

WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
GOVERNING BOARD MINUTES: REGULAR MEETING

2011-2012

November 10, 2011

Administrative Center
Governing Board Room
4650 West Sweetwater Avenue
Glendale, AZ 85304-1505

I. REGULAR MEETING – GENERAL FUNCTION

A. Call to Order and Roll Call

Mr. Maza called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Governing Board members constituting a quorum were present: Mr. Chris Maza, Mr. Bill Adams, Ms. Clorinda Graziano, Mr. Aaron Jahneke, and Mrs. Tee Lambert. Mrs. Lambert departed the meeting at 8:33 p.m.

B. Moment of Silence and Meditation

Mr. Maza called for a moment of silence and meditation.

C. Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Maza led the Pledge of Allegiance.

D. Adoption of the Regular Meeting Agenda

A motion was made by Mrs. Lambert that the Governing Board adopt the Regular Meeting Agenda, with flexibility. The motion was seconded by Ms. Graziano. The motion carried.

UNANIMOUS

E. Approval of the Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Adams that the Governing Board approve the Minutes of the October 27, 2011 Regular Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Lambert. The motion carried.

UNANIMOUS

F. Current Events: Governing Board and Superintendent

Dr. Cook shared that Lakeview students would be singing a musical medley and acknowledged the parents who were in attendance. Dr. Cook introduced Jaime Tejada, Principal at Lakeview Elementary School, who introduced music teachers, Mary Mininni and Christy Gourley. Ms. Mininni thanked the District for its ongoing support of the music program. Ms. Mininni stated that the students would demonstrate the following concepts: performing a partner song and singing on pitch. The students were presented with certificates and music folders.

Mr. Adams shared that he enjoyed attending the Washington Elementary School District (WESD) Parent University and thanked everyone involved with arranging the wonderful event.

Ms. Graziano shared that she enjoyed attending the following events:

- Arroyo Elementary School's Thank You Reception honoring Arizona Senator Linda Gray and Representative Kimberly Yee for donation of backpacks for the students at Arroyo Elementary School by the Foundation for Women Legislators;
- Sunburst and Sweetwater Schools' Trunk or Treat Night;
- Kiwanis Walk-a-Thon – thanked the volunteers and sponsors;
- Rachel's Challenge Assembly at Mountain Sky Junior High School;
- WESD Parent University – thanked volunteers, sponsors, and parents.

November 10, 2011

Ms. Graziano acknowledged and thanked all of the veterans on the District's staff for their service.

Mr. Jahneke acknowledged the following:

- Honored to meet Jason Schechterle at the WESD Parent University and enjoyed his inspirational speech.
- Congratulated Glendale Elementary District and Glendale Union High School District for passing its bond elections, especially since many WESD students attend high schools in the Glendale Union High School District.
- Recognized everyone administering the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZELLA).

Mrs. Lambert shared that she enjoyed attending the WESD Parent University and appreciated the efforts of the District to create business partnerships for the schools.

Mrs. Lambert shared that she enjoyed reading Palo Verde Middle School's newspaper, The Panther Press. She stated that the articles were well written and very interesting.

Mr. Maza commended the District for the Business Advisory Team meeting and gave special thanks to Sandy Mendez Benson for her efforts. Mr. Maza urged employees to support the local businesses because we are partners for the best interests of students.

Mr. Maza thanked the Board members who attended the Arroyo Elementary School Thank You Reception for Senator Linda Gray and Representative Kimberly Yee. He thanked Representative Yee for attending (Senator Gray was unable to attend) and thanked both of them for their efforts to have the backpacks donated to the Arroyo students.

Mr. Maza thanked the staff members who worked at the Parent University for their time and efforts and acknowledged Councilman Bill Gates for attending.

G. Public Participation

There was public participation. Ms. Doreen Zannis, community member, advised she attended the WESD Parent University. She stated it was an extraordinary day and she had many positive experiences. She commended the District for striving to be a community based school district that is focused on children. She thanked the staff for their forethought to meet the needs of students, parents, and community members. Ms. Zannis stated she volunteers for an advocacy group, Support Our Schools AZ, and was pleased to be asked to make a presentation at the Parent University. She acknowledged Board members and Dr. Cook for allowing them to participate in the event.

Ms. Zannis acknowledged the WESD staff, administration, and Board members for their efforts to pass the Glendale Union High School District (GUHSD) bond election which benefited children. She advised that WESD employees, as private citizens, worked very hard to pass the GUHSD bond and publicly acknowledged the integrity and character of the WESD employees.

IV. INFORMATION / DISCUSSION ITEMS (moved at discretion of Chair)

A. Discussion Regarding Geothermal Technology

Dr. Cook asked the Board members for their directions and questions regarding the use of geothermal technology at the new Lookout Mountain Elementary School. She advised that it was a pleasure working with David Schmidt of Orcutt/Winslow Partnership and John Brakeman of Adolfson and Peterson Construction who were very

knowledgeable in their area of expertise and were guests at the Board meeting. Dr. Cook introduced Ms. Cathy Thompson and Mr. David Schmidt who gave a presentation to the Board regarding geothermal technology, the pilot project at Desert View School, and the possible use of geothermal technology at the new Lookout Mountain Elementary School. Ms. Thompson advised that monitoring equipment was installed at Desert View School for the pilot project and was monitored by an outside agency that provides usage reports to the District.

Mr. Jahneke asked what the energy consumption reduction was in August 2011 at Desert View School. Ms. Thompson stated she did not have monthly data, only cumulative, and that the classroom with geothermal technology installed had reduced energy consumption by approximately 40% over the last six months. Ms. Thompson advised that the energy cost had decreased for the entire Desert View School, not just the pilot project buildings.

Mr. Adams thanked everyone involved for their time and efforts and had the following comments/questions:

- Why was solar not considered? Ms. Thompson responded that solar was investigated and many options were considered, including combining geothermal and solar at the new Lookout Mountain site. Ms. Thompson explained that geothermal would reduce the energy consumption for the air conditioning systems and solar would be an alternate method of producing energy. She stated that they have discussed building the new Lookout Mountain structures to accommodate solar in the future. Ms. Thompson advised the Board that the geothermal decision would need to be made in the early stages of the design process, whereas, solar could be considered at a later date.
- Requested a cost comparison for solar and geothermal. Mr. Schmidt advised that they are trying to build the most energy efficient school at Lookout Mountain. He stated that they investigated what they could actually build into the school to make it as efficient as possible, e.g., envelope, orientation, and geothermal. He explained that they do not know the life expectancy of onsite renewable energy sources, e.g., solar, but you would be left with the baseline school. However, solar could be easily added onto a building.
- Requested a cost comparison for maintenance of solar and geothermal. Mr. Mike Kramer, Director of Capital Projects/Maintenance, advised that his in-house technicians are able to service the geothermal technology. Mr. Kramer advised that they are establishing pathways at various locations at the new Lookout Mountain site for the possibility of future solar implementation.
- Concerned with upfront geothermal cost of \$1.7 million. Ms. Thompson responded that the cost of solar in the new Lookout Mountain parking lot would cost \$1 million.
- What will be the RFP process if this project should move forward? Will it be offered to the public for proposals? Ms. Thompson will respond when the recommendation is presented to the Board.
- Consider having someone from the solar industry provide information.

Ms. Thompson asked Mr. Adams for clarification on his cost comparison requests. Mr. Adams suggested seeking data from other school districts that have solar systems and use comparisons for a comparable sized school. He stated that other districts may have received tax credits and had the ability to lock in the cost for twenty years.

Mr. Maza asked how much damage the District sustained to the air conditioning systems from the hail storm on October 5, 2010. Mr. Kramer reported that the District received a cumulative amount of \$3.5 million for roofs, air conditioners, and sky lights.

Mrs. Lambert had the following comments/questions:

- Is there a solar project for air conditioning systems? Mr. Schmidt advised that solar is an onsite energy producing system and does not make the air conditioning systems more efficient. Geothermal technology reduces the amount of energy used by the air conditioning systems; therefore, it reduces energy costs. Mrs. Lambert reiterated that the geothermal technology would reduce energy costs and the possibility of adding a solar system at a future date would further reduce energy costs.
- Would maintenance costs be the same for geothermal and standard/high efficiency air conditioning systems? Mr. Kramer stated that the costs would be the same because the technology is the same for both types of systems.
- What does Estimated System “First Cost” mean on the Cost Analysis? Ms. Thompson replied that it was the initial cost of installing the entire system. Additional costs would be for operation/maintenance of the system for its life expectancy.
- Would tax rebate money be able to be deposited into the capital or bond budget funds? Ms. Thompson stated that any incentive money received would be deposited into the fund utilized for the installation of the system. She advised that a \$13,000.00 incentive payment was received from Arizona Public Service for the geothermal pilot project at Desert View and deposited into the fund used.
- Do you plan to use capital funding next year and not bond funds? Ms. Thompson advised that several options were presented to the Board for consideration. One option was to create budget capacity for the Lookout Mountain project in the 2012-2013 capital budget. Another option was to increase the bond budget for the Lookout Mountain project to allow for the upgraded system, but would require the District to group other bond projects and handle them through another process, e.g., financed for several years. Ms. Thompson stated there were other possible options provided in the presentation.
- Were the difficulties with water pressure at Desert View a City of Phoenix problem or an internal problem? Mr. Kramer reported that it was due to the system’s water field loop which had been repaired and was currently holding water pressure.
- Are the solar accommodations at Lookout Mountain going to be for car shade structures? Mr. Kramer responded that they plan to install underground conduits for possible future solar projects so that the asphalt will not have to be ripped up if a solar system is installed.
- If solar was installed on Lookout Mountain buildings, would the roof need to be reinforced? Mr. Schmidt reported that the roof would need to be reinforced slightly, however, many solar projects are now using shade structures or canopies due to the cost of replacing roofs on existing buildings when installing a solar system.
- What was the attitude of Lookout Mountain’s site council regarding the geothermal system? Mr. Kramer stated that the geothermal system was not discussed with the Lookout Mountain site council. They discussed sustainability in general with the design team. The geothermal system is a part of sustainability and will be presented to the community at a future meeting.
- What happens to the geothermal system if the water table drops? Mr. Kramer responded that it was not a factor.
- Interested in receiving information for:
 - Cost for half geothermal and half high efficiency RTU;
 - Lookout Mountain community response to geothermal technology;
 - Cost savings for solar system.

Ms. Graziano had the following comments/questions:

- How does the annual cost of an air conditioning system, e.g., filters and annual maintenance, compare to the geothermal system. Mr. Kramer replied that it would be difficult to calculate the cost for one air conditioning system because it varies according to different factors, e.g., brand, quality, or age of the system. Mr. Kramer stated that the in-house technicians can service both systems successfully.
- What will happen after the life expectancy of the geothermal system in 50 years? What will need to be replaced, e.g., the pipes or the entire system? Mr. Kramer advised that there are two components to the geothermal system. The mechanical component is located between the roof and the ceiling tile and will last longer than rooftop units because it is not exposed to the elements. The second component is the well field loop which has the 50 year life expectancy.
- What is the life expectancy of an HVAC system? Mr. Kramer advised 15-20 years. Ms. Graziano commented that there could possibly be two to three different HVAC systems compared to the 50 year life expectancy of the geothermal system.
- Are there any incentives or grants to assist with the funding for the Lookout Mountain project similar to what the District received for the Desert View pilot project? Ms. Thompson reported that there are incentives and rebates available, however, the District cannot budget for them because they may not be available in the future.
- Since it is not possible to install geothermal for the entire Lookout Mountain campus without moving students off campus during construction, would it be possible to retrofit for geothermal at a later date? Mr. Kramer stated that it is possible to retrofit buildings with geothermal, however, it would be very difficult at Lookout Mountain due to the space needed for well fields and the cost of tearing up newly constructed areas.

Mr. Jahneke stated that he trusts that the recommendation will maximize and increase long term savings for the District.

Mr. Maza appreciated the information that Desert View reduced its energy consumption by 40.2%. He stated that the Board has a difficult decision to make regarding this issue.

E. Head Start Committee Update

Mrs. Lambert stated that she enjoys being the Board representative on the Head Start Communication Committee. Mrs. Lambert reported that there are 1,792 regulations that have to be met in order to provide education to the pre-school children. She stated that the Head Start program had met its full enrollment of 588 seats and was maintaining a 94% daily attendance rate. The program received an additional \$125.00 per student grant which is being used for supplies, playground equipment, and licensing fees.

Mr. Adams thanked Mrs. Lambert for representing the Governing Board on the Head Start Communication Committee and stated he was impressed with the program and the services it provides.

B. 2011 United Way Update

Dr. Cook introduced Ms. Pam Horton, chairperson for the District's United Way campaign. Ms. Horton reported that District employees contributed \$37,829.00 to the 2011 United Way campaign and was the largest per capita contributing school district in Maricopa County. She thanked the 32 site coordinators for their efforts to make the campaign a success. She also thanked the employees for their support and generosity.

Ms. Horton thanked Schmitt Jewelers and the Washington Education Foundation (WEF) for their donations for the District's incentive program. Sunburst Elementary School raised the most per capita with their contribution of \$1,821.00. Ms. Horton acknowledged the efforts of campaign coordinator, Sally Cook, and principal, Rhonda Warren, who will be presented with a check for \$1,000.00 from the WEF. Employees designated \$13,739.00 to be donated to the WEF.

Lakeview, Acacia, Orangewood, and Sunset schools increased contributions by more than 100%. The campaign coordinators and principals will be presented with a certificate for their success.

Dr. Cook acknowledged the efforts of Pam Horton who made the District's United Way campaign a success. Dr. Cook congratulated Sunburst Elementary School for its victory over the Administrative Center.

- I. H. Approval of the Consent Agenda** **UNANIMOUS**
A motion was made by Mr. Adams that the Governing Board approve the Consent Agenda items as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Graziano. The motion carried.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

- *A. Approval/Ratification of Vouchers** **UNANIMOUS**
Approved and ratified the vouchers as presented.

- *B. Personnel Items** **UNANIMOUS**
Approved the personnel items as presented.

- *C. Public Gifts and Donations** **UNANIMOUS**
Approved the public gifts and donations as presented.

1. Mr. W. Scott Donaldson donated a check in the amount of \$300.00 to the Communication Services Department to be used for recognition of students in the Washington Elementary School District.
2. Ms. Clorinda Graziano donated 400 violin/viola shoulder rests with an approximate value of \$600.00 for the benefit of music students in the Washington Elementary School District.
3. James and Andrea Cartmell donated an Engelhardt cello with an approximate value of \$1,700.00 for the benefit of music students at Maryland School.
4. Sunset Elementary School PTO donated a check in the amount of \$544.75 to be used to move a SMART Board to another classroom for the benefit of students and teachers.
5. Sunset Elementary School PTO donated a check in the amount of \$3,600.00 to be used to purchase a SMART Board for the benefit of students and teachers.
6. Assistance League of Phoenix donated 291 books with a value of \$2,034.09 for the benefit of 6th and 8th grade students at Mountain View School.

- *D. Out-of-County/State Field Trip** **UNANIMOUS**
 Approved the out-of-county/state field trip as presented.
 1. Barbara Newman, Mountain Sky Junior High School, submitted an out-of-county/state field trip request to Marana High School, Tucson, AZ, January 28-29, 2012, for 7th and 8th grade wrestling students at a cost of \$225.00.
- *E. Out-of-State Travel** **UNANIMOUS**
 Approved the out-of-state travel as presented.
 1. Angie McClellan, Northwest Christian Private School 2nd grade teacher, submitted a request to attend the Orton-Gillingham Phonics 30-hour Comprehensive Training,, December 4-9, 2011, in San Francisco, CA, at a cost of \$2,100.00.
- *F. Award of Contract – Bid No. 11.017, Commercially Purchased Fruit and Vegetables to Fresh Point Arizona** **UNANIMOUS**
- *G. Amendment of Letter of Understanding with Operation Quality Time (QT), Inc. to Provide Grant Funds for After-School and Non-School Time Programs** **UNANIMOUS**
- *H. First Reading of Proposed Amended Board Policy JJIB – Interscholastic Sports** **UNANIMOUS**
- *I. Second Reading and Adoption of Proposed Amended Policy DN – School Properties Disposition** **UNANIMOUS**
- *J. Second Reading and Adoption of Proposed Amended Policy EHB – Data/Records Retention** **UNANIMOUS**
- *K. Second Reading and Adoption of Proposed Amended Policies IHB – Special Instructional Programs** **UNANIMOUS**
- *L. Second Reading and Adoption of Proposed Amended Policies IJ – Instructional Resources and Materials and IJND – Technology Resources** **UNANIMOUS**

III. ACTION / DISCUSSION ITEM

- A. Amendment to the Contract with A Blanket of Hope, Inc., d/b/a Brighten A Life, for Construction of Green Schoolhouse Projects at Roadrunner Elementary School and Orangewood School** **UNANIMOUS**

Dr. Cook introduced Ms. Cathy Thompson who reviewed the amendment to the contract for the green schoolhouses at the Roadrunner and Orangewood school sites. Ms. Thompson advised the Board that due to delays in the design and procurement process for both sites, an amendment to the contract was submitted to revise estimated dates of completion (July 31, 2012 for Roadrunner Elementary School and January 31, 2013 for Orangewood School).

A motion was made by Mr. Adams that the Governing Board approve the amendment to the contract between A Blanket of Hope, Inc., d/b/a Brighten A Life and Washington Elementary School District to revise the estimated dates for completion and authorize the Superintendent or designee to execute the required documents. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jahneke. The motion carried.

IV. INFORMATION / DISCUSSION ITEMS (moved at discretion of the chair)

D. Update Regarding Strategic Action Plans

Dr. Cook advised the Board that the District revised the strategic action plans every year based on accomplishments, challenges and future vision. She introduced Ms. Sue Snyder who facilitated the review and revision process. Ms. Snyder stated that there were initially five strategic action plans with a sixth plan added last year to focus on employee recruitment and retention. She advised that a fiscal management and accountability strategic action plan was added this year. The administrators responsible for each strategic action plan gave a presentation regarding accomplishments to date, as well as current and future activities.

Ms. Graziano thanked the administrators for their time and efforts and had the following comments/questions:

- 5.1 on page 102 under Teacher and Principal Effectiveness: “Reimburse for the Arizona Educator Proficiency Assessment (AEPA) subject knowledge content test once passed.”; and “Reimburse for up to six credits per individual to be paid upon proof of having earned an A or B in coursework required for HQ status for future hard-to-fill positions.” Is this being considered or is this in effect now? Janet Sullivan responded that both items are currently in effect. Ms. Sullivan stated that in looking towards the future, they will review what areas may have needs for highly qualified teachers and endeavor to support those teachers who wish to pursue an additional area of highly qualified status to meet an existing need, e.g., middle school math and science teachers. Ms. Graziano asked if this applied for newly hired teachers. Ms. Sullivan stated it did not apply for new teachers, but was in anticipation of future needs.
- 5.2 on page 105 under Teacher and Principal Effectiveness: “Conduct side-by-side coaching with classroom teachers during lesson plan development sessions and post-observation coaching sessions to focus on the application of effective instructional strategies.” Is this conducted during a PLC meeting by grade levels or teams? Ms. Sullivan replied that many of the schools have grade level planning during PLC time. Ms. Sullivan stated that teachers are offered side-by-side coaching with the opportunity to visit other classrooms and observe the implementation of lessons in an area of their interest.
- Is there a District template for lesson plans? Is there a standardized template or are there different templates by subject? Ms. Sullivan responded that there are several lesson plan templates available on the District’s Intranet website. Ms. Sullivan advised that there is no mandate for template structure, although some schools have come to an agreement on the template they may use at their school site. Ms. Sullivan stated that the District has mandated three components for the template:
 - What is the objective?
 - What are the activities to communicate the objective?
 - How are you assessing the implementation of the objective?
- How long do you expect that it takes a teacher to prepare lesson plans? Ms. Sullivan replied that it is an individual choice of how someone would prepare a lesson plan and what the end result would like, therefore, would be difficult to estimate a timeframe.
- 5.8 on page 111 under Teacher and Principal Effectiveness: “Develop a variety of teacher recruitment strategies that will portray WESD as a desirable place of employment; strategies are to include ideas such as a plan for removing the cap for professional growth on the WESD salary schedule and a ‘signing bonus’ for effective teachers who are placed in schools with the greatest need.” Is this being considered or has it already been implemented?

Ms. Sullivan advised that it had not been implemented, however, it was being encouraged by Title II. Ms. Sullivan advised that it was an expectation that the District would move toward putting highly effective teachers in the school with the greatest need. Ms. Graziano asked if this was going to be considered by the Interest-Based Negotiations (IBN) team. Ms. Sullivan replied that it will go through the IBN process.

- 3.1 on page 116 under Marketing: “Maintain a marketing plan to serve as a roadmap for marketing efforts.” Do we have any demographic studies to include lost students that have left the District and still live here? Where have they gone and why? For students in the District on a variance, what schools do they attend and why? Have any of these been included in the demographic studies that have been done for marketing? Ms. Donaldson responded that a study was conducted two years ago. She stated that there was no budget to do a demographic study in this fiscal year. Ms. Thompson advised that she and her staff were trained on a new program that has the capability of doing some of the demographic studies mentioned by Ms. Graziano. They plan to begin some in-house studies rather than pay an outside source.
- Genesis on page 139: How easy has the implementation been? Are employees adapting easily to the new program or is it creating stress? Does it seem to be doing what you wanted? Mr. Lieurance replied that the implementation of the entire student information system went well. He reported that the system is meeting expectations and will improve as they include more features.

Mr. Jahneke thanked the administrators for their efforts. He stated that the Strategic Actions Plans were beneficial to the District because they were being implemented with successful results.

Mr. Adams agreed with comments made by other Board members and thanked the administrators for their accomplishments.

IV. INFORMATION / DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Discussion Regarding Geothermal Technology

At the discretion of the chair, Mr. Maza moved IV.A. – Discussion Regarding Geothermal Technology following I.G. – Public Participation.

B. 2011 United Way Update

At the discretion of the chair, Mr. Maza moved IV.B. – 2011 United Way Update following IV.E. – Head Start Committee Update, following I.G. – Public Participation.

C. 2011 Accountability Update – Assessment Report: Part Two

Dr. Cook introduced Ms. Janet Sullivan who presented Part Two of the Assessment Report. Ms. Sullivan updated the Governing Board on the Spring 2011 results of three assessments administered in Arizona to measure student achievement: Arizona’s Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS), the Stanford 10, and the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZELLA).

Mr. Jahneke asked what attributed to the large 6th grade percentage of gain in the AIMS reading scores. Ms. Sullivan advised that the District implemented a new reading program three years ago that was systemic across all schools. Prior to the implementation of the new reading program, schools were not using the same reading program, e.g., grades K-2 had one reading program, grades 3-4 had a different reading program, and grades 5-6 had another reading program. Ms. Sullivan advised that the systemic implementation of the new reading program has created a consistent learning environment and has impacted the test results.

