and most apparent difference. The standards for math practice carry across all grade levels. There is a certain way that a mathematician solves problems, which may be different from other people. The goal is to build in the mathematical thinking and reasoning into the content that the math class is given. The math content is developed by grade level through the seventh grade, and then would be exposed into different areas. The math domains progress over several grades, with two to four focal points each level. The high school standards are presented by theme. Instead of algebra, pre-algebra, geometry, etc. they are all integrated into each course.

The opponents of the common core standards don't realize that they are the same standards, just presented in a different way. Students with the new math core will start learning algebraic concepts in the early elementary grades.

The advances are that it is more focused and coherent. Each grade level focuses on key topics and progresses over the grade levels. The procedural fluency helps work through the problems. There is a much larger focus on mathematical thinking and problem solving. Ms. Tuckett commented that the students will know why they need to know some of the concepts at an earlier age. It is more relevant and easier to connect to real life practices. The goal is to help the student understand conceptually the reason for doing certain steps. The model that Murray will be using is: Math 7, Math 8, Secondary Math 1 (an integrated math), Secondary Math 2 (additional concepts and a deeper understanding).

Dr. Hirase stated that the question most asked is whether or not higher level math will be available. He replied that those courses will be available to be taken as electives. There will be an honors track with all of these math courses. It will be difficult to switch to an honors track mid-stream.

Ms. Wells asked when these standards would begin if a child didn't start them in kindergarten. Dr. Hirase said the standards were implemented three years ago, beginning in the sixth grade. Sixth grade was chosen because seventh and eighth grade really build upon what was learned in sixth grade. The same thing was done with Secondary 1 Math. The implementation for K-5th grade started a couple of years ago. Ms. Johnson commented that her children in the eighth and tenth grade have the hardest road because they got switched mid-stream. The elementary kids are in good shape coming through the system. Ms. Wells commented on the transition and asked if it was frustrating for the children. Ms. Johnson commented that it is difficult that her children don't have a textbook because the teachers use all different resources.

Dr. Hirase said it has been a difficult transition for the teachers because it requires a broader knowledge of the concepts. He believes it makes the teachers better teachers because they have a better understanding. Mr. Nicponski said that it is important not to miss a link in the chain as the children are learning these concepts.

Mr. Shaver commented that his son has gone through the transition and struggled in the beginning but now loves it.

Ms. Tuckett said that the teachers were frustrated in the beginning, but now all really like the program.

Internal Business

3.1 Election of 2014 Officers-

Dave Nicponski

Mr. Nicponski said that a new Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson were needed for next year. The Chairperson will be a school board member for 2014.

Ms. Huff nominated Cris Longhurst as Chairperson. Ms. Longhurst declined due to time constraints. Ms. Huff nominated Darrell Pehrson. Mr. Pehrson accepted and all were in favor.

Mr. Brass nominated Mr. Hales as Vice-Chairperson. All were in favor.

In 2014, the School Board will take over the agendas and minutes for the meetings. There will be three meetings next year: January, April and October.

Ms. Lopez said the next meeting will be January 9th, 2014.

Ms. Tuckett announced that the Council Members and staff would be invited to come and see the new school site.

Mr. Nicponski adjourned the meeting at 6:09.

Council Office Administrator II
Kellie Challburg

DRAFT