

AMPHITHEATER PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Tucson, Arizona

MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGARDING HIGH SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL TIME

Place, Date and Time of Meeting

Wetmore Center, 701 W. Wetmore Road, Leadership and Professional Development Building, Tucson, AZ
85705, September 27, 2016 at 5:00 PM

Committee Members and Facilitators Present

Joe Paddock, Director of Interscholastic Activities
Mike Robinette, AEA Representative
Mike Bejarano, Chief Academic Officer of Secondary Education
Tassi Call, Facilitator and Co-Chair
Wendy Biallas-Odell, Facilitator and Co-Chair

Canyon del Oro High School:

Paul DeWeerd
Carol Trejo
Sandy DuPlain
Nina Godlewski
Stephen Rothkoff
Sarah Stuart

Ironwood Ridge High School:

Kersten Kremer
Hope Goldsmith
Paul DesJarlais
Susan Williams
Jenny Een

Amphitheater High School:

John Lansa
Deborah Ingram
Marian Johnson
Lisa Millerd

Committee Members and Facilitators Absent

Amphitheater High School:

Vanessa Ruiz
Eric Rossi

Ironwood Ridge High School:

Natalie Burnett
Christian Sandoval

Canyon Del Oro:

Mitch Bohenkamp

Others Present

Tina Mehren

Karen S. Gardiner, Administrative Assistant to the Governing Board

Call to Order

Ms. Call called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM and asked all in attendance to rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

Facilitators and Co-chairs Ms. Tassi Call and Ms. Wendy Biallas-Odell

Welcome and Roll Call

Facilitators and Co-chairs Ms. Tassi Call and Ms. Wendy Biallas-Odell

Ms. Call welcomed guests and Advisory Committee Members. She introduced herself and Ms. Biallas-Odell as the Facilitators and Co-Chairs of the committee. Ms. Gardiner led roll call to verify attendance.

Announcement of Date and Place of Next Advisory Committee Meeting

Tuesday, October 18, 2016, 5:00 PM - 7:00 PM, 701 W. Wetmore Road, Leadership and Professional Development Center

Ms. Biallas-Odell announced that the date and place of the next Advisory Committee meeting is Tuesday, October 18th, 5:00 - 7:00 PM, here in the Leadership and Professional Development Building. **(Fall Break is October 10th - 14th.)** The meeting schedule, as well as information regarding the Committee and meeting minutes, are available on the Amphitheater website at www.amphi.com, under Quick Links, Advisory Committee Regarding High School Instructional Scheduling.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT¹

There was no public comment.

Ms. Biallas-Odell announced some housekeeping before getting started. A little housekeeping before we get started. The Advisory Committee is an official committee of the Governing Board and as such who is speaking, and as much as possible, what is said needs to be noted. In order to maintain good order during discussion and questions Committee Members should raise their hand to be acknowledged by the facilitators and speak in turn as acknowledged. As a reminder, there is a microphone at each table. Whenever a Committee Member has raised their hand and has been recognized to speak or ask questions, please assure the microphone gets passed down to the speaker. Speakers, please use a microphone. This is necessary for the official recording of the meeting, for the minutes notes Ms. Gardiner is taking and so that you can be heard by everyone. Thank you.

2. AGENDA

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Board Book Information: *Minutes from the August 30th meeting were submitted for approval.*

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50217094>, Item 2.A.] (Exhibit 1)

Ms., Biallas-Odell asked for a motion to approve the Meeting Minutes for the August 30, 2016 meeting. Mr. Paddock moved to approve the minutes as submitted and Mr. Bejarano seconded the motion. Motion carried 22-0.

B. Presentation: Scott Little Questions and Answers

Board Book Information: *Scott Little, Chief Financial Officer, will answer questions that the Advisory Committee has submitted, and other questions they may have, regarding funding, the District budget and the impact that changes to high school instructional scheduling would have on funding and the budget.*

The questions that were submitted are:

1. *What is the budget impact of changing our current 6/6/6/4?*

2. *What are the budget ramifications of doing a 6/6/5/5 vs the current 6/6/6/4?*

3. Clarification on financial implications when seniors are not fulltime students. (\$150,000-\$200,000)

4. Clarify loss of funding when students take JTED and CTE.

This information is provided for the Advisory Committee's understanding of how funding and the District budget are affected by and work in conjunction with master schedules and instructional hour considerations.

[\[https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50217094\]](https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50217094), Item 2.B.] (Exhibit 2)

Board Book Note: There are still issues with the floor boxes the microphones hook into picking up on the audio recording. The vendor who installed the system is working the problem. A recording was also taken on cell phone in meeting mode. Some sections may be inaudible.

Ms. Biallas-Odell introduced Item 2.B. and asked Mr. Mr. Little to review and clarify the financial information presented at the August 30, 2016 meeting and answer questions submitted by the Advisory Committee via email.

Mr. Little provided finance information in a PowerPoint presentation. State Statute 15-901 is the definition section that really pertains to all school finance issues. Contained in that is what is defined as a full-time student. They make reference to a minimum of four subjects and at least 720 hours for a 180-day school year. That is the statutory reference to the minimum requirements. In addition the Arizona Department of Education has a guidance document which is Policy GE-18 that everyone was provided at the August 30th meeting, which is a multipage document that goes on to clarify what qualifies as instructional time pursuant to the requirements of statute. Arizona Revised Statute has defined instructional time as were the students are engaged in regular scheduled instruction. Instructional hours provided by the school are characterized by a teacher who is teaching to an objective that is taken from the academic standards approved by the State Board of Education using curriculum materials adopted by the school board and assessed for student performance. Using those definitions lunch, passing time and assemblies do not count as instructional time. The State modified instructional time in the 2013 legislative session. If you go to the policy document it makes reference to the new numbers beginning in the 2012-2013 year where it defines a full-time student as a student in grades 9-12 who must be enrolled in four or more subjects which count towards graduation, each subject must meet a minimum of 123 hours for the required number of days of 180 days during the school year. Or four or more subjects combined must meet at least 720 hours for a 180-day school year. So the issue of where the 180 comes from is 720 divided by 4 periods equals the 180 hour requirement that everyone discusses. A little note, there is a provision in law that allows school districts to provide the equivalent of 180 days. Amphitheater works on a 178-day school year so we have 2 less days which means we have to spread that time over 178 days versus 180 days. An item you want to note when comparing us to other Districts is those 2 days' time gets spread across all periods in order to not attend those two physical days. All of this is driven by a funding formula. The State formula basically says that if a student is not attending the full 720 hours, our funding gets prorated. The Statute further defines how that proration works. These are the instructional hours required by Statute. 9th - 12th Grade is 720 hours, 7th and 8th Grade is at 1,000 hours, 4th - 6th Grade is 890 hours. For the purposes of our discussion we are talking about calculations at 9th -12th Grade.

When talking about the financial implications of 5 classes as full-time, right now each class counts as 25% funding. If a student is taking 4 classes it equals 100%, 3 classes 75%, 2 classes 50%. Going to a 5 period model means that a student who takes 1 class we will get no funding for, a student who takes 2 classes will only get 25% funding for, a student who takes 3 classes will get 50% funding, 4 classes 75% funding and 5 classes and above 100% funding. The formula will cause us to be penalized going to a 5 period model based upon how we are currently configured. Based that the numbers we had at the start of the school year we have 195 students who are carrying 4 or less classes. Assuming no other change other than going to a 5 period full-time model, that change would result in a funding loss of about \$221,000 annually. Nothing else, just changing that model to 5 periods equals full-time instead of 4 periods, we know we have students based upon historical trends who will not qualify for funding. During the last presentation someone did ask me to clarify students who are carrying 4 or fewer classes. This year we have 7 students carrying only 1 class, 10 students carrying only 3 classes, the rest are carrying 4 classes totaling 195. How have other school districts actually done this? Most of the Districts that run a 5 period model as full-time have graduation requirements that are higher than our, most commonly 24 credits. They've added to their graduation requirements which makes it real simple - 4 years, 6 classes every year produces the 24 credits needed to graduate. If the District chose to make a move to 5 periods as full-time, we

could potentially if we did some form of a change to cause more classes to be taken in later years, it would still take 4 years until those changes actually resulted in the loss disappearing. As with most graduation credit items, the changes are made for the upcoming Freshman class and not imposed on the class that is in their final years. It can take up to 4 years for that funding loss to go away [arranging the schedule so that students had to take a certain number of classes] if we went to what I think was proposed a 5/5/6/6 or 6/6/5/5. Ultimately there are staffing issues that would come from changing the model resulting in teachers teaching 6 classes as their regular load instead of 5 classes as their regular load.

So to address the questions that were asked. What is the budget impact of changing our current 6/6/6/4? The budget impact of changing from 6/6/4/4 is \$221,000 per year until next years 2017-2018 Freshmen become seniors and hopefully correct the problem. Roughly \$750,000 over 3 years' worth of funding loss until that future Freshman class arrive needing additional credit in there later school years. The next question is, clarification on financial implications when seniors are not full-time students. I am not really sure what the question is. Whatever happens it will be impacted. If a student currently is only carrying 3 classes that is 75% funding. If using a 5 class as full-time model then 3 classes would only be 50% funding. So in all situations there would be approximately a 25% loss in funding. Next question, clarify loss of funding when students take JTED and CTE. I am probably not the best person to answer this question. There are going to be implication of changing the model relative to CTE and JTE courses. Going to a 5 period versus 4 period model means fewer students could take JTED classes which means fewer funds that come back to the District fund classes. The implications would be better answered by our Career and Technical Education Director Patti Greenleaf. But when we require students to take one more additional class that is one less JTED class they can generate which is less funding to the JTED which trickles back to us. Above and beyond the number I presented here there would be funding impacts to JTED, but exactly what that would mean is something JTED would have to better explain. Probably we are talking significant programmatic changes to what JTED can offer in that environment. With that I can try to answer any other questions.

Ms. Een: Some financial implications are speculative, right? The financial implication that is sure right now would be the \$221,000, but you can't tell that we wouldn't change different policies, etc., so it's not for sure that the other things would happen like the increase in staffing, or the trend of not enough students being enrolled in classes. Some are speculation; some is not on paper financial implications every year. Yes, no?

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Can I clarify the question?

Ms. Een: Some of it is speculative. The black and white financial implication of \$221,000 that would be true if everything remains status quo, if we didn't change around the culture or make some sort of suggestions that students have to take these classes, or whatever.

Ms. Biallas-Odell: I believe Mr. Little that she is asking that the \$221,000 would be the ramifications if we changed nothing else. Is that correct?

Mr. Little: Correct.

Ms. Biallas-Odell: And if we make some additional changes, we can only speculate what the financial ramifications can be?

Mr. Little: Correct.

Ms. Stuart: I think I asked the question regarding JTED and actually what I asked was right now based on the numbers you gave, 78 are taking 4 classes out of 195. So how many of those, without knowing what their classes are those are the ones considered full-time because they are taking 4 classes, correct?

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Can I clarify that Mr. Little, because I believe when you said 195 students, I believe that number was 178.

Mr. Little: Correct the number is 178 and then it is not counting the JTED classes because they are not part of our funding formula.

Ms. Stuart: Okay so these 178 they are taking 4 academic classes not including JTED. Or is one of those classes perhaps a JTED.

Mr. Little: None of those classes are JTED courses.

Ms. Stuart: So the 178 taking 4 classes there's no financial loss because one of the classes isn't JTED.

Mr. Little: The JTED is an entirely separate issue. JTED classes do not count toward our funding. The funding generated from those classes goes to the JTED who then in turn funds portions of our programs with it.

Ms. Stuart: Correct. It was my understanding at the last meeting you were at that you indicated that yes, some of those Seniors in their 4 classes that they are taking one might be JTED.

Mr. Little: I do not believe that to be correct. In no shape or form in those numbers are any students taking any JTED classes. If they are taking JTED that is a class above and beyond what we are reporting for funding purposes, which is what was presented on that slide.

Ms. Stuart: Okay, so that's the clarification, that's fine. So the 17 students that are taking 1, 2 or 3 classes combined we are already experiencing a loss with them, correct?

Mr. Little: Correct, we are already experiencing a loss.

Ms. Stuart: And I know it's only 17 students approximately what is that financial loss presently?

Mr. Little: Mathematically it would be 25% for each class less than four.

Mr. Stuart: Right per student but in terms of a dollar amount.

Mr. Little: Well if you wanted to approximate it you'd probably say every class at about \$1,400 to \$1,500 probably.

Ms. Stuart: Ok so \$1,500 times ...

Mr. Little: Ten of them taking 3 classes would be 10 classes at approximately \$1,500 apiece. For the other seven it would be 3 classes a piece at \$1,500. But none of those numbers are included which the impact already assumes we don't get that money, because we don't get that money.

Ms. Stuart: Right, but the point I am making is that we are experiencing a loss no matter how big or small with these 17 students. So I wanted to know how much that was so if we increased [classes], if they took more we'd actually be making more and that would be a way to maybe recover some money that is at a loss. Speculative but we are losing money already.

Mr. Little: Keeping in mind that is making the assumption that it takes 4 years to actually materialize. It also makes the assumption that some of them may be I fact 5th year Seniors, Special Education students who are carrying classes beyond their 18th birthday for Special Education Purposes. So there are other factors in there that we would have to consider. We cannot force students to take classes they do not need for graduation. The guaranteed way to make them take more classes is to increase the graduation requirement.

Ms. Stuart: Okay I may allow somebody else to point to that. Thank you for the clarification that of the 178 students we are talking about [in the example] as full-time, that none of those students, in their four classes, is taking a JTED class, but...

Mr. Little: That's not correct. I said none of them are carrying a JTED class for the purposes of our full-time funding calculation.

Ms. Stuart: Okay. So then you clarify, are they taking 5 classes then or 4?

Mr. Little: For the purposes of our funding they are taking 4 classes.

Ms. Stuart: Of those 4 classes, none of them are JTED?

Mr. Little: None of those 4 classes are JTED. If you are taking a JTED it is above and beyond the 4 that generate full-time for us.

Ms. Stuart: We are in agreement, okay. I just want to make sure, and maybe someone else wants to address the other issues, because we are not asking to increase graduation requirements we are looking for a redistribution of credits.

Mr. Little: Correct. And the redistribution of credits would take 4 years to take effect and would result in losses of funding until that new redistribution takes effect [for students in all grades]. So you would have the \$221,000 per year until next year's [2017-2018] Freshman class caught up with the new model of how you get them to take classes in their Freshman and Sophomore year.

Ms. Millerd: I was not at your first presentation so I am digesting [the information]. Let me make sure I am understanding this. Am I understanding that a full-time student has 4 courses, that's considered full-time every single year? Is that what full-time funding is?

Mr. Little: All funding is on a per year basis. To be considered a full-time student in any year its 4 classes for the full year produces the full-time funding.

Ms. Millerd: So if we are talking about a student being counted as a full-time student for funding purposes only, not credits for graduation, they only need to take 4 classes each year for funding purposes.

Mr. Little: Correct. Under the current 180 hours per class, 4 classes to count for full-time funding under the current configuration.

Ms. Millerd: As a 9-10 Grader they are taking the extra two six to make 6 periods... If we go to 6/6/5/5 [just rearranging how many in what year] I guess I don't get how that impacts funding because the students are still on a 4 period per funding per year, I don't see how that shifts to this other thing that you talked about. That's my confusion.

Mr. Little: I think I can address that. If we start a new formula like what we are talking about here, and we start it with next year's Freshmen [with a new formula of 6/6/5/5], we still have to deal with the students who are already in the stream right now, who are not following that [still under the old formula of 6/6/6/4]. It will take multiple years of flushing the students out of the system who are working under the old model until the new model actually produces the senior year in which the loss would disappear. So yes, for the student who starts that new formula, or the new way of allocating the class load, when they hit their Senior year it will not be an issue. But it's the issue of the students who are preceding that class will still have the issue for 3 years prior to that new configuration actually hitting its Senior year. Yes, that new configuration doesn't have the funding loss, but it takes many years for students to get from Freshmen to Seniors for that funding loss to disappear. *(It will take several years for the current students under the old 6/6/6/4 to graduate leaving only students on the new 6/6/5/5 model.)*

Ms. Millerd: But we are only talking about moving one Junior section to a Senior section, so it really doesn't impact Freshmen and Sophomores.

Ms. Call: Mr. Little why don't we clarify about how we cannot, what you spoke about with Seniors, we can't make it mandatory for seniors to take classes they do not need if they have met graduation requirements. I believe you spoke to that.

Mr. Little: Correct. By State law we cannot mandate that a student take a class they do not need for graduation. Those students have taken those classes based upon arriving at a graduation point their Senior year. They have all gone under a model. You have to keep in mind it is not all students. Out of our average Senior class of about 850 students we have 178 who take the bare minimum. It's those 178 we have to worry about, it's the 178 that cause the funding loss. Most students take more classes than they need, or whatever reason they chose to take it. They are not the ones we are worried about, it's the students only taking the minimum, the minimum they need to graduate, that causes the funding loss for us. Ultimately, if we change around when students take classes it may or may not...you can guess as to how it plays out. If a student only wants to take a few classes in their Senior year for reasons of work, etc., they go find online courses through a charter school to get what they want out of their Senior year. We can think we can change it around, but students have choices and the students will decide if it works for them or not, and if they don't feel that works for them they'll go acquire that credit somewhere else, and they do. We already experience a funding loss from students who are full-time with us who pursue classes from charter schools and the end result is that we are still providing full-time services for them, but we now have to share our full-time funding with a charter school provider because they went out and chose an alternative. And the repercussions of what you are talking about [changing to 6/6/5/5] could cause more students to pursue alternatives and could cause a funding loss above and beyond what we even know as real numbers of what will happen.

Ms. Millerd: I am still not understanding. The State mandates that a full-time student is 4 academic periods [classes] and all we are talking about is shifting when they take them in their Junior and Senior year, aren't they still considered full-time students with the four and the 5th is their elective or their other period, because it's not their core classes.

Ms. Biallas-Odell: (To clarify Ms. Millerd's question) Operating under a 4 class full-time model, would we lose funding if we have students take 6/6/5/5? My question would be in that model Lisa, are you saying only allow Juniors to take 5 courses?

Ms. Millerd: Not... we've already spoken about this. There are students who want to take more than what's required, so if you are a Junior and you have to do 4 classes to be a full-time student and you need your 5th class to meet graduation requirements you've now got the option to take something else and stay for 6 periods, as do the Seniors. Because students do that, sometimes.

Mr. Bejarano: I don't think that Mr. Little is saying is that we couldn't go to 6/6/5/5, but there's no guarantee that a student will stick around in their Senior year for 5 classes because they could have taken 6 classes in their Junior year therefore that student is not generating full-time funding under the 5/5 model. Because there's a reason these 178 students aren't going full-time with us right now; jobs, want to go to JTED, healthcare courses, all kinds of things. What we are saying is based on our history and numbers that we have for this year we can't guarantee that just because we change the model we can keep a student in their Senior year for that 5th class. Because they can have 18 units by the time they are done with their Junior year only needing 4 units to graduate, therefore that student now becomes a 3/4 funding student. I think that we are making some assumptions by saying we can change the model, it will just take some time to catch up, but even if we change the model we don't know what parents and students might choose under that new model. We know now that our Seniors make choices to do other things in their Senior year and a lot of time are only going for 4 classes, or less, because we have examples of less.

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Marian would you like to clarify?

Ms. Johnson: I think where the confusion is coming in, I think where Lisa's confusion is coming in, is that when we go to this 6/6/5/5, we are actually changing the number of hours for each class. So 4 classes is no longer reaching that 180 hour requirement that we need at the 720. So we are changing it now to less hours for

each class. That's my understanding; is that correct Mr. Little? That's why 4 classes is no longer meeting the full-time requirement. And that is where the difference comes in because if we say 5 classes is the required minimum then we are saying that 720 divided by 5 is actually what each class would be offered (*720 hours divided by 5 required classes equals 144 instructional hours per class*). And that's why they are no longer reaching if they have 4 classes, is that correct?

Mr. Little: Correct. And just to point out also, in going with that model we have no clear understanding of the problematic impacts of being able to provide all the JTED classes that we are offering if we have a 5 period full-time model versus the current model of 4 classes. So there could be implications to what JTED programs could be offered in that environment. As I've said before I am not the person who can really answer those programmatic questions. So if a student needs the 5th credit to graduate and they want to take a JTED class and we say they can't take it because you have to take one of our classes, you know, it's going to be an interesting scenario.

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Ms. Mehren did you have a question?

Ms. Mehren: Back in January of 2016 when I presented to the Board, and you followed up with a presentation, your figure of the loss to the District from reallocating the credits as we've discussed was \$150,000. Today its \$221,000. Back at the time a Board Member, I believe it was Mr. Leska, asked for some clarification on how we got to that number. Is that something that you would be willing to provide to this committee so that we could understand, because I think that might alleviate some of the questions that are in the room. I guess that is question A. Question B, why is there a difference in the numbers where you were talking at that time about 195 students, the same number as we are talking about today.

Mr. Little: I don't believe we ever quoted the exact number of students as being the same. I'd have to go back to the presentation. If I actually remember right we had fewer students in the presentation earlier. Both numbers were based upon the actual students we pulled off the schedule to find out who was taking what. Now, yes the numbers go up because guess what, the funding formulas changed. Proposition 123 has increased the funding formula which means the loss in monetary goes up. We'd have to go back to that PowerPoint and see what the numbers were, but I don't believe the numbers were the same quoted numbers between both then and now.

Ms. Mehren: Okay, but just to clarify the loss you stated at that time was \$150,000 and what we are talking about now is \$221,000, so it's a pretty sizable, it's a 50% increase actually to be exact.

Ms. Call: Mr. Little, can you clarify?

Mr. Little: I guess that kind of points out an interesting trend that the number of students taking four or fewer classes has actually increased.

Ms. Call: You spoke a little bit about funding differentials and a different funding rate than there is currently. Will you address that as well?

Mr. Little: Proposition 123 increased the funding formula, which means that the amount generated per student is higher now than it was a year ago. The numbers that are presented now are the actual number of students, real students with real schedules right now that exist in this year against the real funding formula. Yes, it can vary from year to year but one thing that is obvious is the number of students taking 4 classes or fewer has increased from last year to this year. Which goes to the point that students have choices, you know, they are going to do what they are going to do. So, numbers are the numbers that existed at that time.

Ms. Mehren: Mr. Little, could you tell us please what is the annual budget for the Amphi District?

Mr. Little: Which funds? There are a couple of hundred different funds some of which can be used for some purposes and not others. Overall across all funds we are in excess of \$100,000,000 (100 million). If we are talking only the Maintenance and Operations fund its \$86,000,000 (86 million) roughly.

Mr. Mehren: Okay, so roughly, just to be clear, just to sort of put an order of magnitude on this; \$220,000 on about \$100,000,000 (100 million) is what about? I mean...

Mr. Little: I'll tell you how to calculate the two hundred...

Ms. Mehren: Less than 1%.

Mr. Little: ...the \$221,000 is best compared by looking at what does that do for staffing. That is approximately 5 teachers [salary]. So yes you can say on a percentage basis that's a small number...

(Ms. Mehren began speaking while Mr. Little was speaking.)

Mr. Mehren: Why are you talking about teachers Sir and not about, let's say administrators' salaries or paper towels, or anything else? Why does this always...

Ms. Call: Do we have questions regarding the actual presentation?

Ms. Mehren: I'm responding actually about something that needs brought up, it needs raised and I am really saying that I find it disrespectful to the teachers that this becomes a scare tactic. It's an emotional issue that this will affect teachers and nothing else. Could we not say this is just perhaps a loss, not necessarily a teacher loss? Just a question; you don't have to answer it. I just feel it's relevant.

My next statement I'd like to make is I challenge actually, and if you could I ask you to elaborate on why it would take 4 years to eliminate any loss. If we are looking at a redistribution of credits [of how many classes are taken in each year], as has been proposed, let's say for the next school year [2017-2018], then the way I see it the only students who will go into their "rising year" with an excess of credits would be the current Juniors. So then for example the class of 2018 will be rising Seniors with 18 credits and everyone behind, if they are following the 6/6/5/5 as has been proposed, would actually get to their Senior year with 17 credits not 18. So can you clarify because I think there is a lot of confusion in the room. Why this is, why you are projecting a 4 year or more loss when in fact perhaps it's one?

Mr. Little: Perhaps it's two perhaps it's three...

(Ms. Mehren began speaking while Mr. Little was speaking.)

Mr. Little: The reality is that you can't ignore the impact of what could happen. Yes, some configuration could come up that could turn it into only a 1 year loss. Although I'm skeptical that would actually happen. I practically would see it take 3 to 4 years for it to actually happen. But yes, in theory it could happen in one, in theory it could happen in two, in theory it could happen in three. But practically the long term method by which most Districts do it, they do fewer classes in their Freshman and Sophomore year in order to keep the load high in their Junior and Senior years. And that's how most Districts have it. Could we accomplish it in less? Maybe, maybe not, I don't know. Again, as I said earlier, we cannot predict behavior of students who may or may not accept that and may choose to go take an online class, or summer school, or Primavera online or some other alternative so they don't have to have that extra class in their Senior year. We could change it and still have the problems that student could still choose those alternatives and still be faced with the cut. It's not a hard Science its merely what we know about the potential of what could happen. What happens is what happens. What could happen is what we are talking about. At the bare minimum you would be talking about 1 year's loss, because those Juniors right now know what they need for graduation credits and if they are like the past groups we've had we are going to have a loss of funding.

Ms. Biallis-Odell called on the next speaker.

Ms. Stuart: So we are talking about 195 Seniors presently. And as you've been indicating, we don't know. We know \$221,000 based on 195 [students]. But we don't know, you yourself said it could be a 4-year process, it

could actually happen in 1 [year] we would only see the loss. We know if our four or less [classes] Seniors are going to go up next year or down. If the District is growing just by sheer numbers then it might go up, but in terms of raw numbers but not percentages. So I think we can all agree that a lot of this is uncertain but should not, in my opinion, prevent us from attempting something that might be educationally valuable, and dare I say invaluable to our staff, our students and our families at Amphi. So, 195 students are dictating a schedule for how many thousands of high schoolers in the district. So how many high school students do we have in the District? Do you know?

Mr. Little: I don't have the number off the top of my head. I'm going to say that right now our average cohort is probably 800-850 students.

Ms. Stuart: So 850 x 12 in three high schools.

Mr. Little: No, 850 x 4. Eight hundred and fifty would be the number of Freshmen, 850 would be the number of Sophomores...

Ms. Stuart: But there are three high schools.

Mr. Little: That's total numbers.

Ms. Stuart: Okay. So why then is such a small proportion dictating what happens to the vast majority of our students and is there anything wrong with changing a culture that says, "Oh, I'm a senior, I am only to take 4 classes." where we know our State schools, and many schools throughout the country, require so much more than the bare minimum? And if only 195 take 4 [classes] then the majority of our Seniors are taking 5 and 6 classes. So with that information I ask, what's preventing us from trying? What is preventing us from doing something that we know in terms of sleep patterns, in terms of breakfast and lunch that was presented and transportation, that there are few issues that they have. So I feel like we are going around and around and we are not getting anywhere, that I would love to propose that we try. If we fail, then we fail, but we've learned a lesson. And again...

Mr. Little: Does this have a question [for me]?

Ms. Stuart: Yeah, my question is why if everything is speculative and you began with its going to take 4 years, and you began with this is seen as teacher salary, it could actually be 1 [year] and the money could actually be administrative costs, so why are we going around and around when we don't actually know and why can't we move forward and attempt this? Because this could be a 1 year loss and turn around, why don't we go for it?

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Sarah that is a question that Mr. Little can't answer. That's a question that we are going to address today as we work in small groups. Thank you.

Mr. Little: For the record can I ask, how many IB students do we have? How many students in the IB Program?

Mr. DeWeerd: Forty-eight roughly.

Mr. Little: Forty-eight. So my understanding was this original issue came up out of the IB program so we are talking 48 students not the 178 who are actually the ones that are driving this conversation.

Ms. Stuart: I challenge that. It was not an IB issue at all.

Ms. Mehren: It is an issue affecting every single...

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Marian. Excuse me. Marian has the next question.

Ms. Johnson: So I guess we [AHS] weren't here at the last meeting, but I think we are needing a little bit of clarification. Because is it required, if we move to 6/6/5/5, that we change the instructional minutes?

Mr. Little: No.

Ms. Johnson: So we could potentially move to a 6/6/5/5 and change the instructional minutes and then we are not actually losing money for those students that are still taking the 4 classes their Senior year. We'd only be losing money for the students less than 4 [classes], correct?

Mr. Little: Correct. They are different issues.

Ms. Johnson: So we could make that 6/6/5/5 change and not actually change instructional minutes and just reallocate the periods that we are expecting students to take and not affect the funding of \$221,000 a year. Am I correct in that?

Mr. Little: Correct. There are many options on what could be done. Correct.

Ms. Johnson: So as long as we are not talking about changing the instructional minutes when we move to the 6/6/5/5 the funding is probably going to stay the same as it is now, and not really affect beyond the 17 students with less than 4 classes that you have right now.

Mr. Little: Correct.

Ms. Johnson: Thank you.

Ms. Mehren: Just a point of clarification. If the minutes aren't changed and the duration remains the same, that invalidates the whole reason that we have been talking about this, I believe. Unless I am missing something with your point. This is a question for the questioner.

Ms. Johnson: Okay, sorry well...

Ms. Mehren: I'll make the statement and then... I want to circle back to your statement that this would trigger an increase in graduation requirements. I just want to make sure that we can fully understand what you are saying and you could clarify that please.

Mr. Little: What I stated was not that it would trigger an increase. What I indicated was that a lot of Districts who went to this model also increased their graduation requirements. That's all I stated was that's how other Districts that are operating on a 5 period full-time model have additional graduation requirements which makes it very unlikely that they wind up with the fractional students in their Senior year.

Ms. Mehren: Oh, so it's a motivational tactic. Is that what you mean? So in other words if they...

Mr. Little: I have no idea what it actually means. I'm saying those districts that we are comparing ourselves to have higher graduation credits which means the students are taking 6/6/6/6 to get to their 24 credits and they are not having the issue of fractional students in their Senior year. It's not a motivational; it's the mathematics of how they have their system setup.

Ms. Mehren: I would say that that is motivational and mathematics, so thank you for explaining that.

Ms. Mehren: So just to clarify, there is no need to do that, that is just an option to solve that so we wouldn't have fractional funding for the 5% of all high school students who would then, based on today's numbers, be fractionally funded. Is that correct? I'll restate it. Today there are 195 students, which is approximately 5% of the high school student body, that are taking 4 classes. We are assuming the same number of students would take

4 classes, we are not sure that that would be the case. If that were the case, those are the students that are fractionally funded.

Mr. Little: You are trying to compare 195 of a Senior class against the entire high school population. It would be 195 that represent closer to 20% of the Senior class that were actually impacted.

Ms. Mehren: The reason I say that it's 5% and not 20% is that because of that, because of those 195 students, 100% of the students in the high schools are faced with longer days to the order of magnitude of several hundred hours as compared to their peers in comparable, diverse, high achieving, less well achieving schools. That's what I am saying.

Mr. Little: And I'm not sure, is that a question about the finances? What is the question about the finances?

Ms. Mehren: That was a response to your statement.

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Are there any *questions* for Mr. Little?

Ms. Godlewski: Mine's pretty simple. What's the actual dollar amount per student for State funding?

Mr. Little: I couldn't quote it. It's about probably \$5,400 per student, ballpark. Not all students are equal. The funding formula has various weights depending on various grades and other things. On an average we are probably talking \$5,400 - \$5,500 per student probably.

Ms. Godlweski: Is that per high school student?

Mr. Little: Ballpark probably.

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Ms. Een.

Ms. Een: This isn't actually a question; this is kind of a comment in general. I feel like some of these things are out of the scope of finance. That's why I asked if some of these things are speculation. The \$221,000 is perhaps accurate if this happened or that happened, etc. But some other things, we would have research other schools and see if they did have to increase graduation requirements, etc., etc. So I don't know that this is the person to be asking. Some of the things that were presented were speculative, this could happen or that could happen but I think we need to look at, you know, do other schools always require graduation requirements, etc. I don't know if I should be saying that, it just seems like it's going in a circle.

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Are there any financial questions for Mr. Little? Ms. Mehren.

Ms. Mehren: Is it possible that we could see the data that would back up the formulae increase of 50% between January and today?

Mr. Little: The individual student data would be protected by FERPA.

Ms. Mehren: I am not asking for individual student data, I am asking for aggregated numbers that would explain how your calculations increased by 50% from the presentation in January to the presentation today. You were saying that it was because of Prop 123 and I'm asking...

Mr. Little: And the change in students, and those numbers are in the record of the presentation.

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Paul.

Mr. DeWeerd: Do I need the microphone?

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Yes.

Mr. DeWeerd: Mr. Little I just want to understand. I think I've heard you say a couple of times, so I just want to make sure I understood. When we talk about this possible change that in terms of staffing of teachers, that a teacher who is currently teaching 5 classes might have to teach 6 classes? Could you speak to that because I didn't understand why that would be and I would just like to understand that thought pattern of how that could actually have to happen if there was a change in the model. Because I think I heard you say that.

Mr. Little: There is right now, look at it, how many hours does a 7th and 8th grade teacher teach direct contact with students? They are carrying approximately the same certifications, correct? Am I correct on that? They are carrying the exact certifications. So if they are not teaching, they are going to wind up teaching less, do you think we'll wind up having a middle school teacher take a middle school job? The goal would be to create parity among class time which if you actually look at our real numbers across all grades you'll find we are a lot closer in instructional time than what the minimums actually require. So the whole point would be to create parity among all teachers teaching with the same types of certification. So do you think that the middle school teachers should teach less? Should the high school teachers teach more?

Mr. DeWeerd: Are you asking me to respond to that?

Mr. Little: Well, yeah.

Mr. DeWeerd: I guess I just still don't understand, and I am not trying to challenge you on this, but I think that means with a change in instructional minutes there'd be time in the day to ask that teacher to teach an additional class, is that what you are saying?

Mr. Little: Correct. There would be time in the day to teach an additional class. Which is exactly what is going on in the equivalent districts who are teaching under the 5-period full-time model. Those teachers are carrying 6 classes as a full teaching load. And that is what is occurring in all comparable districts. So yes, we would need to be comparable to the market place, and be comparable to our middle school teachers.

Mr. DeWeerd: Thank you.

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Sarah.

Ms. Stuart: I would just like to make a point of clarification that, the, um, teachers in terms of teaching 6 classes, the teachers presently are teaching, even though they are teaching 6 classes right now at CDO, they are teaching more time, more hours, than their colleagues in comparable districts because their seat time over the course of the year is 180 hours per class as opposed to the Arizona minimum which is 123. So I can teach 6 classes and be at 123, or teach 6 classes and be at a 180, or I could teach 6 classes and be at 160. So the additional class it's not making sense to me because at least Amphi, CDO and Ironwood teachers are teaching more time than their counterparts in districts here in Southern Arizona but also in the Phoenix area and whatever. So I don't think it is the number of classes, and maybe that's a union thing, but in terms of time in front of the classroom our high school teachers in Amphi [District] are teaching above and beyond the hours that many other high school teachers in TUSD, Sunnyside or Catalina Foothills are teaching. So just wanted to make that clarification that maybe it's not about the number of classes they teach, that we are focusing on instructional time, and they are in front of their students more than they are (unintelligible).

Mr. Little: And the teachers in those adjacent districts are teaching more students. While they teach less they actually have more students which means more papers to grade, more grade books to update. Yes, there are tradeoffs in the mathematical formula.

(Multiple people began talking.)

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Paul, do you have a question?

Mr. DeWeerd: I just want to make sure...do I need the microphone?

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Yes.

Ms. Gardiner: Yes please. Help me out by taking a breather, passing the mic down and not over talking each other. Thank you.

Mr. DeWeerd: ...teaching 5 classes with one planning period. I think the model that has been referred to a lot is the Catalina Foothills model where I don't have firsthand knowledge but I think they teach 6 classes with a planning period. So I would have to do the math to see how many minutes or how many more students they are in front of during the course of the day. I don't know that.

Mr. Little: And then that has less planning time.

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Excuse me I do believe that we are getting into instructional minutes and the time that teachers are teaching, and I believe that Principals and other administrators in your small groups can clarify those questions for you that you have around instructional minutes and how many periods our teachers teach and how many students are on their case load. So those questions are probably not for Mr. Little, but the principals and administrators in your groups can clarify those for you. Are there any additional finance questions for Mr. Little?

Ms. Millerd: I just don't have a question for Mr. Little, but I do have firsthand knowledge for the committee and the whole District for anyone who wants to talk about it. As a parent, former teacher there, etc., etc., etc.

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Thank you. We may utilize your expertise in collaborative groups this evening.

Ms. Call: Are there any other questions for Mr. Little?

Ms. Biallas-Odell: In the light of time we do need to probably revise our ending time this evening if that's okay with others. We do have some additional work groups that we need to get through. Can we move to say 7:30 PM as a dismissal time? Does that work for people?

Ms. Stuart: I'm sorry, I have familial obligations. So my question is if we plan to be here till 7:00 PM and we are not here till 7:30 PM does that negate any work that is happening?

Ms. Biallas-Odell: We would not have as much work time this evening as we get into topics. We'd have to extend it into the 18th which is basically 3 weeks from now. So it's always good to start that work and then finish it right away.

Ms. Stuart: But what I'm saying is that if I leave does it negate the work of my group?

Ms. Biallas Odell: No. How many people can...

Ms. Millerd: Can we make a motion since we are kind of in an official capacity that we extend next time so people can plan for that? That's my motion.

Ms. Biallas-Odell: On the 18th?

Ms. Millerd: Yes please.

Ms. Biallas-Odell: The motion is on the table that we extend on October 18th until 7:30 PM if necessary. All in favor...

Ms. Gardiner: We need a second.

(Mr. Lansa seconded the motion.)

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Questions?

Ms. Mehren: *(Ms. Mehren was not using a microphone and some portions were inaudible.)* Question on the motion. Who knows, what are the agendas.... for the 18th, I believe that is our last meeting...

Ms. Biallas-Odell: It is.

Ms. Mehren: ...for making a recommendation.

Ms. Biallas-Odell: It is. It will be to clarify our recommendations. So we are going to continue that work tonight, hopefully get into collaborative groups by school, make some stronger recommendations than we did last time and then come back on the 18th for some collaborative work and see if we can come to agreement. So next time as long as there are no additional research questions, will be all collaborative school work time. Any other questions?

Ms. Mehren: Is the survey now off the table for the work of this committee?

Ms. Biallas-Odell: A survey is only required if we come to a recommendation. We are not close for a recommendation for change so we need to first collaborate and make some recommendations and then we would do a survey. We can't do a survey without recommendations.

Mr. Robinette: I am little confused. I don't even know where to start with the statement you made. But, why are we getting into groups when we're not changing the mandate to drive the discussion in the group? When it is clear to me, and I am speaking for myself only I understand, but it is clear to me that the District is unwilling to do any mandate changes based on conversations I've heard. So if we are unwilling to examine the 6/6/5/5 or 5/6/6/6 I'm not following, it seems to me we are going "bass akwards". And it seems like to me wouldn't it be more advantageous to talk about mandate change than have each high school discuss the effects of that mandate change because without the mandate change which drives the entire issue as to why we are here, I kind of feel like we are spinning our wheels in groups. And I am not saying that disrespectfully but I think that all of our time is valuable and I am not following... the sense I get, and this is just a personal sense and I have been involved in a lot of these kinds of things, and the sense I get is that there is no willingness at all from the District-level to consider the mandate change. So it seems to me again that if we are unwilling as this committee to examine the mandate changes and the effects that would have on each school individually and allow each school to see how that mandate change would either help them or have a deleterious effect on what they are doing, I still think, wouldn't it be more advantageous to discuss the mandate change and then within the groups what is the effect of the mandate change and then how do we as each individual high school make recommendations relative to the parameters of the mandate change.

Ms. Call: Mike, can you clarify the mandate change so we are all on the same page?

Mr. Robinette: Right now it sounds like to me we are not going to discuss anything other than 6/6/6/4. Instructional time, whatever, to me that's the mandate. To me that's a District mandate the 6/6/6/4. I'm just trying to get clarity.

Mr. Bejarano: Mike, I'm not, I think this group's task is to come up with a recommendation to the Board. It's not up to District administration; I assume that's what you mean by it. But this group's tasked to recommend to the Board that we would like to see, um, implemented a 6/6/5/5 model knowing...

(Mr. Robinette began talking while Mr. Bejarano was talking and his comment was inaudible.)

Mr. Bejarano: ...knowing...knowing that there's a potential for financial loss, or there's a potential for changing school (inaudible), knowing that those are all things that we've heard, so we all know that. So anything that we recommend to the Board would be, knowing everything that we know now where it's this committee's job, as far as I know, we say to the Board, "Here's what we'd like you to consider." then it's the Board's action to make that decision whether or not they want to go down that road knowing everything about all that's been talked about over the weeks. Am I, is that...

Ms. Call: Now, if you look at the charge from the Governing Board that they gave us, that's exactly what they asked us to do.

Mr. Bejarano: It's not, I don't think it's a...Mike I can't speak for what you mean by "District", but I assume that it's the District administrators and the people that have been talking about the implications that, or the potential implications from any kind of change from the current system to how it would affect those..

Mr. Robinette: Why wouldn't it be inappropriate for this committee to discuss 6/6/5/5 change and the possibility that that's a only a 1 year funding loss?

Mr. Bejarano: It's not. It's not [inappropriate]. What I'm saying is it's up to this committee to say that.

Ms. Call: We can say that to the Governing Board once we decide...

Mr. Robinette: (*Mr. Robinette was not using a microphone and some portions were inaudible.*) The problem is how we sit in these groups without discussing it from the perspective of changing.

Mr. Bejarano: I'm not sure what the chairs had in mind for us today, but I would see it as if we did it in smaller communities we would then see it as how does this affect us [by high school]. And then..

Mr. Robinette: Here's what... (inaudible)

Mr. Bejarano: And then any change. Let's just stick with the model of the 6/6/5/5. Let's just say that that is what we are leaning towards, but I think everybody from CDO, Amphi and Ironwood Ridge want to have some input on what does that mean for those schools.

Ms. Call: And that will be an activity we are going to be going into...

Mr. Robinette: Are we, are, is that what the committee is doing? Because what I heard is, um, an attempt to basically say no you can't do that.

Ms. Call: No. I am reading the Charge of the Governing Board and this is what we will be doing. Presentations are presentations. But what we are doing is what we have been asked by the Governing Board and we will present what we believe as a group when we come to consensus on that.

Mr. Bejarano: I believe the hard work is going to come in trying to get a consensus (*Ms. Call spoke at the same time saying, "Consensus by all three schools."*) from this group about what it is you want to present to the Governing Board.

Ms. Call: Because we will be presenting what we've decided to the Governing Board. But we have a motion on the table, right? Mr. Lansa you...

Mr. Robinette: Oh, did you have a comment?

Mr. Lansa: What I was going to say is I think that is where we are going, what you already said, just putting out all those proposals on the table.

Ms. Gardiner: I'm sorry, but may we go ahead and close this motion to extend the 18th of October to 7:30 PM? Yes, we didn't take a vote yet. We had a motion and a second by Mr. Lansa. We need to take a vote please.

Ms. Biallas-Odell: If you would be willing to stay, if need be, until 7:30 PM on October 18th please raise your hand. Unanimous. (22-0)

Ms. Gardiner: Unanimous? Thank you.

ACTION; APPROVED. MOTION: Ms. Millerd, to extend the end time on October 18th until 7:30 PM if necessary; SECOND: Mr. Lansa; VOTE: 22-0 (Show of Hands).

Ms. Goldsmith: So I'd just like to clarify that I understand what you are saying. Are we all discussing the same thing here? Are we all discussing 6/6/5/5?

Ms. Call: You'll be discussing at your site what is best for your students at your site. Because we have to decide what is best for our students at our individual sites before we can even come to a consensus.

Ms. Goldsmith: So then that information we present back to the group.

Ms. Call: Just like we did last week but we are going to go a little bit deeper.

Ms. Goldsmith: And then we will take a vote or have a consensus about what we are going to suggest to the Board.

Ms. Call: We won't be getting there today.

Ms. Goldsmith: Well not today.

Ms. Call: But we'll come up with a consensus of what we will be sending to the Board.

Ms. Goldsmith: After presenting the individual groups?

Ms. Call: Correct. Tina.

Ms. Mehren: Thank you. I have one final question on the survey just because it's been mentioned that we will make the recommendation, if there is a recommendation, then the survey will be conducted. It looks as if the survey is the purview of this committee so shall we be expected to extend our service to the committee beyond November 1st?

Ms. Call: What we've been asked is to present November 1st what our decision is and then if there are changes that need to be made, then they'll be surveying additional groups from there.

Ms. Mehren: So we will no longer have the survey as our task.

Ms. Call: (Unintelligible)

Ms. Stuart: So if this committee isn't going to do the survey, who is?

Ms. Call: Who will ask the questions?

Ms. Stuart: Yes, who will ask the questions?

Ms. Call: I will get those questions answered for you. Let's get going on our process and see if we can even come to a consensus first. That's what we need to do before we get to that point.

Ms. Gardiner: I just wanted to add that sometimes when a committee makes a recommendation, just like for instance Vail, their school board is asking for a Bond Override in November and they are saying, okay here are three options, and they sent it out to everybody. A committee makes a recommendation - here are several different options, like A, B and C that we would like to do, about instructional hours, or changing start and end times, if you shorten instructional hours you get both, etc. Then once that has gone to the Board, the Board can put those recommendations out to the parents, students and teachers and say what is your opinion of those three options. Then they can utilize that data to help make their decision of which option they think is best for the schools and best for everyone involved.

Ms. Call: And that can be what we can do as our proposal to the Governing Board, these are the questions that we would like to ask. That can be part of our (unintelligible).

Board Book Note: After the August 30th financial presentation by Mr. Little, several Advisory Committee members began to focus on the loss of funding for students taking less than 4 classes. The topic of rearranging the number of classes taken each year to make Seniors take 4 classes for full-time funding began to dominate the discussion at meetings. Therefore, ideas and discussion on the specific purpose and charge regarding shortening the length of class periods to reduce instructional hours, a draft plan of such schedules to review the feasibility, and changing start or end times was no longer at the forefront of discussion.

C. Review of Collaborative School Group Work from September 13th Meeting

Board Book Information: *At the September 13th Advisory Committee Meeting the Committee broke into collaborative groups by high school and discussed facilitated questions. They then presented results of their work to the whole Advisory Committee.*

The questions were:

- 1. What additional questions do you have?*
- 2. Based on your current schedule what works well for your students?*
- 3. Based on your current schedule what, if any, changes would you recommend to better meet the needs of your students?*
- 4. Based on questions two and three what would your recommendation be for your high school?*

At tonight's meeting the full notes on work of the collaborative school groups will be reviewed and discussed.

<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50217094>, Item 2.C.] (Exhibit 3)

Ms. Biallas-Odell: Alright the next item is 2.C. Review of Collaborative School Groups, what we did last time from September 13th. At the September 13th Advisory Committee Meeting the Committee broke into collaborative groups by high school and discussed facilitated questions. They then presented results of their work. You have the results all typed up in your package of each high school. What Tassi and I did was looked at your recommendations and put them into categories.

The paper that you are getting right now has your preliminary recommendations along with how each high school responded to those recommendations. If you look at the recommendations from 9/13 every high school had made mention, in their recommendations, to end the day earlier. See who Amphi High says yes, CDO says yes and Ironwood says yes. How we ended up ending the school day earlier we did not agree on how we wanted to do that. The first recommendation was to reduce the instructional minutes. It was very clear in the notes from Amphi High School that they were not interested in reducing instructional minutes. CDO said yes, Ironwood Ridge said yes. There was an increase PD Planning by decreasing instructional minutes. At Amphi High School that was a no, at CDO and Ironwood Ridge it was yes. One of the recommendations from one of the high schools was to require Seniors to take more than 4 classes. That was explicitly stated in the Ironwood Ridge High School sheet. It was not explicitly stated in either of the other high schools sheets, so that is why there are question marks there. And then each high school has unique needs. Every high school made that statement. Amphi High School, CDO; Ironwood Ridge did not necessarily address that topic. So when you are leaving this evening you can take a look at this also and if you have additional recommendations, that are along this line where you put questions marks, certainly feel free to discuss those tonight.

This might be helpful for you to see if we have agreement and where we have agreement across all three of our high schools to start formulating recommendations system-wide.

High School Work Group Notes from the September 13, 2016 Advisory Committee Meeting

Ironwood Ridge High School

1. What additional questions do you have?
 - Who's in charge of the committee?
 - Are we missing data?
 - Other school schedules? Can we look out of district? How do they do it in less time?
 - Backstory/Agenda/Subtext?
 - 6/6/5/5 ramifications?
 - fallout wasn't clear
 - Change current 6/6/6/4 impact?
 - What must we report to the board?
 - Can we ask for more time?
 - When changes were made have our needs evolved?
 - Research about student needs in reference to instructional time
 - Can each HS feeder pattern have unique schedules?
 - Senior culture of "4" is hurting us
 - Is it about duration of the day?
 - What is the red time requirement?
 - How can we "play" with the mandate?
2. Based on your current schedule what works well for your students?
 - Conference period
 - Lots of extracurricular involvement (35%)
 - sports
 - arts
 - competitions
 - personal activities (outside interests)
 - Culture of high expectations
3. Based on your current schedule what, if any, changes would you recommend to better meet the needs of your students?
 - Require seniors to take more than 4 classes
 - More conferences to end the day
 - every kid needs an attachment to an adult
 - less class minutes wouldn't hurt especially if added to conference time for collaboration
 - attention span lower now-kids shut down after 50 minutes
 - Foster relationships
 - Sports absences reduced
 - Sports absences reduced
 - Change "culture" of entitlement of seniors
4. Based on questions two and three what would your recommendation be for your high school?
 - Full recommendation can't be made until we have more info

Canyon del Oro High School

1. What additional questions do you have?
 - Information/recommendations for what is pedagogically appropriate for H.S. students?
 - What is adequate collaboration time for teachers?

- In regards to redistribution if 22 credits for minimum 150 hrs. for funding, why would we be compelled to increase number of credits required for graduation?
 - May we have clarification on financial loss (\$150,000-\$200,000)?
 - What current/existing loss? (JTED & CTE)
 - How does a later start time impact open enrollment?
 - Comment- What works well for CDO students, may not work for Amphi or IRHS demographic.
2. Based on your current schedule what works well for your students?
- Blocks work well because students meet teachers at different times.
 - Tutorial time
 - 8:20 am start time
 - Homework load distribution (every other day)
 - 40 Minutes for Lunch
 - Club meetings before school
3. Based on your current schedule what, if any, changes would you recommend to better meet the needs of your students?
- Reduce/condensed/optimized instructional time with increased PD/Plan time
 - Maximize hours from 180 → 150-160 hrs
 - More tutorial time
 - More planning/PD time (every day)
 - Allow tutorial time for student with zero hour
4. Based on questions two and three what would your recommendation be for your high school?
- Based on recommendations of #3, teachers and students optimize with quality time including, - plan time
 - tutorial time
 - clubs, etc.

Amphitheater High School

1. What additional questions do you have?
- Research-start time impact on academics
 - Do HS schedules need to be the same?
 - Start/end
 - # of minutes
2. Based on your current schedule what works well for your students?
- Consistency day to day
 - Same each day
 - Families like consistency
 - Simplicity
 - Fits academic programs
 - ELD, 4 hour block
 - Cambridge, AP
 - Having early outs
 - Longer lunch- Tutoring help
 - Schedule aligns to AZ merit testing
3. Based on your current schedule what, if any, changes would you recommend to better meet the needs of your students?
- Move end time to 3:00 pm, less students miss 7th period.

- Additional staggered start times
- Shortened lunch
 - Save 20 minutes
 - No off campus
 - Impact on staff
- Shorter passing periods
 - 7 minutes to 5 minutes
- Change breakfast time
 - 7:50 am
 - “official start” 8:00 am
 - Moves end time back to 3:15 pm
- 2 lunches

4. Based on questions two and three what would your recommendation be for your high school?

- Breakfast time
 - Maximize better
 - 180 day
 - 10 min
 - 1,800 min (30 hours)
- Create more time at the end of the day
 - Less missed time at end period
- 12 E.O.
- Keep instructional minutes
 - shift to, clear out end of day
- 7-6 minute passing period
 - 4 minutes/day
 - 720 minutes or 12 hours
- Reduce lunch by 5 minutes
 - take it from end of day (end at 3:10 pm)

D. Collaborative School Group Work Time

Board Book Information: *After reviewing the work of the school groups done at the September 13th meeting, the Advisory Committee will break out into their respective school groups for further collaboration and discussion regarding the needs of their schools and any changes recommended.*

<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50217094>, Item 2.D.]

Ms. Call: Okay. Our item 2.D. is Collaborative School Group Work. Here we break back out into our sessions and we are going to ask you two questions. You probably won't get finished with this task, but we will try our hardest, but probably will not be able to present this evening because of the time schedule. But we are going to ask you to look at your recommendations from last time and really think about what meets the best needs of your students. Think about that question again. And then we want you after have decided what the recommendations would be for the students at your school; based on the recommendation that best meets the need of your students, what would the impact of any changes have on the following areas. So I broke it down into what is in the charge. The State law requirements, instructional minutes, etc. I ask that you do like you did last time; please take notes on what your recommendations will be. And then really, after you have decided your recommendation, we have to look wholeheartedly what it will do to all the areas of study in the charge. But first let's see who we are doing on time and if we don't get to the second part, at least get question number one done this evening.

Each high school broke out into their respective groups.

