

MINUTES

Fairfax County School Board Luther Jackson Middle School

Regular Meeting No. 12

January 26, 2006

1. **CLOSED MEETING**

Chairman Ilryong Moon convened the Board in public session at 6:20 p.m. with a quorum of members present:

Catherine A. Belter (Springfield)	Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner (Providence)
Brad Center (Lee)	Janet S. Oleszek (At Large)
Stuart D. Gibson (Hunter Mill)	Kathy L. Smith (Sully)
Stephen M. Hunt (At Large)	Daniel G. Storck (Mt. Vernon)
Kaye Kory (Mason)	Jane K. Strauss (Dranesville)
Ilryong Moon (At Large)	Tessie Wilson (Braddock)

Mr. Gibson moved, and Mr. Storck seconded, that the Board go into closed session: 1) to discuss and consider disciplinary matters concerning students pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(2), and 2) to consult with legal counsel regarding actual litigation pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(7). The motion **passed unanimously.**

2. **MEETING OPENING**

2.01 **Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance/Moment of Silence**

Chairman Moon convened the meeting at 7:08 p.m. with all Board Members present. Also present were Division Superintendent Jack D. Dale; Deputy Superintendent Brad Draeger; Executive Assistant and Clerk of the Board Pamela Goddard; Deputy Clerk Linda Sabo; and certain other members of staff. Student Representative to the School Board Samantha Kunkel was present.

2.02 **Certification of Closed Meeting Compliance (Exhibit A)**

Mrs. Kory moved, and Mr. Center seconded, that since the Fairfax County School Board convened a closed session meeting on January 26, 2006, pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and since Section 2.1-344(D) of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the School Board that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law, the Fairfax County School Board hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, 1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting, and (2) only such public business matters as

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

2

January 26, 2006

were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered. The motion **passed unanimously.**

2.03 Announcements (Exhibit B)

Vice Chairman Center announced that February was African-American History Month; and he welcomed Boy Scout Troops 1145 and 1580 from Springfield, who were in attendance, working on their communications badges.

2.04 Recognition of National School Counseling Week (Exhibit C)

Mr. Storck recognized school counselors who were in the audience, and invited them to join the Board for photographs.

3. PRESENTATIONS TO SCHOOL BOARD

3.01 Spotlight on Learning – ESOL Model Classrooms (Exhibit D)

Dr. Dale introduced Teddi Predaris, Director of Office of English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), who discussed the ESOL Model Classroom, which provided an opportunity for teachers and school teams to observe and dialogue with a master teacher modeling best practices for instructing ESOL students in a live classroom. Currently, there are two model ESOL Classrooms -- one at Bailey's Elementary School, and one for the secondary level at Liberty Middle School. Mr. Moon noted that the size of current classes were larger than when he was an ESOL student.

3.02 Citizen Participation (Exhibit E)

One speaker addressed the Board in the time reserved for public comment. Sandy Evans addressed later school starting times for high school students.

4. ACTION ITEMS

TAPE REFERENCE: 1-0712

4.01 School Board Policy - Adopt Policy 1710.9, Citizen Advisory Committees to the School Board, as recommended by the Advisory Committee Ad Hoc Committee (SB; Exhibit F)

Mr. Storck moved, and Mr. Hunt seconded, that the School Board adopt Policy 1710.9, Citizen Advisory Committees to the School Board, as recommended by the Advisory Committee Ad Hoc Committee.

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

3

January 26, 2006

Discussion included the following: that the advisory committees were an important way for Board members to interact with the community on important matters; that he appreciated the suggestions for improvement gathered from various committee and staff members; that some of the revisions included designating a Board member as a liaison to each advisory committee and requiring the committees to report to the Board on a periodic basis, and make specific actionable recommendations (Storck); that the Board was fortunate that there were so many articulate community members who were willing to serve on advisory committees and to contribute their knowledge, insight, and advice; that communication would be improved between committee members and Board members (Hunt); appreciation expressed for Mr. Storck and Mr. Hunt's efforts to improve the committee structure (Belter, Kory, Wilson).

The motion that the School Board adopt Policy 1710.9, Citizen Advisory Committees to the School Board, as recommended by the Advisory Committee Ad Hoc Committee, **passed unanimously.**

- 4.02 FY 2007-2011 Capital Improvement Program** - Approve the FY 2007-2011 Capital Improvement Program as described in the narrative and in the Superintendent's Proposed FY 2007-2011 Capital Improvement Program Summary (FTS; Exhibit G)

Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner moved, and Mrs. Kory seconded, that the School Board approve the FY 2007-2011 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) as described in the narrative and in the Superintendent's Proposed FY 2007-2011 Capital Improvement Program Summary, with the following revisions: 1. Reflect the current annual spending limit of \$130 million imposed by the County Board of Supervisors; due to increased project costs resulting from current high rates of inflation in the construction industry, limiting the annual CIP expenditure to \$130 million will necessitate delays in the start up and subsequent completion dates of the following CIP projects: Waynewood modular, Franklin Sherman, Woodburn, Sleepy Hollow, Freedom Hill, Great Falls, Vienna, Graham Road, Mt. Eagle, Beech Tree, Stenwood, Westlawn, Franconia, Oakton, Lake Anne, Clifton, Canterbury Woods, Glasgow, Longfellow, Sandburg, Cooper, Thoreau, Woodson, Edison, Marshall, Jefferson; 2. Direct the Superintendent to design Langley High School for up to a 16 classroom addition with the option to reduce the number to as few as 10 classrooms if enrollment numbers support a reduction at the time the construction award is made; 3. Direct the Superintendent to maintain for the new Glasgow Middle School the current design for 1,500 students; 4. Direct the Superintendent to bid future capital construction projects with bid alternates that will provide the Board with award options should bid amounts exceed the project budget; 5. Direct the Superintendent to review education specifications to ensure that they meet current and projected instructional requirements for all students and recommend appropriate mitigations when those needs are not being met by the existing facilities, with the School Board to be advised by February 17, 2006, of the

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

4

January 26, 2006

schedule for said review; 6. Direct the Superintendent to recommend boundary studies that should be completed in the next two years to address issues related to enrollment projections; and 7. Direct the School Board Chairman to convey the CIP to the Board of Supervisors with a letter that communicates the funding level required to restore the project schedule specified in the originally proposed CIP for FY 2007-2011; to accelerate renovations and other new capacity projects such as Laurel Hill Elementary School and additions to alternative high schools; and to support program initiatives such as all day kindergarten.

Discussion included the following: that the approved CIP would represent the Board's commitment to new construction, renovations, and major maintenance projects over the next five years; that unless additional resources were made available, planned projects would have to be delayed or reduced in scope; that the Board was requesting project funding equal to the \$130 million cap imposed by the BOS and the motion had identified the resulting impact on planned projects; that the motion included requests to review design specifications for all schools and to provide options to the Board when construction bids exceeded the project budget; that while the Board maintained a \$1.8 billion backlog of unmet renovation, new construction, and major maintenance needs, construction costs had increased as much as 50 percent over the past year; that Facilities staff worked diligently to manage costs so that those projects in the queue could be completed; that he believed that the scope of the Glasgow project at 1,500 students should be maintained so the instructional program would not be impacted, coupled with the changing population patterns, would be a catalyst for neighborhood revitalization and would attract families with students who had not previously attended the school; that the Mason District Supervisor and the Planning Commissioner had communicated that new housing investment was planned for Mason District; that although the \$1.5 million savings realized from a reduction in the scope of the Glasgow project was significant, he believed the potential for overcrowding at Glasgow offset the limited potential savings that could be realized (Niedzielski-Eichner); that she appreciated the efforts of everyone—Board members, Facilities staff members, and members of the Glasgow community—who had been involved in the process; that the motion demonstrated the compromises that were necessary to keep the commitments that had been made to the community; that the BOS was very aware of construction cost increases because it also affected their CIP, and everyone must work together (Kory); that staff had noted that building a 1,500 seat Glasgow would exceed the project budget of \$40.5 million; the question whether it was Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner's intent that the language in paragraph #4 of the motion "to direct the Superintendent to seek bid alternates" would apply to Glasgow (Gibson); affirmative response (Niedzielski-Eichner); the question how long the redesign of Glasgow had been in the planning process (Gibson); the response that at the November 2005 work session when staff had first suggested the possibility of a reduced project and there had been no objections indicated, staff members had started exploring options for possible room reductions and directed the architect to begin the redesign efforts (Dean Tistadt, Assistant

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

5

January 26, 2006

Superintendent of Facilities & Transportation Services); the question whether approximately \$100,000 had already been spent in those redesign efforts (Gibson); an affirmative response; that he was prepared to stop the effort if the Board approved the proposed motion tonight (Tistadt); the question how long the design effort for the new middle school had been underway (Gibson); the response approximately two years (Tistadt); that at the Jan. 12 Board meeting, he had asked *will reducing the size of the Glasgow building to more closely match projected enrollment negatively impact instruction and if so how?*; that on January 20 he had received the following response: *Classroom space eliminated would not impact instruction if the projected number of students is accurate. The Office of Design and Construction has met with the cluster superintendent and principal at Glasgow and presented to them an alternative plan that would not decrease science classrooms and would provide additional storage space*; the confirmation that the Superintendent's response had been that the reduction to 1,250 students would not negatively impact instruction (Gibson); an affirmative response (Dale); that on January 24, the response had been reversed based on conversations with the principal and the cluster assistant superintendent (Gibson); an affirmative response; that Board members had received a copy of the principal's analysis explaining that reversal (Dale); the question whether it was correct that the principal's analysis was that if 1,500 students came to Glasgow as designed currently (to serve 1,500) there would not be enough space to serve those students (Gibson); affirmative response; that additional staff were assigned to Glasgow and other schools that had higher percentages of students from poverty and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) programs because more instructional space was required to accommodate those different classes (Dale); that if the Glasgow community's projections were correct as opposed to the staff projection of about 1,000 to 1,200 students, the question whether it would be necessary to have enough classroom space for approximately 1,800 students (Gibson); affirmative response (Dale); the question whether there was space available at the surrounding middle schools—Poe, Holmes, and Jackson—to accommodate an additional 300 Glasgow students if the Board chose to do a boundary study (Gibson); affirmative response (Tistadt); the question whether the education specifications used to design the new Glasgow were the general education specifications adopted in 1999 (Gibson); affirmative response (Dale); that since staff had not made any accommodations for the Glasgow student body when designing the building, he would offer an amendment (Gibson).

Mr. Gibson moved, and Mrs. Wilson seconded, to substitute the following language for paragraph 5 of the main motion: 1. That the Superintendent conduct a thorough review of the facilities needs of those schools (and their staffs) that serve large numbers or percentages of students who live in poverty, receive special education services, or are learning English, to determine whether our present specifications for school facilities adequately enable those schools (and their staffs) to meet the needs of all students; 2. That, if the Superintendent determines that our present specifications for school facilities do not adequately

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

6

January 26, 2006

enable schools (and their staffs) that serve large numbers or percentages of students who live in poverty, receive special education services, or are learning English to meet the needs of all students, the Superintendent shall identify those schools that require facilities enhancements in order to meet the needs of all students, and propose temporary or permanent enhancements to those facilities to enable those schools to meet the needs of all students; and any proposal should include the cost of temporary and permanent facilities and the impact of those needs on the capital and operating budgets; and 3. That the Superintendent may not commit any capital or operating funds to meet the needs for enhancements identified in response to this motion, without the express approval of the School Board. This prohibition shall not cover schools under construction or renovation pursuant to contracts already approved by the School Board, where the enhancements do not increase the cost of the contract.

TAPE REFERENCE: 1-1670

Further discussion included the following: that at the November 7, 2005, Facilities and Operations work session, staff members had recommended a reduction in the size of the new Glasgow middle school from serving 1,500 students to one with classroom space for 1,250 students but with a core capacity designed to serve 1,500 should more students enroll; that the staff recommendation had been based on actual and projected enrollment of no more than 1,000 students for Glasgow within the five-year CIP window; that the Glasgow principal had indicated that the same amount of space originally designed for 1,500 students was necessary to serve the current student body of less than 1,100 and that had been confirmed by the Superintendent; that the Glasgow community had been working with school staff for over two years to design a school to meet their needs but now that design was not adequate to serve 1,500 students if the staff projections were off by 50 percent; that if a 1,500-seat school was built to serve 1,250 students with special needs, then that decision would impact other communities and schools in Fairfax County; that it was important to examine the space needs of all schools that, like Glasgow, served many students with special needs so as not to deprive them of the appropriate facilities; that his amendment would direct the Superintendent to determine whether education specifications were adequate for schools serving special populations and to recommend changes to the Board, so that any changes would be made with consideration of the fiscal impact on both the operating budget and the capital budget; that there was no funding included in the FY 2007 proposed budget to add trailers to meet facilities needs of the Glasgow type; that any funds spent to improve facilities at one school was money not available for another needy school; and that he asked for his colleagues' support for his amendment (Gibson); that there was a Title I elementary school in her district that served similar special needs students and had 20 trailers, and there were needs across the county for other at-risk students; that the Board needed to follow a standard policy; that she would support the amendment (Wilson); that Board members had been willing to look at the Glasgow situation

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

7

January 26, 2006

with some flexibility between 1,250 and 1,500 students, but that had changed with the response about the impact on the instructional needs; that the Board needed to determine what percentage of those students on free and reduced lunch and requiring ESOL services would necessitate a re-evaluation of space requirements needed to serve those students; that it was important to remember that the core capacity of a building—the library, the cafeteria, the gymnasium—could serve more students, as indicated at Glasgow, and that there were schools in the surrounding area with excess capacity that could serve students to relieve overcrowding; that when communities such as South County and Hayfield were forced to consider boundary adjustments to relieve overcrowding, it was important to be consistent across the county; and that he would support the amendment (Center); that she thanked staff for their hard work and recommendations; that while student enrollment was now flat, the Board had a responsibility to use the limited funding wisely, and a savings of \$1.5 million was important; that she supported the amendment (Smith); the request for clarification as to what impact paragraph #3 of the amendment would have on the Glasgow contract (Strauss); that the amendment language indicated that the Superintendent could not commit funds until the Board voted on the contract; that the amendment prohibited the Superintendent from using funds from the construction reserve or operating funds for facility enhancements without the Board's approval (Gibson); the request for clarification whether the proposed amendment was an extension of paragraph #5 of the main motion (Strauss); that paragraph #5 referred to every education specification for every school, while his amendment referred to only education specifications for those schools serving needy populations, like Glasgow (Gibson); the question whether paragraphs #1 and #2 in the amendment requested that staff focus only on the education specifications for those schools serving needy populations (Strauss); an affirmative response (Gibson); the comment that the Board already approved contracts (Strauss); the distinction that the Board did not approve contracts to purchase trailers; that hypothetically the Superintendent could decide that an additional classroom need could be addressed by a trailer that might be destined for another school and change that destination, and the Board needed to know that (Gibson); that the operating budget had specific funding for lease/purchase of trailers that were used for a variety of reasons; the question whether Mr. Gibson thought the Board needed to vote before a trailer was moved from one site to another (Strauss); negative response; that trailers were used to increase capacity at schools, but that his amendment would require Board approval when, for example, a trailer was needed at a school that served a special needs population as opposed to a school that required a specific amount of classrooms for grade six (Gibson); the question whether the amendment would slow down the process of staffing schools (Strauss); the response that the operating budget currently included funding for trailers (Dale); that the typical annual beginning budgeted amount for trailers was approximately \$6 million, which paid for residual lease payments on trailers, other modifications for buildings to accommodate student growth, and expansion of parking lots; that renovation trailers were not paid for out of the operating fund; that trailers were allocated to

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

8

January 26, 2006

meet expanded instructional needs and it would be difficult to differentiate between requirements for special programs or enrollment (Tistadt); that staffing was now weighted so that teachers were placed with the needier children; that she understood the need for having the education specifications relate to the needier children but was concerned about unintended consequences (Strauss); that the amendment only referred to changing education specifications, so that a school might be entitled to more classrooms than they currently had, which would possibly create a requirement to purchase more trailers (Gibson); that education specifications were only used during new construction and renovation and were not used on an annual basis when making staffing decisions (Dale); that he understood that Facilities staff determined the programmatic needs and rated the capacity of every school annually according to the education specifications, and that the amendment addressed that capacity issue (Gibson); that it was his understanding that capacity was based on student population and program requirements within a school, and if necessary, trailers were added to provide a teacher a teaching station; that the calculation was based on the number of teachers and not the number of classrooms (Hunt); that the CIP annually reported the number of classrooms needed, which was dependent on staffing ratios and program requirements (Dale); that the Board had recently approved the algorithm that calculated the number of teachers required; the question what the impact of the proposed amendment would have on the timeline of the Langley and Glasgow projects (Hunt); the response that it was intended to have no impact; that the Langley contract would not be awarded until next year and the Glasgow contract was not scheduled until May; that staff could survey and report to the Board so that decisions regarding system-wide allocation of resources could be made prior to the award of contract; that the amendment was intended to address a situation, like Glasgow, where a building designed to serve 1,500 students actually could not serve that many students because more space was required for the adults (Gibson); that staff determined facility requirements annually for each CIP; the question how normal operations would be different with the amendment (Hunt); the response that the Board already approved the expenditure of capital funds; that the Board would have to approve placing trailers at specific schools based on requirements, whereas now that was done without Board approval (Dale); that he did not believe the staff enrollment projections for Glasgow were accurate and he had done his own analysis that Glasgow's enrollment would be about 1,400; that there was a high attrition rate between first and fifth grade, and fifth and sixth grade, which he believed was because of Glasgow's reputation; that when a new school was constructed, such as South County, families were drawn back to the school, and he thought the same would be true at Glasgow; that he would not want to see any delay in Glasgow's construction (Hunt); that he would not support the amendment; that it would eviscerate the intent of paragraph #3 of the main motion to maintain Glasgow at 1,500 students; that the main motion would accomplish the same purpose of the proposed amendment (Niedzielski-Eichner); that he would not support the amendment (Storck); that she supported keeping the Glasgow design at 1,500 students (Oleszek); that the amendment was not intended to

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

9

January 26, 2006

delay the renovation of Glasgow; that he would offer an amendment to the amendment that would address some of the concerns expressed (Gibson).

Mr. Gibson moved, and Mr. Center, to amend the amendment by deleting paragraph #3 (“That the Superintendent may not commit any capital or operating funds to meet the needs for enhancements identified in response to this motion, without the express approval of the School Board. This prohibition shall not cover schools under construction or renovation pursuant to contracts already approved by the School Board, where the enhancements do not increase the cost of the contract.”).

Discussion continued as follows: that he appreciated Mr. Gibson's willingness to respond and would support the amendment to the amendment (Niedzielski-Eichner); that it was important to review the needs of at-risk children; that Herndon Elementary School's enrollment had declined but neediness had increased, and last year the Board had approved a modular unit that had allowed full day kindergarten, Head Start, and other needed services; that she would support the amendment (Strauss).

The motion to amend the amendment by deleting paragraph #3 (“That the Superintendent may not commit any capital or operating funds to meet the needs for enhancements identified in response to this motion, without the express approval of the School Board. This prohibition shall not cover schools under construction or renovation pursuant to contracts already approved by the School Board, where the enhancements do not increase the cost of the contract.”) **passed unanimously.**

TAPE REFERENCE: 2-0082

Discussion continued as follows: The question how the amended amendment was different from the main motion (Kory); the response that the amendment addressed facilities needs of only those schools that served the neediest students, and required the Superintendent to report back to the Board on those needs and whether the education specifications needed to be revised, and the cost involved; that the main motion only asked for a review of education specifications for all schools (Gibson); the question whether it would be useful to know how much it would cost to revise education specifications for all schools (Kory); that the Glasgow principal had indicated that more space was needed because of the special instructional needs of the students there and the Superintendent had indicated the need for a review of education specifications for schools serving needy students (Gibson).

The motion to substitute the following language for paragraph 5 of the main motion: 1. That the Superintendent conduct a thorough review of the facilities needs of those schools (and their staffs) that serve large numbers or percentages of students who live in poverty, receive special education services,

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

10

January 26, 2006

or are learning English, to determine whether our present specifications for school facilities adequately enable those schools (and their staffs) to meet the needs of all students; and 2. That, if the Superintendent determines that our present specifications for school facilities do not adequately enable schools (and their staffs) that serve large numbers or percentages of students who live in poverty, receive special education services, or are learning English to meet the needs of all students, the Superintendent shall identify those schools that require facilities enhancements in order to meet the needs of all students, and propose temporary or permanent enhancements to those facilities to enable those schools to meet the needs of all students; and any proposal should include the cost of temporary and permanent facilities and the impact of those needs on the capital and operating budgets, passed 10-2, with Mrs. Belter, Mr. Center, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Moon, Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Storck, Mrs. Strauss, and Mrs. Wilson voting "aye" and with Mrs. Kory and Mrs. Oleszek voting "nay."

TAPE REFERENCE: 2-0262

Discussion continued as follows: the question whether paragraph #6 of the main motion regarding boundary studies was normally part of the CIP (Center); negative response (Tistadt); that he did not think the paragraph was germane to the CIP; that the normal course of action for boundaries started with staff recommendations and then the Board's independent action; that the original staff recommendation had included a \$150 million cash flow, but the Board would be approving the CIP with a \$130 million cash flow; that if the BOS did not provide additional funds there were many schools in the queue that would be impacted, although the Chairman of the BOS had recently indicated that the School Board would likely receive at least an additional \$20 million cash flow; that inflation was a major factor in what projects could be completed with \$130 million; that although there were a number of overcrowded schools, such as South County and Westfield High Schools, the CIP did not adequately address the situation; that there would have to be a boundary study for South County to relieve the overcrowding; that it was important for the Board to understand the current methodology used in projecting enrollment, and although staff worked incredibly hard, he thought the Board should take the opportunity to view projections from an external source (Center); that since the main motion had been distributed late and had included items that the Board had not discussed previously, she would offer an amendment (Wilson).

Mrs. Wilson moved, and Mrs. Smith seconded, to amend the main motion by deleting paragraph #6 ("Direct the Superintendent to recommend boundary studies that should be completed in the next two years to address issues related to enrollment projections").

Discussion included the following: that although paragraph #3 directed the Superintendent to maintain the Glasgow design for 1,500 students, there also

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

11

January 26, 2006

was a recommendation that boundary studies be undertaken to adjust over- and under- enrollment; that there were adjacent middle schools to Glasgow that had sufficient capacity; that the message to the community was not consistent; that over the past several months the Board had indicated that boundary studies were almost inevitable; the request for clarification whether paragraph #6 meant boundary studies for enrollment, for gifted and talented (GT) centers, or for certain over-enrolled schools; that the Board needed to discuss the issue prior to any direction given to the Superintendent (Wilson); the response that paragraph #6 was meant to clarify that by approving the CIP there was no commitment from the Board to do any kind of boundary study; that the CIP document included many suggestions where a boundary study might be appropriate, that he would support the amendment since the Superintendent had assured everyone there would be no commitment to any boundary studies as a result of approving the CIP (Niedzielski-Eichner); further clarification that although staff often made boundary recommendations as a part of the CIP, the approval of the CIP tonight would not approve any specific study (Center); that although there were some boundary studies mentioned in the CIP, such as middle school GT centers and certain elementary GT issues, that would be undertaken next year; that it was not appropriate to include paragraph #6 in the main motion (Strauss); that it was important to be able to provide the resources for all students according to their needs (Belter).

The motion to amend the main motion by deleting paragraph #6 ("Direct the Superintendent to recommend boundary studies that should be completed in the next two years to address issues related to enrollment projections") **passed unanimously.**

TAPE REFERENCE: 2-0668

Discussion on the amended main motion continued as follows: that the planned 16-room addition for Langley High School would be reevaluated prior to awarding the contract and if slower enrollment was indicated, the addition would be scaled back, and the community had agreed with that approach; that she supported building Glasgow for 1,500 students (Strauss); that she had already informed the Woodson community about a possible delay depending on the amount of funding provided by the BOS, but any delay that might occur would only be a few months; that enrollment in Fairfax County had increased for a long time, but for the last few years enrollment had been flat and now was declining, with 231 less students today than the beginning of the school year in September; that every construction project should be evaluated based on current enrollment; that the Board had a fiduciary responsibility to the taxpayers of Fairfax County; that the "entitlement" mentality no longer applied because projects needed to be altered based on changing enrollment (Wilson); that this was his eleventh year voting on a CIP, and each year there are needs that spanned the County, from Herndon to Fairfax City to Vienna to Providence; that it was the Board's obligation to allocate the limited resources to all schools, and every dollar spent on one school was a

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

12

January 26, 2006

dollar that could not be spent on another school; that while he applauded those who came to the public hearings to advocate for the needs of their community, it was also the Board's responsibility to hear the needs of children whose parents did not or could not advocate vocally; that the CIP was a planning document that was updated annually because circumstances changed; that technology could have a profound impact on the plan, and ten years ago no one had heard of modular buildings and now they were an integral part of the plan; that every year the CIP was developed to meet needs previously identified, to predict future needs, and to allocate resources fairly, using alternative, cost-effective, fiscally prudent ways to meet those needs; that instead of spending funds to build additional classrooms at one school the Board would consider adjusting boundaries to take advantage of classrooms at nearby schools; that in the mid-1990s the phased renewal of five older high schools had been projected to be completed in five years, but because of rising costs it had taken seven years, and three years ago a modular unit in the CIP had been removed for Langston Hughes Middle School when its enrollment had dropped and had been assigned to a school that needed it; that staff had consistently over-projected enrollment at Glasgow—in 1996, projections were that by 2001 there would be about 1,200 students and that was correct, but since then fewer students have come than projected; that in 2000, staff had predicted there would be 1,400 students, but there were actually fewer than 1,200; that circumstances changed, just as in 2000, 2001, and 2002, there were 3,000 students coming to Fairfax County each year, and now enrollment was flat or declining; that projections made in 2000 based on growth rates were not valid today, but not because staff had insufficient or incorrect information, but because circumstances changed, and that staff worked hard to make progress out of change; that in 1997 when Poe Middle School had been renovated, staff had recommended that Glen Forest Elementary be assigned to Glasgow, but the Board had not approved that and he thought that was a mistake; that the Board had decided to build a new Glasgow instead of renovating and obtained approval to raise the \$40.5 million that it would take to build a new school, although now to build a school for 1,500 student would cost more than \$40.5 million; that the Board was committed to build a new Glasgow to meet the needs of those students; that actual enrollment at Glasgow had ranged from 943 students in 1997, rising each year and peaking at 1,200 in 2000, then declining every year, and was now at 1,081, its lowest level in eight years; that the other two middle schools with grades 6-7-8 had the same pattern of declining enrollment, with Poe currently at 1,133 students and Holmes with 754 students; that although the County's population was projected to grow by double digit percentage over the next 15 years, the mix of the population was growing older; that the feeder school students were not moving to Glasgow and Stuart, and that he agreed with Mr. Hunt's analysis—there was a 25 percent drop between K-1-2 and 3-4-5, or 400 students per year; that if the extra space at Glasgow was needed even if there were only 1,250 students, and the community was right and 1,500 students came, that there would not be enough space at Glasgow, and Stuart High School would also need 350 more seats; that there was another alternative, as there were currently 579 empty seats at the three middle schools closest to Glasgow—

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

13

January 26, 2006

324 at Jackson, 60 at Poe, and nearly 200 at Holmes—and the CIP projected more than 800 empty seats at those three schools by 2010; that it made no sense to build a 1,500 Glasgow when nearby Holmes had fewer than 700 students, and Poe fewer than 900; that if a 1,250 Glasgow was built and 1,500 students wanted to enroll, every student could be responsibly and comfortably accommodated at the neighboring middle schools; that the Board could not justify spending millions of dollars each year to build new classrooms and schools when there were renovated classrooms and schools available; that it was not fair to the taxpayers, the students, or those communities who had waited for renovations that could have built sooner with the limited resources; that every dollar spent to build space not needed at Glasgow was a dollar that could not be spent to renovate Woodson, South Lakes, Key, Thomas Jefferson, Vienna, Freedom Hill, and Woodburn; that it was irresponsible for the Board to build a 1,500 seat middle school that was not justified by the enrollment, nor was he sure from an instructional standpoint that it made sense to have a 1,500 middle school (Gibson); that for the record, that was not staff's proposal in 1998 (Moon); that Supervisor Kaufman was very involved with the revitalization effort in Springfield, and although there were no decisions yet about the housing development projections, he requested that staff observe that area for possible impact on future CIPs in the Garfield, Lynbrook, and Crestwood neighborhoods; that the Board had missed an opportunity to reach consensus on Glasgow; that staff should continue to review the education specifications for Glasgow to ensure the building could accommodate the students; that although he appreciated hearing from the community on issues, the amount of emails would not persuade him to change his position once he had stated what he believed on an issue (Center); that the population had shifted and adjustments would have to be made; that the Board would keep its promise to Glasgow to provide a new school that would meet the needs of their students; that he believed that 1,500 students was the appropriate number for that school; that the capacity of the existing Glasgow building was 1,630, so the new building would actually be smaller; that it was important that those schools in the queue waited their turn, just as everyone else had; that as circumstances changed plans needed to be revised, so that buildings were not built once requirements were no longer there (Hunt); that he believed there was a crisis of confidence in the ability to project enrollment trends, but that was not a criticism of staff; that this was a changing environment, as noted by Mr. Gibson and Mrs. Wilson, with some areas built out, some older, and others progressing with new building; that to accomplish a systematic change would be difficult, but it was important that the Board achieve the effective utilization of the facilities; that he looked forward to working with Mr. Gibson and Mrs. Wilson in the development of a systematic methodology for balancing the use of facilities; that his first consideration for the Glasgow building at 1,500 was influenced by the Superintendent's acknowledgement that it was necessary to keep the design as planned to meet the instructional requirements; that building a new Glasgow building within established boundaries was a unique situation, and would be a catalyst for neighborhood revitalization; that he appreciated hearing from the community on many issues (Niedzielski-Eichner);

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

14

January 26, 2006

that she agreed with Mr. Center that the Board had missed an opportunity to reach consensus on Glasgow; that the County was changing and the student enrollment was changing; that it was the responsibility of the Board to separate emotions and expectations and to make the right decisions that would benefit all the students; that although some Board members were elected to represent a single district, together they were the Fairfax County School Board, and they had to make decisions with the limited resources available; that there were areas where there were no seats for students, and the Board must be cautious on how the funds were spent; that Board members understood and appreciated the hard work and efforts of staff members on enrollment projections; that she was proud the Board had decided to use the \$130 million cash flow figure and she hoped the BOS understood the school system's needs; that there were many schools with students and teachers in cramped spaces but they all did a good job; that this had been a dissatisfying process for many; that it was hard to receive information late when decisions must be made, and there needed to be more time allowed between the work session discussion and the vote; that it was the Board's job to ask the questions, to listen to the community, and to make decisions; that she would support the CIP but she thought the Board could have done better (Smith); that it was important for the Board to encourage involvement, to maintain transparency as a public body, and to respond thoughtfully to the input received; that she appreciated the concern expressed by Board members about the Glasgow community and its unique demographics and instructional needs, and the commitment to provide the best instructional environment possible for those students (Kory); that he wanted to thank the Superintendent, Mr. Tistadt and his hard-working staff for their responses to many questions—Mr. Chevalier, Mr. Bertocchi, Mr. Rawat and Mr. Rauch; thanks also to Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner as the new chairman of the Facilities & Operations Committee for leading the Board to the final vote on the CIP, and to his fellow Board members for engaging in an intelligent, healthy, and civil debate, which was the perfect example of democracy in action (Moon).

The motion that the School Board approve the FY 2007-2011 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) as described in the narrative and in the Superintendent's Proposed FY 2007-2011 Capital Improvement Program Summary, with the following revisions: 1. Reflect the current annual spending limit of \$130 million imposed by the County Board of Supervisors; due to increased project costs resulting from current high rates of inflation in the construction industry, limiting the annual CIP expenditure to \$130 million will necessitate delays in the start up and subsequent completion dates of the following CIP projects: Waynewood modular, Franklin Sherman, Woodburn, Sleepy Hollow, Freedom Hill, Great Falls, Vienna, Graham Road, Mt. Eagle, Beech Tree, Stenwood, Westlawn, Franconia, Oakton, Lake Anne, Clifton, Canterbury Woods, Glasgow, Longfellow, Sandburg, Cooper, Thoreau, Woodson, Edison, Marshall, Jefferson; 2. Direct the Superintendent to design Langley High School for up to a 16 classroom addition with the option to reduce the number to as few as 10 classrooms if enrollment numbers support a

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

15

January 26, 2006

reduction at the time the construction award is made; 3. Direct the Superintendent to maintain for the new Glasgow Middle School the current design for 1,500 students; 4. Direct the Superintendent to bid future capital construction projects with bid alternates that will provide the Board with award options should bid amounts exceed the project budget; 5.a. Direct the Superintendent to conduct a thorough review of the facilities needs of those schools (and their staffs) that serve large numbers or percentages of students who live in poverty, receive special education services, or are learning English, to determine whether our present specifications for school facilities adequately enable those schools (and their staffs) to meet the needs of all students; and 5.b. That, if the Superintendent determines that our present specifications for school facilities do not adequately enable schools (and their staffs) that serve large numbers or percentages of students who live in poverty, receive special education services, or are learning English to meet the needs of all students, the Superintendent shall identify those schools that require facilities enhancements in order to meet the needs of all students, and propose temporary or permanent enhancements to those facilities to enable those schools to meet the needs of all students; and any proposal should include the cost of temporary and permanent facilities and the impact of those needs on the capital and operating budgets; and 6. Direct the School Board Chairman to convey the CIP to the Board of Supervisors with a letter that communicates the funding level required to restore the project schedule specified in the originally proposed CIP for FY 2007-2011; to accelerate renovations and other new capacity projects such as Laurel Hill Elementary School and additions to alternative high schools; and to support program initiatives such as all day kindergarten **passed 11-1**, with Mrs. Belter, Mr. Center, Mr. Hunt, Mrs. Kory, Mr. Moon, Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner, Mrs. Oleszek, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Storck, Mrs. Strauss, and Mrs. Wilson voting "aye" and with Mr. Gibson voting "nay."

4.03 Additional Appointments - Appoint individuals to serve on committees as listed in the agenda item (SB)

There were no additional appointments.

4.04 Confirmation of Action Taken in Closed Meeting

Mrs. Strauss moved, and Mr. Gibson seconded, to expel a student for distributing illegal drugs on school property. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Mr. Center moved, and Mrs. Smith seconded, to expel a student for numerous acts of misconduct at school. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Mrs. Wilson moved, and Mr. Gibson seconded, to expel a student for vandalism of school property. The motion **passed unanimously.**

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

16

January 26, 2006

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mrs. Wilson, Mrs. Kory moved, and Mrs. Belter seconded, to expel a student for assaulting a student on school property. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mrs. Wilson, Mrs. Kory moved, and Mrs. Belter seconded, to expel two students for possessing illegal drugs on school property. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mrs. Wilson, Mrs. Belter moved, and Mrs. Kory seconded, to expel two students for violating the conditions of probationary school assignments. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Oleszek moved, and Mrs. Strauss seconded, to expel a student for assaulting another student with a weapon on school property. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Oleszek moved, and Mrs. Strauss seconded, to expel a student for assaulting another student on school property. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Strauss moved, and Mrs. Oleszek seconded, to expel two students for setting fires on school property. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Strauss moved, and Mrs. Oleszek seconded, to expel a student for possession of illegal drugs on school property. The motion **passed unanimously.**

5. **CONSENT AGENDA**

- 5.01. **Minutes** – Approve minutes of January 12, 2006, regular School Board meeting (SB; Exhibit H)
- 5.02. **Monthly Separation Report** - Confirm the separations as indicated below for the period beginning December 1, 2005, and ending December 31, 2005 (HR; Exhibit I)
- 5.03. **Quarterly Separation Report** - Confirm the appointments and separations as indicated below for the period beginning October 1, 2005, and ending December 31, 2005 (HR; Exhibit J)

Chairman Moon stated that, without objection, the three items on the consent agenda would be adopted. Hearing no objection, the consent agenda **passed unanimously.**

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

17

January 26, 2006

6. NEW BUSINESS

TAPE REFERENCE: 2-2420

- 6.01 Easement** - Recommendation to grant an easement at Burkholder Center to Dominion Virginia Power with no compensation (FTS; Exhibit K)

There was no discussion of this item.

- 6.02 Easement** - Recommendation to (i) approve the agreement for the granting of public street and related easements ("Agreement") with the City of Fairfax ("City") – Eleven Oaks Center and (ii) authorize the Assistant Superintendent of Facilities and Transportation Services to execute on behalf of the School Board said Agreement and all related deeds and documents as approved by School Board counsel to implement the Agreement (FTS; Exhibit L)

There was no discussion of this item.

- 6.03 Sale of House** - Recommendation to authorize the Division Superintendent, or his designee, to sign all documents associated with the sale of the sixth house on lot five (Lot Five) of Condon Manor of McLean Section Two (IS; Exhibit M)

There was no discussion of this item.

- 6.04 Fairfax County Purchasing Resolution** – Recommendation to adopt the revised Fairfax County Purchasing Resolution (FTS; Exhibit N)

There was no discussion of this item.

- 6.05 Amendment of Contract** - Recommendation to approve amending the contract with Management Partnership Services, Inc., for consultant services for K-12 pupil transportation services, in the amount of \$45,600, and authorize the Division Superintendent, or his designee, to proceed with the contract amendment on behalf of the School Board (FTS; Exhibit O)

Questions and comments included the following: That the consultant had proposed to relax the constraints identified as key limiting factors in Phase I of the study, and to develop three options; that Option 2 assumed an increase in the length of the elementary instructional day to make it equal to middle and high schools, but would leave the length of the morning time window at an hour and 35 minutes as in the Phase I final models; that Option 3 was a model with an hour and 55 minutes window; the question what the cost would be to the operating budget to increase the length of the elementary school day to make it equal to the middle and high school day independent of the cost of increased transportation; the request that the information be provided to the Board prior to the February 9 vote (Gibson); that there could be at least two possible scenarios,

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

18

January 26, 2006

including increasing the Time to Teach (TTT) (Dale); the request for the response to include at least two scenarios: increased staffing costs resulting from extending the work day for teachers and hourly support staff by half an hour, and increased TTT; the additional request for instructional estimates on the pros and cons of either scenario independent of the high school start times; that before the Board decided whether or not to award the contract, it would be useful to know if the costs were prohibitive independent of the transportation costs (Gibson); that the consultant had been asked to provide options so that the Board would have an opportunity to look at alternatives (Center); the request for information on the increased salary paid to bus drivers currently, what the bus driver shortage was currently, and how much more salaries would have to be increased to gain more drivers (Smith); an affirmative response but trying to project the number of new drivers and costs would be difficult (Dale); the question what would be the cost of the contract if Options 2 & 3 were eliminated, if it was determined that the instructional costs were prohibitive (Gibson); the response that he would speak to the consultant (Tistadt); that if the cost of Option 2 or 3 independent of transportation was \$20 million, then the Board needed to have that discussion about spending any more funds; the request for information on whether the increases in bus driver salaries were at the point that they could have an impact on potential salary reclassification for other employees on the US scale that were performing less demanding tasks, and if so, what that would cost (Gibson); that the implications of changes to driver pay was something staff reviewed carefully (Tistadt); the question whether the timeline in Phase II could be shortened (Storck); negative response; that the timeline would need to be readdressed with the consultant; that it would not be possible for any information from the study to impact any decisions for the next school year; that after the study, there was community outreach and planning involved and it would not be possible to accomplish that for the next school year (Tistadt); the question whether that was true for a county-wide change versus an area change that could serve as a test (Storck); the response that it would be very difficult to do anything other than county-wide because of the interconnectedness of the transportation system between pyramids (Tistadt); the request for clarification that the consultant would not be able to complete what had been proposed by the end of April (Storck); that the proposal had been predicated on the assumption that the contract would have been awarded before Jan. 26; that even with an earlier timeline he had never thought it would be something that would be implemented this school year because it was of such significance to the community, and the school system needed to be thoughtful about the feedback (Tistadt); the question about details of the public involvement in Phase II (Storck); that if the Board approved the study, there would be four public meetings planned—one would be a kick-off meeting to explain the general parameters of the study; then two interim meetings, one with the consultant and one without the consultant, to get feedback from the community; then the fourth meeting would be a summary meeting of what would be presented to the Board; that another reason for the April timeline problem was that the consultant had other clients in the queue (Center); the request for information comparing both full time and part time bus

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

19

January 26, 2006

driver salaries for the surrounding districts (Oleszek); affirmative response (Tistadt).

7. **SUPERINTENDENT MATTERS**

TAPE REFERENCE: 2-3099

7.01 **Superintendent Matters**

Dr. Dale noted that the seventeenth house that had been constructed by 70 high school students as part of the residential construction program had recently sold for \$2.15 million; that this great program was a partnership with the Foundation for Applied Technical Education, and provided future builders, contractors, electricians, plumbers, and other on-site classroom instruction; and the profits from the sale of the house were returned to the residential construction program to continue educating students in the construction trades. He congratulated Chief Financial Officer Deirdra McLaughlin and the budget staff for receiving a Meritorious Budget Award for excellence in preparation and issuance of the FY 2006 budget from the Association of School Business Officials International. He was pleased to announce that Dr. Lillian Lowery, Assistant Superintendent for Cluster VII, had accepted the Superintendent position in Christina, Delaware; and everyone wished her the very best.

8. **SCHOOL BOARD REPORTS**

8.01 **Committee Reports (Exhibit P)**

Instruction, Special Services, and Youth Development; January 23; Kathy Smith, Chairman

No Child Left Behind update; School Improvement Planning Process with the staff from Rocky Run Middle School; 2007 Technology Plan

Facilities and Operations; January 23; Phillip Niedzielski-Eichner, Chairman

Base Realignment Committee (BRAC) update with Colonel Lauritzen, Garrison Commander at Fort Belvoir, and Dr. Robert Templin, President, Northern Virginia Community College; and Capital Improvement Program.

Resource Management and Evaluation; January 23, Jane Strauss Chairman

Discussion of FY 2007 Proposed Budget.

Legislative Update; Stuart Gibson, Chairman

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

20

January 26, 2006

That bills to start school prior to Labor Day, to require seat belts on buses, and to make modifications to the Local Composite Index were killed; bill to shift the burden of proof to school systems in special education cases carried over until next year; House bill 481 to require school boards to allocate certain percentage of budget to instruction spending was passed by indefinitely; and special education vouchers were still alive in Senate Education Committee.

Forum on Board Topics; January 26; Ilryong Moon, Chairman

Discussion included School Board committee structure; and development of a policy on hiring outside consultants.

8.02 Board Member Announcements

Kathy Smith, Sully District

Ms. Kunkel had asked her to announce that the candidate packet for student representative to the School Board election was due February 1 and the election would take place on February 21 at Robinson Secondary School.

Daniel Storck, Mount Vernon District

Thanked the members of the West Potomac High School pyramid community for a successful town meeting that had over 200 community members in attendance; that the year 2010 had been the focus of the town meeting; that future Capital Improvement Programs should focus more on program needs and less on where buildings were located; that the bottom line was the school system needed more money to meet their capital needs.

Janet Oleszek, Member at Large

Thanked Mosby Woods Elementary School Principal Astie Mahri for the invitation to celebrate Inclusion Week in conjunction with ARC of Northern Virginia; that inclusion was very valuable; recommendation that citizens read the article in the Fairfax section of *The Washington Post* about the Start Later for Excellence in Education Proposal.

Phillip Niedzielski-Eichner, Providence District

Congratulated Debbie Tyler, Pine Springs Elementary School principal, who had been selected as the new principal of the new elementary school located in western Fairfax.

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 12

21

January 26, 2006

Kaye Kory, Mason District

The Capital Improvement Program had been approved tonight and the Board of Supervisors should realize the needs of the school system.

Stuart Gibson, Hunter Mill District

Thanked the Reston Community Center for their Martin Luther King, Jr. Day celebration, where Ezra Hill, one of the original Tuskegee airmen, had spoken.

Catherine Belter, Springfield District

Welcomed Debbie Tyler to the new elementary school in western Fairfax.

Brad Center, Lee District

Looked forward to constituent e-mails.

Ilryong Moon, Member at Large

January 29 was New Years Day on the lunar calendar.

Mrs. Strauss, Mr. Hunt, and Mrs. Wilson had no comments.

9. **ADJOURNMENT** TAPE REFERENCE:

9.01 The meeting was adjourned at 10:29 p.m.