

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
BOARD OF EDUCATION, EAU CLAIRE, WISCONSIN, NOVEMBER 1, 2010  
PRESIDENT CRAIG PRESIDING**

Following the Pledge of Allegiance, President Craig called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. Secretary Patti Iverson confirmed that the meeting was properly noticed and was in compliance with the open meeting law.

Roll call was taken and the following commissioners were present: Craig, Duax, Faanes, Janke, Johnson (arrived at 7:40 pm), Shiel, and Wogahn. Absent: None. Student Representatives Joe Luginbill and Rebecca Giles were not present.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

Dan Severson, 1807 Hatch Street, said because there will be a substantial drop in debt payments after 2011-12 and a new referendum would not mean an increase in taxes, the public should be open to it. Particularly because the funds would be used for maintaining District buildings. He felt a follow up referendum within a year or two for operational costs would be difficult to pass.

**BOARD/ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS**

Superintendent's Report

Dr. Heilmann shared information obtained from the 13th Annual Comparative Analysis of the Racine School District, which looked at ten comparably sized school districts including Eau Claire. When looking at the ten year change in aggregate spending, Eau Claire ranked 10<sup>th</sup> out of the 10 comparable school districts in instruction, pupil services, instructional staff services, general administration, and building administration. The district ranked 6<sup>th</sup> out of 10 in transportation costs. The ten-year change in aggregate revenue ranked Eau Claire as 7<sup>th</sup> in property tax, 9<sup>th</sup> in state aid, and 10<sup>th</sup> in federal aid. The analysis also looked at percentages of attendance (6<sup>th</sup>), truancy (5<sup>th</sup>) and drop out rates (9<sup>th</sup>) during the 2008-09 school year. Eau Claire ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> in the percentage of students who have been suspended and expelled during the 2008-09 school year.

Dr. Heilmann shared a referendum update providing highlights from the latest community roundtable meeting. At the last meeting they talked about the importance of union support, a FAQ document, and the "Vote Yes" efforts. They continued discussions about key issues identified over the last several meetings. The next meeting will be November 8th prior to and in conjunction with the PAC meeting.

The first referendum "Frequently Asked Questions" document is in draft form and consists of five questions and answers. The questions include: Why a Facilities Referendum? What About My Taxes? Why Not Just Open Little Red? What Will You Do with Little Red? How Will the Success of this Referendum Help Future Facilities Needs?

The Wisconsin Retired Educators Association recently recognized DeLong Middle School's Prime Products Program as a student run business. Students learn about being an entrepreneur and ways to give back to the community. The school received a grant in the amount of \$2,000 from the Association.

Staff members will be asked to complete two brief electronic surveys in the next week. One has to do with elementary school sizes and the other regarding the new parent-teacher conference schedule this year. Dr. Heilmann said he anticipates some changes being made for the spring conferences and the feedback obtained from the staff and public will be helpful.

There will be an evening "Board with Your Coffee" session on November 4th at 6:30 pm at the Coffee Grounds and a morning session on November 5<sup>th</sup> at Acoustic Café at 8 am.

Dr. Heilmann reminded voters to be extra cautious as they go to vote in school zones. He encouraged the public to show students the importance of one of the most important rights of citizenship – the right to vote.

Communication to Superintendent/Board President - No report given.

#### Student Representative Report

The student representatives were not present but they shared a written report with the Board. It was noted that the student reps plan to be at the next PAC meeting to talk about the use of cell phones in schools and the related policy.

#### Other Reports

##### Policy and Governance Committee

The committee has started working on school hours, class size, and school calendar policies. They asked Ann Franke to get an abstract and research surrounding the issue of starting the school day later for high school students.

### **CONSENT RESOLUTION AGENDA**

Board members asked to pull Resolution 5 from the consent agenda.

Com. Wogahn moved, seconded by Com. Faanes, to approve the consent resolution agenda consisting of the following items:

- ◆ The minutes of Board meeting of October 18, 2010, as mailed.
- ◆ The minutes of closed session of October 18, 2010, as mailed.
- ◆ The matters of employment of November 1, 2010, as presented.

- ◆ Award the sale of a tax and revenue anticipation note in the amount of \$6 million for the period November 9, 2010, through August 26, 2011, at a net interest rate of 0.6788% to R.W. Baird and Company.

Consent resolution agenda items approved by unanimous roll call vote.

## **INDIVIDUALLY CONSIDERED RESOLUTIONS**

### Resolution #5 – Intent to Hold Capital Referendum

Com. Duax said she talked to some community members who think the Board should wait to hold a referendum until 2012. She understood the concerns but felt the decrease in referendum debt gives the district a good opportunity in 2011 and thought the Board should move forward. She was concerned about the costs for DeLong and whether it was too much to spend in one place. She felt the Board should carefully consider the priorities with that project.

It was clarified that adopting a motion to hold a capital referendum in April 2011 would show the Board's intent to go to referendum for facilities but additional details would follow including the step to vote on the actual ballot language and the amount that will appear. Holding a referendum would give the public an opportunity to voice their opinion.

Com. Janke was not in favor of holding a referendum in April 2011 but not because he didn't think it was needed. He didn't feel it would pass due to economic factors. He suggested waiting for another year. He felt the Board would have to wait for a year or two to go back to the public if it didn't pass. Dr. Heilmann pointed out that the law says that if a referendum is not successful, districts must wait a minimum of 45 days before bringing another question to the community.

President Craig said she is still concerned about the operational piece noting that the when the federal stimulus monies are gone there, will be a significant funding cliff (loss of money). In addition, the state is facing considerable budget challenges. She wanted the Board to have an operational plan in mind as it moves forward with the capital referendum so the district isn't faced with having facilities and not enough operational funds. She noted that the Board could still consider more than one question. She added that the model or philosophy of middle school learning should be incorporated into all capital improvements so that the building project is compatible with 21<sup>st</sup> century learning.

Com. Faanes moved, seconded by Com. Wogahn, to give intent to move forward with a capital referendum election on April 5, 2011. Motion carried by the following roll call vote: Aye: Craig, Duax, Faanes, Shiel and Wogahn. Nay: Janke.

Regular meeting adjourned.

Submitted by Patti Iverson, Board Secretary

**COMMITTEE MEETING  
BOARD OF EDUCATION – EAU CLAIRE, WISCONSIN  
NOVEMBER 1, 2010**

1. Call to Order – Committee Meeting

Board Members present: Craig, Duax, Faanes, Janke, Johnson, Shiel, and Wogahn. Absent: None. Student Representatives Joe Luginbill and Rebecca Giles were not present.

2. Committee Reports/Items for Discussion

A. Follow-Up on Elementary Art Delivery Options

President Craig said the Board took action in April 2009 to change the delivery model of the art program which resulted in a reduction in art instruction. She said the Board is committed to its “plan, do, check, and act” model and a group was charged with looking at challenges that exist with these changes.

Elementary art teacher, Sue Carey, said that art instructional time was cut by 15 minutes to reduce elementary teacher classroom prep time. She said because of scheduling challenges, they were told this was the easiest place to cut. The Board heard a report from the elementary art department last year outlining the impact the reductions have had on the program. The 25% reduction resulted in an increased student load for each elementary art teacher, and they must teach 750-850 students per week and then assess those students. She pointed out that this is much greater than other subject areas. Another big impact was in the structure of the art class. Ms. Carey said that when there were 60 minutes classes, they had time to develop projects and work on peer assessments. Each class still needs introduction, clean up, and set up time so the work time went from 35 minutes to 20 minutes. She said this has had a big impact on kids. She reviewed a chart that showed curriculum implications with this decrease in class time.

Principal Kim Hill oversaw the committee that was charged with looking to see if cost neutral changes could be made to make elementary art more manageable and to address the reality of teaching and assessing 700-800 students now. She said the group needs some flexibility in making changes and wanted feedback from the Board on things like completing report cards once a year rather than three times or using portfolio assessments. She said that teachers feel it is very challenging to get to know students well enough to report on progress they are making. Ms. Hill said the group will work with the Teaching and Learning Department to come up with some assessment options and will keep the Board updated.

Generally Board members said they could be flexible in looking at assessment options. Some of the options discussed with the art teachers included having students reflect and assess their own work, utilizing portfolios, and evaluating students once a year.

Kim Hill shared a chart that was developed by the elementary art teachers with five different variations of schedules ranging from 45-minutes every week up to 90-minutes every week. The chart showed the implications of each schedule on the number of students, percentage of DPI minutes, curriculum, work time, contract issues and the impacts beyond art. It was noted that not all options were budget neutral.

During discussions there were several areas where concerns were expressed including not providing adequate assessments for parents, gifted and talented students not getting additional art services, contract violations and inconsistencies in reporting schemes across art, music and physical education.

Administration was asked how discussions about post-secondary readiness might affect some of these decisions. Dr. Heilmann said there will continue to be discussions about the role of elementary art and fine arts at all levels as it relates to PSR. Mr. Leibham added that all students have different needs and learning styles, and he didn't think it could be determined that one program might provide greater service, value or benefit than perhaps another service or program.

There was discussion about making changes yet this school year in the delivery model for art. Dr. Weissenburger said there would be a variety of reasons why that might not be practical including the fact that they have had quite a bit of difficulty finding elementary art teachers for classes that have already been added. The master schedule of every building would have to be changed. Ms. Hill said that school schedules are connected with art, music and physical education classes. When the schedules are made, it affects when those classes can be held and what the building's reading block looks like. She said if the Board wanted to find solutions that look differently than going back to 60 minutes, they would like to know that soon. Com. Johnson suggested looking at providing some relief this year with team teaching or utilizing interns to help with set up.

Dr. Weissenburger explained that the art reduction wasn't to provide additional prep time for grade 1-5 teachers. Art time was reduced, but all contractual requirements were still met with prep time. Students are now with their general education teachers 15 minutes longer every week. If 15 minutes of art time was added back, it would increase prep time for every grade 1-5 teacher and increase prep time for art teachers as well.

Elementary art teachers would teach five sections a day rather than seven with 15 minutes added back.

While there were some concerns about going beyond a cost neutral alternative, there was consensus to look at options that are no longer cost neutral as possible solutions to the issues. It was suggested that the union be involved in these discussions because the options that are cost neutral involve contract issues. Dr. Heilmann said the Board would have to keep in mind that anything added back into the budget would have to be taken from another area.

B. Discussion & Possible First Reading of NEW ECASD *Policy 825 – Distribution of Non-School-Related Materials*

The Policy & Governance Committee presented a draft of a new policy which covers distribution of non-school-related materials. Some of the language was similar to the advertising policy already adopted by the Board in terms of what criteria materials must meet in order to be consistent with the law, the District's vision and mission, and other policies in the District. It was noted that the committee got feedback from some partnership coordinators as well as administration on the policy.

There was some discussion on possible charges assessed with distribution of materials. Fees could be charged to cover staff time to distribute items. The administrative rules would likely need to address this if it was determined that this was feasible. The Board also talked about similarities between distributing materials and advertising; this may need to be considered.

It was recommended that the second to last sentence be changed to read, "Administrative rules will be reviewed by the Board prior to changes."

The committee will make adjustments to the policy as recommended and will also reach out to community organizations to get feedback. This will be brought back to the first meeting in December for a potential first reading.

C. Discussion/Review of ECASD *Policy 331 – Charter School Guidelines*

President Craig said that Policy 331 – Charter School Guidelines – was adopted in June 2008 to guide decision making of charter schools. She said there has been a point of interpretation regarding the transportation piece that states that "Transportation will be provided in a manner it is offered to other students in the ECASD unless it is exempt in the charter contract. The charter school attendance area is the ECASD boundary."

Dr. Heilmann said that discussions on the contract renewals are taking place now and noted that Montessori does not provide transportation at this time. The governance board has indicated that they would like transportation provided. Should the Board wish to provide transportation to Montessori students, Student Transit estimated it could be from \$35,000 to \$73,000. The cost would be less if they could take advantage of utilizing existing routes and getting students to a common point to Montessori versus providing service from each home to Montessori.

President Craig felt the policy that was adopted by the Board on June 2008 provided for transportation to charter schools as new contracts are written. If a charter school doesn't want transportation provided or if it is located outside the district, it would not be. She believed the Board's use of the words 'will be provided' rather than 'may be provided' indicated the Board's intent to provide transportation. Superintendent Heilmann's position was that transportation will be provided unless it is exempt in the contract. He said the charter contract becomes the driving instrument and negotiations would allow flexibility in this area.

Board members discussed this. Some felt transportation should be provided to charter schools. Others felt that using the clause 'unless it is exempt in the contract' gives the Board the opportunity to negotiate that portion of the contract. They felt that parents can make a choice if they feel a charter school would give their child a unique opportunity, but the district shouldn't have to transport those students. There were concerns expressed about having to add money back into the budget for transportation at the charters given the current fiscal situation. On the flip side, there were also issues with equity and possible discrimination expressed if transportation isn't provided. It was reported that some families who considered Montessori decided not to go there because they wouldn't get transportation.

Mildred Larson serves on the Montessori Governance Board and was on the ad hoc committee as well. She felt the committee was concerned about equity and access. She said there are some students who are not attending Montessori because there is no transportation, and she realizes that contract negotiations are underway. She felt the district was discriminating on a socio-economic basis and there should be free access to resources on the same basis as other schools.

JoEllen Burke was on the Charter School Committee and is the coordinator for Engage Charter School. She felt the committee viewed transportation as an equity and access issue. She believed the policy stated that transportation will be provided to charter schools. She said the negotiation process will allow transportation as a possibility and noted that some charter boards may opt out of transportation. She felt that students shouldn't be

denied access to school based on where they live, a parent's ability to transport their child, or socio-economic reasons.

The majority of the Board interpreted the policy to consider transportation as a negotiable item with governance boards. If a governance board feels transporting students is critical, there may be some give and take with other contract items.

3. Request for Future Agenda Items
4. Other Business
5. Motion to Adjourn Committee Meeting

Com. Wogahn moved, seconded by Com. Janke, to adjourn committee meeting.  
Carried by unanimous voice of acclamation.

6. Meeting adjourned at 9:25 pm.