



# Citizens Advisory Committee

## Minutes of September 28, 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, David Heinke, Jason Heskett, Roger Hewitt, Maria Jackson, Mori Mandis, Jenny Martin, Gail Marzolf, Daniel McCune, Wes Morse, Emmanuel Muriuki, David Nishijima, Miko Otoshi, C.S. Prakash, Amit Raikar, Jena Rajabally, Terri Shieh-Newton, Uma Sriram, Pratibha Sriram, Mark St. John, Liming Wang, Elaine Zhang, Yanping Zhao

CAC Members absent: Samy Cherfaoui, Anusikha Halder, Shivangi Sharma, Sandi Spires

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

Topic	Summary
Welcome	<p>Facilitator, Minh Le, called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.</p> <p>Minh asked CAC members for their cooperation to achieve a total consensus or at minimum an 80% majority vote in recommending an enrollment stabilizing solution.</p>
Confirming the List of Options	<p>See Enrollment Stabilizing Options Handout.</p> <p><u>List of Enrollment Stabilizing Options</u></p> <p>Option 1: Boundary Change</p> <p>Option 2: John Mise Park (JMP) Area of Choice</p> <p>Option 3: District-wide Open Enrollment (Lottery)</p> <p>Option 4: District-wide Open Enrollment (with targets set for each of the impacted high schools)</p> <p>Option 5: All 8<sup>th</sup> Graders in the Cupertino HS attendance area have the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than slots.</p> <p>Option 6: All 8<sup>th</sup> Graders in the Hyde Middle School attendance area have the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than slots.</p> <p>Option 7: All 8<sup>th</sup> Graders in the Miller Middle School attendance area have the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery</p>

	<p>is used in case of more applicants than slots.  **NEW Option 7G: All 8<sup>th</sup> Graders at Miller Middle School have the option to choose to attend LHS.  Option 8: All 8<sup>th</sup> graders at McAuliffe have the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than available slots.  ***NEW Option 8G: All 8<sup>th</sup> graders at McAuliffe have the option to choose to attend LHS.</p> <p>**The newly added Option 7G would extend the temporary policy adopted by the Board on Jan. 12, allowing 8<sup>th</sup> graders at Miller who do not live in the Lynbrook attendance area to choose to attend Lynbrook in 9<sup>th</sup> grade. 7G differs from Option 7, in that no students would be turned down. Option 7 includes a lottery if there are more applications than the available number of slots.</p> <p>***Option 8G was proposed and added later during the meeting (after the first round of vote completed and before the second round of vote started), when it was suggested that whenever Miller and McAuliffe were combined together in a proposal, there was a strong desire to treat 8<sup>th</sup> graders from both schools the same way. If option 7G was available, it would be appropriate to also have option 8G.</p>
<p>Clarifying Questions  on Enrollment  Stabilizing Options</p>	<p>Q: Would students under any of these options need to live within our district boundary to be allowed to enroll in Lynbrook, or would this also apply to out-of-district students?  A: The district has been clear that it should only include students who live within the district boundaries.</p> <p>Q: What is the current enrollment at Miller for 8<sup>th</sup> grade?  A: The current enrollment is 428, of which 373 live in the Lynbrook enrollment area. That means there are 55 8<sup>th</sup> graders at Miller who do not live in the Lynbrook area.</p> <p>Comment: With regard to Option 6, if we are talking about students at Hyde Middle School, we should clarify if we are talking about kids who attend Hyde or those who live in the Hyde attendance area.  Response from Superintendent Polly Bove: We should be talking about students who live within the school's boundary area. This would include any students who are currently attending private school.</p> <p>Q: With regard to Options 7 and 7G, those students at Miller that are not in the Lynbrook attendance area, are they all CLIP students?  A: Many are, but not all. As of February 2016, there were 55 Miller 8<sup>th</sup> graders who did not reside in the Lynbrook attendance area and, of those, 36 were CLIP students. As of August 2016, there are 58 Miller 8<sup>th</sup> graders who did not reside in the Lynbrook attendance area. Of those, 42 were CLIP students. Note: there are 6 inter-district transfer</p>

	<p>students included in these numbers, who will not qualify under Options 7/7G. For employees of the district that have children, there is an established process and employee-privilege policy for them to follow to be placed in a school of their request.</p> <p>Q: Are there people on the CAC that live in the Lawson/Cupertino HS attendance area?  A: Three committee members raised their hands to indicate they are from the Lawson/Cupertino HS attendance area. One then stated that he did not live in the Lawson attendance area, but in 2010 his son was given the option to choose between Lawson and Cupertino Middle and attended Lawson.</p>
<p>Nominations for Proposals</p>	<p><b>Various committee members made the following eight proposals:</b></p> <p><b>Proposal A:</b> Option 7G: (All 8<sup>th</sup> Graders at Miller Middle School have the option to choose to attend LHS.)+ Option 8G**** (All 8<sup>th</sup> graders at McAuliffe have the option to choose to attend LHS) + Option 6 (All 8<sup>th</sup> Graders in the Hyde Middle School attendance area have the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than slots) (with each option implemented concurrently)  (this does not include Lawson students, different from Option 5)</p> <p>****Proposal A was originally nominated with Option 8. However, during discussion, it was suggested that for the comparable treatment of Miller and McAuliffe, there may be a need for Option 8G. There was unanimous agreement among CAC members to change to Option 8G for this reason. (Again, 8G was suggested and accepted after first round of vote completed and before second round of vote started).</p> <p><b>Proposal B:</b> Option 1 (boundary change)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We could recommend a boundary change and include any necessary considerations along with our recommendation, but we do not need to define a boundary ourselves.</li> <li>- A school board can legally make a boundary change. Education code 35160.5(b)(2)(B), "The governing board of a school district shall calculate the capacity of the schools in the district for purposes of this subdivision in a non-arbitrary manner using pupil enrollment and available space."</li> <li>- I think a boundary change should aim to bring LHS to 1850 students consistently.</li> <li>- Q: Are we talking about a one-time boundary change? What if, in future years, the Board needs to shrink or enlarge the enrollment area because there are too many or too few students in the new Lynbrook area? Would the Board have the authority to keep making boundary changes or would they have to come back to this committee? A: I see this as one proposal, but if things change in 10 years, there may be a need to do another boundary change. For now, we are just talking about recommending a boundary change to be</li> </ul>

made at this time. If things need to change later on, the Board still has the authority to determine another solution.

**Proposal C:** Option 6 (All 8<sup>th</sup> Graders in the Hyde Middle School attendance area have the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than slots) + Option 7 ((All 8<sup>th</sup> Graders in the Miller Middle School who do not live in the LHS attendance area have the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than slots)

- We would set a target (as high as 100 students per year) and reach out to the 8<sup>th</sup> graders at Miller who don't live in the Lynbrook attendance area and the 8<sup>th</sup> graders who live within the Hyde Middle School attendance area. If there are more applications than the target enrollment number, a lottery would be conducted across all applicants from both schools.
- This would also include students who are living in the Hyde Middle School attendance area and are currently attending private school.
- Q: What happens if we do not meet our target with this option? What if we don't get enough applicants? A: An adjustment would be made in the following years.

**Proposal D:** Option 6 (All 8<sup>th</sup> Graders in the Hyde Middle School attendance area have the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than slots) + Option 7 (All 8<sup>th</sup> Graders at Miller Middle School who do not reside in the Lynbrook attendance area have the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than slots) + Option 8 (All 8<sup>th</sup> graders at McAuliffe Middle School have the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than available slots)

- This should also be seen as another compromise solution, similar to Proposal A, but with a key difference. This approach will put all three groups of 8<sup>th</sup> graders in the same category.

**Proposal E:** Option 5 (All 8<sup>th</sup> Graders in the Cupertino HS attendance area have the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than slots)

**Proposal F:** Option 6 (All 8<sup>th</sup> Graders in the Hyde Middle School attendance area have the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than slots.)

**Proposal G:** Option 1 (boundary change) + Option 2 (John Mise Park area of choice)

- Allows for flexibility; they can create an area of choice in one area and boundary change in another area.

**Proposal H:** Option 7 (All 8<sup>th</sup> Graders at Miller Middle School who do not reside in the Lynbrook attendance area

	<p>have the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than slots) + Option 5 (All 8<sup>th</sup> Graders in the Cupertino HS attendance area have the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery is used in case of more applicants than slots)</p>
	<p>Q: Can you remind us of what the maximum capacity for Lynbrook is?  A: Maria Jackson, Lynbrook Principal, answered, "We had 2200 students at one point in time and made it work, without double lunches or other adjustments to the schedule."</p> <p>Comment: While we are talking about a target of 100 students per year, we are talking about current enrollment. That number may change. We should continue to think in terms of the range established by the Enrollment Projection Subcommittee and the CAC's established target of 1850-1870 students, as we know the reality will fluctuate.</p> <p>Q: When will this recommendation be presented to the Board?  A: Once the committee has reached a consensus and based on our actual progress in putting together a report of our recommendations to the Board, Superintendent Bove will speak to the Board so that they can make a determination about which board meeting the CAC will present at.</p> <p>Comment from Polly Bove: "I do believe that to implement a boundary change, our district would need to take more time from the point we are at today. It is not the kind of thing you would rush through within a few months. According to an in-depth analysis and presentation made by the California School Board's Association, the overall timeline for school districts to implement a boundary change is about 2-3 years, including conversation with the community, input from all stakeholders and study of the data."</p>
<p>First Round: A  Preliminary Test of  Consensus (before  advocacy)</p>	<p>Proposal A: 10 votes  Proposal B: 15 votes  Proposal C: 1 votes  Proposal D: 2 votes  Proposal E: 1 votes  Proposal F: 0 votes  Proposal G: 0 votes  Proposal H: 0 votes</p> <p>Proposal B: Boundary Change received the most votes in the first round of voting (15 out of 29 possible).</p>

	<p>For those who wanted to include their name with their vote: Roger Hewitt, Zongbo Chen and Liming Wang voted for Proposal A; Jason Heskett, Gail Marzolf, David Heinke, and Daniel McCune voted for Proposal B.</p> <p>***By previous agreement, members would vote anonymously. However, if they specifically requested to be identified with their votes, they would write their name on the ballot. No one was required to disclose how they voted if they didn't want to.</p>
<p>Advocacy for Proposals</p>	<p>Minh went around the room giving each committee member a brief opportunity if they wish to explain their reasoning for voting the way that they did and to advocate for the proposal that they would like to see the rest of the committee give more support to. This also served as an opportunity to signal openness to other proposals in order to support a compromise.</p> <p>Comments from Committee Members (one comment/quote per CAC member):</p> <p>"One of the reasons why I proposed A is because students at Miller have been together for three years and will want to continue to be with their friends at high school."</p> <p>"I am undecided between A and B."</p> <p>"My thoughts go back to the Board meeting where the temporary solution was proposed. A wise Board member said that we, as a community, needed to start the healing process and I am keeping that sentiment in mind. I voted for A. I think it is a good compromise that allows time for healing and moving forward together."</p> <p>"I voted for D and, while I would also support a boundary change, I think this more immediately resolves the issue than a boundary change would. I think we should treat all students from the three groups equally in this lottery."</p> <p>"I voted for B. It is a clean, permanent solution. I think it also has minimum impact on students and the community. If not B, I would prefer F and start small."</p> <p>"My preferred proposal would also be B. It seems to be the most clean and precise and we could get the number we need."</p> <p>"I voted for A. I sympathize with students who want to be with their friends [in going from middle school to high school]. I am open to proposal D if there is potential legal risk with A. I am cognizant that B may be required as a next step, if necessary."</p>

"If B were not to move forward, I would vote for A. I think the Miler students should go to Lynbrook if that is what they want."

"I voted for the boundary change because I think it is a nice, firm solution. Everyone knows what this is. I think a better choice to ease in, I like D. I like that the lottery would apply across the board. I could also go for A."

"I still think B is the best proposal, however, I would go for proposal D. I understand that Miller kids have been together for middle school but McAuliffe kids have been together 8 years. At that point it becomes about kids who have been together longer... I'm not sure that's how we should base our decision."

"Proposal B. Easy."

"Proposal B."

"Proposal A."

"Proposal B. It has a definitive effect on all students. It is the most stabilizing, I think. Otherwise, we could do Option 2 and lead in to Option 1." (Jason H.)

"I think it is stirring the pot by opening a lottery or an area of choice."

"I voted for A because I think it the most pragmatic. Proposal B is why we are here. I don't think Proposal B will persuade the opposition."

"I vote for A as well. I echo the views of others that we need to heal the neighborhood. I think we need to come together in search for middle ground."

"My focus was on trying to unite the community across the district. Open enrollment was my initial choice but I think A would be good, as it would limit the impact on the CHS area and provide opportunity for all Miller students to go together. I think it is a better compromise."

"I voted for A. Feeder inclusion is important and A would mitigate the impact on other schools. B is cleaner but I think the persistent conflict that would result would drain District resources and time."

	<p>"Proposal B is the cleanest option, especially looking at the next couple of years' enrollment numbers. I think over the next couple of years, the decline will be more significant. I am open to proposal D, 6 + 7+ 8, which gives students choice. The fear of kids being separated is a fear at Lawson too."</p> <p>"I voted for B. I think it is the cleanest and most predictable. I like C and D too. I like that the lottery is fair to all students."</p> <p>"My vote was based on what is good for students, community, school and administration. I did not vote for B because of the cost for administration and can continue to divide the community. I was trying to decide between A and D, since they are so similar, but Miller is the feeder for Lynbrook."</p> <p>"Proposal B is clean but I understand the community may not be ready to accept that solution. I like A because it gives them time to understand the issues."</p> <p>"I hope that my child will enter high school with a variety of interests and passions and that the school she goes to has many options for her to explore those interests. Proposal B is about the numbers but it is also about ensuring robust school programming."</p> <p>"B is the only one that I could make any argument as being good for students. My background is with low-income and at-risk students. Community schools are what this district is about."</p> <p>"I prefer B but I'm open to other options. I believe this one year was for healing. I don't like the word "precedent" in 7G. The Board was not trying to create a precedent. It was trying to calm people down with an interim solution, not a precedent."</p> <p>"I would vote for B because of how clear and precise it is."</p> <p>"I asked my daughter what she would choose if she was at Hyde and she said that she would stay with her friends at Cupertino. I think B has the most clarity but A, and possibly D, are other options I would consider."</p> <p>"I liked Proposal B because it is clean. I am also OK with Proposal D."</p> <p>"If we were in a static enrollment situation, obviously boundary change would be the answer; but a vote for a</p>
--	---



boundary change is a vote to repeat the process every year. To see some people in the group not support 7G is disappointing to me.”

“I voted for B.”

There was some discussion by the CAC about the role of the committee being advisory, which means that while the CAC will make recommendations to the Board, the Board may or may not adopt some or all of them. If our recommendations are based on solid information, and contain thoughtful and wise solutions, they are more likely to be adopted. We should also try to create a strong consensus, as it would make our case more compelling to the decision makers. If we only focus on differences and fail to build on our common ground our position will be weaker and less likely to be adopted.

The committee received emails regarding preferred enrollment options from 49 community members in the last 3 days (**Note:** This is not a scientifically representative sample of community members. Information contained in some of these emails indicates the community members may not have read meeting reports or are not apprised of all the factual information that the committee has learned over the course of its meetings. It is however a legitimate effort by residents to influence this committee, and should be considered as additional input):

- Option 1: 4 votes
- Option 2: 1 vote
- Option 3: 1 vote
- Option 4: 0 votes
- Option 5: 18 votes
- Option 6: 28 votes
- Option 7: 8 votes
- Option 7G: 13 votes (21 when combined with Option 7 votes)
- Option 8: 11 votes

Minh: I would like to advocate for compromise. You all realized from the beginning that this was a complicated challenge. We spent many hours just to study the many multi-faceted issues at play. I appreciate that a few minutes ago a number of you indicated that you were open to compromise. You all said on your CAC application that you would be open to compromise, and that is what I ask of you tonight. My commitments from day one included caring about every stakeholder involved in this process and remaining impartial regarding the outcome. However, if you can accuse me of having an agenda it is to have everyone come together to reach an agreement. I believe that after all the time and effort we have spent together, to be divided and not have a strong consensus would be a terrible

	<p>waste of such good committee work. In the spirit of National Good Neighbors Day today, there are three things that make great communities: truthfulness (looking at the facts), power (having the courage to advocate for what you believe), and also love (empathizing with others, including those who do not have all the information, or even those with the wrong information). It is in this spirit that I ask you to support a compromise solution in the second round of voting.</p>
<p>Additional Proposal Considerations</p>	<p>One member raised the issue that, with the adoption of 7G, there should also be an 8G, as both Miller and McAuliffe are feeder schools for Lynbrook. It was noted there is a strong argument to treat these groups in the same manner. Minh asked if there were any objections to this addition of Option 8G and there were none.</p> <p>Proposal A was confirmed as: 7G + 8G + 6</p> <p>A CAC member expressed concern about the impact on the CLIP and McAuliffe alternative programs. Parents may choose those programs for their kids simply as a pathway to Lynbrook rather than a deep commitment to the program.</p> <p>Other CAC members expressed their feeling that parents choose the CLIP program due to their interest in having their children learn Chinese, irrespective of which high school they will attend after middle school. CAC members stated that for many years the demand for entry in the CLIP program has exceeded the available slots, and that this is without any proposals in place for an option to attend Lynbrook. They stated that there are also multiple examples where CLIP parents have chosen not to send their children to Lynbrook when they lived in the Lynbrook residence area.</p> <p>It was suggested that, if the Committee recommended temporary measures (such as included in Proposal A) to stabilize enrollment, then there may be a need to include a caveat for a recommended longer-term solution (i.e. a boundary change) if the temporary measures do not effectively stabilize enrollment.</p> <p>Q: Should all the options be re-evaluated if the recommended temporary measures do not effectively stabilize enrollment?</p> <p>A: We have seen clearly in our discussion that many committee members would resist choice-based enrollment stabilizing methods for Lynbrook HS unless they were temporary measures. There is a clear majority support for boundary change (Proposal B) in the first round of voting (15/29), and many are signaling willingness to compromise by going with Proposal A or D in the second round, but only with the understanding that all of these choice-based options are temporary measures. If the temporary measures don't work all you have left will be the definitive measure of boundary change.</p>

With more than half of the present committee members already in favor of the long-term boundary change, many committee members argued that the recommendation for a long-term boundary change be made explicit in the temporary measure proposals. This may include language such as, "if the temporary measures do not effectively stabilize enrollment at Lynbrook, a boundary change may be necessary" or "the data points that an enrollment change may eventually become necessary," or "the committee recommends the Board consider a boundary change be made in future years if the temporary measures prove unsuccessful at stabilizing enrollment in the short-term."

Those in favor of "Boundary Change" repeatedly emphasized that this was the method that would achieve the most certainty in terms of student numbers, and is an option based purely on consistent defined geographical criteria, as opposed to programmatic criteria that can be determined and altered by our feeder district over which we have no influence. For FUHSD to have a better set of data with which to make decisions, an enrollment plan from CUSD would help make a long-term decision.

A committee member reminded the CAC about the Enrollment Sub-Committee findings that the 2020 projection had a major variance, with the enrollment shortfall range being between 83-26 students per year if the target is 1850. Because of this, the sub-committee unanimously recommended that the CAC focus on solutions that allow for flexibility because of the wide range. The committee member stated they did not feel a boundary change met this criterion.

Additional caveats were suggested, including that any of the options being recommended incorporate ongoing data collection and annual data analysis to assess its impact on enrollment at Lynbrook as well as other schools, and other potential impacts the final recommendations have on the community.

Superintendent Polly Bove recommended that we reconvene this committee in the fall of 2017 to look at data changes over time (this idea was not yet discussed or decided upon).

A committee member suggested that the CAC may want to consider a recommendation to include some minimum number of students enrolled at Lynbrook in subsequent years, and if that number were not met, then a boundary change would immediately be considered as the temporary solutions had proven unsuccessful.

A committee member expressed that the CAC needs to look for a compromise solution to unite the community and not look at extreme measures that further divide the community.

While a majority of this committee believed that after 2020 enrollment decline would continue to get worse for LHS, a significant minority still believe that these transfer measures (such as Proposal A or D) may in fact succeed such that additional stabilization would not be required. Minh confirmed this comment by asking for a show of hands.

A committee member pointed out that with the ongoing collection of data and annual data analysis, the district can continue to communicate information to the community in terms of how we are doing with the temporary transfer measures. If they are not effective at stabilizing the decline, or if undesirable consequences are produced by the temporary measures, the district management and the board would have the right (and responsibility) to initiate more definitive measures, which could include implementing a boundary change.

Another committee member pointed out that if we consider the projection shortfall best case scenario of just needing 25 students by 2020, then it would not be prudent to force a highly disruptive 2-3 year boundary change process to manage that need. The board might have to consider either continuing with temporary measures but scale them back (such as what they put in place for this year). So, the board should be able to consider all options based on what the actual Attending Enrollment turns out in 2020.

Another committee member felt that to claim now that we know exactly what the situation will look like in three years is premature and risks creating unnecessary alarm and over-reactions in the community. A boundary change is psychologically disruptive enough that people should have time, information and communication to help transition them into it rather than feeling like it is being urgently forced on them.

A committee member stated that the CAC members are here to be open minded and willing to compromise for a short-term solution. This member joined the committee with the belief that open enrollment was the best solution. However, over time this member listened to and realized the concerns from other committee members. So the voting for Proposal A only by this committee member was already a compromise from where they began.

It was agreed that Minh would draft some language in the final committee report that reflected the discussion about whether we would need to implement a boundary change several years down the road. The entire committee will have an opportunity to view and comment on this language and on October 12 will be able to approve it.

Based on request of Committee members, legal considerations regarding the proposals were discussed.

<p>Second Round: Aiming for 80% Agreement of Better</p>	<p>In this round of voting, each member was allocated two votes to be used however they saw fit (i.e., a member could vote for one proposal twice or could vote for two separate proposals).</p> <p>Proposal A: 34 votes / 60% (including Liming Wang, Kevin Du, Zongbo Chen, Roger Hewitt)          Proposal B: 8 votes / 14% (including Daniel McCune)          Proposal D: 14 votes / 24% (including Jason Heskett)          Proposal G: 1 votes / 2% (Jason Heskett)          Proposals C, E, F, H: 0 votes</p> <p>David Heinke abstained from voting.</p> <p>84% majority voted on temporary measures A and D.</p>
<p>Third Round: Aiming for Total Consensus</p>	<p>In this round of voting, each member was allocated one vote to use.</p> <p>Proposal A: 22 votes / 76% (including Liming Wang, Kevin Du, Zongbo Chen, Roger Hewitt, C.S. Prakash, Amit Raikar)          Proposal B: 1 / 3%          Proposal D: 2 / 7%          Proposal G: 1 / 3% (Jason Heskett)</p> <p>3 members (10%) abstained from voting. One stated, "I will not vote for D or A without the full language that I am voting on." It was clear that going above the current level of consensus (83%) would not be possible until the committee reached agreement regarding what the final report would say about whether or not the district should implement a boundary change in the future if the temporary measures of Proposal A or D failed to stabilize enrollment at LHS in the next several years.</p> <p>Minh: Thank you for your efforts toward reaching a compromise solution. None of the Proposals achieved an 80% agreement as I hoped. Together, Proposals A and D – both compromise solutions, received a combined 83% of the vote. However, it is clear that Proposal A received 76% of the vote and Proposal D received 7% of the vote. We can now proceed to finalize our work. A draft meeting report will be available on Google Drive by this weekend for you to view and comment. There will be a lot of interest in the report of this meeting, and as usual the facilitation team and I will work hard to ensure that it accurately reflects these proceedings, your comments and your votes. In the next two weeks I will also be drafting for us a final committee report, covering the process we went through, the findings we made along the way, and how we came to the final recommendations we are making to the</p>

	Superintendent and the Board. We aim to post it on Google Drive so that you can view and comment on the language prior to the next meeting.
By unanimous agreement, the official meeting time was extended several times to allow voting to take place. The meeting officially ended at 9:30 p.m.	