Citizens Advisory Committee  

Minutes of June 8, 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, David Heinke, Jason Heskett, Maria Jackson, Mori Mandis, Jenny Martin, Gail Marzolf, Daniel McCune, Wes Morse, Emmanuel Muriuki, Miko Otoshi, C.S. Prakash, Amit Raiker, Jena Rajabally, Terri Shieh-Newton, Sandi Spires, Uma Sriram, Mark St. John, Liming Wang, Elaine Zhang, and Yanping Zhao
CAC Members absent: Samy Cherfaouli, Carol Gao, Anusikha Halder, Roger Hewitt, David Nishijima, Shivangi Sharma, and Pratibha Sriram,
Support staff present: Facilitator Minh Le; Superintendent Polly Bove; Academic Deputy Superintendent Dr. Kate Jamentz; Assistant Superintendent Trudy Gross; Program Administrator, English Learner Programs Dr. Welton Kwong; Monta Vista High School Math Teacher and Lead Negotiator for the Fremont Education Association Jon Stark; Principal on Special Assignment, Stakeholder Engagement John Dwyer; Coordinator of Curriculum and Assessment Marianne Hew, and Communications Coordinator Sue Larson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Welcome and Introductions | At 6:02 pm, Facilitator Minh Le began the CAC meeting by welcoming the members to the second CAC meeting. Minh reminded CAC members about the prior agreement on their CAC application to the shared CAC values of caring for all students in FUHSD, being committed to fact-based thinking, and embracing an openness to find win-win or compromise solutions. He further proposed that the following communication agreements be central to CAC proceedings:  
  • No interrupting to argue or correct something being said by someone. Let them finish.
  • No blaming, judging, or attacking of anyone. Make them want to talk with you.
  • No attributing ideas or comments of committee members to people outside of the CAC.
  • No identifying committee members to community groups for criticisms or attacks

Minh also spoke about a ‘Report to the Citizens Advisory Committee: June 8, 2016’ document which provides information about comments sent by community members for the CAC. This document has been added to the CAC Google folder. CAC members will receive reports like this prior to each CAC meeting which will detail information received from community members since the prior CAC meeting. Minh reviewed a situation (which is included in the report that has been uploaded) and shared the counsel he received from the judge with whom he has been working. The judge asked Minh to remind any CAC members who are employed by FUHSD that they should express their opinions freely and if they receive any undue pressure to vote in a certain way that the individual should advise Minh. |
It was suggested that it would be helpful to communicate information about the CAC application acceptance rate to the community and to indicate which CAC members are employed by FUHSD. This suggestion has previously been discussed with the judge and the judge and Minh agreed that because each of the CAC members were selected without regard to their employment category that the FUHSD employment information should not be reported.

Furthermore, the judge understands the concerns about undue pressure and he recommended that anonymous voting take place in CAC matters. However, if a CAC member wanted to indicate by their name how a vote was cast, that should be respected and followed. Minh asked the CAC members how they felt about casting votes anonymously and the following opinions were shared:

• It may be best to delay making a decision about the voting process until we are further along in the CAC proceedings when it may be clearer about how to best move forward
• The proposal of giving both options (anonymous voting and a request to be named) is fair and appropriate
• A decision about the voting process would be helpful to make sooner rather than later because to delay the decision may become associated with the nature of a specific vote to be taken
• How is anonymity being defined for CAC voting purposes?
• Minh shared information about how the CAC might use technology to vote quickly and anonymously
• In order to function within an environment that is trusting and unified, it will be important to be able to share opinions without fear of voting information being shared inappropriately
• Voting anonymously produces a feeling of safety when voting
• Confidentiality within the CAC is essential and CAC members should be able to trust that individual comments expressed at a CAC meeting are not attributed to a particular person and shared outside of the meeting
• Being transparent means that we identify CAC members’ comments or votes within the CAC

There was an agreement that CAC members would protect one another’s anonymity outside of the CAC, making it possible to have completely candid conversations within the CAC. Anonymous voting methodology will be available should CAC members decide that is needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Projection Sub-Committee Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minh advised the CAC that the Enrollment Projection Sub-Committee met with demographer Tom Williams and several FUHSD staff members on Saturday, June 4. Reports and information from this meeting have been added to the CAC Google folder. The next Enrollment Projection Sub-Committee meeting will take place on Wednesday, June 15 from 6 – 8 pm at the FUHSD District Office. CAC members who would like to attend this meeting are welcome to do so and should notify Minh and he will send them a calendar invite.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question and Answer Session with Superintendent Polly Bove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| As a regular feature of the CAC meeting, Minh invited CAC members to ask any questions that they may have of FUHSD Superintendent Polly Bove. The following questions were asked (A summary of Polly’s responses are italicized):
• Did the reaction of residents from the Lynbrook High School attendance area to the FUHSD proposed Area of Choice enrollment option surprise you in any way? If you could handle that situation in a different way knowing what you know now, would you? What would you do differently? |
It is fair to say that we were surprised by the reaction of some community members. That is not because we hadn’t previously spoken with many community members and with LHS teachers, classified staff members, and administrators who were concerned about the negative impact of Lynbrook’s declining enrollment. What is true, and what I would do differently, is to send out information about the Lynbrook enrollment situation to the entire LHS attendance area – whether or not a resident had children in CUSD or FUHSD schools or no longer had children living in their home – and not just to the John Mise Park area as we originally did. I was also surprised that some residents believed that the Area of Choice proposal was a ‘done deal’ and permanent in nature and that no public input could be provided, which also wasn’t part of the FUHSD plan. We could certainly have done a better job of more clearly explaining the situation and broadened our communication with the community. Although our focus was trying to keep Lynbrook the great school that it is, we knew that to do so we would need to get more students to Lynbrook, and I now better understand that it would not necessarily be obvious to the community that the way to keep Lynbrook great would be to add students. I hope, though, that as you learn more about FUHSD operations that CAC members will better understand why we were concerned about declining enrollment at Lynbrook.

- In the past, FUHSD used a lottery system to help send students to FUHSD schools that had extra room. Why can’t we do that again? CUSD does that at a number of their elementary schools and that system seems to work fine.

  Because of the Allen Law – legislation that allows parents to have their children who are under fourteen years old attend a school near to where their parent works -- the Cupertino Union School District (CUSD) is required to accept children at their schools who do not live within their attendance area. In addition, school magnet programs are not necessarily an unusual approach for some schools and that has worked well at CUSD. However, FUHSD is not affected by the Allen Law and because of FUHSD’s commitment to a comprehensive high school experience for our students, a magnet school approach is not a viable option. You are correct; FUHSD has used a lottery system in the past. That approach was created by FUHSD when a lottery was designed to proportionally fill openings that we expected in FUHSD schools. At the time, we took a calculated risk, spoke with several attorneys, and believed that we could legally argue that the lottery met the intent and spirit of the law in order to spread enrollment throughout FUHSD. However, lawyers have subsequently advised us that to conduct a proportionally based lottery approach now would be more risky and legally precarious based on current conditions.

- Was FUHSD the only school district in California using this proportional approach to a lottery?

  Yes, the approach was invented at FUHSD and I believe that we were the only school district in California using this method.

- In order to convince the community that a proportional approach to an enrollment lottery is no longer a viable option for stabilizing enrollment, it would be important to share more about what FUHSD has learned and why this is no longer an option under consideration.

  I agree, and that is certainly our intention.

- A lot of people in the Lynbrook area have sacrificed mightily to buy a home in the LHS attendance area because they want to make sure that their children will attend Lynbrook. One of the residents’ concerns is that if an enrollment change is made it is conceivable that in the future there may be an overflow of students at Lynbrook and their children will not be able to attend Lynbrook and then their sacrifice will mean nothing.
I completely understand that people choose to move into the FUHSD attendance area, and in many cases give up nearly everything, in order to reside in this area so that their children can attend FUHSD schools. I do not take this lightly. Never in the nearly one hundred year history of FUHSD has this district prevented students who live within an attendance area from attending their neighborhood school. I understand that people are looking for a guarantee that this will always be the case. However, because I am not able to speak on behalf of future FUHSD Board of Trustees, I cannot, and current Board members cannot, offer that guarantee. I understand the residents’ fears, and I think that we can come as close as we reasonably can to provide a guarantee, but we cannot speak for the actions of future FUHSD Boards. I can assure you that during the history of our school district, FUHSD has made sure that students can attend the schools in the area in which they live. Hypothetically speaking, let’s consider a possible scenario that may help to provide a deeper understanding of how FUHSD has handled enrollment. If, based upon a CAC recommendation, the FUHSD Board expands the Area of Choice for LHS and Lynbrook’s enrollment continues to grow. And at the same time, there’s an unexpected influx of the number of people that move into the Lynbrook attendance area and now there is a real concern by residents that there will not be enough room for their children at Lynbrook. I hope that it will be encouraging to know that FUHSD has had experience in handling situations when we had large numbers of students at a high school. When Monta Vista High School’s enrollment was quite large we found creative ways to use MVHS’s actual capacity to accommodate their growing enrollment. No student who lived in the MVHS attendance area was prohibited from attending Monta Vista High School.

- At CUSD is it a fairly regular process that children have to go outside their attendance area to attend a CUSD school. Why won’t something like that happen at FUHSD?

  You’re correct, that is not just happening in this local area but also throughout the United States. However, an essential component in such a decision is the values and standards to which a school district adheres. FUHSD decisions have been based on our commitment to students, and to children attending their neighborhood school. And that commitment has been consistently applied for nearly a century.

- The demographer’s enrollment report is relatively reliable, but only for five years out. Therefore, how can FUHSD make decisions beyond that five-year period?

  Although I cannot speak on behalf of the FUHSD Board, I can assure you that we do closely examine enrollment projections. Factored into that analysis is a deep understanding of school capacity and that is a subject that we will discuss further at the next CAC meeting. It is important to consider long-range projections so that we can be prepared to provide adequate numbers of classrooms, teachers, and financial support to meet the needs of our students down the road. Our experience at Monta Vista High School is a good example of FUHSD handling a situation at which there were hundreds of students over the capacity of the school but because of our commitment to have students attend their neighborhood school, we found space to make that enrollment size work at Monta Vista High School.

- Has FUHSD made any attendance area boundary changes in the past? If so, how was it done?

  In 1981, a decision was made to close Sunnyvale High School because of declining enrollment. That situation was not handled well and I have never spent a week in FUHSD since I came in 1989 when someone hasn’t spoken to me about how poorly that situation was handled. Also -- with thanks to CAC member Mori Mandis who reminded me of this piece of history -- when Monta Vista High School was opened because of growing enrollment there were
FUHSD Study Session

FUHSD Superintendent Polly Bove began a study session intended to familiarize CAC members with the accountability requirements and the constraints under which FUHSD operates. This foundation of information will be essential to know when the CAC contemplates enrollment recommendations for the FUHSD Board’s consideration.

Several FUHSD team members assisted Polly in these endeavors including Academic Deputy Superintendent Dr. Kate Jamentz; Assistant Superintendent Trudy Gross; Program Administrator, English Learner Programs, Dr. Welton Kwong; Monta Vista High School Math Teacher and Lead Negotiator for the Fremont Education Association Jon Stark; and Coordinator of Curriculum and Assessment Marianne Hew.

Here is a summary of the information that was shared:

- Although the authority and responsibility for educating students in California is granted by the State of California, it is true that Federal regulations do impose requirements that have a bearing on school operations. These requirements range from somewhat small to massive and continue to change and evolve over time. Federal funds to supplement and not supplant State funding are sometimes, but not always, associated with these requirements.

- Some school measurements previously used by the State of California -- such as the Academic Performance Index (API) composed of California Standards Test scores and High School Exit Exam scores -- no longer exist. A new accountability system for California is now under development and we know that multiple measures of a school will be included in that new system.

- Several years ago, the State of California created the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) that, in most cases, ties school funding to State established priorities, and provides additional focus and funding for English Learners, Special Education students, Foster youth, and students from low-income families. LCFF also requires greater engagement with parents and the community. Because FUHSD is community funded, the LCFF does not affect how FUHSD receives funding, however FUHSD is still accountable to adhere to federal and state standards. FUHSD does take this responsibility seriously and submits an annual Local Control Accountability Plan (as part of the LCFF).

- CAC members were given the opportunity to check their understanding concerning the legal and accountability risks that could be encountered by FUHSD by discussing the answers to several questions related to potential decisions that FUHSD might make. A summary of each table’s discussion was shared with the CAC.

- Factors by which FUHSD holds itself accountable were shared and include:
  - Comprehensive high schools
  - Adequate social and emotional supports
  - Equity and excellence
  - Maximizing the benefits of diversity
  - Conservative and creative fiscal management
Productive relationships with employee groups result in working together respectfully and closely to best serve students and to be good stewards of the funds that the community provides to FUHSD
- A collective professional culture
- Not resting on our laurels
- Amplifying the voice of all stakeholder groups

It was suggested that attention to the above values results in a supportive community, a proud and engaged parent community, a stable high-quality teaching staff, and high achieving students.

A recent history of FUHSD facilities bonds and parcel tax measures was shared, as was FUHSD’s gratitude for the community’s support.

Feedback from the recent FUHSD parent survey was shared and included areas of strength (School safety; rigor and quality of educational program; broad offerings and courses for graduation including honors and AP classes; college and career preparation; and instructional approaches that encourage students to think critically, think deeply, be creative, and read and write across the curriculum) as well as needs for improvement (Inconsistencies between teachers; communication between teachers and parents; academic support for struggling students; and the need for emotional support for struggling students).

The importance of a stable, high-quality teaching staff was discussed as were the challenges resulting from the high cost of housing, higher salaries for teachers in neighboring school districts, a spouse’s job change creating a need for a FUHSD teacher to relocate, and the plentiful availability of other career options.

With regard to keeping excellent teachers, FUHSD has a 96% retention rate of teachers that FUHSD wants to keep on their staff. This is a direct byproduct of the transparency and shared values held between FUHSD and teachers. Although that rate is very high, there has recently been a slight decline and FUHSD and teachers are actively reviewing potential solutions.

Information about student achievement was also presented and benchmarked compared with four nearby school districts (Acalanes Union High School District, Los Gatos-Saratoga Union High School District, Mountain View Los Altos High School District, and Palo Alto Unified School District). This analysis included information about ethnicities and demographic information, CAASPP testing results, cohort graduation rates, Advanced Placement exam results, as well as college eligibility, persistence, and graduation rates.

Key findings from this comparison included the confirmation that in the first year of CAASPP, that FUHSD was the highest performing high school district in the state, that on nearly all indicators FUHSD Asian and Caucasian students perform similarly to all other high performing high schools, and Hispanic, low-income, and Special Education students generally do better than the California average, but not necessarily as well as the benchmark districts. CAC members asked for demographic information for the parents of students in the benchmark districts and for information about school districts that more closely resemble FUHSD’s size and demographics. Data about specific FUHSD schools is available in the FUHSD school plans that are posted on the FUHSD website.

CAC members were given a brief quiz entitled ‘What is the Best High School in the Fremont Union High School District?’ and asked to complete the quiz and bring it to the next CAC meeting. Answers to the quiz will be provided
Kate advised the CAC that the second part of this study session will continue at the next CAC meeting and it is expected to include information about funding, the interdependence of enrollment, funding, staffing, and course offerings, as well as information about school size, capacity, boundaries, and school facilities.

| Future CAC Meetings | Minh confirmed that copies of documents and PowerPoint presentations that were shared at this CAC meeting would be added to the CAC Google folder. A draft of the minutes for this CAC meeting will be uploaded to the CAC Google drive by noon on Thursday, June 9 and CAC members will have until noon on Friday, June 10 to suggest revisions to those minutes. CAC minutes will be uploaded to the FUHSD CAC website by the afternoon of Friday, June 10. The Enrollment Projection Subcommittee will meet on Wednesday, June 15 from 6 to 8 pm at the FUHSD District Office. CAC members are welcome to request from Minh a calendar invitation to attend that meeting, if interested in doing so. The next CAC meeting will take place on June 22 with dinner available at 5:30 pm and the meeting will begin at 6 pm. |
| Meeting Conclusion | The official meeting ended at 8:30 pm, and the unofficial information session ended at 9:09 pm with Minh thanking the participants for their participation and dedication. |