A Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees was called to order at 5:50 p.m. by President Herrera. Member Martinez-Roach, and Member Shirakawa were present. Clerk Mann arrived at 6:10 p.m. Member Nguyen was absent.

1) BOARD RECONVENED FROM CLOSED SESSION
The meeting reconvened at 6:04 p.m.

2) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3) WELCOME AND EXPLANATION TO AUDIENCE
President Herrera extended a welcome to the audience, explained the format of the meeting, and noted that all Board Meetings are recorded.

4) CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA
None

5) PUBLIC MEMBERS WHO WISH TO ADDRESS THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
   5.1 Lou Kviter, District Demographics
   5.2 Lou Kvitek, District Office Site Disposition
   5.3 Lou Kvitek, Evergreen Valley High School Enrollment
   5.4 Jon Reinke, District Demographics
   5.6 Frank Biehl, District Demographics
   5.7 Alan Chin, District Demographics
   5.8 Ed Wong, District Demographics
   5.9 John T. Moore, District Demographics
   5.10 Ruben Dominguez, District Demographics
   5.11 Lisa Davidson, District Demographics
   5.12 Jim Zito, District Demographics

6) OPERATIONAL ITEMS/BOARD DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION
   6.1 Application for funding from the California Department of Education under the Teacher Recruitment and Student Support Program (TRSSP) for James Lick High School, William C. Overfelt High School and Yerba Buena High School.

   On February 10, 2006, Jack O'Connell, Superintendent of Public Instruction, announced that our District may apply for $99,566 in state Teacher Recruitment and Student Support Program (TRSSP) funds to help educators in low-performing schools become highly qualified.
6.2 Presentation on District Demographics – Alan Garofalo, Assistant Superintendent of Operations, Tom Williams, Enrollment Projection Consultant.

Tom Williams stated he had reviewed the current and pending attendance boundary issues and offered some suggestions. He presented the following documents, Goals, Options, and Potential Boundary Changes.

Some of Tom Williams recommendations from the Goals Letter dated February 2, 2006, were:
1) Meet Facility Capacities: have enrollments that stay within the capacity range determined to the appropriate for each site
2) Observe Elementary District Perimeters: limit the number of elementary districts within each high school attendance area to what is truly necessary, and limit the number of high schools each elementary district is split between to what is truly necessary
3) Avoid Splitting Local Neighborhoods: follow more significant dividers such as major streets
4) Consider Ratios of Students Qualifying for Subsidized Meals: do not widen the difference between the schools in the percentages of subsidy-qualifying students, and reduce that difference where possible, without violating the three higher priorities that are listed above
5) Limit Student Movement to Only the Degree Necessary (“Grandfathering”): no students should be required to change schools to the greatest extent possible

The Option Letter, dated February 3, 2006, listed some of the other District’s possibilities to deal with. Besides boundary changes, we could look at magnet programs and special schools that would effect where students go to school. This would mean if the District relocated some of these programs it would have an effect on the enrollment at some of the District’s school sites. This letter also mention “curb appeal”. Noting people judge schools from the outside. Many parents believe this factor reflects on the quality of education going on inside the school. Parents make a decision on their child’s education based on what a school looks like.

Tom Williams stated James Lick High School has lost 25% enrollment. Tom Williams believes there is an issue of “addressing” going on. Tom William believes there are hundreds of students in our district using false addresses. This of course affects the enrollment issues at various schools. If the District chooses to
enforce this issue this will impact enrollment throughout the District.

In the Potential Boundary Changes letter dated February 27, 2006, Tom Williams presented a series of potential attendance boundary revision based on the criterion and capacity ranges described in the “Goals” letter. He divided these concepts into separate groups were feasible. Many of these groups were decided on separately, such as the possible changed between Piedmont Hills and James Lick, which is one group of potential shifts, being distinct from those between Mt. Pleasant and Evergreen Valley. Each individual group, however, probably needs to be made entirely or not at all.

There are boundary adjustments that should be considered to virtually every existing attendance area, but the only urgent issue is the imminent overcrowding at Evergreen Valley High School. Tom Williams recommended eliminating all or most of the Mount Pleasant/Evergreen Valley Option Area (a.k.a. Choice Area), with those students being put solely in the Mt. Pleasant High School region. Students from that area, who are already enrolled at Evergreen Valley High School, potentially include the following year’s ninth graders and any siblings who could be concurrently enrolled, could be “grandfathered” at that school.

**Member Martinez-Roach**
How many students come to our schools that do not live in our district? How many intra-district transfer students are we talking about? We need to take action. We are obligated to have public meetings so parents will know of the recommendations we are making. Safety should be a priority issue. Students should not have to pass freeways to get to school. I want to see students go to their neighborhood schools. I want our students to be integrated. We need to look at our Charter School issue. I am prepared to do boundary changes this year.

**Superintendent Bob Núñez**
We do feel we need to take action this year. It may not be implemented until the following year, but we do need to take action. We do want to listen to the community.

**Alan Garofalo, Assistant Superintendent of Operations**
This is a very sensitive issue with everyone. We need to be reasonable. Many 8th graders already have plans to attend the high schools they are already assigned to attend in the fall. I do believe in “grandfathering”. Recommendation would be a sibling that would arrive at the given school within three year could attend the school of its sibling.
Clerk Mann
I appreciate Tom Williams report. I agreed with the priority list and recommendations. This should not affect incoming 9th graders. The important thing to decide is the affectivity date of the changes and upholding the "grandfathering" rules. Now is the time to act. The current boundaries clearly don't meet the needs or the capacity and constraints and demands we have in our District.

Member Martinez-Roach
I do not agree with Tom Williams priority list. I believe safety comes first.

Ric Abeyta, Assistant Superintendent of Student Services
The District is very conscious with intra and inter district transfers at our schools. We do have a lot of inter transfers that could be reduced by some of the recommendations. There is the safety issue where we have had a large number of families come to us especially in the Yerba Buena High School/William C. Overfelt High School area of the freeway.

Clerk Mann
What are our rights as a District with regards to NCLB (No Child Left Behind)?

Ric Abeyta, Assistant Superintendent of Student Services
We need to show we have taken a number of requests.

Clerk Mann
Is there any reason why we could not do a district wide "enrollment cleanup"?

We need to agree. I can accept the recommendations from the demographer as a framework to move forward. I would like to have administration come back with the affectivity date. Then we can begin the public process.

Legal Counsel Rogelio Ruiz
There are not public hearing requirements.

Clerk Mann
We should have two public hearings.

President Herrera
We will go to the community with guiding framework.
Superintendent Bob Nuñez
We would be ready by next Thursday, March 16, 2006. Alan Garofalo, Assistant Superintendent of Operations has been working on this proposal.

President Herrera
We need to look at other program reports for boundary changes.

Motion was made by Clerk Mann to accept the priorities as presented by the demographer to allow the administration to return on April 9, 2006, to present a plan and come back with recommendations. Seconded by Member Martinez-Roach.
Vote 4/0
Vice President Nguyen absent.

7) REPORT CLOSED SESSION ACTIONS

Nothing to report. (Rogelio Ruiz)

10) ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned by President Herrera.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

1. Manuel Herrera, Clerk
East Side Union High School District
Clerk of the Board of Trustees