

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF EDUCATION, EAU CLAIRE, WISCONSIN, AUGUST 16, 2010
PRESIDENT CRAIG PRESIDING**

Following the Pledge of Allegiance, President Craig called the meeting to order at 7:04 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, Shiel, and Wogahn. (Com. Wogahn had to leave at 7:25 pm) Absent: None. Student Representative Joe Luginbill was present; Rebecca Giles was not present.

NOTICE OF CLOSED SESSION

President Craig announced that the Board would go into closed session following the committee meeting under 19.85 (1)(c) to consider employment, promotion, compensation or performance evaluation data of any public employee over which the governmental body has jurisdiction or exercises responsibility to discuss administrative compensation and contracts.

PUBLIC FORUM

Sandra Benedict, Elderberry Lane, shared a document with the Board. She said she has not received any disallowance of claim from the Board regarding a February 2010 document she distributed to the Board. President Craig said the matter has been forwarded to the District's attorney.

BOARD/ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Heilmann stated that President Obama signed the \$10 billion Federal Education Jobs bill to help save or create educator jobs during the 2010-11 school year. The district is expected to receive up to \$2 million. These funds are one-time monies that can be used to retain, hire back, or hire new employees.

Dr. Heilmann said in an effort to receive input from the public with regards to Board meetings, the Board has implemented a feedback form. Feedback is designed to be anonymous but someone could list their name and address if they wish to be contacted. A box is located outside the Board Room for people to submit the feedback form.

The first Community Roundtable was held and others will be scheduled. Participants broke into seven different groups to give feedback on specific questions about the referendum: past budget cuts, obstacles, information taxpayers would need,

advantages of passing a referendum, economic factors, time and resources needed as well as tasks, and recommendations from the group. An eighth category was added for ideas and ways to get information out to the community.

The ENGAGE Charter School has received its full \$175,000 planning grant from DPI. The group is scheduled to give an update on their planning efforts at the October 4th Board meeting, followed by a discussion of the ENGAGE contract on December 6th, with possible action scheduled for December 20th. This would permit ENGAGE to actively advertise during the state open enrollment period in February 2011.

Communication to Superintendent/Board President

President Craig said the recent article in the *Leader Telegram* regarding the District's technology policy was well written and very informative.

Student Representative Report

Joe Luginbill said that he and Becca Giles were charged with finding ways to involve more students in the referendum process. He said they are thinking of starting an advocacy group comprised of students who can go around and campaign.

Com. Wogahn left the meeting at 7:25 pm.

Other Reports

Policy and Governance Committee

The committee has met with Tim Leibham about a policy for distribution of materials. There is a procedure in place that is different than has been used in the past. The committee has some sample policies and will be drafting a policy. They have also created a draft of the conflict of interest policy, which has been reviewed by WASB legal staff and the District's legal counsel. A finalized first draft should be ready for the Board's review soon. The cell phone policy will also be reviewed by the committee in the near future.

Budget Development Committee

Com. Shiel said the committee plans to meet in early September.

CONSENT RESOLUTION AGENDA

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

- ◆ The minutes of closed session of July 19, 2010, as mailed.
- ◆ The minutes of Board meeting of August 2, 2010, as mailed.
- ◆ The gifts in the amount of \$906.75 for the period of July 1, 2010 through July 31, 2010.

- ◆ The matters of employment of August 16, 2010, as presented.
- ◆ One-Year Extension of the Student Transportation Contract with Student Transit

Consent resolution agenda items approved by unanimous roll call vote.

INDIVIDUALLY CONSIDERED RESOLUTIONS

Com. Duax moved, seconded by Com. Shiel, to approve the payment of all bills in the amount of \$7,406,435.52 and net payroll in the amount of \$2,998,178.11 for the period of July 1, 2010, through July 31, 2010. Carried by the following roll call vote: Ayes: Craig, Duax, Janke, Johnson, and Shiel. Abstained: Faanes.

Regular meeting adjourned.

Submitted by Patti Iverson, Board Secretary

**COMMITTEE MEETING
BOARD OF EDUCATION – EAU CLAIRE, WISCONSIN
AUGUST 16, 2010**

1. Call to Order – Committee Meeting

Members present: Craig, Duax, Faanes, Janke, Johnson, and Shiel. Absent: Wogahn. Student Representatives Joe Luginbill was present; Rebecca Giles was not.

2. Committee Reports/Items for Discussion

A. Update on Work from the *Demographic Trends & Facility Planning Council*

Executive Director of Administration Tim Leibham provided an update from the Demographic Trends & Facility Planning Council regarding early learning and elementary long-term solutions.

Mr. Leibham said it is anticipated that early learning (EL) enrollments will continue to increase for a number of years. In 2009-10 there were 712 children in EL programs. That is projected to increase to 820 by 2018-19, and it already appears that we will exceed that projection. The council recommends that all early learning programs be in one centralized location. This may be an existing non-district educational site requiring modifications or the building of an EL center. This would accommodate growth for ten years, increase effectiveness and efficiency of program delivery, increase child placement flexibility based on needs, save on bus routes and reduce bus travel time, provide for natural growth of Montessori, and provide space for a possible future charter school at North. It would require additional staff and increase utility expenses.

Members of the Demo Trends Council toured Epiphany Lutheran School recently. The property will be available and with some alteration and renovation, it appears to meet the programmatic needs of an Early Learning Center.

The Board asked if there would be a maximum enrollment at Montessori. Mr. Leibham has met with the Montessori Governance Board and they would like to increase a section at each level. They are denying people now because they have a limited enrollment at the first level. The Board wanted to know the number of students that have been turned away.

Mr. Leibham said that based on Applied Population Laboratory projections, district-wide elementary enrollments will increase by at least 377 students over the next ten years and there is potential to increase by over 500

students. The enrollment increases will occur primarily on the south side and will create excess enrollments at Robbins, Sherman, Lakeshore and Meadowview. All elementary schools will be at, near, or over capacity in ten years with the exception of Longfellow which may experience a slight decline in enrollment. Robbins, Lakeshore and Sherman may be beyond capacity within two years.

The Council said that the District will have to increase elementary capacity. This could be accomplished by adding classroom space to existing schools or by building a new four-section school on property currently owned by the district or a new property. Over the next five to six years the District will deal with increased elementary enrollments by shifting boundaries or moving fifth graders into the middle schools. Mr. Leibham shared several broad issues with expanding or creating a new school. Expanding existing schools would minimize boundary adjustments. It would also create very large schools with enrollments between 552 and 690 and would commit the district to large elementary schools. Expanding would also require additional infrastructure renovations and increased utility costs. It would create a greater economy of scale relative to staff and administration.

If a new school was built, it would ease enrollment pressures on the south and west sides and allow for future south side expansion on existing schools if needed. It would maintain a more balanced enrollment size between schools in the district but would require boundary shifts. There would also be additional staff needed for the office, grounds and maintenance, and food service. There may be an opportunity to partner with the City and private developer(s) to generate new neighborhood growth.

Mr. Leibham said he plans to get into the elementary schools and show parents and staff the data, trends, and what is projected. He will get feedback from those groups.

The group recommended that an architect be contracted to provide assistance to the District.

It was anticipated that the Board would have enough data by January or February to make a decision regarding expanding existing schools or creating a new school.

B. Identification of Possible Operational, Capital and Facility Needs as they Relate to One or More Referendum Questions

Superintendent Heilmann said that the District has reduced the budget by \$32.2 million since revenue limits were imposed in the 1993-94 school year. In the last four fiscal years, the average reduction has exceeded \$4.6 million. Long-term debt repayment drops approximately \$4.6 million in

the 2012-13 school year and remains constant at \$1.1 million through 2019-20. The figure of \$4.6 million cannot be transferred to another part of the District budget, so unless the public approves additional expenditures in the form of a referendum, the District will lose the taxing authority from that money. This would result in a significant decrease to the District's overall property tax rate, so the timing would be right to hold a referendum to take advantage of that reduction in debt repayment. Paying off the bonded indebtedness gives the District the opportunity to go to referendum with a negligible impact on the tax rate.

Dr. Heilmann said that operational referendum and capital/facilities referendum questions must be separate. Operational questions can be structured by asking for a fixed number of dollars in perpetuity or by asking for a certain number of dollars over a fixed period of time. Capital/facilities needs questions can be structured by issuing bonds for a fixed period of time not to exceed 20 years or by asking for a certain amount over a fixed period of time.

Mr. Van De Water said that when reviewing the District's capital needs, there is data from the Demographic Trends Council and the five-year capital improvement plan that can be utilized. The projected capital needs for 2011-12 would be \$9.6 million and if all needs and those not scheduled are considered, that number exceeds \$45.5 million. He said the Board will have to consider if it wants larger referendums less frequently or smaller referendums more frequently.

The operational needs (day to day operations) would have more variables and be more complicated. An operational referendum would be impacted by bargaining laws and the state's budget problems.

Mr. Van De Water explained that 80.2% of the budget is in salaries and benefits and 71.4% of that requires negotiations. There are specific laws that deal with bargaining. He reviewed the process of mediation/arbitration and the statutory factors that are considered by an arbitrator. In essence 71.4% of the budget is under the potential control of a third-party arbitrator. On the revenue side, revenue limits control 87.3% of all revenue. There are variables to the revenue limit formula that are subject to change: enrollment, per pupil increase factor, and non-referendum approved debt. The state controls 93% of the revenue stream.

In the next biennial budget for 2011-12/2012-13, the state is looking at a deficit of \$2.5 to \$2.7 billion. Past solutions at the state level have been to reduce the local ability to raise revenue and reduce general state aid to schools. He showed the impact of changes that could be made in per pupil increases on total revenue. There can be several variations to projections because of these factors. Mr. Van De Water showed three different

scenarios over five years ranging from a projected deficit of \$13 million to a \$25 million deficit.

Mr. Van De Water reiterated that long-term debt repayment will drop in 2012-13 and be paid off in 2019-20. This gives the District an opportunity to wrap new debt around this schedule without causing a tax increase. He shared several possible election dates starting in April 2011 and said that September 2012 would be the last time to take advantage of that debt reduction.

When looking at capital needs, there is a projected \$45 million in the Five-Year Facilities Plan. Mr. Van De Water said that much of the data needed to prioritize is available. He suggested sitting down with a financial advisor and putting a plan together. Mr. Kramer was directed to prioritize the capital needs. The operational projections would also be needed. The Budget Development Committee will assist in this process.

There was some discussion about waiting until 2012 and whether that would give the Board more time to consider the impact of the state budget and the use of the projected \$2 stimulus funds. Working capital could be used for next year and by then more enrollment information would be available.

Joe Luginbill felt the time was right to move ahead with a referendum after hearing what students have to say and participating in the roundtable discussions.

Citizen Carolyn Barstad urged the Board to move ahead with a referendum in April 2011.

Com. Faanes asked to get statistics on two questions passing on one referendum.

C. First Reading of Revisions to *ECASD Policy 364.1 – Student Acceptable Use of Technology* and *ECASD Policy 527- Employee Acceptable Use of Technology*

Com. Janke shared the first readings of Policies 364.1 and 527:

Policy 364.1 – Student Acceptable Use of Technology

Student behavior expectations with regard to the use of Technology:

The Eau Claire Area School District expects students to use technology in ways that promote a productive educational environment as determined by the District. Technology includes, but is not limited to, electronic devices, private and public networks. Students shall not engage in an electronic activity that disrupts,

distracts, or compromises the learning process or environment for the student or others.

Policy 527 – Employee Acceptable Use of Technology

Eau Claire School District staff shall use technology in a way that promotes a productive educational environment and that is consistent with the curricular and instructional goals of the district. Technology is defined to include, but is not limited to, electronic devices, private and public networks. Staff shall continually evaluate and monitor all technological resources used with students to ensure compliance with all local, state, and federal laws and regulations including, but not limited to, The Child Internet Protection Act (CIPA). District staff shall not engage in electronic activity that disrupts, distracts, or compromises the learning process or environment.

The Board asked for an update on the progress of implementation of these revisions at the beginning of 2011.

D. Review/Update of *ECASD Policy 830 – Use of School Facilities* and How Recent Changes are Applied

Mr. Van De Water said that in accordance with Policy 830, school facilities are to be made available to groups and individuals of the community when not in use for school purposes. School purposes include all district sanctioned student activities, PTO/PTA activities, and Booster Club activities. Uniform rates shall be established to recover reasonable usage fees for all groups using facilities that are not for school purposes. Fees are differentiated based on whether use is, or is not, during regular school hours/calendar. Uniform rates shall be differentiated based on whether the activity is designed primarily for school-age children or for adult activities. A district-wide reservation system shall be used to provide fair and equitable procedures to reserve designated district facilities for groups that are not directly related to a school purpose. The reservation system shall provide a reservation priority hierarchy. Highest priority shall be assigned for ECASD school purposes followed by groups that are not under the definition of school purposes but provide activities for school-age children. Information about school facility reservations and utilization priorities shall be on the district's website. All groups and individuals who reserve a facility shall provide proof of indemnification before being allowed to use any district facility. Mr. Van De Water shared how each of these provisions would be applied, and how the rules and fee schedule conform to these regulations.

Mr. Van De Water also shared facility rental conditions of use and fee schedule for each building use classification.

The Board made a few suggestions for changes. Under "Concessions/Food Service" it should be noted that the Director of Food Service approve the

sale or distribution of food or drink. Under scheduling priorities it was asked to add some more distinctions between non-profit and profit groups. It was recommended that the reservation system be included under the community tab on the website. It was also thought that adjustments should be made so that school-age children are given higher priority than adults (Class 3 vs. Class 4)

There was some discussion about charging school-aged children or nonprofits to use pools and other areas during the school day. Mr. Van De Water explained that pools are much more expensive to maintain and a reasonable cost would be charged. Com. Faanes did not feel the District policy was designed to charge these groups to use the pool; other board members felt it did. The Board will review the minutes of the meetings when it discussed this policy and clarify the intent at the next Board meeting.

D. Request for Future Agenda Items

E. Other Business

F. Motion to Adjourn Committee Meeting

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

G. Motion to go into Closed Session

Com. Faanes moved, seconded by Com. Shiel, to go into closed session under 19.85 (1)(c) to consider employment, promotion, compensation or performance evaluation data of any public employee over which the governmental body has jurisdiction or exercises responsibility to discuss administrative compensation and contracts. Motion carried by the following roll call vote: Aye: Craig, Duax, Faanes, Johnson, and Shiel. Nay: Janke.

H. Meeting adjourned at 9:52 pm.