

January 9, 2007

To: Board Members
From: Janet Bernard
Through: Tom Bishop
Subject: Study Team Report on Additional Funding for the Site Enrichment Program

On August 23, 2006, the Board of Trustees approved the formation of a District Study Team to examine the current practice of allowing parents to purchase additional enrichment program staffing at each school site. Although the District has appreciated the additional financial support for the enrichment program, the practice has had an impact contrary to the Board approved equity concept formula for enrichment staffing. This impact has necessitated a need for further study and review of the practice.

On October 30, 2006, site administrators participated in a meeting to brainstorm the "pros" and "cons" of parents purchasing additional staffing (Attachments A and B). In the afternoon of October 30, a Study Team of fourteen members representing parents and staff from every school went through the same process. The Study Team then compared their brainstorming lists with the brainstorm lists developed by the principals. Both lists were then merged together as found in Attachments C and D. The Study Team was also able to formulate key questions (Attachment E) related to the pros and cons that need to be addressed as recommendations for Board policy are discussed and developed.

The District would like to sincerely thank all the members of the Study Team for their time and effort with this task. Team Members include:

Ashley Falls

Sue Lichter, parent
Kris Pike, teacher

Carmel Del Mar

John Logan, parent
David Skinner, teacher

Del Mar Hills Academy

Jana Stoudemire, parent
Cecelia McPhee, teacher

Del Mar Heights

Kim Filanc, parent
Kathy Zack, admin. asst.

Sage Canyon

Kim Cassidy, parent
Peg LaRose, principal

Sycamore Ridge

Juan Carlos Nava, parent
Jennifer Howard, teacher

Torrey Hills

Janet Kahn, parent
Tanya Lubomudrov, teacher

This evening, three members from the District Study Team will present a summary of the Study Team meeting held on October 30, 2006:

Timeline/Process	–	Peg LaRose, Principal, Sage Canyon
Pros/Cons	–	Jen Howard, Teacher, Sycamore Ridge
Questions	–	John Logan, Parent, Carmel Del Mar

The next Board agenda item offers several options the Board should consider in developing a policy on enrichment staffing for the 2007-08 school year.

FISCAL IMPACT: The total enrichment program costs the District approximately \$2.2 million dollars each year. The District receives approximately \$600,000 from the DMSEF and \$100,000 from the PTAs to offset this total cost.

RECOMMENDED: The administration requests direction from the Board with the best option for providing:

1. Equity to ALL students
2. Teacher release time to meet the contractual obligation
3. A program option that supports the District's Mission and the Foundation's Mission

Process Timeline for 2006

January – February	Equity formula for enrichment staffing developed.
March	Enrichment staffing for 06-07 presented to the Board as an information item.
August	Board approved the deployment of a District Study Team.
September - October	External Facilitator (Lyn Perino) and Internal Facilitator (Janet Bernard) met to map out a working strategy for the Study Team and to develop an agenda.
October	Met with the site administrators and District Study Team to brainstorm pros, considerations, and questions. Sub-committee selected to present all information to the Board.

Enrichment Staffing

October 30, 2006

AGENDA

Issue: Should Parents Be Able to Purchase Additional Staffing for the Enrichment Program?

Principals

Establish Ground Rules

History/Background

Pros and Cons of Issue

(No decisions . . . information for Study Team only)

Study Team

Establish Ground Rules

History/Background

Pros/Cons of Issue

Compare with Principal Pros and Cons

Generate Questions to be Addressed

Information to the Board for next steps.

Attachment B

**Additional Parent Funding
for the
Site Enrichment Program**

Pros

- Reflects desires of individual school communities
- Helps to develop well-rounded individuals (physical education)
- Promotes the uniqueness of individuals
- Provides incentives for parents to contribute to a particular area of interest
- Allows for additional opportunities for teachers to work together in professional learning communities
- Expedites meeting student needs
- Supports site educational plans
- Expands the educational program and enriches student learning experiences
- Supports flexibility with staffing
- Allows for greater flexibility in program scheduling
- Equalizes curriculum offerings
- Improves the learning opportunities for some students who may not otherwise have them
- Enriches the educational program beyond the core academics
- Provides a deeper understanding of the curriculum
- Creates a sense of schoolwide and districtwide unity
- Provides a competitive educational program as compared to program offerings found in many private schools
- Allows students to maximize their potential
- Enhances the Academy Program vision and program model
- Encourages intradistrict transfers to smaller schools
- Supports the instructional model for technology
- Builds capacity among classroom teachers
- Communicates to parents that needs can be addressed and met
- Opens endless possibilities for an enriched educational program
- Allows schools to be different
- Expands the amount of program funding received from state and federal sources
- Provides an opportunity for parents to directly support an enriched curriculum for their children
- Supports a positive dynamic between parents, staff, and students

Attachment C

**Additional Parent Funding
for the
Site Enrichment Program**

Cons

- Creates unbalanced programs
- Conflicts with the mission statement and core values of the Del Mar Schools Education Foundation
- Increases the potential for encroachment on core program instructional minutes, which affects the district's highest priority—student achievement
- Causes the enrichment program to look differently from site to site
- Creates anxiety on staff assignments; feelings of uncertainty and a lack of continuity from year to year
- Forces principals and teachers to become fundraisers and experience marketing pressure
- Causes parents who contribute to desire a voice in personnel practices, which changes the dynamics between site staff, administration, and parents
- Increases the potential for students to receive different programs across the District; programs cannot be sustained for all children
- Creates divisiveness within the community
- Causes an unbalance with fundraising efforts due to the varied socio-economic status of school communities; could eventually lead to schools of "have" and "have not"
- Increases the risk for negatively impacting personnel policies and practices, i.e., hirees get District "rights," and/or unqualified people being hired
- Perpetuates competition and confusion among and between the PTA and Foundation; could lead PTAs away from their mission
- Causes an unclear understanding as to how additional funds are used
- Conflicts with the District's core belief of a responsibility to ALL students
- Dilutes efforts to create equity; a new layer of inequity emerges
- Establishes philosophic incongruence; some believe the District should fund ALL staff, including credentialed enrichment staff
- Increases the potential for viewing parent funding as a threat
- Affects site collaboration efforts
- Creates a negative school climate with the loss of an enrichment teacher due to lack of funding

Attachment D

**Additional Parent Funding
for the
Site Enrichment Program**

Questions

- How do we keep the current benefits and address equity?
 - What is our definition of equity?
 - Can we raise the full-time equivalent baseline for both enrichment and PE?
 - How much can enrichment funding be cut without impacting programs?
 - What's the difference between a "program" and a "teacher"?
 - Can the enrichment teachers and P.E. teachers be funded 100% by DMUSD?
 - Could the enrichment teachers and PE teachers be funded 100% by an endowment?
 - Can the PE program be considered an enrichment program?
 - How much differentiation can happen legally?
 - Could the 501(c)(3) status of DMSEF be in legal jeopardy due to not meeting their mission statement of supporting "all students"?
 - What District funds are available to support the enrichment program?
 - Should PE be viewed more critically since it is mandated by the State of California?
 - What are the enrichment program differences between schools?
- Consider:
- Quality?
 - Amount of time per subject area?
 - Staff utilization?

- What are the various roles of the DMSEF, PTA and DMUSD in relationship to enrichment staffing?
- What role do the PTAs have in fundraising?
- How many enrichment specialists should be purchased without negatively impacting the core academic program?
- What happens if a school does not meet its fundraising goal?
- Could enrichment teachers travel as itinerant specialists?
- How would itinerant specialists affect other instructional programs in a school?

Attachment E

January 9, 2007

To: Board Members
Through: Tom Bishop
Subject: Del Mar Hills Academy—Input from parents

Del Mar Hills Academy parent Jana Stoudemire requested that tonight's agenda include an item about the Hills Academy as the Board makes its decision regarding 07/08 enrichment staffing.

I asked Hills Academy Principal Laurie Francis to contact Jana Stoudemire and get the language for this agenda item. On January 10, Laurie Francis emailed the district with the following language from Jana Stoudemire:

“Del Mar Union School District Academy Program:

All Board members are aware and well versed in the adopted Del Mar Union School District Academy Report and Research Development document, April 2000.

Affirmation and acknowledgement from the DMUSD Board of the Board approved and adopted Academy Charter with specific attention to section 6, page 9 as it relates to local funding sources and section 3, page 5 at it relates to enrollment.

The sanctioned Academy program was created with the agreement and understanding that local funding would be employed to maintain and carry the unique program/staffing. This was reaffirmed at the May 2005 DMUSD Board meeting (please refer to the minutes). From 2000-present, Del Mar Hills Academy has successfully implemented and maintained the program under these guidelines.”

Note from DMUSD staff: Del Mar Hills staff will be delivering copies of the documents for this item on January 11 so that Board can review the documents as it determines the best policy for all DMUSD students. Hopefully the documents will be delivered to the District Office by noon on January 11. If the documents arrive after the Board packet is delivered on January 11, staff will send the documents to Board members by an alternative delivery method.

RECOMMENDED: For information Only. No action required.

Board Meeting of January 17, 2007

January 9, 2007

To: Board Members

Through: Tom Bishop

Subject: Options for Board Policy on Purchasing Enrichment Staffing

Critical Question:

SHOULD THE DISTRICT CONTINUE THE PRACTICE OF ALLOWING SCHOOLS TO PURCHASE ENRICHMENT STAFFING POSITIONS THAT EXCEED THE ENRICHMENT ALLOCATIONS PROVIDED BY THE BOARD?

Background Information:

Three years ago, the Board of Trustees decided that enrichment positions be allocated to sites so that large schools with more students have more enrichment positions than small schools who have fewer students. When the Board adopted this policy, several smaller schools immediately asked if they could raise funds to purchase enrichment positions that would exceed the enrichment allocations that are provided by the Board. The Board responded by authorizing sites to purchase additional enrichment positions. The funding for these additional enrichment positions has been generated mostly by site PTA units. The previous Board item (Report from the Enrichment Equity Study Team) outlines some of benefits and drawbacks that have resulted from the Board decision three years ago. Parents, teachers, and administrators have asked for a more definitive long term policy on this topic for the future.

District staff have created four possible policy options for Board consideration that may help the Board before it decides the 07/08 enrichment staffing policy. The options are fully explained to help all stakeholders understand the issues that surround each option.

Financial Update:

The 06/07 DMUSD enrichment program will cost about \$2.2 million. The District currently anticipates that the DMSEF will make a \$600,000 donation toward this expense, while local PTAs have contributed about \$100,000. The District general fund will provide the remaining \$1,500,000.

Considerations:

1. Does the Board have an interest in ensuring that all DMUSD students receive the same instructional program?

2. Should some DMUSD students have a “richer” program than other district students, based upon the capability of individual sites to raise funds to purchase additional staffing?
3. Does the Board have an interest in the allocation of instructional time that will keep our schools focused on NCLB and our high priority academic goals as measured by STAR testing results and the Academic Performance Index?

**ENRICHMENT STAFFING POLICY
2007/2008**

Option 1

Maintain all current 06/07 practices within the DMUSD and DMSEF and allow sites to purchase enrichment staffing positions that will exceed the 07/08 enrichment allocation. (Status quo)

Benefits:

- Enhances site vision and program
- Increases enrichment opportunities at some sites
(See complete list of benefits from the Study Team in previous board item)

Drawbacks:

- Creates program inequity across the seven sites
- Encourages competition between DMSEF and PTAs that harms DMSEF
- Causes confusion regarding complex DMSEF formula that includes site incentives
(See complete list of drawbacks from the Study Team in previous board item)

Option 2

Distribute 100% of enrichment resources based exclusively on student enrollment ; Board identifies DMSEF as exclusive organization that can raise funds for enrichment staffing; DMSEF raises funds as a “whole district”, not as individual sites Sites not allowed to purchase additional enrichment staffing because of negative impact on enrichment equity, and negative impact on DMSEF.

Benefits:

- Provides an equitable enrichment programs across the District
- Reduces fund-raising pressure on PTA units

Drawbacks:

- District may not have adequate resources to support site goals/vision
- Donations to DMSEF may decline

Important Notes

This option eliminates the practice of establishing DMSEF annual site goals and also eliminates incentives for those school communities that reach their annual DMSEF goal. Instead, all DMSEF donations would be placed in one pool and tracked all as a whole district. (The 06/07 DMSEF goal per student is \$190; in previous years, those schools that met the annual goal ($\$190 \times$ enrollment) by March 1 were allowed to purchase ADDITIONAL enrichment positions (beyond the District enrichment allocation) if the site had ADDITIONAL funds to pay for the ADDITIONAL position. Thus, a school with 400 students had a DMSEF annual goal of \$76,000. If this site wanted additional enrichment staffing for the following school year, the DMSEF needed to receive \$76,000 in donations from parents at this site AND the site needed to (simultaneously) raise the money to pay the salary/benefits of the extra teacher. For 07/08, we estimate that the total cost (salary, benefits, retirement, etc) of one full time enrichment teacher will be at least \$65,000. So this hypothetical school of 400 that wants an extra enrichment position will need to raise \$141,000 by March 15.

Dividing \$141,000 in expense by 400 students means that the cost to each student is \$352. It is uncertain how many parents can make a \$352 donation during the next few months, but not every parent at every site is capable of donating \$352 to help purchase additional enrichment teachers. Because some parents can't donate \$352, other parents may contribute an amount that exceeds the \$352 amount.

During the past three years, all sites have reached their annual DMSEF goal, which has been the minimum "benchmark". If a site meets its DMSEF annual goal (benchmark), then the site gets an additional benefit: it gets to keep any DMSEF money raised above the annual goal. During the 05/06 school year, the seven sites exceeded their annual goal by about \$100,000.)

Option 3

District assumes 100% of the expense for enrichment program for 07/08 ONLY; Sites not allowed to purchase enrichment positions beyond District allocation; DMSEF is identified as the exclusive organization that raises funds for enrichment positions; Sites are not allowed to raise funds for additional enrichment staffing. During 07/08, District asks DMSEF to raise \$800,000 for 08/09 enrichment staffing. Then 08/09 enrichment staffing is adjusted, based on funds actually raised by Foundation during 07/08. If the DMSEF raises \$400,000 during 07/08, then District designs 08/09 enrichment to include \$400,000 contribution from DMSEF that will be given to the DMUSD by the DMSEF on June 30, 2008. District estimates that total cost of 08/09 enrichment program may be \$2,400,000. District contributes \$1,600,000 and DMSEF contributes \$800,000; if DMSEF contributed less than \$800,000, enrichment program would have to be adjusted.

Benefits:

- Equitable enrichment staffing across the District
- New incentive program for parents to donate to DMSEF

Drawbacks:

- Less DMUSD fiscal integrity; fewer resources in an uncertain future
- District reserves (already not at suggested level for basic aid school district) dip lower, while District challenges (Shores, GASB-45, collective bargaining) likely increase.

Option 4

District assumes 100% of enrichment expense, based exclusively on student enrollment, for indefinite future; PTAs and individuals not allowed to purchase enrichment staffing.

Benefits:

- Equitable enrichment across the District

Drawbacks:

- Significant reductions in unidentified staff/programs for 07/08
- Will likely impact collective bargaining

(If no reductions made, reserves exhausted in four/five years because expenses will be significantly higher than revenues. Inability to meet new challenges.)

(If no reductions made, reserves exhausted in four/five years because expenses will be significantly higher than revenues. Inability to meet new challenges.)

FISCAL IMPACT: Unknown at this time; different options have different fiscal impacts

RECOMMENDED: The Board needs to make a decision on this matter tonight so that staff can begin planning the 07/08 enrichment program

January 9, 2007

To: Board Members
From: Janet Bernard
Through: Tom Bishop
Subject: Update on the January 25 and 26 Professional Learning Academy

The DMUSD Professional Learning Academy will be held on January 25 and 26 at Ashley Falls School, from 8:00 – 3:00 p.m. Attached is a tentative list of the workshops being planned.

Detailed information regarding registration and the format of the Academy will be posted to the District's intranet page no later than Tuesday, January 16.

The Board is cordially invited to attend any of the workshops at the Academy.

FISCAL IMPACT: \$12,000 has been budgeted for this event. This amount does not include the daily rate of pay costs for participating staff. The state will reimburse the District at approximately 75% of the total salary cost.

RECOMMENDED: For Information Only

Professional Learning Academy

January 25 & 26, 2007

Workshops	Length
1. Advanced Differentiation: Another Step Beyond What Most Teachers Practice	Full Day (25 & 26)
2. Professional Learning Communities: Overview of the DuFour Model	2 hrs.
3. What Does Teaming Really Mean?	2 hrs.
4. Everyone's A Writer Through Six Traits + 1 Writing	2 hrs.
5. Everyday Mathematics for Beginners	2 hrs.
6. Organizing Guided Reading Groups in the Upper Grades	2 hrs.
7. Using Reading/Language Arts Assessments Effectively in the Upper Grades	2 hrs.
8. Administering the Upper Grade DRA	2 hrs.
9. Administering the DRA Bridgepack at Grade 3	2 hrs.
10. Exploring Your Creativity Through Art	4 hrs.
11. Integrating Science and Art	Full Day
12. Seismic Outreach Project	4 hrs.
13. Building the Language of Mathematics	2 hrs.
14. Identifying and Analyzing Essential Standards in Mathematics	2 hrs.
15. Identifying and Analyzing Essential Standards in Language Arts	2 hrs.
16. Guided Reading and Writing Strategies for Grades K & 1	2 hrs.
17. Improving Student Performance Through Response to Intervention (RTI)	2 hrs.
18. Developing Effective Formative Assessments	2 hrs.
19. Developing a 4, 5, or 6 Point Rubric	2 hrs.
20. SDAIE/GLAD Strategies for Maximizing English Language Learning	2 hrs.

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| 21.Socratic Seminar: Critical Thinking and Learning Through Inquiry and Thoughtful Dialogue | 2 hrs. |
| 22.Using the DIBELS Assessment to Improve Reaching Achievement | 2 hrs. |
| 23.Powerful Learning Through Inquiry and Discussion: Junior Great Books | 4 hrs. |
| 24.And the Beat Goes On: Teaching Percussion | 4 hrs. |
| 25.Making Beautiful Music Through Orff Orchestration | 4 hrs. |
| 26.CD Music Software | 2 hrs. |
| 27.Technology Workshops: TBD | 2 hrs. each |

January 10, 2007

To: Board Members
 From: Janet Bernard
 Through: Tom Bishop
 Subject: Approval of the Performance Agreements for the Professional Learning Academy Scheduled for January 25 and 26, 2007

Staff is respectfully requesting approval of the following performance agreements for the scheduled workshops as part of the Professional Learning Academy on January 25 and 26.

<u>Consultant</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Wendy Woolf	1 Day	The Colors of Science: Integrating Science into the Arts	500
Sandra Sincek	1/2 Day	Building the Language of Mathematics	400
Leigh Child	1 Day	Engaging Activities and Effective Instructional Strategies Equal Student Success in Mathematics	1,000
Pat Peterson	2 Days	Advanced Differentiation: Another Step Beyond What Teachers Practice	2,400
Claudio Cano Underdahl	1/2 Day	Exploring Your Creativity Through Art	300

The contracts for this work are available for review at the District Office.

FISCAL IMPACT: \$4,600 from the District Staff Development Budget.

RECOMMENDED: The Superintendent Recommends Approval of the Performance Agreements for the Professional Learning Academy Scheduled for January 25 and 26, 2007.

*6.5

January 17, 2007

To: Board Members
From: Tom Bishop
Subject: Board Site Visitations

For the past eight years, the Board of Trustees has visited each school site once during a "normal" instructional day. The visitations were originally requested by the Superintendent to help the Board see K-6 standards based instruction in action. In addition, the visitations provided Board members with an opportunity to learn about site initiatives, as described by the site principal. Finally, the visitations provided Board members with opportunities to observe the safety/cleanliness of each facility, as well as to observe many new teachers in our fast-growing school district. Finally, visitations have provided Board members with an opportunity to observe specialized programs (such as the pre-school special day classroom and program).

At the last school board meeting, the Board asked for input regarding the visitations from different groups, including Directors, Principals, and DMCTA members.

The Directors felt that the Board visitations have helped to provide Board members with accurate program information that can guide all board members as budgets are constructed and approved. The Directors also felt that the visitations have helped the board to understand that each site is unique, with different schools having different cultures. The Directors also complemented the board for donating the time to do the site visitations, as well as using some of the time to interact with teachers and students. The Directors also felt that the annual visitation has provided board members with an opportunity to get to know principals. Overall the Directors believe that the visitations have helped the Board to make good financial and program decisions for DMUSD students.

On January 8, ten members of the DMCTA Executive Board were asked about possible benefits from having board members visit classrooms on a regular schedule during the past eight years. The group of teachers felt that board members have a responsibility to learn as much as possible about DMUSD K-6 education program, and that one way to learn about the K-6 program is to visit classrooms under the guidance of the site principal or a District administrator. The teachers indicated that past visitations did not create educational disruptions to students or teachers. The teachers like that the current visitation rotation is evenly distributed so that all site sites get the same number of visits. The teachers have been impressed that the Board takes their responsibility to learn about K-6 education seriously. The teachers recommended that the visitations continue with the same format.

On January 10 Principals were asked for their input on board visitations. Comments included: “ Board visitations help board members to see that all of our schools have some commonalities, and that there are differences among the seven sites. Visitations have helped to provide accurate curriculum and instruction information directly to board members. Visiting all schools on a regular schedule means that there is no favorite school. Annual visitations have helped the Board to see that our facility is being maintained in a professional manner that promotes high achievement. Visitations are a little nerve-wracking, particularly for “new to the profession” teachers. The recent board visitations that have included Professional Learning Community conversations between Board members and a grade level teams have been constructive.”

Board Meeting of January 17, 2007

January 17, 2007

To: Board Members

From: Tom Bishop

Subject: Possible Kindergarten restructuring for 07/08

In July, 2006, the Board of Trustees approved the inclusion of the following objective in the 2006/2007 DMUSD Goals and Objectives: "Prepare a Fall 2006 Board agenda item that provides staff recommendations for potentially re-structuring the Kindergarten program in 2007/2008".

Earlier today, the Board President, the Superintendent, and the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum met with all Kindergarten teachers to:

*Listen to the kindergarten teachers assessment of the strengths of the 06/07 kindergarten schedule and get input regarding 07/08 improvements.

*Share research findings about the possible benefits of an all day kindergarten schedule in the DMUSD in 2007/2008

During the next four weeks, the District leadership plans to have conversations with a focus group of first through sixth grade DMUSD teachers regarding their perception of the possible benefits of an all day Kindergarten schedule in the DMUSD, and a parent focus group that will be composed of parents from all seven sites. The District will attempt to have one or two Board members at each of these focus group meetings.

At the Board's February 28 meeting, the Board will decide whether or not the DMUSD will re-structure the Kindergarten program for 2007/2008.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

RECOMMENDED: For information only. No action required.

6.7