MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING (03-12) OF THE
BOARD OF EDUCATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1
IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER AND STATE OF COLORADO
HELD IN THE BOARD ROOM, 900 GRANT STREET
5:00 & 7:00 PM, THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 2003

I. Call to Order – 5:00 PM

A. Recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance

B. Roll Call

President Elaine Gantz Berman called the meeting to order. The following Board of Education members were present: Ms. Elaine Gantz Berman, Mrs. Susan G. Edwards, Rev. Lucia Guzman, Mrs. Michelle Moss, Mr. Kevin Patterson, and Mr. Lester Woodward. Mr. James Mejia was absent and excused.

C. Recognitions

Many new Principals were welcomed and introduced to the Board:

1. Dr. Irene Jordan, Southeast Area Superintendent, welcomed two new principals: Greta Martinez, a North High graduate, coming to DPS from Jefferson County to be the new Principal at Slavens Elementary, and Jan Belt, a George Washington High School graduate, who will be the Interim Principal at Steele Elementary.

2. Melanie Haas, Southwest Area Superintendent, welcomed Anita (Ann) Myers, a George Washington High graduate who is coming from District 14 and from the Colorado Department of Education to be the new principal at Force Elementary.

3. Richard Smith, Northeast Area Superintendent, welcomed five new principals: Kathy Callum is coming from Lincoln High back to East High School, where she did her assistant principalship; Jai Palmer will be the new Principal at Whittier Elementary, where he has been serving as Interim Principal. Charles Babb will be the new Principal at Phillips Elementary, where he also has been serving as Interim Principal. Peter Sherman is coming to the District from Jefferson County where he served as Principal at the Jeff K-8 Open School, as well as having served as an Assistant Principal at Odyssey School, and will be the new Principal at Park Hill Elementary; and Cathy Gonzales, former Principal of Fairview Elementary who has been serving as a specialist in the southeast quadrant office, and will be Interim Principal at Greenwood Elementary.

4. The Board was advised that Barbara Cooper was re-assigned to the principalship at Hallett Elementary.
Dr. Wartgow congratulated and welcomed all of the new Principals.

D. **Approve Agenda**

Mrs. Gantz Berman said that before having the Citizens’ Bond Committee Report, the Board would be approving the agenda. Mrs. Edwards moved to approve the agenda be accepted. Mr. Patterson seconded the motion. A roll-call vote was taken and passed unanimously.

**IV. Consent Agenda**

*(Delivered out of order from agenda)*

Assistant Secretary Jacquie Lucero read the Consent Agenda:

A. **Superintendent’s Office**

1. Gift Report (IV-A-1) – This report details public gifts received by the schools with a value of $500 or more.

B. **Administrative Services**

1. **Human Resources**

   a. Personnel Transaction Report (IV-B-1a) – This report contains information regarding employee activity such as appointments, resignations and transfers.

2. **Facility Management**

   a. Final Settlements (IV-B-2a) – These settlements close a specific contract such as closing out a building addition.

   b. Architect Selection (IV-B-2b) – This is an architect selection for approval by the Board of Education for Centennial Elementary four-classroom addition project.

   c. Construction Advisory Committee Final Report (IV-B-2c) – This is a final report for the Stapleton II K-8 Project for approval by the Board of Education.

   d. Dedication Plaque (IV-B-2d) – This is the dedication plaque for Denver School of the Arts School for approval by the Board of Education.

   e. Use of Contingency Funds (IV-B-2e) - The Board of Education will be asked to approve the Use of Additional Contingency Funds for the Dora Moore Restoration project.

C. **Budget and Finance**

1. Financial Services
a. Resolution Approving A Lease Purchase Agreement, an Official Statement, and a Continuing Disclosure Agreement Relating to the Lease-Purchase, and Providing Other Details and Approving other Documents in Connection with the Lease-Purchase Financing (IV-C-1a) – This is for the certificates of participation issue to provide proceeds for the construction of a K-8 school in the Green Valley area to open August 2004 and to acquire parcels of land for future school sites in the Montbello area.

b. Appointment of Custodian Bank for the District’s Bond Redemption Fund (IV-C-1b) – This is to comply with Senate Bill 02-237 signed into law on April 22, 2003, which requires each school district to select a custodian bank on or before June 30, 2003, for the purposes of administering the District’s Bond Redemption Fund.

D. Schools/Community Partnerships

1. Grants Office

a. CDE – Expelled and At-Risk Students Services Grant (VI-B-1a) – This a continuation of an application for Cole, Kepner, Smiley, and Bruce Randolph Middle Schools with a focus on suspension and substance abuse prevention, in collaboration with community partners.

Seeing no held items, Ms. Gantz Berman asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion was made by Mrs. Edwards and seconded by Mr. Patterson. A roll-call vote was taken and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Gantz Berman announced that the Consent Agenda passed, and everything that was read as part of the Consent Agenda passed.

DCTA Grievance 02-23

Mrs. Edwards offered the motion, Appendix 03-12, VI-C-1a, to accept the arbitrator’s opinion and award with matter of DCTA Grievance 02-23. A roll-call vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

III. Superintendent’s Reports
(Delivered out of order from agenda)

There were none at this time.

II. Board Member Reports
(Delivered out of order from agenda)

Citizen’s Bond Committee Report
Ms. Gantz Berman thanked all of the members of the Citizens’ Bond Committee on behalf of the Board for their yeoman’s work over the past several months, which has included sitting in many meetings to learn the various aspects of the DPS. She introduced Steve Kaplan, Chair of the Citizens’ Committee on Facility Needs (“CCFN”), to present the recommendations to the Board of Education regarding the possibility of an upcoming Bond and Mill Levy election for this November. A copy of the committee’s recommendations is attached to these minutes and marked Appendix 03-12, II-A.

Steve Kaplan Introduction

Mr. Kaplan said it’s been a great privilege to be a part of this committee over the last 5 months, noting that their first meeting was on Jan 8th. At that time they thought they’d be meeting every other week for about 6 weeks, little knowing that they would end up meeting virtually every week for 5 months. He also recognized the dedicated and professional DPS staff for their hard work, Wayne Eckerling, Allen Belczarek, Mike Langley, Larry Williams, Ethan Henning, Rich Allen, Velma Rose, Supt. Wartgow, and many others. He said there were 15-20 staff people at every meeting, and they run until 7:30 or 8 PM every week.

Mr. Kaplan said that the committee’s recommendations to the Board reflected a needs-based program, which started with an assessment of what they thought the needs of the District are, both on the capital side and the mill levy side. They spent several weeks immersing themselves in the work that the staff had done for the previous six to nine months; they’d done quite a lot on the bond side in terms of laying out needs, assessing school by school and program by program what was needed; that initial report totaled over $1 billion in needs at DPS. They then established a common information base by learning more about educational finance, state funding, mill levies, and the DPS budget, recognizing what a difficult spring it has been budget-wise.

He explained that they used a number of guiding principles, but focused on basics like safety & security, strengthening neighborhood schools and neighborhood programs, so that if students and families decided to attend a different school than the one in their neighborhood, it would not be because their neighborhood school was deficient, but because the District offered another exciting choice at another school.

He said they organized themselves into subcommittees. Stephanie O’Malley chaired the New Schools Committee; Judge Larry Manzanares chaired the Technology Committee - Rafael Quintero will report on Technology; Denise Burgess chaired Codes & Life Safety, Jean Abney chaired the Required Repairs Committee - she is out of town and this presentation will be made by Brian Wert. He said that he and Theresa Pena would address issues of the Educational Programs Committee, which had a Capital component and a Mill Levy component.

Mr. Kaplan said about three weeks ago they started to distill this information and decided to establish a conference committee, with the chair and one member of each subcommittee meeting to finalize their proposals to the Board. Their two goals were: 1) to establish on the Bond side a package of $310 million, because they had been advised that is the amount of a bond package that can be floated without an increase in the mill levy rate, and 2) to present the Board with what they considered to be a comprehensive and prioritized package, which came to $470 million, and is referred to in Appendix 03-12, II-A as “CCFN Recommendation”; the cost would be about $18 per year ($1.50 per month) on a $237,000 house (estimate of average household). The committee, with some minor modifications, agreed to present the $310 million package to the Board, saying, “but let it be known, that is not our recommendation to the Board” because they believe that the
needs of the District are greater. They also spent considerable time and discussion on a mill levy package. The staff had not been asked to spend as much time on the mill levy package previous to the committee’s formation, and as a result, it took longer to develop, but by the end they put together what they believe is a really exciting educational programming mill levy package of $20.2 million per year; the cost of which is roughly $48 per year on the estimated average household.

He said that each subcommittee would present to the Board in more detail the information in the packets which were handed out earlier; but first he gave the summary of the totals. The New Schools Committee includes both enrollment-driven new schools, security, transportation and some school lunch improvements; the difference between these packages is the difference between $78 million and $104 million. The Technology Committee faced many challenges because the needs are overwhelming, the equipment purchased always becomes obsolete, and Y2K created some extraordinary problems for the District. The Codes Committee focused on Life Safety and those really critical issues – fire suppression, fire alarms, etc. Required Repairs is in the maintenance category: boilers, roofs, parking lots, playgrounds, classrooms, painting, windows, heating systems, and there is a very strong sense that DPS needs to have a comprehensive program. The Educational Program Committee looked at a number of additional capital programs that are not necessarily enrollment-driven, and both programs include a refinancing of certificates of participation of $26 million, which is important to the District in terms of making sure the District does its financing in the most efficient and fiscally responsible way, so both packages include that piece.

1. New Schools Committee

Stephanie O’Malley, New Schools Committee Chair, thanked all of the members of their subcommittee, Alan Balczarek from the staff, and Mr. Patterson. She said their initial numbers in their committee as it related to recommendations from the staff, amounted to approximately $186 million, which included all of the categories of New Schools, Transportation, Food Services, and the Classroom Additions; she gave that number so the Board could make a relative comparison from where they started from to where they’ve come.

Ms. O’Malley began her committee’s presentation with the New Schools, saying they have made recommendations that from the $310 million package add up to approximately $48 million, and then the recommendation outside of the $310 million package came to a total of $69,698,000. They recommended a total of four projects in the New Schools category. The first two were strictly enrollment driven, and the new Green Valley II K-8 school as well as the new Montbello I K-8 school were both enrollment driven projects. Due to the capacity issues in the far northeast neighborhood, the committee was in agreement that these schools are needed there because if they aren’t built, the children will have nowhere to attend school.

The next project in terms of priority was the Stapleton High School and the land purchase that went along with it. They were not all in agreement with regards to the Stapleton project, but in the end they did come to an agreement and decided that this would be good for the District. Although this is not an enrollment driven project, there are nevertheless capacity issues at George Washington High School, East High School, and at Montbello High School, which is currently at 80-85% in terms of their capacity. This school was seen as a school that could offset some of the capacity issues at those other high schools. Also, with the growth that is expected in the Stapleton redevelopment area, there will be a need for a high school there. This is a small school, approximately 450 students at the onset, with room to grow. It’s also a small-school-based high school, and research is showing that the smaller high schools are more conducive to student
learning. They thought there was a need; the school will be built in the vicinity of 56th & Havana. The land purchase that came along with this project was estimated at $4 million with an overall project cost of $24 million. In the $310 million package, it’s just the land itself at $4 million.

The next priority was Denver School of Science and Technology Charter School. It is also not an enrollment-based project, however, the committee believes it would be an excellent addition for the following reasons: 1) the school has a focus on the subject matters of science and technology, and no other schools in the District, at the high school level, exclusively address those subjects; 2) the school has already acquired the donation of ten acres of land at Stapleton, and raised $5 million in capital dollars plus $2 million towards its programming. The school (DSS&T) originally asked them for $7 million, and after much discussion the school decided that the $5 million in both the CCFN recommendation and in the $310 million package would meet their needs. She added that this was a project that would allow students across the District to participate, because it’s not all test-based admission. This school is committed to going out and recruiting students who might not otherwise get an opportunity to attend a school like this, and those who finish the program would gain automatic admission into the University of Colorado, which they consider to be a real jewel for the District.

Mr. Patterson asked where the proposal he’d seen for a high school for Green Valley Ranch (“GVR”) fell in their discussion. Ms. O’Malley replied that, in their initial discussions, they prioritized in geographic regions, considering Green Valley Ranch by itself, Montbello by itself, and Stapleton by itself. In the rankings in the GVR area, the $32 million GVR high school came in third, behind the other two projects. The rationale was that the needs of the K-8 population were more immediate than those for a high school. She reiterated that if those schools aren’t built, the children will literally have no place to attend school this fall.

Regarding the Stapleton High School Project, Rev. Guzman asked whether the three high schools mentioned (GW, East and Montbello) would be at capacity within three or four years if this new school isn’t built. Ms. O’Malley replied that both GW and East are already at capacity, and Montbello is close to capacity at between 80-85%. Rev. Guzman asked why they aren’t considering this project to be enrollment driven. Ms. O’Malley said that it wasn’t immediately enrollment driven, as in a neighborhood where the school’s already filled to capacity. This is a school that will be filled within a central area of the District that would allow some offshoot from those other high schools.

Rev. Guzman also asked what had become of the proposed small school in the southwest. Mr. Kaplan said there’s a lot of support for the notion of an alternative 4-8 school, and they did consider an alternative 4-8 school in far southwest, on land that the District already owns, but decided against it partly for priority reasons, and partly because the school would be located in one corner of the District, as opposed to the middle of the southwest area.

Rev. Guzman asked whether transportation was to be provided for the Denver School of Science and Technology. Ms. O’Malley replied that transportation was not in their discussions, but Mr. Greenburg from the school is working on plans to make sure kids from all over the District would be able to get there.

Mrs. Moss asked how many kids would be housed in Stapleton High and in the Denver School of Science and Technology; Ms. O’Malley said the capacity at Stapleton would be about 450 and DSST would be about 425.
Mrs. Moss asked what became of the recommendation for an alternative high school project that was suggested for the same lot in southwest Denver. Mr. Kaplan replied that the sense they had from the staff was that the preference was for a 4-8. He said there was some discussion of a small, not alternative, high school, to give students another option, but that it was a priority issue. Furthermore, he explained that a lot of students in that part of the District choose not to go to DPS, and although they want to come up with programs that will attract them and keep them, that high school might not be the best way to achieve that goal. Mr. Patterson asked whether there was any conversation about a small alternative high school. Mr. Kaplan said there was discussion about a small high school that was structured programmatically so it offered options, but not what he considers an alternative high school.

Ms. Gantz Berman returned to the question of the choice the committee made for a high school at Stapleton versus a choice for a high school at Green Valley, and asked if the student enrollment projections over the five years fail to justify a high school in Green Valley Ranch. Ms. O’Malley said that they do, but that if the Stapleton High School were built, it would assist in taking on some of the students from the Green Valley Ranch area. Ms. Gantz Berman asked whether that means there is a projection for more high school students at Stapleton than Green Valley, which didn’t seem logical to her. Mr. Balczarek replied that, over the 12-15 year life of the development at Stapleton, the projections will substantially exceed that of Green Valley. Stapleton’s numbers would be about 250 initially over a 4-5 year period, building out to about 800-900, over the course of the entire development, depending upon what type of market product they have; Green Valley’s projection at this point is about 250 additional students based on the build-out, which would allow Montbello High, while nearing capacity, pretty much to be at capacity in the 98-100% range. Ms. Gantz Berman asked what the projections would be if we look at high school student enrollment projections over the next 5-7 years and not over the entire build-out of Stapleton. Mr. Balczarek said that over that time period they are relatively close, between 240-280 students in each development. He also said that GW and East are projected to be substantially over 100% during the course of that period of time and reminded them that GW is the high school for the Stapleton neighborhood. Mrs. Edwards asked, looking at the full roll-out of both Green Valley Ranch and Stapleton, how many high schools we will need. Ms. O’Malley said we will need two. Stapleton is structured to grow from 450 to 1000. Green Valley Ranch would be expected to need an 800 capacity school. The unknown factor in both Montbello and Green Valley Ranch is the number of students who choice out of the area right now.

Ms. O’Malley resumed her presentation, and the committee’s discussion of classroom additions. They started out with the following four classroom additions: eight for Johnson Elementary, eight for Schenck Elementary, six for Schmitt Elementary, and eight for Gust Elementary.

Mr. Woodward asked whether there is a present enrollment over-capacity in each of these schools, or whether anticipated growth in student enrollment is driving this consideration. Ms. O’Malley answered that the need is there now.

Ms. Gantz Berman asked, with these additions, how large these schools will be in terms of student enrollment. Ms. O’Malley didn’t have that specific information. Ms. Gantz Berman said it would be fine to get the information later. She then asked whether there was any consideration of a maximum enrollment for an elementary school. Ms. O’Malley said that hadn’t been discussed.

Ms. O’Malley spoke next about Transportation, and said that the recommendation from the staff viewpoint totaled $31,715,000, but this committee pared it down to $13,905,000 in both the CCFN recommendation and the $310 million package. A lot of sacrifice was made in this category, and the things that ultimately ended up being recommended. They strongly believe
there is a need for the bus terminal, which is a safety issue, with a price tag of $13,732,000. There’s also a need for a refurbishment of Hilltop at a cost of $173,000. These were included in both the $310 million package and the CCFN recommendation package, because they came to the top of the list.

There were no questions from the Board.

Ms. O’Malley said in the Food & Nutrition Services category, there was originally a request for $2,967,200 in both the CCFN recommendation and the $310 million package; the funds would be used to remodel kitchens at Lincoln, Montbello, West, and North High Schools, and Skinner Middle School. These campuses are closed, so the kids have no place to go other than the cafeteria to eat. These decisions were made in an effort to keep the kids on the campus during the school hours, in order to eliminate them going out into the community where there might possibly be problems outside of the school.

Mrs. Edwards said she knows that there has been a lot of remodeling work done on the cafeterias at Montbello and Lincoln since she’s been on the board, and asked whether the upgrades being proposed are strictly in the cooking/kitchens area. Ms. O’Malley said yes, adding that what was done initially was what the budget allowed for, and there were other items that needed to be done and haven’t been done yet, so these are the continued things that need to be done to bring these facilities up to par to provide better food services to the students.

Regarding Security, Ms. O’Malley said that the committee agreed that there was a severe need for everything that the staff recommended from a security standpoint. She said the safety of all of our students is at issue here, and there was no deviation from any of the asked items, which they believe should be included in both the $310 million package and the CCFN recommended package. She offered to go through them for the record, otherwise the attachment speaks for itself, but it does include steps taken to enhance the security of the schools and of the staff.

Mr. Patterson interjected a question not requiring an immediate answer, asking how many radios we’re purchasing and whether we’ve looked at a replacement cycle and how that might impact operating. Ms. Gantz Berman asked where the Closed Circuit TVs are placed. Ms. O’Malley said they are in areas where there is egress and ingress into and out of the school, so you can see who is coming in and out of the buildings, as well as at specific high-traffic sites within the schools, and in particular hallways or corridors with blind spots. Ms. Gantz Berman asked where they are monitored from. Ms. O’Malley said from the Main Office as well as a central area.

2. Technology Committee

Rafael Quintero spoke on behalf of Larry Manzanares, the chairman of the Technology subcommittee. They looked at seven projects, which might be considered six projects because the first two projects are related. Because they went from $72 million to $49 million, some very worthwhile projects, such as distance learning, were left off.

First, Network Infrastructure Upgrade of Facilities Not Funded by E-Rate, requires cabling the remaining 60% of the schools that do not qualify for the E-Rate program, and would require the installation of network cable into every classroom in the city that is not currently up-to-date. The second item, Technology Construction Support, is the construction support to do the cabling.

Mr. Quintero explained that the Replacement of the Telecommunications System 911 is twofold: 1) to upgrade the phone switch or PBX that DPS owns, in order that it could handle the new
schools at Stapleton as well as continue to provide such functions as 4-digit dialing, voicemail, call forwarding, as well as to provide cheaper phone service by being centrally located here at 900 Grant, rather than at each individual school; 2) to provide call recognition for 911: after this upgrade, if someone calls 911 from a phone in the District, the 911 operators will know where the phone being used is located.

Technology Systems Disaster Recovery is a fairly small item at $613,400, and is to purchase equipment for technology recovery. Mr. Quintero said that currently, the Department of Technology does its own back-up off-site. This would create a Disaster Recovery site in case there is a disaster here at 900 Grant. It would also serve as a test bed for new systems applications.

Mr. Quintero said that all of these projects were recommended for both the $310 million package and the $470 million package proposals.

He explained that the Centralization of a Student Information System project is a replacement for an existing system, due to the fact that the SASI system, which currently keeps track of student attendance and grades, will no longer be supported by the vendor of the software. Therefore that system will have to be replaced. He said there is some belief that it cannot be done in a bond, but he thinks it can be done, which is one reason it is not in the $310 million package.

Mr. Quintero said that Replacement of End of Life Enterprise Equipment is to buy the larger computers, the servers, which are approaching the end of their natural life cycle. He explained that quite a lot of the technology which was purchased back in 1998-99 needs to be replaced now.

He said that the $4.1 million for the Enterprise Data Warehouse Implementation is an additional function that the Department of Technology wants to provide to DPS, because currently at DPS, “there is plenty of data but not a lot of information”. The Enterprise will be a system that lies on top of all the silos, such as financials, SASI, and so forth, and can produce reports across all information, all data, in the District.

Mrs. Edwards asked what specific function would be brought to the schools if the network cabling were to be done in all District schools. Mr. Quintero replied that the DPS cabling that dates back to the late 1980s, early 1990s is faulty and doesn’t transmit the amount of data that is necessary for today’s standards, both for accessing the internet and accessing the systems such as SASI or any other system a teacher may need to use. He said that if you install computers in a classroom, you also want to have connectivity from that computer all the way to the main closet in the school and then to the internet, so this is the last mile. It is the cable between the front door in the school and the actual computer, wherever it may be. He explained that the bigger the building is, the more expensive it is to do, because it requires more relays. For example, Lincoln High will require $1 million to re-wire, while Bromwell will only require $200-300 thousand.

Ms. Gantz Berman asked whether we’ve gotten clarification from the staff if the Centralization of a Student Information System can be included in the bond or not. Steve Kaplan responded that Velma Rose had been looking into it, but it had not been resolved when this recommendation was prepared. Ms. Rose said that her conversations with DoTS personnel revealed that the costs would entail only hardware and software, and would not be in conjunction with any construction project or involve running any new conduit or doing anything to the facilities, which is a prerequisite to allow use of bond dollars.
3. Codes Committee

Denise Burgess, the Chair of the Codes Committee, said she is on the CCFN Committee representing the Colorado Black Chamber and the HUBS Council for DPS. Their task was to investigate the federal and local code violations that are in our schools, and they felt very strongly that we need to get our schools to at least code compliant. Reviewing the list, you’ll see Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance; Backflows Containment, Isolation, and Fire Suppression. The Building Addition is for Crofton Elementary, because there is a code that provides that 2nd grade and under cannot be on the 2nd floor, and this would allow an addition for the library so that the kids could be on the main floor and have full access to the library. The Code Violations refer to fire sprinklers at Lincoln Elementary and a Sandoval fire escape; Elevators refers to ADA compliance; the Fire Alarm System is for 50 schools – that covers that $17 million; the Backflow Fire Suppression is to protect the city system; the HVAC Corridor is the smoke suppression in corridors for the older schools. Orders to Comply refers to exit doors which currently have chains or bars on them, and it would make them code compliant. The Sidewalks referred to are those with a safety issue in regards to tripping and falling. For this committee, the $310 million package was $44,544,000, and our recommendation is $54,834,000.

Mr. Patterson asked why the Backflow Fire Suppression wasn’t in their $310 million package. Ms. Burgess replied that due to cost, it was left out because it is a code issue rather than a real safety issue.

Ms. Gantz Berman asked if the Building Additions was for one library in one school. Ms. Burgess said it was for a 4-room, 1-library addition at Crofton Elementary. Ms. Gantz Berman asked whether the committee had taken into consideration the fact that Crofton is a 100-year-old school, and whether it might be more economical to move the program than to build four classrooms and a library. Ms. Burgess replied that they had taken that into consideration, but they knew that the Board would make the final decision. Mr. Patterson asked if there had been discussion of Crofton’s lunchroom facilities. Ms. Burgess said that it had not come up in their committee. Mr. Langley replied that it would come under Repairs. Ms. Gantz Berman asked for the committee’s rationale on the Crofton additions. Ms. Burgess said that all of the schools they were dealing with under Code Compliance are older schools, and because they didn’t know where the program would move to, and there were no guarantees that it would stay in the same quadrant, they decided they wanted to try and keep it in the neighborhood, and leave it up to the Board to take it out if they wanted to.

Ms. Gantz Berman asked whether Sidewalks was for safety reasons. Ms. Burgess said it was.

Mr. Kaplan commented that the older schools which are in need of serious attention is highlighted in the Required Repairs and Maintenance committee’s work, and introduced Brian Wert.

4. Required Repairs Committee

Mr. Wert said a few of them did the same thing for the 1998 bond issue. They also had a few additions to their subcommittee, including a former board member, a current principal, and a bond lawyer. To put the numbers in the slide (Appendix 03-12, II-A, pg 12) into perspective, through 2020, the 10,000 physical assets of the District will require about $1.6 billion worth of repair and maintenance expenditure. Over the next 7 years, $500 million of that expenditure will be required. He explained that the term “assets” refers to such tangible things as boilers and roofs, and there are about 10,000 individual assets across the District. Their committee started its work
at about $350 million in needs to consider for a bond question in 2003, and in the CCFN recommendation at the $470 million bond issue level included $173 million of repairs, which is about $10 million less than they recommended to the entire CCFN. Contrasted with a $310 million bond package, only $99 million is allocated to repairs, and their committee is very concerned that that would leave many significant assets prone to failure before another bond issue would be possible, and emphasized that the need for an additional bond would occur no later than 2009 or 2010. He also said the $310 million package includes no expenditure at North High School. He explained that, within the $310 million package, he believes that staff would like to move money within some categories before everything is finalized, but the total would not change. For example, they might reduce roofs and put that money to some other uses. He also said that if there are no mill levy funds approved in 2003, the District will have no way to sustain the improvements made under the 1998 bond or a 2003 bond, and without mill levy funds, staffing for maintenance within the District is inadequate. Although he was unable to attend last night’s CCFN meeting, he understood that a vote on the question of mill levy funding on the ballot in 2003 ended in a tie vote; therefore it’s his subcommittee’s recommendation that mill levy funds for maintenance from the 1998 election be restored. This committee recommends no bond expenditures for repairs to North High School, but instead recommends funding for construction of a new North High School. He said that this would be difficult due to the building’s historic designation, but it can be done. However, he explained that if the Board decides not to fund the replacement of North High, the $10 million repair figure in the $470 million package is essential to the structural integrity of some parts of that facility.

Mr. Woodward asked whether they looked at individual items, such as boilers, to determine their replacement dates. Mr. Wert said an analysis was prepared for essentially every asset in the District, using a database which did not exist when this was done in 1998, but which staff have developed for the entire District in the last five years. He said a lot of that was done internally over the last 2 - 2 _ years without much outside consultant help, and it represents a lot of overtime, probably unpaid, on behalf of staff members. The sophistication of the analysis is impressive, listing the installation date of each asset, the installation cost, the expected life, the remaining life that could be expected for that type of asset, and the remaining life based on analysis of each asset at each building. Therefore every boiler, roof, window, etc. was examined. Mr. Woodward asked if these represent a priority out of a much larger overall number, based on urgency. Mr. Wert said yes.

Rev. Guzman asked whether North is the only high school that is in such poor condition that it must be either restored or demolished. Staff said yes. She said that such a decision will require a full engineering report regarding the state of the building and what it would require, and asked what a report like that would cost, and whether that expense needs to be figured in. Mr. Langley said they have some studies and background for North already from their discussions with Dr. Wartgow, and they plan to have an architect and consultants evaluate the building, including structural, HVAC, electrical, etc. He said he has a completed study line item by line item with associated costs, and that will be available for the Board when they make their final determination in August. He said “we have the funds, not bond funds, but we have the funds and will have the study that will drive the scope, the cost, and in turn your decision, go, no-go, and what you want to do if you do go and do something for North”. Rev. Guzman asked if the building is safe and secure if we don’t do anything. Mr. Langley said the building has a lot of problems with smells, heating, etc, but not life safety issues. He said that if life safety problems occur, they will either be repaired, or portions of the building where those problems exist will be vacated, as has been done on occasion in the past in other DPS buildings.
Mr. Patterson asked what the cost would be to replace North High and how that compares to the cost of restoration. Mr. Wert said “in some very round numbers” it would cost between $30 million and $40 million. He said they were focused on a $10 million package, but there were about $20 million in repairs that were recommended by staff, plus another $500,000 for kitchen facilities, and once you’re looking at that kind of expenditure only for repairs on a building that has other problems, it makes sense to consider reconstruction. Rev. Guzman asked whether we would then have a plan for where to house the students during reconstruction. Mr. Langley replied that, whether we reconstruct or do a very extensive renovation, we would have to have a plan for the students for some period of time. He said that Area Superintendent Joe Sandoval, North’s former principal, was here at that time, and approximately 20 years ago it was actively discussed to try and replace the entire facility, however the historical aspects came into play and that’s why it was not done at that time, and considerable coordination and efforts would have to be made if the facility were to be replaced. Rev. Guzman asked whether, if we moved to the zero funding, then the reconstructing of a new building, if we chose to do that, it would not occur during this bond, during these four years, that would be in the future? Mr. Langley said that depends on the category; you could zero-fund the restoration under Repairs and put 35 to 40 million dollars under New Schools and build a new school. He said that Mr. Dean and his staff have done a great job with keeping it going under some severe circumstances, and that’s what we’d have to continue doing until we got adequate funding.

Mr. Woodward asked what he meant when he spoke on the “continuation of the 1998 Mill Levy”. Mr. Wert explained that, to address recent budget shortfalls, the mill levy funds approved in 1998, which had been allocated to maintenance, have been pulled back and are used in other areas; so if mill levy funds allocated to maintenance are not forthcoming from a 2003 question, then their recommendation is that the mill levy funds for maintenance from the 1998 question be restored. Mr. Langley added that that $3 million that was in the 1998 mill levy override that was devoted to repair and maintenance projects; to meet the budget shortfall that is not used for maintenance repair projects, it is being used for maintenance salaries. He said it’s the hope and intention of the administration in future years to try and restore that, but right now those funds are being used for salaries. Mr. Allen added that there will be an attempt in the course of the 2003-2004 year to restore those maintenance project reductions with one-time money and then in ‘04-‘05 to get it back in the base. Mr. Woodward asked if their committee considered whether it would be more desirable to have a bond issue like this for things like maintenance and repair or whether there ought to be an ongoing mill levy allocated to something that is in fact a continuing cost which this District bears above normal costs because we’re the older District with the older buildings which have more repair and maintenance needs. Mr. Wert said that is a correct assessment of the nature of the District’s buildings, which are, on average, older than any other district in the state. The committee did not specifically consider a recommendation for a different way to fund maintenance, but did recognize that other districts do it very differently than DPS, and some of them have huge reserves for facilities and maintenance, whereas DPS doesn’t have that luxury.

Mrs. Edwards concurred with Mr. Woodward and recalled that when they advocated for the 1998 bond, and Mr. Milner will also recall, that because of their awareness of the ongoing maintenance needs in the District, and the inappropriateness of putting maintenance items in a bond election, they specifically designated $3 million of the 1998 mill levy for maintenance. She agreed with the recommendation that that money be restored so that the quality of our buildings can be maintained.

Referring to page 12 of Appendix 03-12, II-A, Mrs. Edwards asked how specific the itemized prioritization for each of the items listed on the repair list is. Mr. Wert said it is based on the
condition of the assets, for example, with Paved Playgrounds, to go from $12.8 million to $6 million, just means that some of these will be forced to wait longer. Mrs. Edwards asked if there were specific playgrounds in the $6 million price and specific ones in the $12,896,000 price. Mr. Wert confirmed this. Mrs. Edwards asked that he go into more detail about Athletic Fields. Mr. Wert said there are two aspects: one concerns upgrading conventional fields and the other concerns artificial turf. They looked at a package that would include all high schools, and at an alternative package that would include one high school in each quadrant or representative district.

Mr. Kaplan addressed the issue of mill levy versus bond money by saying that relatively speaking, the committee’s sense was that the bond money is a better value, and that the annual cost of the $80 million, compared to the cost of the mill levy, was considered. He said the District has a greater amount of bonding capacity than of mill levy capacity, with about $50 million a year in mill levy capacity left, and over a billion dollars in bond capacity. The committee tried to reserve space in the $50 million a year for teacher pay-for-performance, so that if the Board was successful in those negotiations, there would be plenty of capacity to implement that program, should the voters approve it. Secondly, they really believe that the educational needs on the programming side, in the classroom, needed considerable attention, and those really can’t be funded out of the bond side and need to be funded out of the mill levy side. He said this explains why you see, relatively speaking, so much in Required Repairs. They also made an assumption in the bond package consideration, which seems consistent with the Board’s, i.e., that the District has started to look at a 5-year cycle for bond packages. He also said that within the next couple of days, as a preliminary matter, the Board will get a school-by-school breakdown of what each school will receive under the recommended package. He noted that every school receives something, and virtually every school receives a significant project or set of improvements.

5. Educational Programs Committee

Mr. Kaplan began this report with Byers Middle School, an older school in a beloved building, which is in need of great repair. He said the committee thought that no money should be put into that school under the $310 million package. However, they recommended an $8 million improvement because they believe the school is a useful asset, being a relatively large school, and well placed in the community in terms of transportation, so it works well as being a choice school. One of the primary issues with this school is that younger children cannot access the second floor due to safety and code issues, which restricts use of the building.

As for the CEC, the committee recommended an additional room, a college campus program, which would allow students to attend all day, so it wouldn’t just be a part-day program. It seems to be a very successful program, so this was viewed as an expansion. Mr. Kaplan said they discussed the fact that the District has a lot of programs that are working, which they would like to see replicated.

For Program Enhancements, the committee put together a package of capital improvements and a mill levy piece to address revitalization and transformation of a certain number of schools every year. They spent a lot of time on schools that were under utilized, but were in neighborhoods with a lot of kids, and many of those were low performing. They tried to overlay under utilization with the demographics of neighborhoods where kids were choosing out, perhaps because they didn’t think the school was adequate for their needs. They tried to address strengthening neighborhood schools and encouraging choice, with the idea that choosing out would not occur because the neighborhood school is deficient, but because the District offers a different option. They believe this will enable the revitalization to be implemented and those schools that need it will have some capital improvements and not just additional staff or programmatic changes.
Learning Landscapes is a program designed to have a strong impact not only in the school, but also in the community around it. All of the schools that were able to get federal and other funding, which was managed through the city, have been done, and this is to focus on those schools that have not been done. The full package is about $24 million – one package is $10 million and the other package is $24 million. The key to this program is in involving the neighborhood and school community; those who know this program love it, and it’s a very strong program.

The KIPP Charter School Program, a new charter school in southwest, is based on a national model that is very successful. They requested $4 million for a modular facility on a site that DPS already owns. Because the program is so new, we don’t really have a track record with it, therefore, because: 1) it was modular and 2) it was new, we recommended half of what the school said they needed and challenged them to go raise the other half. It’s similar to what the New Schools committee did with Denver Science & Technology Charter School. Also, the charter schools were all offered the opportunity to request to participate in the bond package, and this committee received proposals from four schools; we recommended funding for two of the four, and we can go into detail if you so desire.

Air Conditioning is a topic that was considered in various ways; it would cost over $300 million to provide air conditioning for all of the schools that don’t have it now. We felt that, as the school calendar has moved into August, this is a need, and the six schools the committee recommended are the six year-round schools that do not currently have AC.

Rev. Guzman asked for the names of those six schools. Mr. Kaplan listed Smedley, Barret, Bryant-Webster, Fairmont, Smith, and Johnson.

Mrs. Moss asked if there’s a list of who would get Learning Landscapes if the Board decided on the lower amount. Mr. Kaplan said there was not a specific list, because that priority assessment was not done, and given the nature of the program and that it’s more than just a physical improvement, it’s hard to do. He said that a lot of people told them that if we didn’t do it all, the communities that did not receive funds would be upset, and that was hard for the committee to evaluate. He said he mentioned it only because the people who know that program feel so strongly about its impact on the neighborhoods. Mrs. Moss said she knew that on many of the previous Learning Landscapes projects we had partnerships with the City and County of Denver, and asked whether there is potential for that partnership to continue, and whether there are additional funds that we might be able to get for that program. Mr. Kaplan said the schools that have been done are all of the schools that are eligible to receive federal and city funding. He said it was really federal funding, which was administered by the City, as well as private money matched. Mr. Langley confirmed that in the last 3 years we’ve received several million dollars from the City, primarily passed through federal dollars, also GoCo dollars, as well as significant millions of dollars from foundations. They have all been towards “focused” neighborhoods, which is the term the City used for the lower socio-economic neighborhoods. He said we will complete those this year, and no one is looking to provide funds to the other neighborhoods, which aren’t focused neighborhoods. Mrs. Moss said she thought she’d heard there was a potential that there would be, those focus neighborhoods would now go away, and that they may potentially pick up some new focus neighborhoods. Mr. Langley said this is all new information and he had not heard anything about that. He said there were a couple of things, however, that this would not be a pure bond project, and this was discussed with the citizens’ committee: firstly, that there are some schools that have been outstanding at raising some funds to help themselves. Southmoor and Bryant Webster are examples of two schools, in vastly different neighborhoods,
that have raised tens of thousands of dollars. Secondly, it is the intention, as briefed by Mr. Kaplan and to the citizens’ committee, that wherever the Learning Landscapes are placed, community involvement will be important, not only in the design, but also in volunteers, which will save some money, and will have the citizens out there helping, laying sod, putting in the fill for play pits, etc, to truly get a community effort and a community buy-in for the facility.

Ms. Gantz Berman asked about air conditioning for the proposed new classroom additions. Mr. Langley said the District’s policy so far is that only additions to air conditioned buildings have been air conditioned, unless it has been something unique, such as the addition at JFK High School, which contains high-tech equipment. Otherwise, it has not been District policy to air condition the additions.

Ms. Gantz-Berman took a moment to announce that the public hearing normally starts at 7:00 PM, but that the current meeting will continue for about 10 minutes, after which the Board will take a short break for dinner, and then they will return.

6. Mill Levy Summary

Theresa Pena spoke on the Mill Levy recommendation, saying that it was really the educational programming component in support of the bond facilities, and their two primary objectives were 1) to strengthen our neighborhood schools 2) to raise student achievement. The student achievement was really an innovation idea, and the strengthening of neighborhood schools was really a programming idea. She said they want to bring people back into the DPS, to make our neighborhood schools more attractive, and to expand choice to all schools.

The School Revitalization is $2.5 million, which they consider an R&D opportunity for the District. The first of the two components is an opportunity to use under-utilized resources. This committee felt very strongly that we have several buildings which we don’t use fully, and rather than build new schools, we could save money, and bring programs in, which is a less expensive alternative, and draw enrollment, and potentially new revenue, back into the District. The second component to turning around low-performing schools is the achievement component. It is an opportunity to erase the stigma of the School District, as well as to go into the low and unsatisfactory schools and do something very different with a sustained effort in. Of $2.5 million, one million is transportation costs, and the remaining $1.5 million is staff salaries, training, and materials. It’s a strategic initiative intended to pull in all parts of the city. Ms. Pena explained that the innovation piece is to look at the low-performing and unsatisfactory schools, but then the plan to utilize under-utilized resources is an opportunity to pitch this mill levy to all parts of the District, because there are under-utilized resources throughout all the quadrants.

Art/Music is an opportunity to put one art or music teacher in every single elementary school and all eight of the K-8 schools. This would add arts education to the core curriculum. Research has demonstrated that the presence of arts education enhances the core content, and this would be a position that could not be changed, it would have to be one art or music person. The rationale is that you start providing feeder schools to go into DSA. We did consider the opportunity to add middle school and high school art and music teachers. That would cost an additional $2.1 million, but we were working from a tops-down approach, and we had to stay under a $20 million mill levy.

ECE was an opportunity to return to where we were in 2002-2003, so next year we know that with the tuition-based, that we were losing some families, there has been much documented research that indicates that ECE is critical, particularly for the children from low-income families,
and if we lose that, it’s really hard to catch up in later years. The committee also discussed whether, if you’re going to fund all-day kindergarten, the tuition-free all-day kindergarten, you really need to set those children up for success, and if you don’t have ECE, then it doesn’t really make sense to go into tuition-free kindergarten in those same areas.

Ms. Pena said that we had Textbooks in the 1998 mill levy, and that would stay at the $3.5 million level. One of the goals of the District is to have expectations, and in order to do that you need comprehensive materials. Unfortunately, with the cuts the District has had to make, schools have ended up funding some of the textbook purchases out of their operational budget. This funds $48 per student and gives the schools some relief to not continue to use money from their operational budget for textbooks. It also gives us a 6-7 year cycle on textbooks, so it gets us a little more competitive in order to achieve that objective.

Secondary School Teachers is another strategic initiative. Most of the initiatives we looked at were geared toward elementary schools, but this was an opportunity to pitch the mill levy to middle school and high school families, as well as to our own employees – we understand the DCTA was very disappointed with the cuts that happened at the middle and high school level. One thing we wanted to avoid was locking ourselves into a staffing level ratio. As enrollment fluctuates you want to be able to move to that. So this would be written to be commensurate with the enrollment levels, because we’d like to add some of that staffing back as needed.

Ms. Pena said that when the committee first looked at the All-Day Kindergarten, it would have been about $8.6 million; of that $8.6 million, $7.5 million initially is ongoing cost, so we had to move from $7.5 million to $2 million. We looked at schools with the highest need in order to have a tuition-free all-day kindergarten. We would have to prioritize the schools, which has not yet been done, and we’d be looking at schools that have a high reduced and assisted lunch need.

Mrs. Moss asked whether the $48 per student textbook money would go directly to the schools as a part of their budget, or would it come to DPS to decide the priorities. Dr. Eckerling replied that we would probably start with some District-wide initiatives but we might be splitting it, so if we didn’t have a District-wide initiative we could give that money to the schools as additional allocations to purchase other things. To build a rich curriculum with accelerated learning you need rich materials, and we’ll need money for textbooks to support that.

Mrs. Moss asked whether the one teacher, non-convertible, art or music teacher at each elementary school, applies only to K-5 and K-8 schools. Ms. Pena confirmed this, adding that each school would have to decide whether they wanted an art or music teacher.

Regarding Dr. Eckerling’s explanation of how to allocate the textbook money, Mr. Patterson asked what the “other things” he mentioned referred to. Dr. Eckerling replied that money is only for textbook, but then added that there’s core subject area and then schools also have to purchase for things like music and art and things like that.

Rev. Guzman asked if the ECE was based on restoring the tuition-free ECE back into our schools. Ms. Pena said yes, that it would not be any new schools, but would basically be taking it back to what we have this year.

Mrs. Moss asked about the ECE proposal, and whether it would make it so that those people that had been charged the $185 this year for, would next year, or in the following years, be able to come back and get that for free. Dr. Eckerling said it was planned so that there would be at least one tuition-free ECE classroom at each school, and some schools would get more than one. Mrs.
Moss asked if other children, past that one class, would still be able to pay the $185 and we would do a testing situation to decide, so your most needy kids would get it. Dr. Eckerling said that’s the way we would propose it to you, and in some schools it could even be more than one class of needy children.

Mr. Kaplan urged the Board to put the bond issue and the mill levy package on the November ballot. He said the committee members pledge to help pass it, and they think that this community is ready to make DPS a priority.

Ms. Gantz Berman expressed the Board’s gratitude for all of the work that had gone into the research and presentations of the subcommittees, and said that the next steps for the Board of Education and the Superintendent were as follows: there will be an all-day work session meeting on Thursday, June 19th, to go into more detail and study the recommendations. They will reconvene in August after their summer break, and then they will make a final determination on what will go into the bond and mill levy package. She said the Board understands that the CCFN is recommending a package of $470 million on the bond and $20 million on the mill levy, and that they are strongly recommending that the Board go for both in this November’s election. She said the Board will determine what the size of the bond and mill levy will be, as well as the content of the bond and the mill levy, and will take all of the CCFN recommendations into great consideration. She invited all of the CCFN members to attend the June 19th meeting, and said they, and the public, will be kept informed as the Board moves ahead. She said the Board will be counting on their help and their leadership if the Board moves into campaign mode in late August/early September. She thanked Steve Kaplan for his leadership with this committee, adding that this was a very difficult task, but tonight’s presentations came across extremely well-organized and thorough, and she thanked everyone.

Ms. Gantz Berman recessed the meeting until 7:30 PM.

VII. Re-Convene Public Comment/Budget Hearing – (1st Thursday of Each Month)  
(Occurred out of order from agenda)

Ms. Gantz Berman said this would be the last public hearing before they adjourn for the summer. She briefly reviewed the rules and announced the first speaker.

Gloria Semien challenged the constitutionality of the Board policy which limited her ability to criticize staff by name. Board Counsel Ms. McEldowney responded that District Policy BEDH prohibits discussions of individual grievances.

Ms. Semien said her son complained about the superintendent leaving the room shortly after she and her son came to the microphone at the last meeting. She then continued to discuss problems with her son’s dual enrollment at Slavens and Morey, some unresolved issues about transportation to Slavens, and the grading and course requirements in the HGT program.

Ms. Gantz Berman responded that the Board has called Ms. Semien multiple times and she has not called back. They were able to reach her attorney and asked her attorney to please call her.

Jazman Chavez was not present.
Mary J. Armstrong, Margie Rooney, and Beverly Geisert are retired DPS employees. They commented that even if they didn’t know what the budget was going to be, they should have budgeted for three different possibilities - small, medium and large - so they could act on the day the legislature signs it by the governor. The greatest unknown factor is the negotiated salary increases with the DCTA and she thought there should have been several scenarios worked out in advance.

Sharday Kiel, a Manual High School student, was concerned that budget cuts caused the loss of some great teachers at Manual.

The Board awarded Shaday Kiel a $50 gift card.

Mrs. Edwards thanked her for taking the time and trouble to bring her message from Manual, and agreed that quality educators are essential to good education. She said that they can’t change the staffing situation for the coming year but they will be trying to bring staffing back, but in the meantime she asked her to take the initiative to encourage other students at Manual who might be struggling as she had. Dr. Wartgow also thanked her for her feedback, because it’s most meaningful when it comes from students like her, and assured they would do their best to keep quality teachers.

A group came to speak about the Elder Care Program, which has been housed at the Career Education Center for the past seven years. Michelle Williams said that although the program will be shut down due to the budget cuts, and knowing they can’t stay at CEC, they would like to move this valuable inter-generational program to another District property. Mary Trujillo, Rose Cisneros, Dee Perez and Pam Erickson also spoke on behalf of the program.

Rev. Guzman said this program is a good example of how DPS is connected community wide. She acknowledged that the cut was a tough decision, and that the students at CEC have certainly benefited from this character-education program, and hoped the Board would be able to help find a suitable room somewhere in the northwest quadrant.

Mrs. Edwards also acknowledged the importance of this program, especially as it pertains to the increasing need for geriatric care as baby boomers age, although that component of the program didn’t flourish as they had hoped.

Ms. Gantz Berman asked Mr. Langley to update the Board, and he said that there are different things throughout the District that we could find to accommodate, but this is not a facility issue per se, we could work that out. Dr. Wartgow encouraged them and said they’re trying to help. Ms. Gantz Berman added that it was the Board’s understanding that the staff is trying to help find another facility, but that they understand that the District doesn’t have the resources to help them financially.

Jeannette Sanchez, Sandy Baca Sandoval and Carmen Atilans are from the Northwest Denver Education Collaborative, a collaborative of representatives from northwest Denver businesses, community-based organizations, educators, parents and other individuals interested in working towards a common education vision for northwest Denver. They presented their vision: 1) to build a community vision and strategy for K-12 education in the North High feeder pattern; 2) to create a sustainable infrastructure that engages the entire community to implement and maintain that vision, and that facilitates mutual accountability for the success of this plan; 3) to create a set of tools and opportunities with administrators, teachers, parents, and other community members, to build individual school plans in alignment with the larger community vision. They are interested in community
health and well-being issues, and hope to work together with DPS to create a culture of educational success for the children of northwest Denver and asked for the Board’s support in this effort.

Rev. Guzman said it’s been her desire and plan to have some type of comprehensive plan that takes the educational situation into account in our quadrant and how can we support the restorative process in all of our schools, to bring them up, because we have several schools that have been unsatisfactory or low, and we want to do all that we can. She said she was thinking tonight as the Board was receiving the report from the bond committee, and their recommendations in terms of the bond as well as the mill levy educational programming, how this could coincide with their recommendations that we select some schools in each in quadrant to begin to reform. She recognized that their collaborative has grown and developed very well, and she said she hopes that we could formalize some type of comprehensive and strategic plan involving this community if it is possible.

Dr. Wartgow said that we’re now in a position to formalize this under the District, and he’s talked with Dave Debus and Joe Sandoval about this, and that Sally Mentor Hay has been involved in some discussions about how we can put something together for the whole region.

Mrs. Moss said that it’s very exciting to see the community rally around their schools and showing such a willingness to put in the effort to help.

Rev. Guzman noted that, due to the Board’s schedule, it may take until August before this plan can be formalized.

Teri Pinney, Lisa Nolan, Sarah Crippen, and Phuonglan Nguyen spoke about the Early Excellence program, an early childhood program at four elementary schools: Maria Mitchell, Harrington, Fairview, and Wyatt-Edison Charter School. ECE refers not only to classrooms for 4-year-olds, but also outreach to parents, playgroups, reaching out to kids under age six and their families. The Piton Foundation is excited about this program because children who have positive, early experiences do better in school later on, so it’s in the District’s best interest to make sure our kids, especially those who are at-risk, get the early experiences they need to be successful. Issues they are up against include the fact that over 90% of the kids they work with come from families who qualify for free and reduced lunch, and they’re giving a vocabulary assessment to kids before they enter the program (the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test and the MacArthur Communicative Developmental Inventory for the babies). The preliminary data shows that over 70% of the kids are well below the 50th percentile national norm, so their goal is to get these kids prepared by the time they get to kindergarten. Since they starting this grant 9 months ago, they’ve hired staff, as well as the Research & Development Center at CSU to be the program’s formal evaluator, and they’ve started an Advisory Board. Ms. Pinney reported that they had a “soft start” this spring. The directors and schools and partnership of communities spent several months planning what they wanted to do with the grant. It is a 3- to 4-year grant with three years of full implementation. They had two kick-off events, which attracted over 150 people. Currently, over 200 children under age six are enrolled. They’ve held over 50 programs across all sites, and 130 of the enrollees are in Project I.D., an innovative partnership between DPS, the City, Head Start, and the Center for Human Investment Policy. They’ve partnered with over 25 community groups to do outreach. Ms. Nolan spoke about the various methods of evaluating the program which includes test scores, assessment of parent outcomes; “journey mapping”, a web-based database program developed by Barry
Kibble, which allows everyone involved to log onto the website from home or school, and track families as they progress along the journey of awareness.

Bill Johnston gave a progress report on district reform over the last two years, using key findings from case studies of how four large, urban school districts successfully raised their academic performance. Some of the significant, strategic reforms the District is implementing include: creating a concrete accountability system that holds District leadership and principals responsible for producing results; developing multiple indicators of success for measuring performance and improvement planning; using district-wide curricula and instructional approaches rather than allowing each school to develop their own strategies, supporting professional development and consistent implementation; giving teachers assessment data to measure growth, and make improvements; starting reforms at the elementary school level; focusing on unsatisfactory and low-performing schools; developing a new compensation system that rewards teachers who consistently meet high expectations. This Progress Report Card finds the District moving in the right direction, with some signs of success in the short term and a Board and administration committed to achieving the District’s goals in the long term. To build support, however, the public needs to hear from the District periodically about progress in implementing the strategic reform plan and the resulting improvements in student achievements.

Ms. Gantz Berman announced that there are five finalists to fill the vacancy created by Mr. Mejia’s resignation: Tom Downey, Jennifer Gamblin, Dr. Maria Guajardo Lucero, Theresa Pena, and Dr. Louise Torres. A public forum will be held on Wednesday, June 18th, at 7:00 PM here in this boardroom, and the public are invited to attend and ask the candidates questions. Afterwards, the Board will conduct individual interviews and select a replacement for Mr. Mejia.

V. Old Business
(Delivered out of order from agenda)

There was none.

VI. New Business
(Delivered out of order from agenda)

The Board received a draft of the District’s plan to apply for federal funds under the No Child Left Behind Act (VI-D-1). No action was taken on the plan at this time.

VIII. Adjournment

Ms. Gantz Berman adjourned the meeting at 9:30 PM.

Susan G. Edwards, Secretary
Board of Education