REGULAR MEETING - GENERAL FUNCTION

1. Ms. Jennifer Tanner, Governing Board President, called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Governing Board members constituting a quorum were present; Ms. Jennifer Tanner, Mrs. Bonnie Schroader, Ms. Christine Pritchard, Ms. April Allen and Mr. Jerry Eynon.


3. A motion by Tanner/Allen was entered to approve the Agenda Form consistent with Board Policy BEDB and temporarily suspend any Governing Board Policy with which this agenda may be inconsistent. **UNANIMOUS**

4. Summary of Current Events
   - Superintendent
     - Dr. Pletnick reported the school year got off to a great start with no major incidents or situations.
     - Today, the Strategic Plan Action Committee team members met to receive training on the work to be done. Members who could stay for the beginning of the Board meeting were introduced. Dr. Pletnick thanked these individuals who represent the various stakeholders for helping with the revision process of the Strategic Plan.
   - Presentations, Recognitions, Celebrations
     - The Sundown Mountain Classroom Spotlight was aired. This spotlight may be viewed at: [http://dysart.org/video/99/Sundown_Mountain.html](http://dysart.org/video/99/Sundown_Mountain.html).
     - Strategic Plan Video – This video provides updates on the District's Strategic Plan process which defines a roadmap of excellence for increasing student achievement. The video may be viewed at [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8_yf7NZgkC8&feature=bulletin](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8_yf7NZgkC8&feature=bulletin).
     - The National School Boards Association awarded to the District its NSBA Technology/Learning Spotlight District Award. Each year they recognize three districts in the country. Dysart will become a host district to visitors next year who will come to see how Dysart is doing things great through the use of technology.
   - Governing Board Update
     - Jennifer Tanner – On opening day Ms. Tanner accompanied Dr. Miller and Mr. Eynon in their tour of nine schools. It was a great experience to walk in and feel the excitement of teachers giving training and administrators making sure that everything was ready and prepared and that everyone was feeling welcomed.
     - April Allen accompanied Mr. Dean August 18th on a tour of three schools; Countryside, Ashton Ranch and Marley Park. Ms. Allen thanked the principals and Mr. Dean for the opportunity to see students engaged in learning, especially through the use of technology.
     - Christine Pritchard visited several schools during the first days and first week of school. She was impressed to see the District has so many dedicated teachers, staff, principals, and assistant principals everywhere in the parking lots keeping kids safe. Ms. Pritchard indicated the conclusion drawn is that parking lot safety is not a staffing issue. Sadly it is a parent issue. She thanked the staff for keeping students safe.
• In preparing her children for their return to school, Ms. Schroader attended several back to school events. She thanked the District for changing the annual practice of asking parents to fill out multiple registration packets for returning students. This year she was asked to fill out one packet which was used to update information for all children in the family. Kudos!
• Jerry Eynon reported visiting nine schools with Dr. Miller. He found administrators out and about with the kids, and intermingling with students and parents while the competent staff manned the front office. It was a great day! We have a really good thing going here at Dysart. And, as we form partnerships with the parents and community and have partnerships between teachers, students, parents, and School Board we can’t help but be successful.

5. Audience with Individuals or Groups - NONE

**ACTION/CONSENT**

A motion by Tanner/Eynon was entered to approve the consent items as presented.

1. Recommendation for Approval to Award Contract #11-1905-015 for Road Construction Services for the Perryville/Cactus Road Improvements
   Approve the award of Contract #11-1905-015 for road construction services to D.L. Withers for Perryville/Cactus Road improvements.
   UNANIMOUS

2. Recommendation for Approval to Award Contract #11-6310-008 for Community Education Enrichment Programs for the 2010-2011 School Year
   Approved the award of contract #11-6310-008 for Community Education Enrichment Programs as presented. Appendix A
   UNANIMOUS

3. Recommendation to Approve a Memorandum of Understanding with the Catholic Charities Community Services, Inc. to Establish a Collaborative Effort to Provide Services to Preschool Children, Including Children with Disabilities
   Approved
   UNANIMOUS

4. Recommendation to Approve Intergovernmental Agreement with the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University for Implementation of a Clinical Student Teacher Education Program for the 2010-2011 School Year
   Approved
   UNANIMOUS

5. Recommendation to Approve Agreement with the Austin Centers for Exceptional Students, Inc. (The ACES) to Provide Transportation Services for Dysart Special Needs Students Attending the ACES Program for the 2010-2011 School Year
   Approved
   UNANIMOUS

6. Recommendation to Approve Personnel Action Items for the Period of August 4, 2010 through August 18, 2010
   Approved. Appendix B
   UNANIMOUS

7. Approval of Qualified Evaluators
   Approved Adriel Grieshaber, Gail Miller, and Traci Price as qualified evaluators for the 2010-2011 school year.
   UNANIMOUS
8. Approval/Ratification of the Minutes of Governing Board Meeting(s) Held August 4, 2010
   Approved
   UNANIMOUS

   UNANIMOUS

10. Out of State Travel for Fifty Eighth Grade Students from Sunset Hills Elementary and Six Chaperones to Attend the Catalina Island Marine Institute in Catalina Island, CA, May 13-15, 2011
    Approved
    UNANIMOUS

11. Overnight Travel for Twelve Willow Canyon High School Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA) Student Members and two Advisors to Attend the 2010 Decalympics Leadership Camp in Heber, AZ, September 24-26, 2010
    Approved
    UNANIMOUS

12. Recommendation for Approval to Dispose of Surplus Property
    Approved
    UNANIMOUS

13. Extra Curricular Tax Credit Fund and Student Activities Fund Reports for the Month of July 2010 and Revised Student Activities Fund Report for the Month of June
    Accepted copies of the Extra Curricular Tax Credit Fund and the Student Activities Fund reports for the month of July 2010 and the Revised Student Activities Fund report for the month of June 2010.
    UNANIMOUS

    Accepted as presented; cash donations of $12,955.62 and non-cash valued at $3,804.85.
    UNANIMOUS

15. Approval/Ratification of Expense Voucher 1073, 1074, 1002 and 1003 in the Amount of $2,328,728.31
    Approved
    UNANIMOUS

16. Approval/Ratification of Payroll Voucher 4, 7384, 5 and 7385 in the Amount of $5,097,666.81
    Approved
    UNANIMOUS
ACTION/DISCUSSION

17. Appointment of Individual(s) to Serve as Observer(s) to Give Feedback to the Board Regarding its Application of the Policy Governance Model
Dr. Pletnick reported Dr. Jandris with Progress Education recommends the Board consider having an observer monitor Board Meetings and give feedback on the implementation of the Policy Governance model at meetings. The observer(s) should be reliable, familiar with Board work, Board processes, trained in Policy Governance, and someone with strong observation and reporting skills.
After discussion, a motion by Schroader/Tanner was entered to appoint the Superintendent to select and appoint three individuals to be Governing Board observers to give feedback to the Board from Board Meetings on the Governing Board’s application of the Policy Governance model. UNANIMOUS

INFORMATION

18. Reduction in Force (RIF) Process – Certified and Support Staff
Due to changes in Arizona law related to reduction in force (RIF) of certified staff, the District processes for RIF needed to be revised. Based on a desire to continue to be as consistent as possible with processes for all the employee groups, a Certified Rubric and Support Staff Rubric for RIF were created utilizing the collaborative process. A training video and FAQs were developed to accompany the certified rubric. The support staff FAQ document and training video are currently under development. Appendix C

19. Enrollment Update
Mr. Scott Thompson reported enrollment is currently at 24,273 and is an increase of 163 students since last year’s 100th day. K-8 students are 423 below and 9-12 students are 72 above expected enrollment based on the roll-up of last year’s students.

20. Update on Hiring for the 2010-2011 School Year
Dr. Bill Roach provided an update on hiring for the 2010-2011 school year including attrition, new hires, and vacancies. Appendix D

21. Exceeding Standards, Future Ready: Updates and Improvements to iPAL
Using the on-line application, iPAL, Dr. Cyndi Miller and curriculum specialists, Peggy Gregory, Jeremy St. Germain, Michelle Love, and Mary Hoffman, demonstrated updates made to iPAL designed to improve the rigor of curriculum, instruction and assessment.

22. Strategic Plan Revision Process and the Gathering of Input from the Governing Board
Dr. Gail Pletnick provided the Governing Board with documents related to committee work completed or planned along with timelines for critical tasks. Thus far, the District has completed the first three steps and has begun step four. The District has completed the data audit and the research audit and has established and trained the Action Committees. The next step in the process will be for these committee members to review the current plan, district data and relevant research as part of the gap analysis and goal revision process.

Dr. Roach reported the goals remain the same as there is still work to be completed in 2010-2011. Two additional objectives have been added to the plan to improve and expand District efforts in teacher recruitment and employee discipline protocols and materials.
Mr. Scott Thompson reported the online marketplace, Asset Exchange, has seen limited use. The next steps will be to bring together a focus group in an effort to determine what modifications can be made to improve its usage.

Mr. Evan Allred, Director Information Technology, reported on action steps to 1) upgrade Dysart’s classroom walk through tool by embedding indicators of 21st Century Skills aligned with the current Guiding Pupil Success (GPS) form in iPAL and train site administrators in the use of the tool; 2) pre and post test students in grades 3, 5 and 8 using Technology Literacy Assessment, students in grades 4, 7 and 10 as well as teachers and administrators using 21st Century Skills Assessment from Learning.com; and 3) combine District provided devices with the accessibility of student’s personal Internet enabled devices. Action step three will result in conducting a parent survey to determine the type of personal technology to which students have access as well as changes to discipline procedures to allow limited teacher-guided use of the personal technology in the classroom.

26. Proposal to Recind Governing Board Policy GDP and GDP-R – Support Staff Promotions and Reclassification – First Reading
This policy is recommended for rescission as it has exceeded the pilot program’s three-year timeline. If renegotiated, the process would be incorporated into a DESP agreement with the Governing Board.

27. Proposed Revision of Governing Board Policy JEB – Entrance Age Requirements – First Reading
Dr. Pletnick reported changes were made to this policy last year in response to some changes in law. However, in so doing the language of the policy did not honor District practice. Administration recommends another change to clearly articulate how the District handles kinder and first grade entrance and a policy which reflects the practice that has been in place since the District began full-day kindergarten. Dr. Pletnick provided backup material, answered questions and agreed to provide requested information at the September 1, 2010 meeting of the Board.

At it’s September 1 meeting, the Governing Board took action to revise the minutes to include a verbatim transcription of all comments regarding this item. See Appendix E.

REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

• Information regarding procedures for Excessive Heat Warnings / Heat Advisories.
• Information regarding the District Volunteer Program.

ADJOURNMENT
On a motion entered by Tanner/Schroader and by a unanimous vote, the meeting ended at 9:03 p.m.

Signed: [Signature]
Date:

September 1, 2010
AWARD FOR COMMUNITY ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS
2010-2011

- Abyss Community Sports and Education
- All Star Driver Education
- All the Right Moves
- Athletics in Training
- Chess Emporium
- Kidz for Life Inc.
- Mad Science
- RMASS Education Seminars
- Sabakiball International
- Universal Driving School
- Young Champions of America, Inc.
NEW HIRES

GUEST TEACHERS

The following Guest Teachers will be paid by M&O per Board Policy.

Begley, Michelle
Begley, Shannon
Breevaart, Kara
Britton, Heather
DeBattista, Matthew
Estorga, Daniel

Jones III, Warren
Jones, Amy
Lee, Rebecca
Markham, Christine
Marquez, Juan
Selander, Jaime

Smith, Michael
Stowers, Glen
Troy, Leslie
Vargas, Frank
Vines, Richard
Yadon, Alison

CERTIFIED STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SALARY</th>
<th>ASSIGNMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams, Kimberly</td>
<td>$36,619</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew, Maria</td>
<td>$33,112</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert, Ann</td>
<td>$36,002</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camenisch, James</td>
<td>$32,384</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deffinbaugh, April</td>
<td>$40,028</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey, Rena</td>
<td>$32,384</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannam, John</td>
<td>$32,384</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimmel, Kasi</td>
<td>$32,384</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koshar, Katrina</td>
<td>$32,384</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krupp, Dorothy</td>
<td>$32,384</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan, Odell</td>
<td>$43,754</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louthain, Christine</td>
<td>$35,025</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCuen, Kristina</td>
<td>$35,025</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paine, Katelynn</td>
<td>$32,384</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson, Monique</td>
<td>$39,608</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piper, Marit</td>
<td>$47,574</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinex, Derek</td>
<td>$32,384</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow, Tiffany</td>
<td>$32,384</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Germaine, Jeremy</td>
<td>$36,619</td>
<td>Math Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodruff, Rachel</td>
<td>$35,025</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUPPORT STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SALARY</th>
<th>ASSIGNMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alvarado, Cecelia</td>
<td>$20.82 per hour</td>
<td>Speech Language Pathology Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Grade 30/Step 9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey, Kimberly</td>
<td>$13.68 per hour</td>
<td>Data Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Grade 17/Step 5)</td>
<td>Technician</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 18, 2010 Governing Board Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SALARY</th>
<th>ASSIGNMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porter, Aimee</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUPPORT STAFF EXEMPT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>OLD ASSIGNMENT</th>
<th>NEW ASSIGNMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeffries, David</td>
<td>Skilled Maintenance HVAC</td>
<td>Maintenance Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maata, Cindy</td>
<td>HRIS Technician</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberson, Matthew W.</td>
<td>Data Records Technician</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUEST FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE WITHOUT PAY

CERTIFIED STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ASSIGNMENT</th>
<th>DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Kathleen</td>
<td>Gifted Specialist</td>
<td>07/01/2010 – 06/30/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, Bridget</td>
<td>Teacher 4th Grade</td>
<td>07/01/2010 – 06/30/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmore, Barvetta</td>
<td>Teacher 4th Grade</td>
<td>07/01/2010 – 06/30/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUPPORT STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ASSIGNMENT</th>
<th>DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noseworthy, Paul</td>
<td>Receiving/Property Control Technician</td>
<td>08/05/2010 – 11/01/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESIGNATIONS

GUEST TEACHERS

LaMotte, Gary

CERTIFIED STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>REASON</th>
<th>EFFECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clow, James</td>
<td>Mutually Agreed</td>
<td>8/05/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Jonathan</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5/21/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUPPORT STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>REASON</th>
<th>EFFECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Busha, Cynthia</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullins, Jessica</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telesco, Andraya</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakeman, Mark</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weldon, Dale</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUPPORT STAFF SUBSTITUTES

Daly, Gail        Torres, Manuel
SUPPLEMENTAL COMPENSATION

CERTIFIED

Staff will be paid per MOU through grants for Teaching or Tutoring.

Bejarano, Vicki
Benavides, Yvette
Chavez, Kelly
Corey, Jeffrey

Downs, Valerie
Hodge, Kara
Robitaille, Debbie
Ruebsamen, Holly

Trevillion, Ami
Wagher, Elizabeth
Whitman, Danielle

Staff will be paid through M&O for Translation.

Santellan, Mary

Staff will be paid through Grants for Coordinator Assignments.

Benavides, Yvette
Monnett, Sarah

Trevillion, Ami

SUPPORT STAFF 2010-2011

Staff will be paid through M&O for Bus Driver Training.

Fabela, Moises
Keneffick, Rebecca

Sauls, Henry
Utter, Michael
CERTIFIED
RIF Rubric

Why? RIF Rubric

- Race to the Top
- HB2010 no more seniority
- Governing Board Policy GCQA

What? RIF Rubric

1. Evaluation/ Student Achievement  40%  800 points
2. Teacher Experience            20%  400 points
3. Education/ National Board     20%  400 points
4. Highly Qualified/ Certification 10%  200 points
5. Service/ Leadership/ Attendance 10%  200 points

100%  2,000 points

Next Step: Pursuant to Senate Bill 1040, Arizona Revised Statute 15-203 is amended to read:

Item A.38. "The state board of education shall on or before December 15, 2010, adopt and maintain a model framework for a teacher and principal evaluation instrument that includes quantitative data on student academic progress that accounts for between 33-50% of the evaluation outcomes and best practices for professional development and evaluator training. School Districts and charter schools shall use an instrument that meets the data requirements established by the State Board of Education to annually evaluate individual teachers and principals beginning school year 2012-2013."
1. Evaluation / Student Achievement

EVALUATION-3 Domains- Total points possible = 360

Teacher receives total points possible for each component with a rating of meets or exceeds. No points awarded for approaching or below standard.

Domain 1: Planning and prep (6 parts/ maximum points possible 120)

- 1a- Knowledge of content/pedagogy (20 points)
- 1b- Knowledge of students (20 points)
- 1c- Instructional goals (20 points)
- 1d- Knowledge of resources (20 points)
- 1e- Designing coherent instruction (20 points)
- 1f- Assessing student learning (20 points)

Total Points for Domain 1

Domain 2: Classroom Environment (5 parts/ maximum points possible 120)

- 2a- Environment of respect and rapport (24 points)
- 2b- Establishing a culture of learning (24 points)
- 2c- Managing classroom procedures (24 points)
- 2d- Managing student behavior (24 points)
- 2e- Organizing physical space (24 points)

Total Points for Domain 2

Domain 3: Instruction (5 parts/ maximum points possible 120)

- 3a- Communicating clearly (24 points)
- 3b- Using question and discussion techniques (24 points)
- 3c- Engaging students in learning (24 points)
- 3d- Providing feedback to students (24 points)
- 3e- Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness (24 points)

Total Points for Domain 3

Total Points for Domain 1 (maximum points possible 120)

Total Points for Domain 2 (maximum points possible 120)

Total Points for Domain 3 (maximum points possible 120)

TOTAL EVALUATION SCORE (Domain 1 + Domain 2 + Domain 3) 360 points possible
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT- One Year Growth- Total points possible= 440

- Based on District benchmarks (or content area pre/post OYG assessments), HAKE score from 1st to 3rd benchmark.
- 1st benchmark (or content area pre/post OYG assessments) to be given to students during the 1st two weeks of school.
- HAKE score to be adjusted to one year growth based on instruction August 1st through March 3rd.
- High School issue must give 3rd benchmark (or content area pre/post OYG assessments) in time for RIF decisions.
- K-6 teachers choose either reading or math
- Testing protocol-fairness/consistency/equitable
- Rigor of assessments will increase as validity and reliability of assessment increases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One Years Growth</th>
<th>Number of Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%-90%</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89%-80%</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79%-75%</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74%-70%</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%-65%</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64%-60%</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%-55%</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54%-50%</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49%-45%</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%-40%</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Teacher Experience

**TEACHER EXPERIENCE**- Total points possible= 400

_____ Public school year(s) experience *(10 points for each year, 300 points max)*

_____ Dysart school year(s) experience *(100 points max)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dysart Yrs Experience</th>
<th>Number of Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10 years</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 and above</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[ ] TOTAL TEACHER EXPERIENCE SCORE - 400 points possible

3. Education/ National Board

**EDUCATION/NATIONAL BOARD**- Total points possible= 400

Vertical column beyond BA/BS on salary schedule *(50 points for each vertical column, 300 points max)*

National Board Certification *(100 points)*

[ ] TOTAL EDUCATION/NATIONAL BOARD SCORE - 400 points possible

4. Highly Qualified

**HIGHLY QUALIFIED**- Total points possible= 200

Highly Qualified *(25 points for each HQ area & 50 points for hard to fill HQ, 100 points max)*

Endorsement(s) *(25 points for each endorsement & 50 points for hard to fill endorsement, 100 points max)*

[ ] TOTAL HIGHLY QUALIFIED SCORE - 200 points possible
5. Service, Leadership and Attendance

SERVICE, LEADERSHIP, AND ATTENDANCE - Total points possible= 200

Service (maximum points possible 200)

- Campus or district level committee member (20 points for each responsibility)
- Campus or district level committee chair (40 points for each responsibility)
- Voluntary duty (20 points for each responsibility)
- Professional development presentation (30 points for each responsibility)
- Mentoring a teacher (40 points for each responsibility)
- Club sponsor/non-paid (40 points for each responsibility)

Total Points for Service (if total points exceeds 200, enter 200)

Additional Points Possible for Schools with High Percentage of Students living in Poverty (maximum points possible 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School wide</th>
<th>Number of Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-81%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-60%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Points for Students living in Poverty

Additional Points Possible for Attendance (maximum points possible 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Absent (sick and/or discretionary)</th>
<th>Number of Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 days</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Points for Attendance

Total Points for Service

Total Points for Student Poverty

Total Points for Attendance

TOTAL SERVICE & LEADERSHIP (service + student poverty+ attendance) 200 points possible (if total points exceed 200, enter 200)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIF Rubric</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Student Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Public Teacher Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dysart Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. National Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Highly Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Endorsements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Why do we have a RIF Rubric?**
   The RIF Rubric satisfies the Race to the Top requirements, legislative bill HB 2010 and Governing Board Policy GCQA.

2. **What if two bottom people have the same number of points, how will it be determined who is going to be RIFed?**
   By the number of points in the evaluation/student achievement category.

3. **If additional responsibilities are on career ladder, are they counted as paid or non-paid?**
   The responsibilities count as non-compensated responsibilities. These responsibilities may be used for career ladder, RIF Rubric, and 301 Approved activities.

4. **Do teachers pick the reading or math assessment for OYG before the school year starts?**
   Yes, Kindergarten – 5th grade (6th grade if self-contained) choose either the reading or math benchmark for OYG.

5. **What does voluntary duty mean? Do you get 20 points for doing it once or 20 points each time you do a voluntary duty?**
   Voluntary duty is an extra duty in the duty schedule. For example, a teacher is assigned to morning playground duty and volunteers to do lunch duty as well for the year.

6. **With professional development presentation, do you get 30 points for doing it once or 30 points each time you present? What about quality?**
   Staff can earn 30 points for each different presentation topic and 30 points for helping to plan and deliver professional development at a school site. Average iLearn survey results must be at least a 3.

7. **Can grade level chairs receive RIF points?**
   Yes, grade chair/department chair will count for RIF, career ladder and 301 approved activities if the teacher elects NOT to be compensated.
8. How will inclusion SPED children be accounted for?
The SPED students that are served by both the sped teacher and the mainstream teacher are 100% included in both teachers OYG score.

9. What benchmark are ED special education students to take?
The special education ED children will take the grade level benchmark. There is no out of level benchmark testing for ED students.

10. Is it fair for special area teachers to be able to grade their own RIF tests when classroom teachers are scanned?
This year all courses that do not have a benchmark that are scanned and scored into iPal will be teacher scored. In addition, all pre-post OYG assessments that are not benchmarks are located on iPal. We believe all teachers will act professionally when administering assessments.

11. What is the policy for students entering later in the school year? Will they be included in the RIF rubric? Is there a cutoff date?
Students are only accounted for on the RIF rubric if they enroll during the first two weeks of school.

12. Will RIF be based on all staff scores or comparable scores in a given highly qualified area?
All staff will be ranked numerically from high to low but some hard to fill positions may be exempt from RIF.

13. What benchmark do ELD classrooms use?
For kinder – 8th grade ELD teachers may choose either the math or reading benchmark. There is no out of level testing. High school ELD will use pre-post OYG tests that are housed on iPlan. The English credit bearing course at the intermediate level will use the high school 9th grade reading benchmark.

14. Why were the fall benchmark dates moved to the first two weeks of school?
The window for OYG pre and post tests and benchmarks are the first two weeks of school to give teachers maximum instructional days and early student data in order to make one year's growth.
15. Why are spring benchmark dates before the end of the year?  
Benchmarks are designed to be predictors of student achievement on AIMS and this early time line gives teachers data in order to plan instruction to improve student achievement on the AIMS assessment and to provide information for RIF in a timely manner.

16. How can you figure one years growth, HAKE score, when teachers only have from August to end of February to prepare students for the test?  
Hake will be calculated based on 70% of the school year.

17. How does the RIF rubric apply to teachers hired after the first benchmark/OYG testing window?  
Teachers will “inherit” their students’ pretest scores.

18. How does RIF Rubric apply to teachers on long term approved leaves of absence?  
Teachers on leave will be accountable for their students OYG growth.
SUPPORT STAFF
RIF Rubric

Why? RIF Rubric
- Consistency with certified staff mandates under HB2010 - no more seniority
- Governing Board Policy GCQA

What? RIF Rubric
1. Evaluation 25% 500 points
2. Experience 25% 500 points
3. Education/ Certification/ Licensing 20% 400 points
4. Attendance 20% 400 points
5. Service/ Leadership 10% 200 points
100% 2,000 points

1. Evaluation on primary job

EVALUATION (primary job) - Total points possible= 500 points
Staff receives total points possible for each component with rating of performing at reasonable standard, above standard or outstanding performance in that area. No points awarded for performing below standard or not observed.

Essential Duties and Responsibilities (maximum points possible 200)
Points possible varies by job title. Points possible per indicator found by dividing 200 by the number of indicators in this area.

Total points for Essential Duties and Responsibilities

Job Knowledge (4 parts / maximum points possible 60)
- Exhibits ability to learn and apply new skills (15 points)
- Displays understanding of how job relates to others (15 points)
- Uses resources effectively (15 points)
- Competent in required job skills and knowledge (15 points)

Total points for Job Knowledge
QUALITY OF WORK (3 parts / maximum points possible 45)

1. Demonstrates accuracy and thoroughness (15 points)
2. Monitors own work to ensure quality (15 points)
3. Looks for ways to improve and promote quality (15 points)

TOTAL POINTS FOR QUALITY OF WORK

COOPERATION (4 parts / maximum points possible 40)

1. Adheres to Governing Board policies and regulations in accordance with job responsibilities (10 points)
2. Offers assistance and support to co-workers (10 points)
3. Establishes and maintains effective and positive relationships with staff (10 points)
4. Works cooperatively in group situations (10 points)

TOTAL POINTS FOR COOPERATION

COMMUNICATION (4 parts / maximum points possible 40)

1. Listens and requests clarification when unsure (10 points)
2. Edits work for spelling and grammar (10 points)
3. Responds to questions appropriately and in a timely manner (10 points)
4. Accepts suggestions for improvement and reports back to supervisor on effects of such changes (10 points)

TOTAL POINTS FOR COMMUNICATION

SAFETY AND SECURITY (2 parts / maximum points possible 18)

1. Observes safety and security procedures (9 points)
2. Uses equipment and materials properly (9 points)

TOTAL POINTS FOR SAFETY AND SECURITY

CUSTOMER SERVICE (3 parts / maximum points possible 27)

1. Displays courtesy and sensitivity (9 points)
2. Manages difficult or emotional customer situations with tact (9 points)
3. Displays a problem solving, helpful attitude when assisting customers (9 points)

TOTAL POINTS FOR CUSTOMER SERVICE

ORGANIZATION AND PLANNING (3 parts / maximum points possible 30)

1. Uses time efficiently (10 points)
2. Integrates changes smoothly (10 points)
3. Prioritizes and plans work activities (10 points)

TOTAL POINTS FOR ORGANIZATION AND PLANNING
DRAFT

Initiative and Judgment (4 parts / maximum points possible 40)

______ Takes independent actions and calculated risks when appropriate (10 points)
______ Seeks and takes advantage of opportunities for improvement (10 points)
______ Exhibits sound and accurate judgment (10 points)
______ Includes appropriate people in decision making process (10 points)

Total points for Initiative and Judgment

TOTAL EVALUATION SCORE 500 points possible

2. Experience

EXPERIENCE- Total points possible= 500 points

Related work experience year(s) – based on placement experience given on
entrance to the district (10 points for each year, 100 points max)

Dysart experience school year(s) (40 points for each year, 500 points max)

TOTAL EXPERIENCE SCORE- 500 points possible

3. Education/ Certification/ Licensing

EDUCATION/CERTIFICATION/LICENSING- Total points possible= 400 points

______ Approved non-required professional development class (10 points for each class,
100 points max)

______ Valid license(s) in area related to work (50 points per license, 100 points max)

______ Valid certification(s) related to area of work assignment (50 points per certification, 100 pts
max)

Accredited 2 year degree program(s) (50 points for each degree, 100 points
max)

Accredited 4 year degree program(s) (100 points for each degree, 200
points max)

TOTAL EDUCATION/CERTIFICATION/LICENSING- 400 points possible
4. ATTENDANCE

ATTENDANCE- Total points possible= 400 points

Absences in current school year (including sick days, discretionary days, unpaid days - not including vacation days)
(see table below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days absent in current school year (does not include vacation days)</th>
<th>Number of Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 days (less than 1 day based on FTE)</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL POINTS FOR ATTENDANCE

5. Service and Leadership

SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP - Total points possible= 200 points – must be approved by district or school-level administration

Service (maximum points possible 200)

Campus or district level committee member-volunteer – Committee points are calculated for committee membership yearly from March to March (20 points for each committee, 80 points max)

Campus or district level committee chair-volunteer - Committee points are calculated for committee membership yearly from March to March (25 points for each committee, 100 points max)

Approved mentoring for a new employee, person new to position or a new program (20 points for each responsibility)

Total Points for Service (total points maximum 100)

TOTAL SERVICE & LEADERSHIP (200 points possible if total points exceeds 200, enter 200)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIF Rubric</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work Related Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dysart Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Education/Certification/Licensing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support Staff RIF Rubric/FAQ

1. **Does flex time impact the points possible for attendance?**
   Flex time does not impact the points possible for attendance because employees using flex time, in the same week, still work a full hourly week.

2. **How are points for committees approved?**
   Membership on school or district-level committees is approved through the committee facilitator. The support staff member must have a membership form signed by the facilitator in order to receive points for membership on school or district committees.

3. **Does a 2 or 4 year degree have to be related to my job responsibility to receive points?**
   No, any accredited 2 or 4 year degree will earn points.

4. **Can a support staff member use comp or flex time to attend non-job related professional development classes?**
   Yes, flex time or comp time may be used to attend these opportunities. However, employees must have the comp or flex time approved by their supervisor.

5. **Why was dependability left out of the evaluation category on the RIF Rubric?**
   Dependability is covered through the attendance component on the RIF Rubric. Including it in the evaluation section would have provided a situation where it would have counted twice on the Rubric.

6. **What if I hold more than 2 jobs in the district?**
   The RIF Rubric will be calculated based on the employee’s primary job.

7. **Do points carry over from year to year?**
   No, the RIF Rubric is calculated on a yearly basis and starts over each year.

8. **Why do the committee points count from March to March of each year?**
   Committees are calculated from March to March each year due to late spring and summer committees that are formed based on district need.
Human Resources

Attrition and Hiring Report
August 18, 2010

Certified Staff
Attrition by School Year

- Total Teachers
- Teacher Attrition
2010-2011 CERTIFIED STAFF
Teacher New Hires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number of New Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K – 6 Teacher</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 8 Teacher</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K – 8 Music, PE, Art</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K – 8 Interventionist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – 12 Teacher</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These numbers will be changing as we permanently fill positions covered with Guest Teacher/Long Term Substitutes AND as we adjust staff to meet enrollment demands.

2010-2011 CERTIFIED STAFF
New Hires as of 8/11/10

- TEACHERS - 125
- COUNSELORS - 2
- CURRICULUM SPECIALIST MATH - 1
- SPEECH PATHOLOGISTS - 3
- PSYCHOLOGIST - 1
- PSYCH INTERN - 2
- ADMINISTRATORS -15
2010-2011 CERTIFIED STAFF  
New Hires - Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Number of Hires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4 YRS EXP</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 YRS EXP</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+ EXP</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATA ACCUMULATED IN VISIONS AS OF 8/12/10

2010-2011 Certified Staff  
Teacher Vacancies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number of Vacancies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 Teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8 Music, Librarian/Media Specialist</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8 Interventionist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 Teacher</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These numbers will be changing as we permanently fill positions covered with Guest Teacher/Long Term Substitutes AND as we adjust staff to meet enrollment demands.
Support Staff
Total Number of Positions and New Hires

2010-2011 Administrative Staff Hired

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>New Hires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gail Pletnick – Madam President, members of the Board changes were made to this policy last in 2009 in response to changes in the law. However, in so doing the language of the policy became more confusing and didn’t honor our practice. We are recommending going back basically and changing back to the language that we had as it refers to full day kindergarten and entrance age. Originally the policy was changed in 2007 and it came from work that we did with committees when we were implementing full day kindergarten. If you remember, Dysart implemented full day kindergarten before it was actually funded by the state. So we had a number of different committees that worked on what this would look like what curriculum would look like; all of those sorts of things. So we did research and made recommendations in terms of this particular policy item. When we made the change to reflect being able to charge tuition and some other components, we did not retain the components of it that we had been following and practicing since 2007. One of the things I should mention is when Arizona adopted full-day kindergarten in terms of saying that they would fund it. Originally it was phased in into the schools that had the highest numbers of students that were on Title 1. At that time, Governor Napolitano indicated that you had to be five by September 1st or they would not fund the child. Then the latest change in legislation was they would fund the child but if the child was retained they wouldn’t fund the child. And, then the last change was they did away with full-day kindergarten. So they’ve been changing those kinds of budget things. What I would say is that in doing the research you can find lots of research involving this. Most of the most recent research is about red shirting children; waiting until they’re six years of age before putting you put them in. But there is lots of research. What we did is take the research. We looked at the budget implications and then what options we could have to create the best way for us to address this. So from a research perspective there is lots of research that goes back and forth that does or doesn’t matter it weighs in; it’s kind of like that block scheduling kind of thing; but some recommendations about having a set age. From a budget perspective, again two things that the district considered one is whether or not we would be funded for those children and again we would not be if they were not five by September 1st under Governor Napolitano’s budgeting and then now if a child is not successful then again under current they said that now we are not funded at all. Then the other piece is that if ever you are going to have consideration then you better have a good screening process in place. and i’ve worked in some districts where we had that in place and quite frankly they don’t now because they did the same kind of research we did. In order to do that you better be staffing staff in the summer to do this, you better have the materials to do the screening and then be able to utilize that to make good decisions. So in the summer if you have 100 people who want to be screened, we used to find that maybe 20 would actually make it into the program and qualify and be ready. Of that 20 we started tracking and found that over a K-2 period the majority of those students ended up being retained if not in K in 1 or 2. So again in looking at that, then where is the best use of your resources. In doing this screening in doing again this early entrance which then could equate to retention or is it best to utilize those resources then when a child is entering school to make sure that again we are able to differentiate and offer the programs that we need. So it comes as both research based as well as budget research based recommendations in terms of our entrance age. So it is our
recommendation that we go back to what our practice has been since 2007 and we would ask the board to support what we have found to be a practice that allows us then to best utilize our resources when we are talking about our early childhood program. Remember what we've also done to accommodate this is we have expanded our preschool program so we offer other opportunities to our parents in terms of some additional preschool opportunities in the district.

Jennifer Tanner - Any questions from the Board?

Bonnie Schroader – I actually have several comments. I left my actual document at home. I've got all my supporting stuff so I may have to look over at yours. I have concerns about removing the September to January 1 out for the kindergartners. In talking to Dr. Pletnick, we've supposedly only had only had a handful of kids actually try to get in to kindergarten using the gap that is actually in Arizona law right now. The Arizona statute does state September 1st but if a child is born between September 1st and January 1st they can under a meeting between the parents, guardian, the children, the teacher and a principal with a consultation can actually be admitted into school and it is state law to do that. I know Dr. Pletnick had sent us a document about the NEA and when we had talked on the phone she said that they supported not letting anyone other than five. But actually this document on page 3 at the bottom specifically says to give children the best possible chance to benefit from kindergarten the NEA recommends that five be the uniform entrance age for kindergarten but the minimum entrance age of 5 and the maximum allowed age of 6 should not be applied rigidly. However, in joint consultation with parents and teachers the school district should be allowed to make on a case a by case exception to age requirements. And I have a problem with us removing that ability to have that exception in the document. And I think it needs to be left in there.

Christine Pritchard – Do we have that, is that on the a....

Bonnie Schroader – It's being crossed out. It's being removed.

Christine Pritchard - but on.... oh okay I'm looking at the ...

Bonnie Schroader – We are allowing it still for first grade but not for kindergarten

Gail Pletnick. – And I will share that the document that. The policy that's been in place is only that current one since January and we just discovered that it was I sent the originally one that we had been practicing under since 2007. So quite frankly the reason we don't have a lot of those requests is because our policy has been consistent since 2007 in terms of using September 1st. So that has been why we don't get the requests. Because we have that and the law states the Board MAY adopt policy and there are many districts like ours like Deer Valley for instance that also does not have that as part of it.. So it is..

Bonnie Schroader – But Peoria, Peoria has it

Gail Pletnick – Absolutely.... Yes, it is absolutely a choice in terms of policy. What I am sharing is we are recommending that our practice has been to use the September 1st. We have been again consistent with that. We have utilized that and we believe that we have a strong program that then meets the needs of students. We do have an option in our expanded preschool. And certainly if the board would like to adopt that policy, then I would go back and we would look at what is the process that we would have to adopt in order to screen these children, what ever the requests are. We could then put together that cost of what that would be and I would bring that back to the board and then the board could tell me what areas in the budget you would want to see us cut in order to implement this new
program in order to do that level of screening in the district. We can certainly shift the resources if that’s what the board elects to do. I’m sharing that we’ve been successful with the process that we have been utilizing in terms of entrance into kindergarten and so we’re recommending that in terms of continuing forward.

Bonnie Schroader - I have a concern with saying that this is just a budget issue. I mean, these are kids and being born 24 hrs later than another child doesn’t determine whether they are smart, ready or not ready. And even in the first paragraph we give a three month differentiation for 3 yr olds. So we are allowing 2 yr 9mo old kids to have a variation and to be looked at to get earlier services. We are letting the first graders have the advantage to having that and we do all kinds of screening to help disabled kids on the far end of the spectrum and I think it is discrimination and where state law saying that it should be allowed and the National Education Association supports it that we should not take that right away from a parent to decide. There is nobody that asks a parent why they hold their kids back. You can hold a child back and nobody questions because you say I don’t think he is ready and yet we will not help parents whose children are ready to be able to come in even though it is allowed under state law. Peoria’s document that they have actually does have some things that would address your concern. Their policy says that children may be admitted to district schools for enrollment in kindergarten when they are five years of age prior to September 1st. Children who reach the age of five years prior to January 1st of the school year but subsequent to September will generally not be enrolled. But children may be admitted under the conditions indicated below. They are tested to determine their maturity level and their readiness for learning. Tests will be at no expense to the district. And then they have two subsections. The results of the tests are reviewed by the parents or legal guar and school officials. It is the consensus of those officials that school enrollment is in the best interest of the child. And, then they also address some concerns that we really haven’t on children moving in from other districts. I did call around and I know that one of the charter schools actually takes children through October 31st. We could actually have kids go there and then move in, in first grade so that they can get around our policy. And then several things that they can actually go and take on-line classes and skip around the policy too and wouldn’t we rather have those kids and those dollars in our own schools. But, I don’t think we should take away the right of a parent to determine their child’s readiness when it’s allowed by law and supported by the NEA.

Gail Pletnick - A couple of clarifications, number one special preschool under federal law we have to do “Child Find” so those are regulations that are part of federal mandates. In terms of what you read with Peoria, then we would be charging parents. So you would be asking parents to pay for those costs and much as we just discussed with technology, if we have parents that can’t pay, you know, is that a concern? That would certainly be for the board to decide if they thought that’s a concern. Number three is no if a parent says they want to hold their child back we don’t just agree; we go through a process because if its not in the best interest of the child then it is our duty to provide that data to the parent that indicates why that is not the case. So there is actually a process for both retention and acceleration that looks at all of that data. That’s part of it. In terms of providing access for children who need challenges. Coming in as a kindergarten student, again our expectation is there will be differentiation. And as you know then as they move through if they continue that that is required, we do have options such as gifted programming for students. So we do not discriminate against any students and we do provide those resources and again our recommendation is certainly based on what we have found to be best practice in meeting the needs of student and doing so in a way again that provides us with best opportunities in servicing our students. We have also expanded that preschool program because again often times wheat we are told when parents are making these requests is that really it is about having their kindergartener in there full-day and if they can’t have the student in full
day that means they are going to have to pay for day care. So when we talk about budget kinds of things those are usually the budget kinds of things we end up hearing in terms of some of the reasons why.

Bonnie Schroader - I don’t think we should be penalizing parents who may be doing it right simply because there are some that abuse the system though. I mean if we do have kindergarten testing for Gate, at least according to the web site we do, we have the ability to test these kids. If we can go out and test a child and find out why the parents should keep them in school, couldn’t we use those same dollars to help test a child to put them in school?

Gail Pletnick – Again, if the board would like us to redirect our resources, I can absolutely come up with those costs and other districts that have done them we can certainly utilize that information.

Bonnie Schroader - The only state requirement says that they need to have a meeting with the principal. And that’s one of the things that we need to look at because I believe the policy says superintendent, but state law says it should be a principal.

Gail Pletnick - You are right it is the principal. However we want to make certain when we’re making decisions for kids we’re making best decisions. We wouldn’t arbitrarily want to place a child and then find that they are not being successful because, retention, whether you talking about kindergarten, first grade, 2nd grade, any grade level is not a good choice for a student unless it’s the only choice. We use retention for the very last choice. So having children enter and then not be successful is not a good option. I again would advocate that we would have to have a process in place in order to assure good decisions are being made about placement of children.

Jennifer Tanner – When some of these tests are given or have been given in the past, do they account at all for emotional or behavior or is it strictly knowledge of material?

Gail Pletnick - A good screening will account for all of those components. Are they ready physically because there are also physical attributes children have to have even in manipulating. You know we move from the large pencil to the small pencil that’s because again of student script that sort of thing. There is certainly also that academic side but the emotional and social side too and especially with a full day kindergarten program because students have to be able to again have that ability then to really maintain through a full day of classes. And so that is part of it. So are there screenings? Absolutely there are screenings that incorporate all of that. Does it add a cost? You are talking about bringing staff members in teams, bringing children in and then putting them through that battery of assessments in order to get good information. You can do it any other way. It is like anything else. If you’re fixing a car and you want to do it cheap and you want to buy second hand parts, you can do that. So can we do it in any way? We can do it in any way. I would only want to advocate for what is the best way in terms of the best way to get information for a good placement for students.

Jennifer Tanner – Any thoughts from the board?

Jerry Eynon - I’m sure there will always be those exceptional kids that arbitrary dates catch them you know one day your 15 and you can’t drive, the next day your 16 and you can drive and maybe the child was able to drive at 12. Arbitrary dates that’s where arbitrary dates get.... When I say arbitrary, they’re not arbitrary but, that’s where dates get kind of interesting. You know if we would go to January 1st but then we are going to hear from the parent whose child was born January 2nd. But, I agree with Bonnie in the sense that I’m sure that there are some kids that are more than ready for kindergarten and their birthday doesn’t happen to fall before September 1st.
Bonnie Schroader - I just don’t think we need to pull that out and leave that option there so it is available. Because, otherwise we are totally cutting it off and it currently already is in policy.

Gail Pletnick - It was not in the policy that was in 2007. But, if we leave that I feel very strongly that I have to advocate that we have a screening process in place and whatever the cost of that is, that the district assume that cost and it not be placed on the parent because I don’t think that... and it would have to be... and we would have to then dedicate those staff because most of that would have to be done in the summer. So you would be bringing in a team of staff. I know exactly how that’s done because I worked in a district where we did that for several years. And, you bring them in and then you go through those assessments. I can also tell you that they had data which they changed policy to reflect that. Because of the numbers that they were... the monies they were putting in doing that, because you can’t refuse anyone. So any parent that wants to come in you’re going to be testing them. So if it is 20 this year it could be 100 next year. You will then find that a small percentage would actually make it through and then even from that small percentage there weren’t many that were making it through that retention in K-2. So you’re absolutely right. There are always exceptions and you’re absolutely right. It could be September 1st, it could be September 2nd, you could pick any date and there would be someone after that or before that. But, in terms of then utilizing our resources when our students come in and we find that they need those challenges or they need that support, then it’s at that time we should make sure we’re using our resources to provide that differentiation and those programs in order to do that.

Bonnie Schroader – Well, if we do that, then maybe we should take out the first part of the paragraph for the 3 yr olds. I mean, so if we are giving them a 90 day leeway and we are giving the first graders a four month leeway, I mean it should be equal across the board because they are all in state law. So it should either all match or it should not. I mean, we should not pick and choose which side of state law we want to follow.

Gail Pletnick – Dr. McCarthy can you help with the dates because that is about special education?

Juliann McCarthy - Madam President, members of the board.... There is a reason why it’s in federal law. That’s the federal law you are speaking to, IDEA. And the reason is because the federal law requires that we have those children identified and in services by age three. That’s a 100 percent compliance issue. They have to be in services by three and so that 90 day issue is about allowing the team to go through the evaluation process that’s necessary so they can begin to identify those kids and have them in place by age three. That’s the federal law. It’s truly not even the same issue I don’t think.

Bonnie Schroader – How many? I know we do testing about every 6-8 weeks in the early education center.

Juliann McCarthy - We test every 2 weeks.

Bonnie Schroader - Every two weeks. And how many kids apply to get in there don’t actually make it in?

Juliann McCarthy - You know, I don’t have those numbers in front of me. I ... we...

Bonnie Schroader - Is it a lot, a little?

Juliann McCarthy - Yes, a lot that don’t qualify. You know I can’t even ... I’m not even able to estimate that. What I can tell you is that we have tremendous numbers of people approaching us. We are over filled every two weeks in our screening process. And that those kids are then screened and moved on to
further evaluation. And those that we move on from screening to evaluation we tend to have what I would call a high hit rate for those who are actually qualifying for services. But we screen a tremendous number of children we can’t we don’t turn any children away.

**Bonnie Schroader** - So how many of those would you say probably do that because they know they get free preschool?

**Juliann McCarthy** - I’m sure that there are people who approach us. I know that there are people that approach us.

**Bonnie Schroader** - So we currently are paying for that to happen in the preschool but we wouldn’t be able to test these children if there was a need.

**Gail Pletnick** - Federal law requires that we do that. There is not an option.

**Bonnie Schroader** - But your concern is that we have people that would probably be abusing the system because they want their kids in kindergarten. Where we actually have the same problem happening in the preschool that they are trying to get their kids in preschool because they get free bus pick up and they get free day care and their children get services. So you could have the same problem either way.

**Gail Pletnick** – You’re right we do have it there but until they change federal law unfortunately we can’t change. That is not an option. It’s not written you may, it’s written that you must.

**Bonnie Schroader** - I just... the services should be equal across the board. The opportunity for the parent to help their child and the policies are there to support it at the state and the national level.

**Jennifer Tanner** – Dr. Pletnick, when you talk about a cost for something like that, I don’t know if you are even able to give a ballpark figure on how or what we would be looking at for an individual test.

**Gail Pletnick** - We can certainly work on that. It would be a battery of test.

**Jennifer Tanner** - Because I would like to see that. I mean, because I would like to see that. I guess, what are your hesitations by not having the parent be responsible for that?

**Gail Pletnick** - Again there will be a number, the cost of that could be a significant amount much like we talked about whether it’s an iPod to say you must bear the burden of that. To me that is a concern when you’re talking about anything in public education. So, it would be the same as saying you must pay for...

**Jennifer Tanner** - Right

**Gail Pletnick** - Can you? You know we would even have to research the can you part of it. I know it’s in Peoria’s. I’m sure they may have. We’ve never looked at that.

**Jennifer Tanner** - I know that, you know, personally I do know that there are people who have put their kids in kindergarten just because they couldn’t afford preschool, or what not. So, I mean, I do know there are legitimate ones that, you know, are ready for kindergarten. But, then I also know there is a high majority that it is looked at almost as kind of a type of a day care type of situation that the parents don’t need to worry about that aspect. So, I would be interested in knowing the cost. And then, I would also be interested in, I don’t know, what kind of data you can provide for this whether it’s in our district or other districts, like, what kind of percentages are they looking at with having to retain some of those
kids who did enter early. How many of them ended up having to be repeated or just kind of percentage of those kids who are ready for that. Are you able to come up with anything like that?

Gail Pletnick - We don’t have that because we’ve had this in place since 2007. I can certainly attempt to get that. But, again when you are talking about that kind of student information sometimes you can get it and sometimes you can’t get it.

Bonnie Schroader - Can we try contacting... I know Peoria is not the only one I found. Like Scottsdale has a similar thing and theirs didn’t talk about the cost. And, I mean, also if we don’t blow it out of proportion because the law states that technically the only requirement is that for children that there could be a determination made upon one or more. So it could be one single visit or more between the parents/guardian, the children, a teacher and a principal. So I hope we don’t bring in, you know, the entire military for something that could be with one person to do an initial evaluation and blow it out of proportion either.

Gail Pletnick - I don’t think one person would be able to determine the academic, social, emotional or physical kinds of abilities of a student and then we would be setting students up for failure. So we certainly don’t want to not attend to those kinds of concerns either. So I think your right we certainly are not going to put them through 3 days of testing. But we certainly need to make certain that we have data on all of those areas.

Christine Pritchard - Not knowing where the Board is going to go with this... I do agree though I don’t think we should charge parents for the cost of the test. Because again, you know, just like the technology piece mom’s working three jobs, dad’s working two and that cost of... They may think their child is completely ready for kindergarten but they can’t afford the test because they don’t have the money. So I definitely am not even interested in. I mean, I wouldn’t want to charge parents for that is my opinion if that’s where we go with it.

Jennifer Tanner - Anybody else?

Jerry Eynon - What are the implications a child is tested and found not to be ready and the parents now want to fight the testing procedure; that they insist that the child is ready even though the tests might indicate they’re not ready?

Gail Pletnick – Unfortunately, again, you can get in, as I’m sure your aware.... Sometimes those dueling tests then they go out and say I’m going to get a test from this place and bring that test in. So, does that happen? That happens in special education. That hasn’t happed in relation to this because we have not had it in place; but, there’s potential that you can have those kinds of disputes; absolutely.

Jennifer Tanner - I mean I agree a lot. I mean, Jerry what you said totally makes sense, there’s always going to be a date and that date is not always going to work out for whoever. There is always going to be a number of people that that date is one day later than what they had wanted. So I don’t know but...

Bonnie Schroader – But, I’m sure that’s why the state gives that flexibility. I mean, they put it in there that there is that four month window that these other children could be looked at and be allowed to go in. I’m sure that’s why because there is, you know, all children mature differently they have different habits, they have different learning styles.

Gail Pletnick - I can share we have had requests for students born in February so.... It does... Whether you say its January 1st or September 1st, there will probably be another.
Bonnie Schroader - I just skipped the whole problem and induced them at 9PM on August 31st.

Jennifer Tanner - Dr. Pletnick if you wouldn’t mind just coming up with a cost on what that would look like, I would appreciate that.

Gail Pletnick – Absolutely, okay.

April Allen - And the retention rate if you could. That would interest me.

Gail Pletnick - Okay if I can get that.

Christine Pritchard - And what was... just so I’m clear too. What’s the reason why if that’s what the state requires why I’m sure we had some reason for moving away from that what was that?

Gail Pletnick - When we were planning our full day kindergarten program, we spent probably half of a year with committees in looking at both policy implications and programs implications. So we had teams including parents and teachers. And, the team that worked on the entrance piece looked at the research related to it and came up with that we should be consistent with our September 1st for reasons both within the research as well as implications for programs. And, then right after we did that the state came out... When Governor Napolitano began to introduce funding came out with the same kind of thing, you had to be by September 1st. They left the law in place. But, how they got around that is okay, if you take them after September 1st we are not paying for that child in that classroom. So, September 1st really became the date. Then they changed the law again and instead of saying we wouldn’t pay for it if they entered in because they are funding everything, it was about retention and whether that child was retained and the state wouldn’t pay for it. So it’s been changing. But, from the get go based on research and some best practices in terms of how we could best provide services to students and what the research was talking about was that whole child. We were moving to full day kindergarten. Not many places had full day kindergarten when we moved to it. And, you’re talking about a long day for a little guy. So it’s more than just those academic pieces. How would they do socially, emotionally, and physically in those settings? And using that information, the recommendation was let’s take that September1st date which is in law and stick with that.

Christine Pritchard – And, so based on the research then that’s what made us decide that we don’t even do the screening or the testing.

Gail Pletnick – Yes, because then that would be additional resources so when we thought about where we wanted to put our resources.... Can you do that? Yes, but we thought it was better to put our resources into that program which we were starting up and at that point not getting any state funding for it.

Jennifer Tanner - Any other questions?