

**DES MOINES PUBLIC SCHOOLS
REGULAR SCHOOL BOARD MEETING
BOARDROOM — 1800 GRAND AVENUE
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 2, 2010**

PUBLIC FORUM – 5:45 p.m.

The Board of Directors met in regular session on Tuesday, February 2, 2010, in the boardroom at 1800 Grand Ave., Connie Boesen presiding. There were no speakers at the public forum.

Present: Boesen, Buckton, Caldwell-Johnson, Link, Murphy, Strong, Woods
Absent: None

REGULAR MEETING – 6:00 p.m.

The Board of Directors met in regular session on Tuesday, February 2, 2010, in the boardroom at 1800 Grand Ave. Connie Boesen presiding.

Present: Boesen, Buckton, Caldwell-Johnson, Link, Murphy, Strong, Woods
Absent: None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Link moved to approve the agenda as amended. Second by Caldwell-Johnson.

Aye: Boesen, Buckton, Caldwell-Johnson, Link, Murphy, Strong, Woods
Nay: None
Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Strong moved approval of the minutes of January 19, 2010. Second by Buckton.

Aye: Boesen, Buckton, Caldwell-Johnson, Link, Murphy, Strong, Woods
Nay: None
Motion carried.

CONSENT ITEMS – 6:04 p.m.

7. Contracts for Approval	1
8. Award of Bid No. B6026 — Window Replacement Park Ave. Elementary	5
9. ELL Endorsement — Monroe Elementary Staff	7
10. Additional Early Retirement	9
11. List of Bills for Approval	11

Ms. Link moved approval of the consent items including payment of bills previously authorized and certified by the secretary and reviewed by her as paid in the amount of \$3,649,638.71 and unpaid bills in the amount of \$848,735.59. Second by Woods.

Mrs. Woods asked where the source of funding was for the Monroe ELL project. Dr. Sebring responded the funds will be coming from Title I funds for school improvement and professional development funds. As a SINA (School in Need of Assistance) school, Monroe is provided additional money by the federal government to establish improvement efforts. She stated that one third of the students at Monroe Elementary are second language learners.

Mr. Murphy clarified Monroe Elementary received a grant for \$161,000 and \$33,000 for this comes out of that grant.

Aye: Boesen, Buckton, Caldwell-Johnson, Link, Murphy, Strong, Woods
Nay: None
Motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARING – 6:06 p.m.

- 12. Mechanical Retrofit — Madison Elementary School ----- 13
- 13. Student Drop-Off — Howe Elementary School ----- 15
- 14. Window Replacement — Mitchell School ----- 17

OTHER – 6:09 p.m.

- 15. Establishing a One-Quarter Mile Boundary Around Choice Schools ----- 19
- 16. Monitoring Report for Management Limitation 2.3 — Financial Condition & Activities
for the Quarter Ending December 31, 2009 ----- 25
- 17. Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools ----- 29
- 18. Graduation Credit Requirements Effective With the 2010-2011 Ninth-Grade Class 35
- 19. Sale of Statewide Penny Sales Tax Bonds Series 2010 ----- 39

REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION – 9:11 p.m.

Dr. Sebring stated the Board needs work sessions on assessments and turnaround. Mr. Murphy asked for a calendar of the staff development dates and locations.

Ms. Boesen stated the professional team plans to get that information to the Board as soon as it is available.

Dr. Sebring asked that a schedule of professional development events for February 15 be given to the Board.

February 2, 2010

Ms. Caldwell-Johnson brought to the attention of the Board a couple documents that were sent to them regarding the leadership survey.

Ms. Buckton asked Ms. Caldwell-Johnson if she was looking for editing input or wanted Board members to complete the survey.

Ms. Caldwell-Johnson asked for any edits or comments the Board might have so the survey can be finalized for distribution.

CHAIR'S REPORT

Ms. Boesen commented the Board will be going out to the public through the Linkage Committee to explain to the public what impact the budget is having. She clarified that many things are unknown but the Board wants to inform and get feedback from the public on the budget. The first forum will be Feb. 9, 2010, in the boardroom. The schedule of forums is listed on the Web site and will be posted.

ADJOURN 9:15 p.m.

Item No. 7**Page 1 of 4****Subject: CONTRACTS FOR APPROVAL****For: ACTION****Contact: Greg Davis**
(greg.davis@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-7773)**Attachments: None**

Contract No. 10-003**Project:** E-Rate contract for eligible internal connection services**Contractor:** Baker Electric Voice and Data Cabling Systems**Background:** The Universal Service Fund (E-Rate) program requires the district to establish contracts with providers of eligible E-Rate service. These vendors must be chosen through a competitive bid process that complies with both local and E-Rate bidding requirements.

These requirements have been met, and Baker Electric Voice and Data Cabling Systems have been selected to provide the eligible internal connection services, based on the terms of a State of Iowa Master Contract.

DMPS is requesting up to \$313,423.19 from the E-Rate program to support the E-Rate eligible work done by Baker Electric Voice and Data Cabling Systems in FY11. The actual services will be provided by Baker Electric Voice and Data Cabling Systems and be based on district needs and resource allocation. This E-Rate contract does not bind the district to do a set amount of work with Baker, contingent on approval of E-Rate funding.

Funding:

Revenues (into Technology budget/DWMCTSFTZN): \$313,423.19

Expenses (from Technology budget/DWFACOPRZN): \$75,000.00 (estimated)

Term: One year**New or Renewal:** Renewal**Contact:** Greg Davis
(gregdavis@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-7773)

Item No. 7**Page 2 of 4**

Contract No. 10-004

Project: E-Rate contract for eligible internal connection services

Contractor: Communication Technologies

Background: The Universal Service Fund (E-Rate) program requires the district to establish contracts with providers of eligible E-Rate service. These vendors must be chosen through a competitive bid process that complies with both local and E-Rate bidding requirements.

These requirements have been met, and Communication Technologies has been selected to provide the eligible internal connection services, based on the terms of a State of Iowa Master Contract.

DMPS is requesting up to \$132,662.00 from the E-Rate program to support the E-Rate eligible work done by Communication Technologies in FY11. The actual services will be provided by Communication Technologies and be based on district needs and resource allocation. This E-Rate contract does not bind the district to do a set amount of work with Communication Technologies, contingent on approval of E-Rate funding.

Funding:

Revenues (into Technology budget/DWMCTSFTZN): \$132,662

Expenses (from Technology budget/DWFACPPRZN): \$35,000 (estimated)

Term: One year

New or Renewal: Renewal

Contact: Greg Davis

(greg.davis@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-7773)

Contract No. 10-005

Project: E-Rate contract for eligible internal connection services

Contractor: Embarkit

Background: The Universal Service Fund (E-Rate) program requires the district to establish contracts with providers of eligible E-Rate service. These vendors must be

Item No. 7**Page 3 of 4**

chosen through a competitive bid process that complies with both local and E-Rate bidding requirements.

These requirements have been met, and Embarkit has been selected to provide the eligible internal connection services, based on the terms of a State of Iowa Master Contract.

DMPS is requesting up to \$707,539.70 from the E-Rate program to support the E-Rate eligible work done by Embarkit in FY11. The actual services will be provided by Embarkit and be based on district needs and resource allocation. This E-Rate contract does not bind the district to do a set amount of work with Embarkit, contingent on approval of E-Rate funding.

Funding:

Revenues (into Technology budget/DWMCTSFTZN): \$707,539.70

Expenses (from Technology budget/DWFACOPRZN): \$175,000.00 (estimated)

Term: One year

New or Renewal: New

Contact: Greg Davis

(greg.davis@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-7773)

Contract No. 10-006

Project: E-Rate contract for eligible internal connection basic maintenance services

Contractor: Black Box

Background: The Universal Service Fund (E-Rate) program requires the district to establish contracts with providers of eligible E-Rate service. These vendors must be chosen through a competitive bid process that complies with both local and E-Rate bidding requirements.

These requirements have been met, and Black Box has been selected to provide the eligible internal connections services.

DMPS is requesting \$75,127.32 from the E-Rate program to support the E-Rate eligible work done by Black Box in FY11. The services provided will be done by Black Box will be based on district needs and resource allocation. This E-Rate contract does not bind the district to do a set amount of work with Black Box.

Item No. 7

Page 4 of 4

Funding:

Revenues (into Technology budget/DWMCTSFTZN): \$75,127.32

Expenses (from Technology budget/DWFACOPRZN): \$20,000.00

Term: One year

New or Renewal: Renewal

Contact: Greg Davis

(greg.davis@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-7773)

Item No. 8
Page 1 of 1
**Subject: AWARD OF BID NO. B6026 — WINDOW REPLACEMENT
PARK AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**
For: ACTION
Contact: BILL GOOD

(harold.good@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-8321)

Attachments: None

Issue: Award of contract for the window replacement project for Park Avenue Elementary School.

Superintendent's Recommendation: The superintendent recommends a contract for the Base Bid and Alternate No. 1 be awarded to the lowest responsive/responsible bidder Swanson Glass, Inc. in the amount of \$266,860.00.

Presenters: None. Bill Good will be present to answer any questions.

Background: This is one of the first projects to begin under the statewide penny funding. The work at Park Avenue will be divided into several individual bid packages.

- **Base Bid:** Replacement of the exterior windows and repairs / replacements of selected exterior entry doorways.
- **Alternate 1:** Change the doors to be replaced from hollow metal to fiberglass reinforced polyester doors.
- **Alternate 2:** Change to alternate window specification.

The district received bids on January 26, 2010. The results are as follows:

Bidder	Base Bid	Alternate 1	Alternate 2
Swanson Glass	\$258,960	\$7,900	-\$18,170
REEP, Inc.	\$259,186	\$12,714	\$2,518
Edge Commercial	\$313,150	\$13,500	-\$5,000
Bergstrom Constr.	\$314,000	\$13,600	-\$13,000

Funding: Statewide penny (Students First Program)

Item No. 9**Page 1 of 1****Subject: ELL ENDORSEMENT — MONROE ELEMENTARY STAFF****For: ACTION****Contact: Cindy Wissler**
(cindy.wissler@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-8425)**Attachments: None**

Issue: Tuition payment for four hours of graduate credit from William Penn University totaling \$33,600.00.

Superintendent's Recommendation: The superintendent recommends payment of the graduate courses for Monroe Elementary staff.

Presenters: None

Background: Monroe Elementary has a goal of all certified staff earning an ELL endorsement. The staff has an arrangement with William Penn University to provide the 18 hours of the graduate credit necessary for the endorsement. Monroe has received a grant for additional SINA (Schools in Need of Assistance) funds from the Iowa Department of Education in the amount of \$161,600 for 2009 to 2011. This payment of \$33,600 will cover the course work of 42 Monroe teachers. The remainder of the SINA grant will be used for tuition payments for future coursework from William Penn.

Class information:

EASL 250 Language Acquisition — 3 credit hours

EASL 360 ESL Tutoring — 1 credit hour

Funding: Monroe Elementary's Title I SINA Additional Funding Grant

Item No. 10

Page 1 of 1

Subject: ADDITIONAL EARLY RETIREMENT

For: ACTION

Contact: Twyla Woods/Patricia Schroeder

Attachments: None

(twyla.woods@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-7972/patricia.schroeder@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-8527)

Issue: An additional early retirement offering.

Superintendent's Recommendation: The superintendent recommends the Board approve an additional early retirement opportunity for this year for eligible employees under the current plan. This will be from March 1, 2010, through March 12, 2010.

Background: Currently we have 78 certified staff and administrators approved for early retirement effective at the end of this year.

Providing additional time for eligible employees to apply for early retirement may provide the district with further savings opportunities.

The additional opportunity will be available to the first 15 eligible employees as determined by date of receipt of Request for Early Retirement form by the Office of the Chief of Staff and Student Affairs.

Item No. 11

Page 1 of 1

Subject: LIST OF BILLS FOR APPROVAL

For: ACTION

Contact: Patricia Schroeder
(patricia.schroeder@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-8527)

Attachments: None

Issue: A list of bills will be furnished to the Board of Directors at the Board meeting for approval. The secretary will be glad to furnish information as requested on any of these items. Prior to the meeting, one member of the Board will have checked this list with the invoices.

Item No. 12**Page 1 of 1****Subject: MECHANICAL RETROFIT — MADISON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL****For: PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION****Contact: BILL GOOD**

(harold.good@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-8321)

Attachments: None

Issue: Approval of the plans and specifications for the mechanical retrofit package for Madison Elementary School. Publication for the Public Hearing was included in *The Des Moines Register* on January 27, 2010.

Superintendent's Recommendation: The superintendent recommends the Board approve the plans and specifications prepared by RGD IA Inc. d/b/a for the mechanical retrofit package for Madison Elementary School.

Presenters: None. Bill Good will be present to answer any questions.

Background: This is one of the first projects to begin under the statewide penny funding. Generally, the approach to be utilized on the upcoming projects is to divide the work at each school into several individual bid packages. These bid packages will address safety and security, energy efficiency, technology, with a focus on those buildings which have not realized major improvements.

A copy of the plans and specifications are available for review at the district's facility management office.

Funding: Statewide penny (Students First Program)

Minutes

Ms. Boesen opened the public hearing. There being no speakers she closed the public hearing and Dr. Sebring introduced the recommendation.

Mr. Murphy moved to approve the plans for Madison Elementary. Second by Link.

Aye: Boesen, Buckton, Caldwell-Johnson, Link, Murphy, Strong, Woods

Nay: None

Motion carried.

Item No. 13**Page 1 of 1****Subject: STUDENT DROP-OFF — HOWE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL****For: PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION****Contact: BILL GOOD**

(harold.good@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-8321)

Attachments: None

Issue: Approval of the plans and specifications for the student drop-off package for Howe Elementary School. Publication for the public hearing was included in *The Des Moines Register* on January 27, 2010.

Superintendent's Recommendation: The superintendent recommends the Board approve the plans and specifications prepared by OPN Architects for the student drop off package for Howe Elementary School.

Presenters: None. Bill Good will be present to answer any questions.

Background: This is one of the first projects to begin under the statewide penny funding. Generally, the approach to be utilized on the upcoming projects is to divide the work at each school into several individual bid packages. These bid packages will address safety and security, energy efficiency, technology, with a focus on those buildings which have not realized major improvements.

A copy of the plans and specifications are available for review at the district's facility management office.

Funding: Statewide penny (Students First Program)

Minutes

Ms. Boesen opened the public hearing. There being no speakers she closed the public hearing and Dr. Sebring introduced the recommendation.

Mr. Murphy moved to approve the plans for Howe Elementary. Second by Link.

Aye: Boesen, Buckton, Caldwell-Johnson, Link, Murphy, Strong, Woods

Nay: None

Motion carried.

Item No. 14**Page 1 of 1****Subject: WINDOW REPLACEMENT — MITCHELL SCHOOL****For: PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION****Contact: BILL GOOD**

(harold.good@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-8321)

Attachments: None

Issue: Approval of the plans and specifications for the window replacement package for Mitchell School. Publication for the Public Hearing was included in *The Des Moines Register* on January 27, 2010.

Superintendent's Recommendation: The superintendent recommends the Board approve the plans and specifications prepared by Larrison & Associates for the window replacement package for Mitchell School.

Presenters: None. Bill Good will be present to answer any questions.

Background: This is one of the first projects to begin under the statewide penny funding. Generally, the approach to be utilized on the upcoming projects is to divide the work at each school into several individual bid packages. These bid packages will address safety and security, energy efficiency, technology, with a focus on those buildings which have not realized major improvements.

A copy of the plans and specifications are available for review at the district's facility management office.

Funding: Statewide penny (Students First Program)

Minutes

Ms. Boesen opened the public hearing. There being no speakers she closed the public hearing and Dr. Sebring introduced the recommendation.

Ms. Strong moved to approve the plans for Mitchell School. Second by Link.

Aye: Boesen, Buckton, Caldwell-Johnson, Link, Murphy, Strong, Woods

Nay: None

Motion carried.

Item No. 15**Page 1 of 5****Subject: ESTABLISHING A ONE-QUARTER MILE BOUNDARY AROUND CHOICE SCHOOLS****For: DISCUSSION****Contact: Nancy Sebring/Beth Nigut****Attachments: 10-007**(superintendent@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-7766/elizabeth.nigut@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-7837)

Issue: Establishing a boundary of one-quarter mile around the choice schools: Cowles Montessori School, Downtown School, Jefferson Traditional School, Phillips Traditional School, Walnut Street School, and Goodrell Middle School.

Presenters: Dr. Sebring and Beth Nigut will be present to answer any questions.

Background: When the superintendent's Facilities Advisory Committee presented its recommendations in June 2009, one of the recommendations was students living close to a choice school be given enrollment priority. The attached proposal titled "Enrollment Policies of Choice Schools" is a result of this recommendation.

This proposal creates consistency with respect to waiting lists at each of the choice schools and provides priority enrollment for those students living within a one-quarter mile radius to the school. In addition, as long as the application is received two weeks prior to the start date of school, those students enrolling in the entry level grade of the respective choice school will be guaranteed enrollment.

Minutes

Speakers: Jim Patch, 2803 Stanton
Rossi Frith, 1229 15th Street
Frank Hilton, 5325 Shriver Ave.
Mike Murray, 3224 East Douglas

This discussion was recommended by the Facilities Advisory Committee. Dr. Sebring and Beth Nigut explained the choice schools boundaries.

Ms. Nigut reiterated this discussion was a recommendation of the Facilities Advisory Committee. Ms. Nigut and Mr. Good and other administrators met with the principals of the choice schools to work out a way for students living within a close proximity to these choice schools to be, eventually, guaranteed enrollment in that choice school. The waiting list procedures that were in effect also were considered and the committee wanted to come up with a way to make the waiting list procedures as consistent as possible, across the district, and allow for more equity in the waiting list procedure and enrollment while giving the students living within close proximity some priority. This item is a result of the directive from the Facilities Advisory Committee. The district is initially establishing a quarter-mile radius surrounding the school. Maps were provided

Item No. 15**Page 2 of 5**

indicating the proposed boundaries. This process will be phased in beginning July 1, 2010. The district will make changes to the waiting list procedure. The student must be 3 years of age at the time they apply to go to the elementary school. In the past there have been varying methods to the wait-list procedures. In 2011, kindergarten students, as long as they submit their application to the respective school two weeks ahead of the start time, those kindergarten students will be guaranteed a seat in that kindergarten class. The reason the district needs to phase this process in is because of class size issues at the schools. The district wants to be sure class sizes are not compromised. If there is a third- or fourth-grade student who submitted an application two weeks prior to start date, that student is not guaranteed a seat in the classroom, but the student would receive priority on the wait list.

Dr. Sebring commented the choice schools have been ensured their programs will not change to accommodate families in the neighborhood. Families can have the choice to opt in or not but there will be another school for the family to choose.

Ms. Nigut commented the district is trying to align the choice schools' boundaries with the open enrollment policy. When a family chooses to open enroll their child within the district, the policy specifically states on the open enrollment form that acceptance is contingent upon good behavior, good attendance, etc. The same philosophy applies to the choice schools. They have some of the same policies in place. The neighborhood students who want to attend a choice school are still required to abide by the individual school's policies. If students do not abide by the policies, the student's enrollment will be evaluated. The goal is consistency between open enrollment and choice schools' enrollment.

Ms. Nigut responded to concerns about between- district open enrollment and within-district open enrollment. Between-district open enrollment is governed by statute. The district cannot change the statute that states the district cannot give priority to students within the district first. To the extent the district has a diversity plan, which we do, and the diversity plan is not negatively impacted, and space availability is not an issue, the student can be accepted. That is the governing principle with respect to between-district open enrollment. This designation of choice schools applies to the choice schools that have an application process. Edmunds and King do not accept enrollment based upon applications. They are considered neighborhood schools. That is why those two schools are not included in this boundary proposal. To give a priority to the district's within-district students, they are required to file for open enrollment once while they are students in our district. Previously, students were required to re-file their paperwork if they entered middle school and again when they entered high school. The district will no longer require that process. Ms. Nigut reiterated the choice school boundary proposal was suggested by the Facilities Advisory Committee. She stated this is a step the district is proposing and determination will be made as to whether the district can expand from the quarter-mile boundary. She stated the students on the current waiting list will be grandfathered in. This process of accepting kindergarten students into the

classroom will begin in 2011. The process of requiring students to be 3 years of age before applying for enrollment in a choice school will begin in 2010.

Dr. Sebring commented that one of the issues that needed to be dealt with is establishing the boundaries and aligning that with the wait list process. Each choice school had their own procedures for their wait list. She also stated another step in this process will be developing a district-wide boundary study committee with recommendations.

Ms. Strong commented this subject has come before the Board previously. She emphasized the need to look at class sizes. Once this process has been implemented, the Board can take another look. She feels the quarter mile is small but a good start. She commented also that her hope was the district could offer a traditional school in each one of the regions. She wanted to clarify an open-enrolled student from outside the district is not provided transportation.

Ms. Nigut responded if a student applies for open enrollment, whether it is between or within district, it is specifically stated that transportation is not provided by the district.

Ms. Buckton asked about the number of students on the waiting lists at the choice schools.

Ms. Nigut responded that each school varies. She commented that many of the names on the wait lists are in the neighborhood of the school.

Ms. Buckton commented one of her concerns was how many students are open enrolling out of the district or choose to go to a private school because they didn't apply to the choice school in time and were frustrated. She asked how the district could get a measure on that.

Ms. Nigut reiterated the between-district open enrollment form is a state form that cannot be changed. There is not a space for families to state a reason for leaving the district.

Ms. Link asked why the district does not use a lottery instead of a wait list. Her concern was families that move into the community never get to take advantage of a choice school because they were not in the district from the time of birth.

Ms. Nigut responded this policy is more consistent with our open enrollment policy and increasing the age limit to 3 years old will hopefully alleviate that problem.

Dr. Sebring commented this is not a perfect system but it is a step and possibly a lottery will be the goal in the end but is too extreme at this point.

Item No. 15**Page 4 of 5**

Ms. Link asked how a school decides if they have an application — how do they become a choice school? She feels the school is popular because it has implemented an application process, not because of the fundamental belief of the school.

Dr. Sebring commented the choice schools have been in place for some time now and was not sure what the schools did to become choice schools.

Mr. Murphy asked what constitutes a “traditional” school that differs from other programs the district has started in other schools in the district.

Ms. Strong cited a primary difference between a traditional school and other schools: traditional schools spend more time on the core subjects and give up time on PE, art and music. Choice schools have implemented a dress code also.

Dr. Sebring commented the traditional schools tend to have more emphasis in the core areas and generally a different curriculum than the district-wide curriculum. She feels the neighborhood schools can accomplish the same thing that has been restricted to choice schools in the past.

Ms. Caldwell-Johnson commented choice schools often had higher grading scales.

Ms. Woods and Ms. Strong commented the choice schools ask parents and students to sign a contract in regard to the school’s philosophy and it is reviewed every year.

Ms. Link asked why King-Perkins does not have an application process when the other choice schools do.

Dr. Sebring stated that King-Perkins evolved differently because of their critical placement geographically in the city when the desegregation plans were implemented by federal laws. In recent years, King-Perkins has served the neighborhood pretty well. She also believes the district is at a point (as well as other districts) where every school is unique in their own way. She commented that Edmunds has a unique history because in the middle of the desegregation, their enrollment was down. Edmunds is now a neighborhood school so the enrollment is up.

Ms. Strong commented there are differences in all of the schools in the district from parent/teacher groups, after-school programs, block scheduling, etc., depending on the needs of the neighborhoods.

Ms. Link suggested an application for every school.

Ms. Boesen and Dr. Sebring commented that essentially every school does have an application process through open enrollment. Anyone can apply to any school in the district at any time through open enrollment.

Mr. Murphy commented that Des Moines residents should be counted on a waiting list. The district can turn down an open enrollment if the school is full. For example, if a student from another district wants to open enroll in a Des Moines school. Des Moines residents should have the opportunity to enroll ahead of an out-of-district student. He is questioning the uniqueness of the choice school because the district has been cutting music, art and PE all over the district.

Ms. Link commented the choice schools are popular because they have an application process, not because of the school's philosophy.

Ms. Caldwell-Johnson asked what the Edulog report is that is mentioned in the attachment.

Ms. Nigut responded the Edulog report is a transportation tool.

Ms. Caldwell-Johnson commented the real issue is density in the neighborhoods of choice schools.

Dr. Sebring stated the density issue had been discussed with building principals and felt this process would take longer to implement if each choice school had a different boundary radius. It was decided to start with a quarter mile for every school, get the enrollment and wait list system in place, and once the wait list and quarter-mile students are transitioned, then go back to each school and revisit the density issue.

Mr. Murphy stated that most of his comments from the public concerned the Jefferson area and the quarter-mile boundary will not affect a lot of residents in that area.

Dr. Sebring commented the committee charged with the boundary issue was very well aware of the concerns and particularly the Jefferson area and reiterated that this is only a first step and is a work in progress.

Ms. Strong is in support of the choice school boundary issue and realizes this is an important step for the district to establish consistency within the district. She is confident the quarter mile will be expanded.

Dr. Sebring stated the Board could bring back any individual school boundary at any time and discuss that boundary individually if necessary.

Ms. Nigut commented that the principals at these choice schools are very aware that this is a continual work in progress.

Item No. 16**Page 1 of 3****Subject: MONITORING REPORT FOR MANAGEMENT LIMITATION 2.3 —
FINANCIAL CONDITION & ACTIVITIES FOR THE QUARTER ENDING
DECEMBER 31, 2009****For: ACTION****Contact: Patricia Schroeder**
(patricia.schroeder@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-8527)**Attachment: 10-006**

Issue: Board Governance Policy 3.4 — Monitoring Superintendent Performance includes a schedule relative to monitoring reports that requires a quarterly monitoring report on Management Limitation 2.3 — Financial Condition and Activities.

Superintendent's Recommendation: The superintendent recommends the Board receive, discuss and take action on the quarterly monitoring report for Management Limitation 2.3 — Financial Condition and Activities for the quarter ending December 31, 2009.

Background: The Management Limitation 2.3 — Financial Condition and Activities Monitoring Report is included as Attachment 10-006. This report covers the quarterly period from October 1, 2009, to December 31, 2009, unless otherwise stated.

Management Limitation 2.3 states: With respect to actual ongoing condition of the district financial resources, the superintendent shall not cause or allow the development of fiscal jeopardy, or a material deviation of actual expenditures from the Board's Ends priorities.

Accordingly, the superintendent shall not:

1. Fail to provide quarterly summaries of the financial condition of the district.
2. Fail to settle district payroll obligations and payables in a timely manner.
3. Fail to implement prudent competitive quoting procedures for all facility improvement projects in an amount that meets or exceeds the competitive quote threshold as established by Iowa law.
4. Fail to implement prudent competitive bidding procedures for all facility improvement projects in the amount of \$100,000 or more.
5. Fail to implement prudent competitive procedures, including but not limited to RFPs, for purchasing products and securing contractual and professional services.
6. Obligate the district to contracts or expenditures greater than \$25,000.
7. Acquire, lease or dispose of real property.
8. Invest funds in securities contrary to state law.
9. Allow tax payments or other governmental ordered payments or filings to be overdue or inaccurately filed.

Item No. 16**Page 2 of 3**

Minutes

Patti Schroeder presented the quarterly Monitoring Report 2.3. She pointed out one area of non-compliance and the remainder of the report is compliant.

Ms. Caldwell-Johnson moved to approve the monitoring report as presented. Second by Link.

Ms. Strong commented she appreciates the thoroughness and good explanation of the report.

Mr. Murphy wanted to confirm the district's solvency ratio is 3.3 percent.

Ms. Schroeder confirmed as of June 30, 2009, the audited solvency ratio was 3.3 percent.

Mr. Murphy asked if the district can go below that if necessary.

Ms. Schroeder commented the Management Limitation talks about 3 percent.

Ms. Buckton responded the Board put the administration's position of reporting non-compliance unless the Board changes that 3 percent target to something else under the circumstances. She suggested the last Monitoring Report of this fiscal year would be a good time to talk about that.

Dr. Sebring commented on the law that was recently passed and asked Ms. Schroeder to explain that law.

Ms. Schroeder explained the law talks about the School Budget Review committee taking a more active role in looking at what they believe might be excessive, undesignated, unrestricted fund balances and they define that as being 25 percent of total expenditures and that will go down to 20 percent. At 3 percent the district is not close. The law also states if an organization wants to come to the School Budget Review Committee and ask for modified allowable growth, the committee could look at the district's fund balance. If it is excessive, the district would be required to use the fund balance before talking about modified allowable growth.

Ms. Caldwell-Johnson asked about the report of non-compliance and whether the purchasing policy was not followed before Board approval or subsequent to Board approval.

Ms. Schroeder responded purchases were approved subsequent to Board approval.

Item No. 16**Page 3 of 3**

Ms. Caldwell-Johnson wanted clarification on the printing press that was purchased as a result of a bank repossession. She wanted clarification on the sequence of events on this purchase.

Ms. Schroeder explained how the opportunity to purchase the press came about. The decision needed to be made very quickly. The purchasing policies that should have been followed should have been a quick competitive bid process, however she believes the outcome would have remained the same because the press was sold to the district at a much reduced rate. The district did not go through that process and should have done that.

Ms. Nigut clarified that since the Board did approve two purchases in excess of \$25,000 that piece of the limitation could state there was approval but where the non-compliance came in, is under No. 5 where the district did not follow the RFP process.

Ms. Caldwell-Johnson stressed the importance of explaining the non-compliance so the public understands how this happened.

Fire Alarm 7:15 p.m.

Resume 7:35 p.m.

Ms. Buckton commented on the schedule in the report that references the re-estimated fiscal 2010 budget and all the federal funds in this section, Title I, etc. She asked if these funds extend for a one- or two-year period.

Ms. Schroeder commented in this case this is two years of money; \$14 million represents the state budget stabilization and the remainder would be IDEA and Title I. Other federal programs might be one year's worth of money because the district receives it in yearly increments.

Aye: Boesen, Buckton, Caldwell-Johnson, Link, Murphy, Strong, Woods

Nay: None

Motion carried.

Item No. 17**Page 1 of 5****Subject: PERSISTENTLY LOWEST-ACHIEVING SCHOOLS****For: INFORMATION****Contact: Nancy Sebring**
(superintendent@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-7766)**Attachments: 10-008**

Issue: The Iowa Department of Education recently named the 35 persistently lowest-achieving schools in Iowa.

Superintendent's Recommendation: The superintendent recommends the Board members receive and discuss information on the persistently lowest-achieving schools within the Des Moines Public Schools.

Presenters: Nancy Sebring, superintendent.

Background: The district was notified that nine district schools are included on the state's list of persistently lowest-achieving schools. These schools are Edmunds Academy of Fine Arts; Hoyt, McCombs, Meredith and Weeks middle schools; and East, Hoover, Lincoln and North high schools. Information on how the schools were identified will be provided, as well as a timeline to address improvement plans.

Minutes

Speakers: Melissa Spencer, Teacher at North High School, 4922 Twana Drive
Alan Young, DMEA President

Ms. Boesen stated the district was notified that nine district schools are included on the state's list of persistently lowest-achieving schools. The schools are Edmunds, Academy of Fine Arts; Hoyt, McCombs, Meredith and Weeks middle schools; East, Hoover, Lincoln and North high schools. Dr. Sebring will explain the procedure and present some ideas the district has to get the schools off the list.

Dr. Sebring presented her PowerPoint. She commented on the state's application for Race to the Top (RTTT) grant. A couple things to know about RTTT are the district did not sign the MOU for reasons that were described at the last meeting. The district does believe the RTTT criteria is being touted as the blueprint for what will be the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, more commonly known as the No Child Left Behind Act. Under the RTTT criteria, there were some critical components that had to be addressed. One was that the state had to present a reformed agenda for education. The state had to address standards and assessments, implement a statewide data system, define effective teachers and leaders, and address how to develop effective teachers and leaders through professional development. There was also a component of the RTTT criteria about addressing persistently low-achieving

Item No. 17**Page 2 of 5**

schools. Prior to the district's understanding of RTTT, the district had been told a couple of things by the Department of Education. One was the state would not be submitting a RTTT application and two, there was a possibility the state would not receive the final installments of the federal stabilization dollars stimulus funds that districts over the state of Iowa had built into this year's budget because the Legislature distributed the funds to schools that way. Ninety-three percent of that money was put into school budgets for this year. This past fall when the district was notified there might be a problem getting the final installments of the stabilization money, superintendents everywhere were concerned about the reasons for that. The federal department changed the rules in the middle of distribution of the stabilization dollars and when the rules changed districts were told they would not get the money unless the districts took some steps. One of the steps was to identify the lowest 5 percent performing schools in the state. Every state had to do this. Every state's calculation of the lowest 5 percent performing schools is based on their own state assessments; every state's calculation is different. Comparability across state lines is difficult but within a state, the comparison is similar. For the state to identify its persistently low-achieving schools, there were several variables that had to be considered in the calculation. The poverty rate of the schools had to be 35 percent or higher to be considered for placement on the list. The proficiency score had to average, over the previous three years, less than 67 percent proficiency in reading and math. All the students' scores over three years were funneled through some mathematical formulas and then brought down to one number. Over the three-year window, there had to be a flat or downward trajectory in terms of the number of students who were proficient. Dr. Sebring commented on a remark by one of the UEN superintendents at their recent meetings that there were schools in their district that were lower performing than the ones identified on the list, but because that school did not meet the 35 percent poverty threshold, it were not on the list. There is a tie to the federal Title I funds. The mechanism by which NCLB was implemented and sanctions were imposed was all through Title I. That was the money used to identify either supplemental dollars for improvement or dollars for sanctions, etc. Dr. Sebring commented on a new program available to schools under which they could apply for school improvement funds. The Department of Education has been asked what they know about applying for the SIG (School Improvement Grant) money, who is going to be eligible, and what the rules are and at one time, superintendents believed the SIG funds fell under the RTTT funds. However, it has become evident RTTT and SIG are two different federal programs so it was not necessary to sign onto RTTT to be eligible to apply for SIG funds. The SIG funds are federal funds used to improve the performance of persistently low-achieving schools. There is a list of four intervention models and the district will be directed to choose one of the four. The models are turnaround, restart, closure or transformation. The district needs to look at a more dramatic intervention into the low-achieving schools than was allowed under NCLB. Turnaround is relatively new thinking in low achieving schools. The premise is to turn the schools' performance around very quickly. All of the intervention models are explained in the attachment. Requirements the district must address in low-achieving schools are listed in the attachment under planning and preparing. Dr. Sebring commented the district has been in contact with the Iowa Department of Education daily

Item No. 17**Page 3 of 5**

and the DE is working as quickly as they can to get information on how to address PLA schools to local districts from the federal Department of Education.

Dr. Sebring, a member of the teacher's association, and a Board member are asked to attend a meeting on February 12 to learn about guidelines for applications for the SIG funds. She is meeting with the staff of the schools that are PLA schools to get input on how to address the issues. She feels there are already plans in place to begin to address the achievement issue such as new math curriculum, plans for professional development, etc.

Mr. Murphy asked about closing schools and if the district closed a school, students need to attend a school that has a higher achievement rate and if so, are students limited to staying within the district?

Dr. Sebring responded yes.

Mr. Murphy commented that four of the district's high schools are on this list and if that is the case, do some of those schools have higher proficiency levels than others?

Dr. Sebring responded that the proficiency ranges are different in those schools and until the district really knows the rules, she cannot answer that question for sure. She added there would have to be space within those high schools.

Mr. Murphy asked if SIG funds would be in addition to Title I funds.

Dr. Sebring responded those funds would be in addition to Title I funds.

Ms. Buckton commented this is a case between urgent and important. The district wants to get PLA schools off the list, which takes different strategies and approaches. What is important is the district wants every student to graduate from DMPS having understood 21st-century Ends policies that should be in every classroom, every teacher has this policy and are trained to deliver this policy. She has heard many times there are formative assessments in the classroom that are helping teachers understand what progress is being made. Ms. Buckton requested the Board see results of some of the assessments that are being used so they know students are on the path they need to be on.

Dr. Sebring responded the secondary schools have more difficulty implementing assessments and strategies than elementary and middle schools. She feels going to block scheduling will help.

Ms. Caldwell-Johnson commented the tool the district uses (ITBS) is not effective and asked what the Board needs to do to get another form of assessment.

Item No. 17**Page 4 of 5**

Dr. Sebring stated this topic has been on the agenda for discussion among the UEN superintendents in the past, as well as Metro-area superintendents. The conversation has taken place many times with the Department of Education. The response is this is the agreement that has been made with the federal Department of Education and they will not open that agreement. She added that during the time the discussion was taking place the economy was not going in a direction that would allow the implementation of a new test. Dr. Sebring stated there is a national movement to implement national standards and a national assessment.

Ms. Caldwell-Johnson asked when the Board will have a work session on turnaround and what the district and Board will be considering.

Dr. Sebring responded as soon as it can be scheduled. She addressed the issue about the collective bargaining requirement also. When she met with Metro superintendents on Sunday, the message they did not want to send was they did not want to collaborate with teachers and work with teachers, but they wanted to in some way be guaranteed the teachers who participated in the bargaining process were the teachers who work in the schools where the work will be done.

Ms. Strong asked about the timeline in implementing any type of intervention model.

Dr. Sebring stated it appears the timeline for the state proposal will be submitted for SIG funds very soon and probably in the spring districts will be able to submit their applications to the state. It is still unknown what will be required in that application. There is not a lot of time to develop an improvement plan but the district could document the steps the district is already taking so it will be enough of a start to demonstrate that this district would qualify for those grants.

Mr. Murphy asked if an agreement in the negotiation process is not reached, would it go to mediation.

Dr. Sebring responded there is a 45-day timeline to reach agreement. If an agreement is not reached within 45 days a mediator is called in who will assist both parties over the next 30 days.

Mr. Murphy asked what happens if an agreement is not reached at that time.

Dr. Sebring responded the district would not receive any federal money but the district would continue to work with teachers in those schools and through whatever resources were already available within the district, and work toward closing the achievement gap.

Ms. Strong asked what the timeline would be in the case the district was not granted any federal funds.

Item No. 17**Page 5 of 5**

Dr. Sebring responded the interventions would be stretched over a longer period of time because of a lack of resources.

Ms. Link asked how often the PLA schools list is released.

Dr. Sebring responded the list is issued annually and the list can change every year. If a school applies and received funds they have a three-year window to do the work.

Mr. Murphy asked whether federal money would leave Iowa and go to other states because Iowa's low-achieving schools are traditionally higher than other states and was concerned Iowa could lose out because those funds would be needed in states that traditionally do not implement programs to raise their achievement level.

Dr. Sebring addressed the Hiatt-North merger. She commented this suggestion had been made after visiting schools around the country and seeing some exemplary 6-12 schools where dynamic changes are happening. After Spence Evans was announced as the principal at North High, he came to Dr. Sebring and wanted to talk about a 6-12 school at North. A message she has heard from the North High staff is if they could get kids to North, they would stay. What has happened in the district is between eighth and ninth grade, students elect to go to other high schools. Students in the North High feeder pattern are not going to North. She felt this would be a good conversation to have with teachers at Hiatt and North. Dr. Sebring asked the North staff if there would be a benefit to having students on campus from sixth through 12th grade considering there would be money available to put reforms in place. Programs could begin to build early. The idea may not go anywhere. It was with good intentions that the conversation began. It was not about North being low achieving. If the North-Hiatt merge is recommended it will be a part of a school improvement plan.

Ms. Buckton stressed the importance of the Board and district figuring out what it will take for students to succeed and what measure will indicate the implementations are successful.

Item No. 18
Page 1 of 3**Subject: GRADUATION CREDIT REQUIREMENTS EFFECTIVE WITH THE 2010-2011 NINTH-GRADE CLASS****For: DISCUSSION****Contact: Connie Cook**
(connie.cook@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-7725)**Attachment: None**

Issue: Our graduation requirements need to be updated to reflect the recommendations of the Iowa Core Curriculum.

Superintendent's Recommendation: The superintendent recommends the Board discuss the proposed graduation requirements.

Presenters: Connie Cook, JoEllen Latham, David Johns

Background: Des Moines graduation requirements were last changed in 2005. The Iowa Core Curriculum presents the concepts and skills to be learned across 9-12 grade bands; this provides the opportunity to deliver high school courses in a more integrated manner.

These graduation requirements will apply to students starting with the 2010-2011 ninth-grade class. A total of 23 units of credit will be required for graduation, including physical education. These graduation requirements will apply to the graduating class of 2014.

Social Studies	3 credits	
History (at least 1.0 U.S. History)*	2 credits	Required (see course catalog for options)
Government	.5 credit	Required
Economics or Micro/Macro Economics	.5 credit	Required
English	4 credits	
English 1	1 credit	Required
English 2 (speech integrated)	1 credit	Required
English 3	1 credit	Required
Additional English Courses	1 credit	See course catalog for options
Mathematics	3 credits	
Algebra I	1 credit	Required
Geometry		
Algebra II		
Pre Calculus		
Calculus		
Probability and Statistics		
Additional Mathematics Courses		See course catalog for options

Item No. 18
Page 2 of 3

Science	3 credits	
Biology, Chemistry, Physics		
Earth Science		
Environmental Science		
Additional Science Courses		See course catalog for options
Applied or Fine Arts	1.5 credits	See course catalog for options
Art		
Business		
Family and Consumer Sciences		
Music		
Technology Education		
Drama		
Speech		
Physical Education	1 credit	Required
Electives	7.5 credits	See course catalog for options
TOTAL	23 Credits	

Minutes

Speakers: Sara Nichols, Teacher at North High School, 2501 44th Street
 Jim Patch, 2803 Stanton

Connie Cook, JoEllen Latham, and David Johns presented information and updates on the graduation requirements. There are no changes in the number of requirements. The changes are in the title changes.

The Board was presented with a brief overview of the Iowa Core Curriculum.

Mr. Johns reiterated there are no changes in the total number of credits required but the changes add some clarity in certain subject areas. He pointed out a change under History credits: at least one credit under History must be U.S. History.

Ms. Latham stated the English credits required do not change from 4.0. The current status requires students take English 9,10, 11, .5 of speech and .5 of an English elective. One of the requirements of the Iowa Core is the integration of reading, writing, listening speaking and viewing. The concept of speaking and communication is not isolated to a single course but integrated in all the English core courses. A couple of changes being proposed are English 9, 10 and 11 will now be referred to as English 1, 2, and 3 and English 4 being the elective and many options for flexibility. Part of this is for NCAA accreditation and the other part of the Iowa Core is it is a 9-12 competency and trying to get away from this is what you do in 9th grade, 10th grade, etc. The committee is proposing that speech be brought into all of the core English classes and would have a

Item No. 18**Page 3 of 3**

specific focus in English 2. Speech would still be offered as a class but it would be an elective and more focused on public speaking performance. There will be another team studying this further this summer. They also have worked with admission directors from the three universities.

Ms. Cook stated these proposals would take effect with incoming ninth-grade students for the fall of 2010.

Ms. Buckton asked if an eighth-grade student takes an advanced math course, does it count as a high school credit.

Ms. Cook responded yes, it would count for a high school credit.

Ms. Buckton asked about career plans for eighth-grade students and the courses they will take. Does the district think differently about delivery of middle school courses.

Mr. Johns responded the Iowa Core is a K-12 model and there is a model for grades 6-8.

Mr. Murphy commented on the speech/English and is concerned about the ELL students who need more communication skills and stressed the importance of these students having the opportunity to take speech.

Ms. Latham assured the Board that oral speaking would be considered when they put the final proposal together.

Item No. 19
Page 1 of 3**Subject: REVISED — SALE OF STATEWIDE PENNY SALES TAX BONDS, SERIES 2010****For: ACTION****Contact: Patti Schroeder**

(patricia.schroeder@dmps.k12.ia.us; 242-8527)

Attachments: None

Issue: Sale of \$70 million School Infrastructure Sales, Services and Use Tax Revenue Bonds, Series 2010.

Superintendent's Recommendation: The Superintendent recommends that the Board take action by resolution to approve the Sale of \$70,000,000 School Infrastructure Sales, Services and Use Tax Revenue Bonds, Series 2010 to **J. P. Morgan Securities, Inc.**

Presenter: Patti Schroeder and Jon Burmeister (PFM) available for questions.

Background: On February 2, the Board Secretary (Chief Financial Officer) at the direction of the Board by resolution at their Board meeting, January 19, 2010, will receive bids for the sale of \$70 million in Tax Revenue Bonds (with the close of the sale on or about March 1, 2010). The bids **(8) were** tabulated by Public Financial Management (PFM) on February 2 and the bid sheet, including the recommended successful bidder **with the lowest overall true interest cost (TIC), is being** handed out at the February 2 board meeting.

The timeline for the current bond issuance is:

DATE	BONDS
February Board Meeting - February 2, 2010	Receive Bids and Award Bonds
February Board Meeting - February 16, 2010	Formalize Bond Issuance
March 1, 2010 (no board action needed)	Bond closing

Therefore, consistent with the direction of the Board, it is recommended that the Board adopt a resolution to authorize the sale and issuance of \$70 million School Infrastructure Sales, Services and Use Tax Revenue Bonds, Series 2010. Based on this action, the Chief Financial Officer will take necessary and appropriate actions in consultation with PFM, the District's financial advisor, and Ahlers and Cooney, P.C., bond counsel, to finalize the sale of the School Infrastructure Bonds.

(See next page for copy of the resolution authorizing bond sale.)

RESOLUTION TO DIRECT AND AUTHORIZE THE SALE AND ISSUANCE OF \$70,000,000 SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE SALES, SERVICES AND USE TAX REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2010

WHEREAS, the matter of the issuance of \$70,000,000 School Infrastructure Sales, Services and Use Tax Revenue Bonds, Series 2010, for the purpose of drop-off upgrades, window and door replacements, mechanical and electrical upgrades, technology upgrades, and infrastructure improvements within the District was discussed. It was the consensus that the District should offer the Bonds for sale as described in this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, this Board directs and authorizes the sale and issuance in the manner required by law of School Infrastructure Sales, Services and Use Tax Revenue Bonds; and

WHEREAS, the Secretary's action in preparing sale information as appropriate, distributing the same on behalf of the School District, and otherwise taking all action necessary to permit the sale of said Bonds on a basis favorable to the School District and acceptable to this Board is hereby ratified, confirmed and approved.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE DES MOINES COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, IN THE COUNTIES OF POLK AND WARREN, STATE OF IOWA:

Section 1. That this Board does hereby accept the terms of the proposal (copy attached hereto) submitted by **J.P. Morgan Securities, Inc.** and takes action to permit the sale and delivery of the same.

Section 2. That the Official Statement (terms of offering) and the form of contract for the sale of the Bonds are approved and the President and Secretary are authorized and directed to execute the contract for sale of the Bonds on behalf of the School District.

PASSED AND APPROVED this 2nd day of February, 2010.

President

ATTEST:

Minutes

Ms. Boesen introduced the issue. This was a discussion item at the last meeting and the Board needs to vote on this tonight. She stated this would move the renovation projects along faster and save money in the long run.

Ms. Schroeder confirmed this was the issue.

Item No. 19

Page 3 of 3

Ms. Caldwell-Johnson moved to approve the sale of the statewide penny sales tax bonds, Series 2010. Second by Woods.

Aye: Boesen, Buckton, Caldwell-Johnson, Link Murphy, Strong, Woods

Nay: None

Motion carried.