

**DEL MAR UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**MINUTES OF SPECIAL BOARD MEETING  
BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
Del Mar Hills Academy – Multi-Purpose Room  
14085 Mango Drive  
Del Mar, CA 92014**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2007  
5:00 p.m.**

**Members Present:** Annette Easton, President of the Board  
Janet Lamborghini, Clerk of the Board  
Linda Crawford, Steven McDowell, Katherine White

**Members Absent:** None.

**Staff:** Thomas F. Bishop, Superintendent  
Sherry Forte, Exec. Asst. to the Superintendent  
Janet Bernard, Asst. Supt., Curriculum & Instruction  
Tom Hauseur, Director of Technology  
Rodger Smith, Director of Personnel/Facilities  
Trish Snider, Director of Pupil Services  
Dena Whittington, Asst. Supt., Business Services  
Todd Boteler, District Webmaster  
Grace Hauseur, Teacher on Special Assignment  
Jennifer Steinman, Technology teacher, Sycamore Ridge  
Nicole Nelson, Art teacher, Del Mar Hills Academy  
Jodi Neilson, Music teacher, Del Mar Hills Academy  
Nancy Swanberg, Science teacher, Del Mar Hills Academy  
Peg LaRose, Principal, Sage Canyon  
Bill Porter, 2nd grade teacher, Carmel Del Mar  
Cinda Peck, Music teacher, Carmel Del Mar  
Linda Dugger, Science teacher, Carmel Del Mar  
Tracy Garber, 4<sup>th</sup> gr. teacher, Carmel Del Mar  
Becky Zebold, Science teacher, Ashley Falls  
Wendy Wardlow, Principal, Del Mar Heights  
Kathy Zack, Administrative Asst., Del Mar Heights  
Julie Lerner, Assistant Principal, Sage Canyon  
Emily Disney, Principal, Sycamore Ridge  
Janet Wolfertz, Technology teacher, Carmel Del Mar  
Jenny Luce, Art teacher, Sycamore Ridge  
Jacqueline Folgner, Art teacher, Del Mar Heights

Others In Attendance: Bill Eiffert, Paul Danninger, Liz Shopes, Dianne Shapp, Jennifer McCroskey, Isabelle Tremblay, Becky Deller, Allison Healy-Poe, Teneia Pritchett, Michael Shackelford, Yang Wang, Myra Pelowski, Camilla Rang, Allison King, Janette Shelton, John Logan, Karen Gilbert, Katherine Roth, Mary Taylor, Susan Miller, Corinne Hackbart, Jennifer McDowell, Laura DeMarco, and approximately twenty other community members.

---

**BUSINESS TRANSACTED WAS LIMITED TO THE FOLLOWING:**

**1.0** Board President, Annette Easton, called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m.

---

**2.0** *Approval of the Agenda* On motion by Member *McDowell* seconded by Member *Lamborghini* the Board voted unanimously to approve the Agenda

Board President *Easton* asked for guidance from the board with regard to the sub items in Item #5 on the Agenda. Member *Crawford* commented to the Board that for clarity, should the board take action on any one item, the board should be reminded of any previous action as they move through the agenda.

---

***BOARD PRESIDENT EASTON CALLED FOR SPEAKER SLIPS.***

---

**3. COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC**

**Public Input:**

- None for non-agenda items

**4. BOARD DISCUSSION ON QUESTIONS RAISED FROM THE ENRICHMENT EQUITY STUDY TEAM AND ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS.**

Supt. Bishop stated that at the last Board meeting on January 17, 2007, the Board asked to have district staff answer the Enrichment Study Team questions presented on January 17, 2007. Supt. Bishop thanked district staff for their input and ideas in answering the questions.

**Board Discussion:**

- Member *White* asked clarifying questions regarding questions #3 and #10 and the cost of enrichment positions. Supt. Bishop and staff clarified the numbers included only certificated district paid enrichment positions. Supt. Bishop offered to re-write the answer to include all teachers, aides, etc., including physical education teachers for further clarification.
- Member *Crawford* asked for clarification to the answer to Question #12 (“What happens if a school does not meet their annual foundation goal and what happens if a school raises more than the annual goal set by the DMSEF? DMSEF co-presidents Gilbert and McGinty-Poteet clarified that all money raised beyond the goal of the school site goes back to the school site assuming the site did not have additional goals. Money raised above the benchmark is returned to the school site at 100%

**Public Input:**

- Jana Stoudemire, 2480 Malibu Way, Del Mar - Asked for clarification with regard to the cost per specialist and the formula the district will use to devise the cost of an additional teacher.

Supt. Bishop explained that the Board would have to make that determination. District staff will calculate the average expense of an enrichment teacher and have it available at the next board meeting.

---

▪

---

**5. 2007/2008 ENRICHMENT**

---

**5.a Board discussion and possible action on whether the Board should continue the use of the current equity policy that allocates large schools with more enrichment teacher positions than small schools.**

Board President *Easton* asked Supt. Bishop to give an update on the current equity policy.

Supt. Bishop stated that three years ago the Board decided that enrichment staffing would be allocated based on school size. He feels one of the discussion pieces and policy decisions by this Board for 2007/2008 is whether to continue with that policy. Supt. Bishop stated that he needs direction from the Board in order to move forward with the allocation of enrichment specialists for 2007/2008.

**Board Discussion:**

- Board President *Easton* asked for further clarification of how the formula for enrichment staffing works.
- Supt. Bishop explained that the current formula of whole and/or half time enrichment specialists works for the district and principals.
- Supt. Bishop and staff responded to Board members clarifying questions regarding:
  - Current policy of staffing based on student population, i.e. full-time staff, ½ time staff, ¾ time staff, etc
  - Analysis of an itinerant model
  - Possibility of one specialist covering multiple specialties
  - Availability of qualified teacher with multiple credentials
  - Availability of part-time credentialed teachers
  - Funding of staff to cover classes for teacher prep time
  - Classified personnel giving instruction
  - Prep time being covered by a classified employee with the teacher present in the classroom
  - The necessity of credentialed staff to cover prep time
  - Legality of contributions covering an expense the district is obligated to pay due to contractual agreement, i.e. prep time
  - Staffing being projected in the spring and adjustments made in the fall
  - Possible funds generated from the Shores and generating a shift in resources to help students

- Fifteen years ago how did the district budget for prep time
- Coverage of prep time by anyone other than certificated teachers
- What kinds of expenses can the Foundation cover
- Unrestricted funds used for staffing enrichment
- Are there other contract options that exist for hiring credentialed teachers on “soft” money
- Designation of “temporary” employees
- Legalities of district being obligated to cover expense of prep time from district sources other than fundraising sources.
- Categorical funded positions

**Public Input:**

- Ken Ruggiero, 13861 Durango, Del Mar; two students in 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade at Del Mar Hills Academy; spoke with regard to some DMUSD schools inability to raise funds. He spoke in favor of Foundation being the correct mechanism for fundraising. He feels principals with teachers and community have experienced great success and he questioned why we need to regulate it.
- Jodi Neilson, Music teacher, Del Mar Hills Academy. She thanked the board for the opportunity to speak. She spoke regarding Item 3. She emphasized that teachers hope the board understands that the arts are part of the core academic curriculum. “Enrichment” teachers are teaching standard based curriculum and are a vital part of the education of children. Under NCLB the arts are a core academic subject. Mrs. Neilson also spoke regarding Item 5: She spoke with regard to the music program providing education for all students and that unfortunately, it is not currently equal for all. She outlined the music programs currently held at the sites. She spoke of how the music program started at Del Mar Hills Academy and how school sites (depending upon its size) have the ability/inability to offer the same identical instruction as Del Mar Hills Academy.
- Nancy Swanberg, Science teacher at Del Mar Hills Academy; She emphasized that science is a core curriculum subject and is mandated and tested by the State. She spoke with regard to “equity” and itinerant teachers. She feels the Science programs in the DMUSD are “cutting edge” compared to others in the county. Urged the board to continue to lead, not to retreat.
- John Logan, 12445 Cavallo Street, San Diego, daughter attends Carmel Del Mar in the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade. He spoke as an individual not as DMSEF board member. He spoke of what is right and fair for all students. He feels students should receive the same programs and the same level of instruction. It should not be based on the parent’s ability to raise funds. He asked the board to please not leave any students behind.

- Yuan Wang, 4043 Carmel Springs Way, San Diego, his students attend Carmel Del Mar. He spoke with regard to students not receiving the same offerings as other schools because parents are not able to contribute. Feels district should treat all students equally and pass this value on to the children.
- Katharin Roth, 12580 Montellano Terrace, San Diego, Kdg. and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade students at Carmel Del Mar. She stated that her family donates annually to DMSEF and is grateful for the opportunities it provides. She expressed her concern about current practices of staffing enrichment programs. She feels that because the district is a public school and the opportunities must be equitable for all students. She thanked the board for continuing to search for the equitable solution.
- Allison Healy-Poe, 4220 Mancilla Court, San Diego, her daughter attends 1<sup>st</sup> grade at Carmel Del Mar. She spent her elementary school years in the Del Mar Union schools and has been a part of the community for her entire life. She feels concern for the community. She compared the district to the theory that “the whole is more than the sum of its parts.” DMUSD has been an award winning whole of its seven soon to be eight schools. She urged the board to not lose sight of the power that is the whole of the community. She stated that the DMUSD students would all meet again in middle and high school. She feels all the children should have equal footing at the elementary school level. She urged the board to ensure ALL schools are as strong as they can be.

**5.b Board discussion and possible action on what funding sources should be utilized to pay for 07/08 enrichment staffing.**

Supt. Bishop stated the district General Fund is paying \$1.6 million of \$2.2 million for enrichment funding. Staff is seeking guidance on what other sources should be used for 2007/2008 enrichment staffing. Currently the DMSEF has helped fund an expanding enrichment program over the last five to six years. Supt. Bishop thanked current and past foundation board members for their assistance in expanding the enrichment program in the district. Supt. Bishop suggested that the meeting with DMSEF might include a discussion on multiple funding sources.

**Board Discussion:**

- Member *Crawford* spoke with regard to the confusion in the community as to where to make their donation for the enrichment programs. She feels it is important for the board to set a clear policy as to what the funding source will be for enrichment. She feels that allowing the PTAs to raise a portion of the enrichment program raised confusion and if there are competing funding sources the capacity to raise funds to meet school site goals is diminished. She feels it needs to be corrected soon. The community is looking to the board for direction.

- Member *McDowell* said “Tom, the statement was made that there was \$2.2 million for the enrichment teachers and \$1.6 from the school board. If the school had said. How was that arrived was it \$2.2 to fund the program and then we said the school can provide \$1.6. What if the school district said that we can only, within our budget, allow for \$1 million for the enrichment teachers, then.”

Supt. Bishop offered clarification and history of the funding determination.

- Member *White* asked about the sources being considered for funding enrichment and challenged the board to review the budget to determine where there may be funds available. She feels that because the district will stabilize after the opening of Ocean Air, there may be resources in the budget that could possibly be shifted to support enrichment staff. She challenged the board and staff to find out what it would take for the district to fund four enrichment teachers at each site and, therefore, not be faced with these funding issues each year.
- Board President *Easton* reminded the board that there is still the issue of how to accommodate a larger school. She agrees the district needs to find a stable funding source. She feels the board may need to revisit the equity formula. She feels it is important to value the diversity of each site and allowing principals, staff and parents to utilize their funds based on what is important to their school community.
- Member *Crawford* expressed concern relative to the district being able to sustain the enrichment programs for long term. She asked Board President *Easton* for clarification on distribution of funds over the foundation goal and the funding of four enrichment teachers at each site and for what period of time.
- Board President *Easton* stated that, as a district there is an obligation to cover the expense of enrichment programs.
- Member *White* stated the community is saying they value the enrichment programs and she is challenging staff to see if we have expenses in other areas that may be modified in order to redirect some funds toward enrichment staffing.
- Supt. Bishop brought to the board’s attention the answers to Questions #16 and #20. He offered many areas where the board could modify the budget, but reminded the board that in any area(s) cut there will be an impact. He also stated that a slow down in construction of new homes might develop into less property taxes for the DMUSD.
- Member *McDowell* asked for clarification regarding the ability of modifying the budget in mid-year. He feels that if the basis of the budget starts with 32 enrichment staff, and then mid-year adjustments could be made in other budget items, if necessary.

**Public Input:**

- Jennifer McCroskey, 4024 Via Cangrejo, San Diego 92130; she has two children attending Torrey Hills School. She has served for a total of five years on both the Torrey Hills and Sage Canyon PTA boards and feels she has a good sense of what the PTA has to do with an entirely volunteer driven organization. She spoke with regard to her concern that the wrong decision on this issue would unduly burden on either the district staff or the PTA's and will force PTAs to focus on raising funds for enrichment rather than concentrating on funding specific school programs for the children. She feels the DMSEF is a well-established entity with the means and resources meet the district goal for enrichment staffing. She reminded the board of why the Foundation was established in the first place and that the main goal of the PTA is to support academic excellence; to maintain communication with the school community; and to be an advocate at the district and state levels. She also spoke with reference to the Del Mar Heights PTA contribution of \$35,000 being made directly to the district in October 2006. She feels it was done to circumvent the Foundation and would like the board to give direction to the district to return the funds to the PTA and for the PTA to contribute the funds to the DMSEF. She is also expressed concerned with the fact that the Del Mar Heights PTA president, who has a vested interest at Del Mar Heights, also serving on the Board of Trustees and voting on such controversial issues.
- Laura DeMarco, 544 Avenida Primavera, Del Mar, currently has two students at Del Mar Hills, one at Del Mar Heights and had two graduates from Del Mar Hills. She spoke with regard to funding sources and agreed that other parts of the budget could be modified, i.e. large litigation expenses. She feels that if the district cannot find the funding sources within the current budget, then the funding sources could continue to be a combination of the PTA, DMSEF and district. She feels the district should make up the difference if there is any inequity in the fundraising ability of a school. She feels enrichment staffing should not be based on a schools ability to raise funds. She feels the DMSEF can do a good job of getting support from the entire community including corporate sponsors.
- Ginny Merrifield, 5191 Seagrove Place, San Diego; she has been a DMUSD parent for 9 years and currently has a son in 6<sup>th</sup> grade at Carmel Del Mar. She feels the primary focus of the budgetary expenditures should be on the classroom core curriculum and district contractual obligations. She feels that before the board can make a decision, they need to be thoroughly knowledgeable

on district overhead and other one-time, non-classroom expenses. She feels it needs to be remembered that it is the donors who will decide where to put their money. She encouraged the board to direct staff to look at the non-essential expenses before talking about teacher layoffs.

- Jennifer McDowell, 1605 Forest Way, Del Mar; has two students currently at Del Mar Heights and one at Earl Warren Middle School. With regard to equity she feels the board should work to achieve the greatest common factor. She feels the schools should not be reduced to a minimum. She asked the board to look at the possibility of an itinerant teacher if needed to have art, music, science and technology (and ultimately PE) at all sites. She spoke in favor of keeping the uniqueness at each of the school sites. She encouraged the board to ask the DMSEF to look at a model where the foundation works independently with each school site on their fundraising goal and then the principal and School Site Council decide where to use the funds.
- Myra Pelowski, 11578 Parkhurst Square, San Diego; she has two students at Torrey Hills. She is very happy with enrichment and feels the DMSEF has done a wonderful job. She also thanked the PTAs for the good work in supporting the schools. She asked that if the board is looking for resources to fund enrichment and looking for a source for income why is the board not looking at selling the Shores property to fund these teachers.

Supt. Bishop explained that the board has been and is currently engaged in studying the possible sale or development of the Shores Property. He explained that the process has been slowed down due to the City of Del Mar filing a lawsuit against the district and the district having to spend time and money defending itself. He stated that the Board's decision would determine what will happen with the Shores Property.

- Allyson King, 4520 Campobello St., San Diego; she has a 5<sup>th</sup> gr. daughter attending Carmel Del Mar and a daughter at Carmel Valley Middle School. She encouraged the board to look at what is best for the entire district and all of the students. She feels the schools should have the opportunity to make some site based decisions regarding their ESC programs including being able to financially support extra ESC minutes. She hopes the district supports ESC programs for each school and fulfill contractual agreements with teachers. She supports asking parents to contribute towards their child's education, however, she feels that donors must know their money is being spent effectively.
- Mary Taylor, 3959 Corte Mar de Brisa, San Diego; she has a 3<sup>rd</sup> grade son attending Torrey Hills. She speaks not only as a parent but also as the current PTA president of Torrey Hills. Even before her son started school she was excited to have the

opportunity to contribute to the DMSEF because she saw that it was growing and there was a vision for it to grow more effective to do wonderful things for our children. She feels the DMSEF is an effective vehicle for parent donations but what the parents want is clarity on what their donations are supporting. In addition to supporting the individual schools, she feels the PTAs should do their best to support efforts of the DMSEF. She asked the Board to find the balance between the district operating as a unit and allowing the schools to explore their individuality. She feels the DMSEF is the entity to get the district where it wants to be, and that it will take the support of trustees, PTAs, teacher, administrators, everyone together.

**5.c Board discussion  
and possible action  
on January 17,  
2007 options and  
new options.**

Supt. Bishop reviewed the options presented at the January 17, 2007 board meeting. They were: 1) keep it as it is for next year; 2) have equity on a large scale across the district, with the DMSEF being the exclusive fundraiser and we raise as a whole district and do not allow individual site fundraising to purchase ESC staffing; 3) the money is raised during the year the money is being spent; 4) the district assumes 100% of enrichment expenses. Supt. Bishop also presented a fifth proposal, created by John Logan, which suggests a fundraising goal per student based on the income of the parents in the different attendance areas.

**Board Discussion:**

Member *White* stated her concern that the numbers presented in John Logan's chart had some issues based on her discussion with Sycamore principal Emily Disney and that the chart misrepresented the income figures for the Sycamore area. Audience member Principal Disney concurred when asked by Member *White*.

- Member *Crawford* asked for clarification of what qualifies a family for the Free/Reduced Lunch program.
- Supt. Bishop stated his concern on establishing a guaranty that each school would receive four enrichment teachers “forever”.
- Member *White* spoke once again of challenging the board and staff to review the budget in an effort to find available resources. She feels the district should keep options open for parent donations that would include the DMSEF and other vehicles. She does not want to limit the options to foundation “yes” or foundation “no”.
- Member *Crawford* stated she is looking forward to the meeting with the DMSEF next week. She hopes it helps to clarify for the parents, what the acceptable vehicles of donations
- Member *McDowell* would like the DMSEF to determine what the achievable goal is for each school. He feels some of the problem may be in the amount of the goal.
- Member *Lamborghini* asked when the board will make a decision as to whether the DMSEF should continue to seek

money for this year enrichment teachers and if the board is going to decide to pay for this years' enrichment teachers completely from the General Fund or if it will allow the DMSEF to continue to raise funds for this years' salaries.

- Members *White*, asked questions of the board regarding the impact of schools not meeting their goals this year and if there would be any consequences. How would the board cover it? What is the incentive to raise the money if there is no downside? She feels that any decision needs to address these questions, as well.
- Board President *Easton* and Member *Lamborghini* further discussed the issue of the DMSEF being the vehicle for fundraising this year, the need to give the DMSEF a vote of confidence in order for them to get back to work raising money, and giving the public clarity of where to give donations.

**Public Input:**

- Patrick Elms, 3932 San Augustine Way, San Diego; he has a son attending Carmel Del Mar. He feels Options 3 and 4 are not viable in the long term, Option 1 has inequity interests, Option #2 may decrease the incentive donate at some of the schools. He proposes a combination of Options #1 & 2 which would designate the DMSEF as the exclusive fundraising vehicle for enrichment staffing; donations in excess of a schools target is pooled to allow district to provide a minimum of four enrichment teachers and excess of donations after each school has four ESC teachers, is returned to the original school. He feels additional thinking needs to go beyond the options provided.
- Marybeth Holgren, 13964 Boquita Drive, Del Mar; she has a 1<sup>st</sup> grade child attending Del Mar Hills, and son starting in Kdg. at Del Mar Hills. She feels that equity is every family contributing towards the child's enrichment. She feels it is inequitable to have to donate more than your individual amount to compensate for those that have decided that they do not have to donate. She feels the school where your child attends is what means the most and that is where she would prefer to give. She wants her dollars to go to the school her children attend to benefit her children and their fellow students.
- Liz Shopes, 14104 Bahama Cove Drive, Del Mar; she has two seven year old children attending Del Mar Hills. She feels that before contributing to help other schools she would want to know that her own schools enrichment program is funded. She feels most of parents would help a school not able to reach it's goal. She supports the DMSEF and feels it is a wonderful institution that has done so much for our schools.

**5.d Board discussion and possible action on whether sites should be allowed to purchase enrichment staff positions that exceed the enrichment allocations provided by the Board.**

- Robyn London, 4241 Cordobes Cove, San Diego; she has 4<sup>th</sup> grade daughter at Carmel Del Mar and a son at Carmel Valley Middle School. She stated that Carmel Del Mar has a 60% participation rate of contributions, parents care about the school and the low-income parents have difficulty in contributing. Supt. Bishop stated that staff is seeking guidance and has no new information. Supt. Bishop thanked everyone who spoke to help educate the board and all the differing opinions.

**Board Discussion:**

- Member *White* asked that as the board is looking at this, are they only looking at parents and contributions funding additional positions or also including grants, and other funds and is solely limited to parental DMSEF contributions or schools are not allowed to provide any staffing other than what is provided by the district.
- Supt. Bishop explained that it is up to the board to decide.

**Public Comment:**

- Sue Tumay, 3975 Carmel Springs Way, San Diego; she has two daughters at Carmel Del Mar. She spoke with regard to the ability of parents at Carmel Del Mar to donate. She said the participation rate has always been high, however, the average gift is lower. She spoke in regard to an article she had emailed to the board earlier in the day. It addressed the issue of school fundraising and equity in a Massachusetts school. She hoped that the policy is obtained and forwarded to the board earlier today would be helpful in formulating a policy for DMUSD. She feels that, if asked, our parents would say they want their core ESC programs. She feels we should make the DMSEF district-wide with the goal of keeping all schools at the same level and change the school goal from a dollar amount to a participation rate.
- Jana Stoudemire, 2480 Malibu Way, Del Mar; she has two 3<sup>rd</sup> grade children attending Del Mar Hills. She said she is pleased that everyone has the courage to have this challenging discussion with no easy answers. She encouraged the board to review the original equity report regarding the baseline for prep time. She feels that when you look at the programs in the DMUSD it looks very different from many “public” schools. She feels there is a lot of good support from parents not only financially but the commitment of time. She hopes the options developed will be ones where the parent community and board’s resources will continue and expand the programs.

Board President *Easton* said she feels tonight’s meeting is useful and the board owes it to the community to look at all the pieces and

come up with a solution that will be in everyone's best interest. She is looking forward to the joint meeting with the DMSEF next week. And feels that conversation will help the board make a decision. She feels additional options need to be explored and she encouraged the board to be creative in their thinking. She is hopeful to have revised options that will be presented at the February 28<sup>th</sup> board meeting.

Member *Crawford* asked the board what the impact would be if the board does not make a decision tonight.

Supt. Bishop stated that the time to fundraise would be limited.

Member *Crawford* expressed her appreciation to those who spoke and her concern if the decision is put off for another month and what it implies, for the DMSEF at each site for fundraising and the staff, is that there a lot of unknowns. She feels the board needs to make decisions sooner rather than later.

Supt. Bishop applauded the DMUSD board and the DMSEF board for agreeing to a joint meeting and feels that maybe after meeting with DMSEF either a new option will arise or new information might help the board make a decision.

The board members discussed the possibility of another Special Board meeting to decide this issue. Member *Crawford* suggested that on the Agenda of the February 7 meeting there be a discussion with regard to a Special Board meeting prior to February 28, 2007.

---

**13. ADJOURNMENT**

On motion by Member *White* seconded by Member *Crawford* and carried unanimously, the Special Board Meeting of January 31, 2007 was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

---

\_\_\_\_\_  
Janet Lamborghini, Clerk of the Board of Trustees

\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas F. Bishop, Superintendent