



# Citizens Advisory Committee

## Minutes of September 14, 2016 Meeting

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

CAC Members absent: Anusikha Halder, Roger Hewitt, Emmanuel Muriuki, Liming Wang

Support staff present: Facilitator Minh Le; Superintendent Polly Bove; Associate Superintendent, Trudy Gross; Associate Superintendent Graham Clark; Communications Coordinator Rachel Zlotziver, and Transcriber Sarah DeWitt Akin

Topic	Summary
Welcome	Facilitator, Minh Le, called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.
Acknowledging and resolving past dynamics	<p>Minh shared some reminders about communicating with one another and avoiding unnecessary conflicts. He asked that committee members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Listen</i> to understand (do not rush to argue/voice opposition);</li> <li>• Separate facts from assumptions;</li> <li>• Use “I” messages to express feelings (rather than “you” messages to point blame); and</li> <li>• Recognize the interdependence of our community in promoting and adopting “win-win” solutions.</li> </ul> <p>He then invited participants in the meeting to acknowledge and resolve past dynamics so that the CAC could move forward in discussing and agreeing upon solutions to recommend.</p> <p>Superintendent Polly Bove asked to share her thoughts: “I recently updated the Cupertino High School staff on our progress with this effort to-date, and had a similar conversation at the recent FUHSD Staff Retreat. As I have done here, I acknowledged my responsibility regarding the error made last year when the district sent a letter to community members that contained confusing language about the proposed area of choice. My goal was to protect Lynbrook High School and I assumed that community would see it that way, but we all know what happens when one makes assumptions. In no way were my actions an attempt to misguide, mislead or hurt Lynbrook or our community. My intention was to have an area of choice; I wanted people to have choice. Unfortunately, we also erred in sending notices to residents of the area of choice before the residents in the Lynbrook attendance area. I</p>

	<p>am sorry that this error triggered negative feelings for community members. I am grateful to the entire CAC for all the time and effort you have given to understanding the many factors that the District has to consider with regards to balancing enrollment and now working to find solutions to stabilizing enrollment at Lynbrook. I reaffirm my commitment on behalf of my team at the District office to communication and community engagement as we move towards a solution."</p> <p>CAC members thanked Superintendent Bove for her words and the FUHSD Board for the opportunity to better understand the issue of declining enrollment at Lynbrook and to help make informed recommendations to stabilize enrollment. They acknowledged the superintendent and her team for their effort in sharing information, responding to questions and providing all the information requested by the committee members in a prompt and open way.</p> <p>A CAC member from the Lynbrook area wanted to affirm that he believed that the entire committee, and 99% of the residents of the Lynbrook area would never make offensive statements about residents of the area of choice, or discriminate against them on the basis of socio-economic status or the API score of the middle school their students came from. However, he did acknowledge that there was a small minority that did make inconsiderate and unlawful statements, creating hurt and pain for others in the community. Minh asked for and received unanimous CAC agreement that the committee recognized that such statements or actions would be unethical and illegal, and the CAC would never consider or condone such talk or action.</p> <p>Comment: "The majority of Lynbrook residents do not want to discriminate on the basis of academic merit or other arbitrary criteria. They are open to finding a fair and legal solution to stabilizing enrollment. Our job as a committee is to help the community at-large by agreeing to recommend fair and legal solutions."</p> <p>Another CAC member from the Lynbrook area wanted to acknowledge everyone in the CAC, especially those who came from other attendance areas for their help in identifying and finding a solution for Lynbrook HS's declining enrollment, demonstrating that they really care about all the students across the district.</p>
Open Discussion	<p>Comment: "My experience in talking to Lynbrook parents is that the opposition to the enrollment change that was initially proposed came from a lack of understanding. While we have posted all the meeting minutes and presentations to the committee, we will need to work on communication tools to share how we came to the solution options we agree on."</p> <p>Comment: "I think we need to be careful not to use language like, 'students will get a <i>chance</i> to go to Lynbrook' or 'students could <i>win the lottery</i>.'" We should instead say, 'students will get a choice' to apply to Lynbrook HS to help stabilize enrollment. We must not somehow convey that one school is the preferred option and the other school is a second choice or even a default choice."</p> <p>Comment: "I would like to clarify that cherry picking is not about having a choice or some conscious effort. The</p>

variables are clear when we are talking about areas of choice or open enrollment: higher education and socio-economic status of the parents. Lower-income families will not fill out an area of choice enrollment form; they will just go to the school that is closest to them. It is well documented that areas of choice are really only beneficial to higher-income families. Cherry picking is not something that people are consciously doing, however, it ends up creating a homogeneous culture, which is not a better educational environment. We need to figure out a way to combat this loss of student diversity, which is harmful to the quality of education and I do not know how to do this."

Comment: "We need to communicate clearly to families that we have some objective criteria for recommending a solution, such as 1) stabilizing enrollment and 2) causing least disruption to students/the community, 3) geographical proximity, and 4) generating a fair number of students closest to the number required for maintaining optimum educational capacity."

Discussion: Parents and students in the room voiced that students will often choose what school they want to attend based on what school their peers will attend. It was also noted that some parents may let their students decide which school they want to attend, but many parents will decide on their child's behalf.

Comment: "We could come up with a criterion that is not palatable to the community, as we all value different criteria differently. So we have the language issue raised earlier of 'choice' vs. 'lottery' and then we have the issue of what 'choice' really means (i.e., maybe families with lower education levels would not have the same choice as families with higher education levels)."

Comment: "If we say that enrollment stabilization is the most important criterion, then boundary change is the best option. It is predictable. It is long-term. That is not to say that we do not have other criteria to address, just that, if we say that enrollment stabilization is the most important, then boundary change wins outright."

Comment: "There are many unknown repercussions of all the enrollment-stabilizing options. We do not know how many students would choose to enroll at Lynbrook under any of these "voluntary" options. We do not know what would happen to school demographics. We do not know what would happen to the impact on traffic. We do not know how the community's feelings of neighborhood schools would change. We also know that short-term solutions may need to be revisited in the medium- and long-term."

Comment: "The biggest concern of the community when the area of choice was proposed was that the area of choice would become a permanent boundary change. Their reaction to the area of choice proposal was similar to how they would react to a boundary change, with the added perception that they were not consulted about it in advance."

Comment: "None of the schools in our district are attended by choice. We all go to the schools in our neighborhood. Compared to the other four schools, Lynbrook HS enrollment area is too small. If we are not going to pursue a boundary change at this time, and I understand there are issues with that, I think we should be testing a boundary

	<p>change, not some other short-term solution. We should be testing enrollment stabilization."</p> <p>Comment: "Before I joined this committee, I wondered why people who are in the Lynbrook enrollment area would be resistant to a boundary change/expansion. Then I spoke to a fellow community member who informed me that the resistance is mainly due to a loss of security in what other changes may occur in the future. No one is confident that there won't be more changes in the future. People want stability and predictability."</p>
<p>Confirming what we have agreed</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is an enrollment decline for Lynbrook High School</li> <li>2. We have identified a target enrollment range that will support good programming at Lynbrook (1850-1870)</li> <li>3. There is not currently a need to go above this enrollment range</li> <li>4. We have also estimated that in the best-case scenario where the enrollment decline is small, we will need to move 25-30 students/year into Lynbrook HS. In the worst-case scenario, we will need to move up to 100 students/year into Lynbrook HS.</li> </ol>
<p>Reviewing available options with pros and cons</p>	<p>See Handout.</p> <p>Option 1. Boundary Change  Option 2. John Mise Park (JMP) Area of Choice  Option 3. District-wide Open Enrollment (Lottery)  Option 4. District-wide Open Enrollment (with targets set for each of the impacted high schools)  Option 5. All 8th Graders in the Cupertino HS attendance area get the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than available slots.  Option 6. All 8th graders attending Hyde Middle School get the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than available slots.  Option 7. All 8th graders attending Miller Middle School get the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than available slots.  Option 8. All 8th graders attending McAuliffe Middle School get the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than available slots.</p>
<p>Updates regarding resident and attending enrollment for Lynbrook HS</p>	<p>Projected attending enrollment: 1734 total*  Actual attending enrollment: 1743 total (includes 14 students going to middle college and 1729 attending Lynbrook HS campus)</p> <p>Projected resident enrollment: 1632 total*  Actual resident enrollment: 1623 total</p> <p><i>*Projections were developed in late 2015. The actual resident enrollment is 9 students below the EPC one-year projection, including that the actual is slightly worse than projected.</i></p>

	<p>Maria Jackson, Lynbrook Principal: "We are already 6 sections over-staffed. I imagine it will be 7-8 sections by the 40th day of the school year. I would have to examine which classes need to be collapsed but the Board agreed to 'keep Lynbrook whole' this year so we do not have to collapse all those classes. I do not think the Board can extend this commitment year after year."</p> <p>Superintendent Polly Bove: "It is likely that, whether we are looking at an additional 70 or 80 or 90 kids, we may be looking at staff from Lynbrook moving to other schools, until we get to 1850. We won't get to 1850 all at once."</p>
	<p>Some CLIP parents take their kids out of the program at 5th grade so that they can go to a middle school and assimilate with neighborhood kids who go to their high school. If they knew ahead of time that their kids would have the option of attending Lynbrook, they may not pull them out at that stage so the number of 8th graders at Miller (currently 55) could go up.</p> <p>37/55 of Miller 8<sup>th</sup> grade students (who do not live in the Lynbrook attendance area) decided to go to Lynbrook when they were given the choice.</p>
<p>Discussing and deciding on options</p>	<p>Option 1: The advantages of a boundary change include being consistent and predictable (for districts and families). The disadvantages include being a disruptive type of change, where some people might perceive a win and others a loss. It is challenging to get community agreement due to the fact that it does not provide a choice for people.</p> <p>Option 2: Nearly 200 kids live in the original proposed area of choice, so the district thought this fit the need we were looking to meet. There was a letter issued to the JMP area that used the language "considered boundary change" and that "students would have choice," which was confusing. Some parents called to clarify if there would be a choice or requirement as they wanted to continue to attend Cupertino HS. When we fixed the language and sent it out to the Lynbrook community, the perception was not at all positive. In addition, residents of the John Mise Park (JMP) area also felt upset and insulted by some of the inappropriate and hurtful comments that were made, and many have said they would not choose to send their kids to Lynbrook HS as a result. Given the negative dynamic that occurred, we anticipated that the actual number of students who would choose this option would be lower than the 47 target that district staff established. The recommendation is to set aside this option in the present situation, but to be sure to include the JMP residents in either option 5 or 6 below.</p> <p>Option 3: Gives the option to every student in the district to apply to attend Lynbrook HS. This option would be met with major resistance as it would have an unpredictable impact on enrollment at schools across the district, and potentially a negative impact on some schools. It would trigger a major concern about the cherry-picking issue raised earlier.</p> <p>Option 4: This option is similar to option 3, but with specific targets assigned to each of the other high schools. This creates legal concerns due to the principle of equity of access. This could be doable only if it was a small number of students (30-35). FUHSD utilized this option when Lynbrook HS had a low enrollment and all the other high schools</p>

had capacity issues such as in 2011. At this time none of our schools will be facing capacity constraints in the foreseeable future so this option while an innovative one will most likely not be needed.

Option 5: This idea came about as some CAC members noticed that by 2020 Cupertino HS may experience over-enrollment (by 250-300 students). It is right next to Lynbrook, which has a declining enrollment challenge.

Question: "What if we offered the option that all 8<sup>th</sup> grade students living in the Cupertino HS attendance area have the choice attend Lynbrook?"

Answer: "We would have to offer a lottery to only admit a certain number. There is a population of 575-600 8<sup>th</sup> graders in this area. What might complicate the implementation of this option is the fact that some Lawson Middle School 8<sup>th</sup> graders will go to Cupertino HS, some will go to Monta Vista HS, and a small number also will go to Fremont HS and Homestead HS. Communicating who at Lawson will have access to this option is more challenging considering that we are dealing with 8<sup>th</sup> graders in a potentially confusing environment."

There was significant concern by CAC members who would not want Cupertino HS to be seen by students and parents as a 'consolation prize'." There is also concern over the entire area being open for "cherry picking."

Question: "Why not start with a bigger population and then move to a smaller population if we get too many applicants the first year?"

Answer: "Once we start with a larger population and have to do a lottery to limit the number of students admitted to Lynbrook HS, it will be really hard to then move to a smaller population as some people who had the option last year will now no longer have it. This perception of having something and then having it taken away will make it extremely challenging to start with a larger population, do a lottery, then move to a smaller population."

Comment: "If we start with a smaller population first, and discover that we cannot get enough applicants, in the next year we can switch to a larger population, which may be easier to do since we are extending the option to more people rather than taking it away. We will just have to slightly increase the number of available slots the second year to make up for the miss in the first year.

Option 6: The 8<sup>th</sup> graders at Hyde Middle School make up a population of approximately 325 students.

This will put a limit of the amount of the Cupertino HS area that is open to "cherry picking," and together with Option 7 (8<sup>th</sup> graders at Miller, roughly 55 students) and Option 8 (8<sup>th</sup> graders at McAuliffe, roughly 19 students) will provide approximately 400 students from which to draw applicants for Lynbrook HS.

Minh: "So there is a proposal to take Options 1-4 off the table at the present time [for our proposed recommendation to the Board], with the transfer options left [Options 5-8]. These may be considered temporary transfer measures (some have referred to them as Band-Aids), but would allow time for communication and

engagement to build community agreement for a longer-term change."

There was a question by some members, whether being taken off the table at the present time means that these options are still viable in future situations and the answer was "yes."

Some committee members felt they needed clarification as to why an enrollment boundary change is considered a 'win-lose,' and some felt that an enrollment boundary change would be necessary in the long-term so it should be recommended to the Board now. A reminder was provided that losses caused by abrupt change may include psychological and emotional perceptions, and it would take time to communicate and allow acceptance of change to happen.

Other members thought that a combination of Options 5-8 would relieve the declining enrollment issue in the short-term (3-4 years) and that our recommendation could include a caveat that a boundary change may be required in the medium- and long-term if the declining enrollment trends continue and the temporary resolutions (i.e., a combination of Options 5-8) do not resolve the issue entirely. This raised the question of whether or not the Options 5-8 would then go away in the long-term.

It was also expressed that 3-4 years would provide ample time for the community to recognize the need for an enrollment boundary change later on, if necessary.

Minh: "So we have two proposals for consideration, it seems. Proposal 1: Put aside Options 1-4 and rely on Options 5-8, otherwise referred to as transfer/temporary stabilizing measures, for the next ~3 years and, during that time, communicate with the community about whether there is a need for a permanent boundary change and how to implement such a change. Or we have Proposal 2: Put aside Options 2-4 and keep 1, 5-8."

Some members expressed concern that keeping Option 1 on the table, which has been very controversial in the community, would create more divisiveness, particularly because no communication and engagement has been done with the community about this as a possible solution.

Other committee members felt it was important to keep Option 1 on the table because it would provide the number of students needed to adequately address the decline in enrollment at Lynbrook and because of their belief that it is the right thing to do and will benefit students equally, rather than only those students and families who have the resources to pursue the option provided by an area of choice or open enrollment.

Several CAC members expressed they were not comfortable with Option 5. It was clarified that "taking options off the table" did not mean that the committee would not recommend pursuing these for the *long-term*, just the short-term. It was also pointed out that, with any long-term option, such as a boundary change, we could exempt students who are currently in the pipeline to attend a given school. Such as, elementary or middle schoolers who are currently planning to attend Cupertino HS.

Committee members acknowledged that any recommendation to the Board should include flexibility. For instance, the committee could recommend short-term options with the caveat of alternative options and future process if the short-term solutions (e.g., Options 5-8) do not adequately solve the problem. An example of this could include a combination of Options 5-8 for 3-4 years and recommendation of enrollment boundary change in the longer-term, with additional considerations for the Board to keep in mind if this issue needs to be revisited in the future.

It was noted that anything that indicated a very strong level of consensus, such as a unanimous agreement behind our recommendations to the Superintendent and the Board would make our case much stronger. It was also reminded that the Board members may choose not to adopt our recommendations. They may have other criteria independent of the CAC's findings that they consider. All that we can do in our power is to find the best solutions to recommend, and to do so with the highest degree of consensus that we can achieve.

Question: "Is it legal to say 40 kids from Miller could attend Lynbrook and 30 kids from Cupertino or somewhere else?"

Answer: "If we announce a program involving 8<sup>th</sup> graders at Miller, McAuliffe and Hyde or Lawson, we would not be able to give the Miller students a priority over the other groups of 8<sup>th</sup> graders, as that would constitute preferential treatment."

Question: "Can we go with two programs? The first program is to continue to allow 8<sup>th</sup> graders at Miller to choose to go to Lynbrook HS for their Freshmen year. By choosing they will be admitted, without any question. We don't specify the number of slots available for this program, but we know how many students are eligible and we have the history of last year, so we can forecast this number pretty accurately. The second program is to provide all Hyde Middle School 8<sup>th</sup> graders the option to apply to attend Lynbrook for their Freshmen year. For this program we would specify a number of slots that will be available. For example, assume we plan to get about 40 students from Miller, we only have to plan to get another 30 students from Hyde in order to get 70 kids for Lynbrook. If we have more applicants than available slots we do a lottery. Can we do two programs like that at the same time?"

Answer: "We probably can, but it will be good to ask the attorney to be sure by the next meeting."

Unofficial meeting ended at 10:15 p.m.