



# Citizens Advisory Committee

## Minutes of August 31, 2016 Meeting

CAC Members present: Peggy Alreck-Anthony, Ganesh Balgi, Nancy Boyle, Zongbo Chen, Julie Darwish, Benaifer Dastoor, , Kevin Du, Leonardo Flores, Mo Fong, Shirley Frantz, Carol Gao, Anusikha Halder, David Heinke, Jason Heskett, Roger Hewitt, Maria Jackson, Mori Mandis, Jenny Martin, Gail Marzolf, Daniel McCune, Wes Morse, Miko Otoshi, C.S. Prakash, Amit Raikar, Jena Rajabally, Terri Shieh-Newton, Uma Sriram, Mark St. John, Elaine Zhang, Yanping Zhao, Shivangi Sharma, David Nishijima

CAC Members absent: Samy Cherfaoui, Emmanuel Muriuki, Sandi Spires, Pratibha Sriram, Liming Wang

Support staff present: Facilitator Minh Le; Superintendent Polly Bove; Associate Superintendent, Trudy Gross; Associate Superintendent Graham Clark; Director of Business Services Jason Crutchfield; Communications Coordinators Sue Larson and Rachel Zlotziver, and Transcriber Sarah DeWitt Akin

Topic	Summary
Welcome	<p>Facilitator, Minh Le, called the meeting to order at 6:04pm</p> <p>The meeting began with a statement of the committee’s goal for the evening: to review and narrow down the enrollment stabilizing solution options available to the district, considering both practicality and reasonability. The next Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting will dedicate additional time to building consensus about which specific options the CAC members will want to pursue as recommendations to the Superintendent and the Board.</p>
Enrollment Projection Beyond 2020	<p>At the previous CAC meeting, the committee heard from the district’s Enrollment Projection Consultant during his presentation, that after the year 2020, he predicted a significant decline in enrollment could be happening across the entire district and throughout the region. However, Minh reminded the committee that at this time, that is not yet an official forecast, and if and when that projection shows up within the 5-year forecast window, there will be ample time for planning and appropriate strategies to be developed to address that development if necessary.</p> <p>For instance, if the main cause of enrollment decline District wide after 2020 is believed to be the high cost of housing, that scenario would suggest that property tax revenue would remain stable. It further suggests that the District (a Basic Aid district) would have stable financial and staff/teacher resources available to address the educational needs of fewer students. The Superintendent was asked to comment, responding that she would see that as an opportunity to do positive things for our students and teachers and staff (i.e. smaller class sizes).</p> <p>Key Takeaway: Declining enrollment becomes a problem if it happens at one specific school, but not necessarily when it is evenly distributed across the district. Declining enrollment is much easier to address if the district can maintain a relative balance of enrollment across the schools. The CAC should maintain its focus on stabilizing the</p>

	<p>enrollment decline at Lynbrook HS through the forecast period, which is 2016-2020. We should not attempt to anticipate the situation beyond 2020, which would be premature and an over-reaction.</p>
<p>Target Setting for Attending Enrollment at Lynbrook</p>	<p>Last week, there was a strong level of consensus to use 1850 as the minimum, healthy number of students at Lynbrook High School, below which it starts to be challenging to provide a quality comprehensive education for students.</p> <p>In 2007-08, there were 1861 students at Lynbrook, but enrollment has been lower since then. At this time, enrollment at Lynbrook is 1740 students.</p> <p>Lynbrook Principal Maria Jackson stated that a range of 1850-1870 supports staffing and gives scheduling flexibility. It also gives room for athletics and extracurricular activities and allows the school to offer robust programming.</p> <p>After some additional discussion, Minh asked if there was any disagreement with a target range of 1850-1870 for attending enrollment for Lynbrook HS by the 2020 period. There was no disagreement with this as a target and this was recorded as a consensus by the facilitator. CAC member Roger Hewitt reinforced his belief that 1850 should be used as the minimum bar that the district needs to meet for attending enrollment at Lynbrook. (*At the start of the CAC process, it was determined by the committee members that statements would not be attributed to members by name unless requested by the committee member)</p> <p>Minh: The enrollment projection sub-committee recommended at the last meeting that if nothing is done to stabilize enrollment at Lynbrook HS, in the best case scenario by 2020, there would be approximately 1750 students attending LHS, and in the worst case scenario there would be approximately 1500 students. This suggests that in the best case scenario there will be a need to move 100-120 students into the LHS area in four years, or 25-30 students a year on average. In the worst case scenario, there will be a need to move 350-370 students to LHS in 4 years, or 88-93 students a year on average. For the next school year, if 100 additional students were enrolled in Lynbrook, the district would be able to provide the capacity and resources to absorb and serve these students.</p> <p>Again, there was no disagreement in the CAC regarding these target ranges. The facilitator recorded this as a complete consensus.</p> <p>Questions by committee members: What can we do to assure everyone that as students are moving from one or more other high schools into Lynbrook HS, -the necessary resources are in fact moving with students? Is there any situation in which the average section size in one high school deviates from that of the other high schools? In addition, what is being done in terms of facilities improvements across the five high schools which demonstrates that all schools are receiving an equitable amount of attention and investments?</p>

Review of Class Size and Staffing

Master schedulers start looking at the enrollment projections for the following school year beginning in January of each year. School departments submit their Section Allocation Worksheets to verify that they are meeting section allocation ratio requirements. Each department must meet the average ratio as a whole, per school. The average ratio is calculated as the total # of students in the department/total # of teachers in the department. Each department must be within .5 of the agreed upon ratio.

These ratios are set by the contractual agreement that FUHSD has with the Fremont Education Association (teacher's union) (see Article 6 of Teachers Contract, available on the FUHSD website). The ratio formula is determined in agreement with the union and dictates the ratio for class sizes in each department, as well as the date by which the departments must meet the agreed upon ratio (40<sup>th</sup> day of the school year). The contractual agreement includes procedures for automatic review of staffing and remedies for an unintentional breach of contract (i.e., the prescribed resolutions if ratios are off at the 40<sup>th</sup> day). The district and union agreed upon the 40<sup>th</sup> day of the school year as the target date as this is 1 week after first progress report, which allows students to re-assess course loads (add or drop courses) after the first progress report card. District staff, school administrators and union representatives communicate on an ongoing basis so that there are no surprises on the 40<sup>th</sup> day.

District-wide Department Ratios

English Gr 9 = 23:1\*\*

Algebra 1= 23:1\*\*

English Gr 10-12 = 28:1

Sheltered/ELD: 23:1, 25:1, 28:1

Music = 36:1

PE = 40:1

All other classes = 32.5:1

\*\*The District voluntarily sets smaller ratios for 9<sup>th</sup> grade math and English, though the Union's contractual required ratio is 32.5

Current Class Sizes at Lynbrook (week of Aug 20, 2016)

Even with a lower population, the departmental ratios at this time are fairly robust. Lynbrook rarely goes over the class allocation ratio [relative to the other schools].

The more sections you have, the easier it is to construct the master schedule for a school. Departments with a smaller number of sections will be hit the hardest when declining enrollment occurs (i.e. when a department is reduced to only one or two classes, it is very difficult to keep teachers employed).

It was suggested by a CAC member that the district run a simulation for enrollment at 1450 with the % of kids that requested specific classes in previous years and use that to project what section allocation could look like. The district acknowledged that this could be done, but it is time consuming and difficult to project what students would

	<p>request for their class schedules. Moreover, there are specific courses that schools must offer (e.g., courses required for graduation, courses demanded by colleges and employers, classes for English Learners and special education classes). The district acknowledged that they could potentially construct another model, but noted that a lot of information goes into creating schedules that may not be easily communicated to the community-at-large without a lot of background explanation (this is one of the reasons that the CAC has dedicated many hours to understanding what goes into creating a master schedule).</p> <p>Comment: One issue that presents itself when creating a master schedule, is that with an odd number of kids requesting a class, it is still hard to schedule, no matter how big or small that number is. For example, 45 kids requesting a class is an odd number. It does not fit neatly into the pre-determined ratio that the district has to meet. The district has to offer two courses in this case.</p> <p>The District noted that enrollment trends change each year, based on a variety of factors including changing state requirements to favored teachers or courses.</p> <p>A CAC member inquired about students not getting into classes they requested. The district described how they typically grant priority enrollment to high school seniors and juniors with courses that they need to graduate, then sophomores and freshman. So, not every student may get enrolled in a course like Java, when requested the first time. However, counselors provide helpful information on when and how to request desired courses so that they can guarantee enrollment during their high school career, though schools cannot guarantee a student enrollment in a particular course in any given year.</p> <p>Comment: Intuitively, we may think a larger enrollment is better so there is more flexibility or room to move [teachers, students, course schedules] around, but section allocation requires us to work within these modular units or blocks. Working within these limits, there are some difficulties inherent in the scheduling process whether a school is large or small. While, more students does equal more sections and more choices, if the number of students interested in a particular course is not an exact multiple of the number needed to fill one section, there are difficulties in creating the master schedule.</p>
<p>Facility Improvements</p>	<p>Measure K, a \$295,000,000 bond was passed in 2014 FUHSD currently has \$450,000,000 worth of facilities needs at the five campuses.</p> <p>District staff explained that with aging buildings, there are a variety of needs; and bond funds can't just simply be divided by the number of school campuses when allocating funding.</p> <p>Lynbrook will be receiving a large portion of the funds from Measure K, with three transformative projects planned for Lynbrook beginning mid-2017; (expect a full-design by the end of the year).</p> <p>The timeline for these projects is designed to have the least negative impact on students possible (during</p>

	<p>construction).</p> <p>Three-fold roll-out schedule:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Addition to Field House (includes weight room, dance and fitness studio, and PE classroom)</li> <li>2) Major cafeteria remodel, a remodel of the main quad and the addition of a new front lobby to the gym. The district received a lot of input from parents, teachers, students and staff on this project.</li> <li>3) New general student services building/front office, parking lot and auditorium lobby.</li> </ol> <p>FUHSD has already selected a builder and architect to carry out the project plans.</p> <p>Though the district has five high school campuses, FUHSD also has a District Office where courses are held and the Adult Education program operates. At the District Office, FUHSD serves approximately 125 students per day, in addition to students served by the adult education program. This building (in which the CAC is meeting) is also planned for an operations upgrade as part of Measure K. It will be up to the citizens of Cupertino to decide whether to approve the Vallco project, but if the project does get approved, the agreement with the developer includes a facility for the adult education program located within Vallco with a \$1/year lease for 34 years. This would save FUHSD 50% of the building costs (or about \$23 million) covered by Measure K.</p> <p>Ten percent of the \$295,000,000 bond has not yet been allocated to a specific project as of yet, as hidden costs may arise in the planned projects and the District can soon re-assess how to allocate this money to additional needed projects.</p> <p>Cupertino, Fremont, Homestead are the three oldest schools, requiring more urgent investment in their infrastructure from the previous bond, Measure B. Several schools also required funds to address enrollment growth and the urgent need for more classrooms.</p> <p>From Measure B, Lynbrook did see several significant improvements, including the addition of solar panels and the new track, fields and stadium.</p> <p>These projects are independent of the work of this committee. The Citizens Oversight Committee (COC) is the body that has oversight of bond expenditures.</p>
<p>Alternatives Available to Stabilize Enrollment</p>	<p>Minh confirmed that the consensus of the group is that in the best case scenario the district will need to move 25-30 students a year on average into LHS. In the worst case scenario, this number is closer to 100 students a year. It is impossible to know the future, but it is wise to hope for the best and plan for the worst. This should be kept in mind as the CAC discusses alternatives for stabilizing enrollment.</p> <p>Methods that have been identified to stabilize enrollment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Boundary change</li> </ol>

2. Area of Choice (John Mise Park Area)
3. District-wide Open Enrollment
4. "Proportional" District-wide Open Enrollment – *could be significant legal challenges with this method if planning to move more than 30-35 students*
5. Eighth Graders from Cupertino High Attendance Area (approx. 575)
6. Eighth Graders from Hyde Middle School (approx. 325)
7. Eighth Graders from Miller Middle School (approx. 60)
8. Eighth Graders from McAuliffe (approx. 19)

Option 1: When considering a boundary change, the committee must consider that it is extremely difficult to get community buy-in with this option as there is a perception that some people lose, while others win; even though it is a legal option available to FUHSD. There is not ample time between the Citizens Advisory Committee's recommendation to the board in November and the implementation of this option (beginning of 2017) to spend time in consultation with stakeholders in the community, which is a very necessary step when looking at a permanent boundary change. Experience from other boundary changes in the area, and the reactions of the community to what many thought was a pre-announcement of a boundary change strongly indicate that significant community engagement over a long period of time (perhaps several years) would be required before such an action should be taken.

Comment: A boundary change is seen as a permanent solution, however, it could then require another boundary change if a correction had to be made a few years from now.

Comment: The goal of this committee is to look at the enrollment projection forecast through 2020. If we are looking at only a 4-year period, is it appropriate for us to consider a permanent/long-term solution [such as a boundary change]?

Comment: While we should not look for a permanent solution, we should recommend a process. We do not want to do this again in four years.

Comment: While redrawing enrollment boundaries would solve our problem in terms of student numbers, we need a longer planning process and more community buy-in to assess this type of permanent, long-term solution.

Comment: We have a big variance in what the enrollment numbers could be so we need a flexible solution to address the issue over the next three years. If we see worst-case scenario every year for the next three years, then we could start to look at the recommendation of a more permanent boundary change.

Comment: This might help the community accept a more permanent change, as it would become evident that it is necessary.

	<p>Comment: The last three years, Lynbrook enrollment has been under-projected (looking at one-year projections).</p> <p>Comment: We already have a trend of under-enrollment at Lynbrook. If we patch this issue again this year, the community may still not recognize the issue next year. They may think the problem is fixed. It would require a long-term fix and better communication to the community to resolve the issue permanently.</p> <p>Comment: The enrollment projection consultant believes we will hit the lower end of the projection committee range.</p> <p>Comment: I like boundary change as a solution because I like permanence. I like the idea of a neighborhood school.</p> <p>Comment: If we don't give people a choice it may cause resentment and stress. However, giving them a choice means that most students will choose to continue to attend their current high school, unless they are an incoming 9<sup>th</sup> grader.</p> <p>Comment: This is a challenging process and the people who the district communicates with on a regular basis tend to change every four years.</p> <p>Minh asked for a show of hands as a consensus test to see how everyone was feeling about the following proposal: "We are not going to recommend a boundary change at this time because there is insufficient time to fully engage and consult with stakeholders in the community. This option remains a legal method for stabilizing enrollment in the future, after sufficient communication and discussion have taken place within the community, and after perhaps several years of trend data to show that a more permanent solution is needed."</p> <p>Three CAC members (10% of the voting population) raised their hands to show disagreement with this motion. The rest of the members were in agreement with it. Minh recognized the objection from these members that the test of consensus seemed to them to be too soon, and that they would like opportunity for more discussion of all the options before additional tests of consensus. The official meeting time was coming to an end, as the ground rules indicated that no voting would take place during the unofficial meeting time.</p> <p>Official meeting ended at 8:38pm</p>
Unofficial Meeting	<p>Option 2: The area of choice (described as the John Mise Park area) gives individuals a choice, which was intended by district management to be seen as a positive thing. However, attempts to communicate this to the community met with an unfavorable response. [Partially due to how communication and outreach was conducted] Some people interpreted this as a pre-announcement that the District was really planning a boundary change without consulting community members, and this caused some emotional reactions. In these heated moments, some comments were made that were interpreted by residents of the John Mise Park area as disparaging against them and their children, and additional negativity was generated. The committee should acknowledge all of this as unfortunate, and recognize that this option if recommended as is, may generate very poor responses and could potentially needlessly</p>

re-activate bad feelings that will not bring about a positive community spirit.

Comment: Before discussing the other options, the committee should have some commonality of criteria for a recommendation besides the enrollment numbers, such as: whether or not we will disrupt other schools, demographic composition and how it will affect residents.

Minh: "You could be right, that we should develop a list of criteria and then review the options. However, another approach I have seen work quite well is that we can review the options and allow for criteria to emerge. For example, we have seen the following criteria show up so far in this discussion:

- Community engagement and buy-in;
- Choice is better than no choice in terms of community buy-in
- Time to establish and convince ourselves of a clear pattern of change before taking action that may be permanent;
- Communication must be upfront and very inclusive. In the absence of a reason, people may assume negative motives behind actions; and
- It is not legal to discriminate against residents or their children regarding their socio-economic status, or use student test scores as a basis in making decisions regarding school attendance areas.
- Note: More criteria will show up as we discuss these options, so please take note of them.

Should we eliminate from our consideration Option 2: Area of Choice for John Mise Park Area?

Comment: This area of choice would not be a big enough area to meet the needs we currently have.

Comment: Taking this option off the table may send the wrong message – that we do not want this area and these students. It must be explained clearly to the community if we do so. For example, we are including the residents of this area in Options 5 and 6, both of which involve larger populations from which we hope to be able to get enough applicants to attend Lynbrook HS.

Question: In a best case scenario, how many students did the District think would take advantage of the opportunity to choose Lynbrook HS from this area of choice (the John Mise Park area)?

Answer: Approximately 47 per year for the next four years.

Clarification: So we are not talking about taking an Area of Choice as a methodology completely off the table, just the original proposal of focusing on the John Mise Park Area as the Area of Choice, as it does not provide enough students for the enrollment need at Lynbrook HS. We need a bigger population that includes the residents of this area and beyond.

Option 4: As option four (Proportional District-wide Open Enrollment) has significant legal challenges, unless it only affects a very small number of students, we may recommend taking it off the table in this case. This could be voted on during next week's official meeting.

Comment: Boundary change while taking away choice, is the only option that does not let us cherry pick students. (The cherry pick comment refers to the idea that when given a choice, individuals tend to choose to send their kids to the school they perceive as a match with their ethnic, cultural and socio-economic background. The concern is that over time our high schools will become more homogeneous.)

Comment: People do not appreciate what may be perceived by them as attempts to conduct socio-economic engineering because of someone's perception that a certain school environment is not heterogeneous enough. Who gets to decide that in a free society?

Comment: Options 5 and 6 do include the John Mise Park Area.

Comment: We want to have the easiest solution, with flexible options, that affects the fewest schools and has the least impact on each student.

Minh: "Here are some more criteria: Solutions have to be seen as a win-win, or a compromise, i.e. no one gets everything they want, but they can live with the outcome. We must not force someone into a win-lose situation, because that will become a lose-lose for all of us."

Comment: Option 3 (Open Enrollment for the Entire District) targets too large an area, and makes it completely impossible to predict how many students from each of the other high schools will be selected to attend Lynbrook HS. This may cause undesirable consequences on other high schools' student population mix, and will meet with significant objections from residents from other areas in the District. We should take it off the table too.

Question: What if for solutions 6 and 7 we only take students from the schools, not the entire school attendance areas?

Answer: We could. However, we would want to communicate with all the people who live in the area anyway. We would want to address it as a geographic area. We would want to communicate with families who attend private school as well as those already in our district.

Comment: The likelihood that we are going to hit the 100 or 80 mark for students is small, we might go under or over but I would be surprised if we hit the mark exactly. It sounds like the group thinks that we could go over, but we don't want a huge bubble coming in since that is a staffing problem. It is hard to forecast what percentage of a certain population will choose to exercise the option to attend LHS for 9<sup>th</sup> grade.

Comment: There is a desire from people in the Cupertino High attendance area for our solution to include only a

small area of choice so that we do not affect a large number of people that go to CHS. However, we do not know how many will apply to go to Lynbrook so it could be better to have a larger area.

Comment/Question: If we look at the Cupertino Attendance area, we would have to send a letter to everyone. I think that would be true for the middle schools as well, because students going to private schools would need to have that choice too. Correct?

Answer: It would depend on whether or not we say the kids are in 8<sup>th</sup> grade in the middle school, or if we are talking about the whole school enrollment area.

Comment: We should consider how easy it would be to communicate our decision. For example, Lawson Middle School 8<sup>th</sup> graders normally go to either Cupertino HS or Monta Vista HS. It will be really challenging to tell a group of Lawson 8<sup>th</sup> graders that some of you can apply to go to LHS but the rest of you cannot.

Comment: Even with a combination of these solutions [options 5,6,7,8], what if we still won't get 100 applicants? On the other hand, if we go far over 100, it may be hard to absorb with staffing.

Question: So if we combined 6,7,8 and we wanted to get 100 applicants, could we prioritize who gets the slots first, second and third?

Answer: No, we have to be non-arbitrary and this would likely be seen as discriminatory.

Comment: McAuliffe is a lottery school in CUSD. After they got into McAuliffe, then they can also go to Lynbrook? This could be seen as unfair. The CLIP program also uses a lottery system.

Comment: The larger area we select, the more likely we run the risk of having to reject a large number of applicants if their number exceeds the available slots. This could be a discouraging factor that will reduce the likelihood of people wanting to apply, which brings down the percentage of a population that may apply for this option to attend LHS, which means we go back to needing a larger area.

Comment: No one knows who will choose Lynbrook given an option. If we think this will be a smaller percentage, we need to choose a larger area – and vice versa.

Comment: If we also impose a lottery, we could scare people off due to unpredictability.

Question: If we don't get enough applicants to fill the available slots, and miss our enrollment stabilizing target, what is the impact on our budget?

Answer: The answer is we won't know the first year. It is becoming clear that we will need to pick a method, try it, and see how many applicants we receive. Manage the impact the first year if any, then make adjustments in the following years. This is what we need to do if we want to give people choice.

	<p>Minh: "I ask that you think more about each of these proposals before our next meeting in two weeks. It seems that there is a desire to take number 1, 2, and 3 off the list, which after examination seem like the most controversial options that will result in someone winning and someone losing, and do not address the need for the community to come together to communicate and find win-win or compromise solutions. Option 4 is creative, but it can only be used when we have a small enrollment problem, not when we have a medium or large one to address. We might want to focus energy on potentially developing a consensus around how to make 5, 6, 7, 8 work."</p>
	<p>Unofficial meeting ended at 9:54pm</p>