

I. PRELIMINARY

Shepherd called the May 5, 2015, meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Roll Call

The following members were present:

JulieMarie A. Shepherd, president
Cathy Wildman, vice president
Mary W. Lewis, secretary
Dan Jorgensen, treasurer
Amber Drevon, director
Barbara J. Yamrick, director

The following member was absent:

Eric Nelson, director

Also meeting with the Board of Education were:

D. Rico Munn, superintendent of schools
William Stuart, deputy superintendent
Georgia Durán, chief communication officer
Brandon Eyre, district legal counsel
David Trautenberg, chief financial officer
Anthony Sturges, chief operating officer
Adrienne Bradshaw, controller
Lisa Escárcega, chief accountability and research officer
Damon Smith, chief personnel officer
John Youngquist, chief academic officer
Tonia Norman, assistant to Board of Education

Pledge of Allegiance

Rangeview High School student Travis Winkler led the Board and audience in the pledge to the flag. Shepherd welcomed visitors to the meeting.

Approval of Agenda

The May 5, 2015, agenda was amended to remove the Student Organization Charter, Vista PEAK Gaming Club, from the consent agenda at the request of school staff.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the regular meeting of the Board of Education held on April 21, 2015, were approved as written.

Student Performance

Rangeview High School students Kaitlyn Shavalier and Travis Winkler, under the direction of Katie Teermer, performed a lyrical duet. The final 2015 Spring Recital Showcase, Light Up the Night, is scheduled on Thursday, May 7, at 7:00

p.m.

Recognizing Excellence

Munn congratulated Aurora Public Schools Director of Nutrition Services Mona Martinez-Brosh for earning the Colorado School Nutrition Association's 2015 Director of the Year award. The award recognizes the contributions of school nutrition directors who manage effective, fiscally sound school meal programs that provide healthy, appetizing meals to students. Martinez-Brosh will be recognized in the May/June edition of the CSNA Healthy Bites newsletter and will be honored at the annual School Nutrition Association national conference in Utah later this summer. Thank you for all that you do for our students. Your hard work and dedication truly make a difference.

This week is School Nutrition Employee Week. We are thankful for our Nutrition Services employees who help our students maintain healthy lifestyles. Congratulations to this group for earning the 2015 Public Health Hero award.

This week is also National Teacher Appreciation Week, and today is National Teacher Day. Our teachers are role models, motivators, listeners and friends who make vital contributions in students' lives. Please help us honor our teachers this week in any way you can.

National Nurses Week is May 6 to May 12. We are grateful for the services our healthcare professionals provide as the health of our students directly impacts their learning.

The APS Board of Education and I are proud of the 2015 Recognizing Excellence winners who will be honored at this time. We commend this phenomenal group of staff members for their hard work and dedication to accelerating learning for every APS student, every day. Each award recipient was nominated by his or her colleagues and/or supervisors. Members of the Classified Employees Council, Aurora Education Association and School Executives of Aurora selected the final winners. Congratulations to the following APS staff:

- Rebecca Dater, Meadowood Child Development Center
- Corine Muehlhausen, Vista PEAK Exploratory P-8
- Lesia Pippins, South Middle School
- Melanie Lawhorn, Gateway High School
- Michael Redding, Maintenance and Operations
- Desiree Jaramillo, Iowa Elementary School
- Jessica Cuthbertson, Vista PEAK Exploratory P-8
- Robert Mangiameli, Aurora West College Preparatory Academy
- Dena Joslyn-Custer, Aurora Central High School
- Jennifer Buster, Crawford Elementary School
- Chris Capron, Murphy Creek P-8
- David Schoenhals, Aurora Quest K-8
- Wendy Doran, APS Online High School
- Shannon Solomon, Nutrition Services

Yamrick thanked the Division of Research and Accountability and the Division of Finance for the excellent information that was provided to the Board in advance of the May 5 meeting.

Opportunity for Audience

Richard Rimpson, concerned Aurora Central parent working in conjunction with Together Colorado, expressed concerns regarding the program format under the proposed innovation structure. He questioned how innovation would affect the special needs student population group and if innovation would be implemented at the middle school level. He questioned why an appointed parent focus group was convened to determine decisions for students without attempted outreach for additional parent participation in the decision-making process.

Liz Wiler, member of the Friends of Aurora Central High School alumni association and mentor for Colorado Youth at Risk, is unconvinced that innovation status would solve issues at Aurora Central. She is a big advocate for Aurora Central, noting that it is the only school that she attended without interruption during her high school career. She shared that Aurora Central is her home and is the reason she became a mentor for Colorado Youth at Risk. She noted that the community that Aurora Central serves has a number of socio-economic conditions and many students are fighting for their future. She questioned if basic survival needs of Aurora Central students and families were being considered and expressed that she would support her family if placed in a position of having to choose between school or family. She shared that Principal Mark Roberts has done a phenomenal job at Aurora Central and needs time, space and flexibility to continue changes that he started.

Wiler requested that the following statement be included in the record: "I'm unbelievably proud to be a Trojan. My name is Javier Lopez and I graduated from Aurora Central in 2013, at what I consider, the peak of my high school success. During my senior year, I was the master of ceremonies at graduation after serving as student body president. I was awarded the Daniels Fund Scholarship, which I am now utilizing as I pursue a Bachelors of Arts degree at Colorado State University. I was never as driven as I am now. Like many students at Aurora Central, I was put on a path at birth that eventually had two ends, incarceration or premature demise. After two years of dealing with poverty that led to homelessness, violence, gang culture and drug use, I was fed up with who I was and made it known. I showed administrators and teachers such as Gayle Egloff and Haidee Flory that I refuse to let my status in this world hold me back and they nurtured that. We all are aware of the issues that Aurora Central students face whether it's an unstable home, income, or support, but these circumstances can be beaten. These obstacles that we face as a community are not excuses to do poorly, but motivation to do more and the devoted staff at Aurora Central knows that. As the school faces drastic changes, I want the Board to know something of great importance to those that have walked the halls at Aurora Central; this is our home. The home that has fostered and allowed so many students to go on to accomplish success and move through the world touching lives and investing in human potential, not in spite of the fact that we graduated from Aurora Central, but because we were fortunate enough to graduate from Aurora Central. Let's take care of our home and our family.

Michelle Mugatha, Columbia Middle School teacher, highlighted a student's essay to demonstrate time, 26 seconds, in which middle school teachers have to provide feedback to students on a daily basis. She discussed the importance of providing equitable planning time for teachers at the middle school level, emphasizing that this has been a major problem at the middle school level for the past four years and has been documented on climate and TELL surveys. She shared that district leaders are proposing to convene a work group to study

equitable planning times, but feels this issue can no longer wait as immediate relief is needed to reduce workloads of middle school teachers. She noted that part of the new strategic plan is to provide every learner with an individualized plan, but questioned how this promise would be kept with only 26 seconds of planning time per day for each student. She asked that the Board consider funding to hire additional middle school teachers.

II. INFORMATIONAL REPORT

Leadership Team Reports

Middle School Sexual Health Curriculum Adoption

Kenny Webb, arts and P.E instructional coordinator; Ryann Patrick-Stuart, science instructional coordinator; and Marybeth Rensberger, director of health services, highlighted a presentation that summarized Colorado law; grant committee findings from spring 2014; seventh and eighth grade plans and expectations; material review findings; curriculum review and matrix differences; similarities, strengths and concerns with proposed ETR HealthSmart and Flash curriculums; strengths and concerns with It Takes Two adopted curriculum; time line for adoption of health curriculum; and professional learning and communication plans for teachers. The proposed Flash curriculum and ETR HealthSmart curriculum are being recommended for adoption. It Takes Two curriculum is being recommended for re-adoption.

The team noted that a recommendation was made to place a health teacher at every school site.

The proposed sexual health curriculum will be included on the May 19 consent agenda for action.

The Sexual Health Curriculum for Seventh and Eighth Grade presentation is appended to the May 5 minutes.

Aurora Central Update

Munn provided the Board with a summary of slides from the Aurora Central – Shaping the Future presentation that highlighted recent actions and supports to address turnaround efforts since the April 2 Board meeting.

Munn highlighted outcomes from a recent visit to the Clark County School District in Nevada, which claims to have turned around several large comprehensive high schools. The visit included a series of meetings that highlighted work around turnaround zones and the Community in Schools program, a national organization that provides wraparound services for turnaround schools.

Munn provided the Board with turnaround research and data from three Clark County high schools, an outline of wraparound services provided by the Community in Schools organization, and the impact of services and data from an elementary turnaround zone. He noted that turnaround zones are essentially innovation zones, and shared that identified schools are placed in zones for specific time lines and received priority for hiring, maintenance and federal funding for SIG grants. He indicated that the UVA process is utilized in the Clark County School District to identify school leaders, as well as school reconstitution in which no more than 50 percent of the staff is retained.

Munn met with representatives from the philanthropic community to discuss funding and resources to support work, and has had conversations with consultants from Mass Insight around capacity building and identifying supports around finance, chartering, and autonomy at the district level. He indicated that a draft proposal and template was provided by Mass Insight. Feedback was provided by district staff and a revised draft is expected in the next few days.

Munn reviewed state mandated options, including school closure, Education Management Option (EMO), charter conversion, innovation status, or “other” change of equal impact. He noted that national research related to EMOs and charters were fairly similar, and highlighted a meeting with consultants from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to review charter options. He shared that questions and requests provided to consultants in advance of the meeting included examples of viable charter conversion models of high schools with more than 2,000 students, key benchmarks or indicators of early success or challenges, required district level supports to ensure success, required private or philanthropic resources, key engagement strategies for community consideration, and relationship management with feeders or other connective schools with different governance models. The group of consultants, included Dr. Don Shalvey, deputy director of the Gates Foundation; Dr. Felicia Cummings Smith, senior program officer of the Gates Foundation; Dr. Megan Quaile, director of national strategy at Green Dot Schools; Dr. Mark Duentz, vice president of school support for New Visions Schools; Scott Gordon, CEO of Mastery Public Schools, and Keisha Campbell, Academy for Urban School Leadership.

Munn shared that a meet and greet was held on Wednesday, April 29, in which some Board members and district leaders attended. He noted that consultants and representatives from the philanthropic community met with district leaders on Thursday, April 30, to discuss advanced questions, requests and the current state of Aurora Central. He shared that consultants indicated that a charter conversion would be a viable option for a small group of experienced organizations, noting that all would consider districts that had a broad charter strategy and significant upfront capital prior to charter conversion work. He believes that Aurora Central would most likely be converted into four autonomous schools with four separate administrations under a charter agreement.

Lewis asked for additional clarification around funding for a charter conversion. Munn shared that costs would be dependent on the organization. He added that the expectation would be to work with the philanthropic community to subsidize costs.

Lewis asked about structural work to the building in the event of a charter conversion. Munn replied that the charter organization would be responsible for structural work and would either sign a long-term lease or purchase the building.

Drevon asked about advantages and disadvantages of splitting Aurora Central into four smaller schools. Munn shared that splitting Aurora Central into small learning communities would allow the school to remain under one governance structure, but indicated that results have been mixed under this approach. He noted that small autonomous schools with clear lines of governance authority have seen more success. He highlighted possible strains that could occur around agreements for common use areas such as gyms, cafeterias, or administrative space.

Munn reviewed a slide that highlighted “other” options that the State Board might view as an equal impact, including reconstitution, which would allow district leaders to develop a school design, replace the current administrative team and retain no more than 50 percent of the instructional staff. The other option would be conversion to a pilot school provided for by Article 44 of the APS Master Agreement.

Munn shared that the Board was provided with a handout of survey feedback from the Aurora Central community and a memo that included guiding principles. He highlighted three viable options and next steps for Board consideration, including innovation and actions zones, charter school conversion, or reconstitution.

Munn recommended that the Board consider innovation and actions zones, and highlighted a presentation that outlined the action zone design platform in which an outside consultant such as Mass Insight might be utilized to provide professional expertise around capacity building. He proposed that a Zone Advisory Committee comprised of business and postsecondary workforce readiness leaders, a Zone Design Team comprised of school staffs across specified action zones, and School-Based Design Teams be convened to develop expectations and start innovation work.

A copy of the APS Aurora Community-Based Transformation, Innovation and Opportunity Network “A.C.T.I.O.N. Zones” presentation is appended to the May 5 minutes.

Lewis asked for clarification related to outside consultant costs. Munn believes that the overall cost would be around \$500,000 to \$1 million. He expects to work with outside funders to subsidize costs.

Munn highlighted next steps for a charter school conversion, including development of a community engagement plan, adoption of a charter school conversion process, development of a request for proposal or letter of intent, and increase charter authorizing capability. He highlighted next steps for school reconstitution, including development of a school design and turnaround plan, identification of a budget to support the transition, and development of a staff transition plan.

Munn provided the Board with a draft Memorandum of Understanding for Turnaround Action for Aurora Central High School, and requested that the Board take action on one of the three viable options at the June 2 Board meeting.

Yamrick asked for additional clarification regarding the Community in Schools organization. Munn shared that Community in Schools is a non-profit organization that would provide wraparound services and coordinate existing services for turnaround schools.

Yamrick asked about the Board’s involvement in committee work and planning for innovation and innovation zones. Munn shared that the Board would be required to approve innovation zone plans, but proposed committees are not currently set up for Board participation. Yamrick requested that Board involvement be strongly considered on proposed innovation zone committees prior to submitting the MOU to the State Board.

Yamrick asked for clarification related to work of Mass Insight and the Bill and

Melinda Gates Foundation. Munn shared that Mass Insight might be utilized as an outside consultant if innovation zones are approved. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation might provide funding for turnaround work.

Lewis asked for clarification regarding inclusion of Boston K-8 in the MOU. Munn explained that Boston is a year behind Aurora Central on the accountability clock and would be included in the innovation zone. Lewis voiced concerns regarding the time line and absence of community engagement work in the Boston community. Munn shared that community engagement work would start once the Board provides direction on a plan. He noted that the MOU would not be submitted to the State Board until June 10 and suggested that a statement be included in the MOU indicating that the district is working to identify schools to include in action zones.

Lewis expressed appreciation for section four of the MOU that states, "The parties acknowledged that implementation of an innovation zone requires the vote and approval of the affected APS accountability committees, teachers, and administrators, and potentially including renegotiation of the current Master Agreement with licensed staff. Best efforts will be utilized to secure these consents, but this agreement shall not constitute a guarantee of that approval."

Yamrick requested that other district schools be removed from the draft MOU and included in a separate paragraph. Munn explained that the draft MOU does not lock the district into anything and highlighted the importance of presenting a plan to the State Board that includes rigor. Lewis understands how schools are being grouped within innovation zones, but reiterated concerns related to the absence of community engagement.

Drevon asked for clarification related to identification of schools to include in action zones. Munn shared that proposed school zones would include commonalities and themes to address challenges at schools with similar populations.

Shepherd asked if additional community engagement efforts would be helpful prior to the Board taking action on June 2. Munn encouraged the Board to engage in dialogue with the community regarding the three proposed options.

Jorgensen noted that the Board has until June 2 to provide direction to the Superintendent related to innovation, but schools have to adopt the innovation plan. He suggested that the Board start having conversations to better assist other district schools approaching the accountability clock.

Drevon is interested in meeting with groups, including the focus group that provided comments during Opportunity for Audience.

Lewis is interested in hearing about community outreach efforts at other low-performing schools in the district. Munn shared that work has been limited as staff is waiting for more Board direction.

Wildman would like to hear from the community regarding the proposed MOU and action zones. Yamrick suggested that the Board hold a town hall meeting to give community stakeholders opportunities to share thoughts on proposed options.

The Board was in favor of holding a town hall forum around the innovation plan,

action zones and other proposed ideas. The communication department will provide the Board with possible dates, times and locations.

Jorgensen noted that it is appropriate to seek community feedback on the innovation zone plan and other options at the town hall meeting, including portfolio of choice, charter schools and teacher-led proposals.

Drevon asked for clarification regarding school innovation plans and charter schools under the innovation framework. Munn explained that schools would have to adopt an innovation plan; the Board would be required to approve an innovation action zone. Eyre shared that charter conversion under the innovation framework would require Board approval. He added that a charter would be considered a separate entity outside of the innovation structure, but the contract could be aligned with established goals within the zone. Escárcega shared that teachers could submit proposals under innovation.

The Aurora Central Shaping the Future presentation is appended to the May 5 minutes.

Jennifer Woods, representative for Arc of Aurora, is working in conjunction with Together Colorado. She is unconvinced that community involvement has occurred around the proposed innovation plan and is worried how this will affect the special needs student population group. She voiced concerns regarding the absence of parent and community involvement at the recent meet and greet with consultants from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in which some Board members attended. She expressed the need for more transparency and parent involvement, and asked for additional clarification related to wraparound services.

Solemi Pedraza, parent of an Aurora Central student, expressed that her son is concerned that Superintendent Munn is not focused on children. She shared that her son is taking AP classes and has a 4.0 GPA. She does not believe any community engagement has occurred around the proposed innovation plan and noted that staff, administrators, and community members have expressed that a decision has already been made. She speaks five languages and noted that many Aurora Central students speak one or more language. She noted that many non-speaking English parents were unaware of potential changes until she began knocking on doors.

Pedraza highlighted statements from her son who expressed concerns regarding recent attacks on young African American males, and now believes it is his school's turn to be attacked. Her son noted that Aurora Central has minority students from all over the world, but few minority teachers that want to teach at Aurora Central. She expressed that many students are unaware that they can come and speak to the Board, which is even more concerning as a parent and community member.

Erika Flores-Rowe, Aurora Central parent working in conjunction with Together Colorado, voiced concerns around strategies and community engagement at Aurora Central. She expressed concerns regarding potential loss of school staff, increase class sizes, decrease test scores, and outside consultants making decisions that would affect the Aurora Central community. She noted that adequate information and notification was not provided to the Aurora Central community, adding that a number of multi-cultural families reside in her neighborhood and many were unaware of potential changes until she went door

to door. She asked why Aurora Central teachers were not involved in the process and why there is little to no African-American teachers at the school. She was under the impression that innovation had to go through parents and teachers and plans to do her own research. She asked Superintendent Munn if innovation had been tried in other districts and what was the outcome. She is certain that a couple of DPS schools have utilized the innovation approach and had to close down.

Amy Nichols, Aurora Education Association, has been listening to Board conversations around innovation zones and charters since February or March. She noted that Aurora Central staff is working very hard and is getting close to hitting required state benchmarks.

Nichols believes that innovation would provide an opportunity for creativity as the intent is to bring the Aurora Central community together to rethink what is best for kids and ensure everyone's voice is heard in the process. She hopes that whatever design is selected is an Aurora design, not a Denver design. She noted that a number of Denver ideas and programs have been mentioned, but emphasized that we are Aurora and our differentiated approach model is better than most cities. She likes the idea of a teacher-led design proposal and challenged everyone to think outside the box to make decisions for the right reasons and work together to create options for student success. She shared that it would be helpful to the community to clearly explain and communicate how DSS, MTSS, UVA, EMO, zones and communities fit together for sustained student success.

Jamie Pasquariello is an Aurora Central graduate and fifth grade literacy teacher at Dalton. She expressed concerns related to innovation and feels it should start at the school level. She is also concerned that a number of Aurora Central teachers and parents were not present or unaware of the Board meeting or topic of discussion. She noted that information was not included on the Aurora Central website and emphasized the need for better communication. She is worried that a charter school would privatize public education and does not want this to happen at her former high school. She expressed that the Aurora Central community is amazing and diverse, and suggested that options be figured out the Aurora way. She asked that the Board be thoughtful of the Aurora Central community, and suggested that discussion topics be better communicated and letters to parents be translated in multiple languages.

Sherry Summers, teacher at Aurora Central, emphasized that a number of Aurora Central teachers and an administrator were present at the meeting. She noted that a number of teachers had to leave due to other commitments or responsibilities.

Summers is a retired DPS teacher and shared that she fell in love with Aurora Central when she first visited the school. She drives 50 minutes, both ways, to get to work and feels it is worth it. She shared that her dad taught her not to bad mouth things if you do not have a better idea. She does not know if there is a perfect idea, but hopes that everyone considers the number of things that can be done to help and support kids. She emphasized that Aurora Central teachers are more worried about what will happen to the kids than their jobs, and implored the Board to consider what is best for them. She realizes that more minority teachers are needed at Aurora Central, but stressed that she is a good teacher who only wants what is best for kids.

Shepherd thanked staff for providing information to the Board. She also thanked Aurora Central staff, parents and community supporters for providing comments to the Board.

Acceptance of Migrant Education Program Funds and Assurances

Jesus Escárcega, director of grants, provided an overview of the 2015-16 Migrant Education Program (MEP) grant application pursuant to Title I, Part C, of No Child Left Behind. APS serves as the fiscal agent for the Metro Region MEP, which services eligible migrant students in 18 school districts located in 10 regional counties.

The MEP grant application will be included on the May 19 consent agenda for action.

The Migrant Education Program presentation and program summary is appended to the May 5 minutes.

Turnaround Strategies

Shepherd shared that the Board was provided with the APS Building Excellent Schools Together (BEST) presentation that addresses turnaround strategies for challenged schools in advance of the meeting. Munn highlighted a graph that outlined time lines related to the school performance framework (SPF) and the impact of state assessments under Senate Bill 163. He indicated that district turnaround strategies are built on the state's school performance framework that identifies schools on year one, two, and three of the state accountability clock. He provided differences between school improvement strategies and turnaround strategies, and discussed time lines and impacts to determine effectiveness of school improvement strategies.

Munn provided an overview of turnaround work and strategies for challenged schools, including call to action, cultural shifts, building and district capacity supports, theory of action, building excellent schools together, communities of practice, time lines, and ongoing work.

Wildman asked if Paris Elementary School required additional supports. Munn indicated that additional school improvement supports are needed at Paris, but not turnaround support. He indicated that Paris might be a school to include in an innovation zone if the Board elects to move forward with innovation.

Drevon asked for clarification regarding responsibility for determining implementation of a school improvement or turnaround plan at a low-performing school. Munn shared that it is currently an administrative decision, noting that the Board would be required to approve TIG grants to better support low performing schools. Escárcega added that the Board is required to approve school improvement plans, which would include actions and strategies. The Board would also be required to approve grants to address turnaround work.

Jorgensen asked about multiple school improvement supports and strategies. Munn shared that school improvement supports and strategies would be based on site data.

Yamrick asked for clarification regarding the accountability cycle if Aurora Central hits required state benchmarks. Escárcega noted that the accountability clock

would stop if a school has one year off of continues priority improvement or turnaround status. She noted that the school performance framework, based on new assessment data, would not be available for Aurora Central until fall 2016.

Drevon asked about criteria benchmarks to determine implementation of a school improvement or turnaround plan. Munn shared that criteria benchmarks are based on site data and analysis.

Drevon asked if school improvement or turnaround determinations were also based on climate survey data or other considerations. Munn discussed the importance of having the right leadership in place at school sites, adding that this is part of engagement work with UVA, as well as the new selection process to identify school leaders. He noted that climate survey data provides evaluation feedback related to new structures, level of supports, and other measures. He shared that RMC provided an objective analysis of the DSS framework and structures, noting that the initial report was promising.

Drevon shared that monitoring cultural shifts and outcomes may be a future discussion topic for Board consideration as part of the revised policy around monitoring. Escárcega indicated that RMC provides an audit around school turnaround strategies every two or three years. She noted that the ultimate evaluation tools are school performance framework and student achievement. Jorgensen shared that the Board could revisit the monitoring tool to indentify gaps if needed.

The APS B.E.S.T. presentation and graph are appended to the May 5 minutes.

Annual Contract Renewal: Rebound and Futures

Stuart presented the Board with alternative education services renewal agreements for the Ombudsman Program (Rebound) and Colorado Youth for a Change (Futures) as required per BOE policy.

Lewis requested that Rebound program slots be reduced from 250 to 220 as a cost saving measure to the district. Escárcega will provide the Board with comparison data that highlights the impact of the Rebound program with other similar programs.

The Colorado Youth for a Change alternative education services renewal agreement will be included on the May 19 consent agenda for action. The Ombudsman Program alternative education services renewal agreement will be included on the June 2 consent agenda for action.

2015-16 Proposed Budget Review

David Trautenberg, chief financial officer, and Adrienne Bradshaw, controller, provided an overview of the proposed budget for the 2015-16 school year, including programs and initiatives to accelerate learning, staff recruitment, state and federal mandates, student enrollment growth, and facility capacity supports. The Board heard changes to the 15 district funds and expected increases to the general fund, including Exceptional Student Services supports, T.E, PERA, Affordable Healthcare Act, workers compensation, transportation, COP reserves, Board and Tabor reserves, and startup costs for the new Edna and John W. Mosley P8. Potential compensation increases and the budget for Pickens Technical College will be included in the adopted budget. The adopted budget

May 5, 2015

will be presented as information on June 2 and included on the June 19 consent agenda for action. The District Accountability Advisory Committee will review the district budget on May 21.

The Board will be provided with cost differences between vested and new teachers. The Board will also be provided with additional clarification regarding the T.E. allocation formula.

Shepherd requested that Board members email additional questions or concerns regarding the budget to Munn or Trautenberg prior to the May 19 Board meeting.

The 2015-16 Proposed Budget presentation is appended to the May 5 minutes.

Policy AED, Accreditation

Eyre shared that Policy AED, Accreditation, was revised to correspond with recommendations from the Colorado Association of Schools Boards.

Yamrick asked for clarification between Board approved polices and district policies. Eyre will meet with Yamrick to discuss.

Proposed revisions to Policy AED, Accreditation, are appended to the May 5 minutes.

This item will be included on the May 19 consent agenda for action.

Policy 2.1, Unity of Decision

Eyre provided the Board with revisions to Policy 2.1, Unity of Decision, as requested by Board Director Amber Drevon.

Proposed revisions to Policy 2.1, Unity of Decision, are appended to the May 5 minutes.

This item will be included on the May 19 consent agenda for action.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Wildman moved and Lewis seconded to approve the following items on the amended consent agenda as presented:

- Application for Committee Appointment – District Accountability Advisory Committee – Jennifer Fryer
- Expenditures Summary and Financial Report as of May 31, 2015
- Personnel

Smith provided the Board with a list of retirees on the May 5 consent agenda for a total of 300 years of service to the district.

Roll Call: Drevon, Jorgensen, Lewis, Shepherd, Wildman, Yamrick #8347

Approved on a vote of 6-0

IV. BOARD WORK

Ends Conversation

Standing Committee Report

Lewis asked that Board members submit items for inclusion in the next newsletter by Thursday, May 7.

Future Business

Drevon requested that future Board agenda topics be discussed prior to the next meeting. Munn asked that the Board inform staff if additional agenda items require inclusion on future agendas.

Munn requested that the Board approve the accreditation contract for the upcoming school year. He will provide the Board with a report on May 19 and asked that the contract be included on the June 2 consent agenda for approval.

Lewis reminded the Board that the protocol is to provide Munn with any questions or concerns by Monday at noon.

Munn shared that the final legislative update will be provided to the Board via a written report.

Trautenberg will provide a bond 101 presentation to individual Board members in the next couple of weeks.

Munn suggested that a TIF workshop be provided to the Board on June 16.

Superintendent Evaluation Tool

Lewis and Drevon will meet with Escárcega on Thursday morning to discuss assessment data in preparation of the Superintendent's evaluation. Wildman suggested that information be included on the district website.

Policy Perception Checklist

Did the Board receive information at tonight's meeting that requires a policy change?

The Board did not received information that required a policy change.

Did the Board receive information at tonight's meeting that requires additional information or monitoring?

Additional information, data and questions will be provided to the Board.

Board Self-Monitoring

Drevon suggested that the Board develop a criteria tool around Board self-monitoring at a future meeting. She indicated that student achievement would be considered a criteria and saw examples of this during earlier discussions related to Aurora Central and turnaround strategies.

V. CONCLUDING ITEMS

Next meeting date

The next meeting of the Board of Education will be held on May 19, 2015, at 4:30 p.m. in the third floor conference room of the Ritchie Center, University of Denver, 2240 Buchtel Blvd.

On Tuesday, May 19, 2015, the Aurora Public Schools Board of Education is expected to recess into executive session under the authority of C.R.S. 24-6-402(4)(f)(I) to discuss a personnel matter, specifically the superintendent's evaluation. The executive session will be held at 4:40 p.m. in the third floor conference room of the Ritchie Center, University of Denver, 2240 Buchtel Blvd.

Adjournment

The regular meeting of the Board of Education adjourned at 11:42 p.m.

President

ATTEST _____
Secretary