

MINUTES

Fairfax County School Board Luther Jackson Middle School

Regular Meeting No. 13

February 9, 2006

1. **CLOSED MEETING**

Chairman Ilryong Moon convened the Board in public session at 6:25 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. Niedzielski-Eichner moved, and Mrs. Kory seconded, that the Board go into closed session to discuss and consider disciplinary matters concerning students pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(2). The motion **passed unanimously.**

Additionally, Mrs. Belter moved, and Mrs. Strauss seconded, that the Board go into closed session 1) to discuss and consider employment, assignment, performance, and resignation of specific public employees pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(1); and 2) to consult with legal counsel regarding specific legal matters involving student admissions pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(7). The motion **passed 11-0**, with Mrs. Belter, Mr. Center, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Hunt, Mrs. Kory, Mr. Moon, Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Storck, Mrs. Strauss, and Mrs. Wilson voting "aye"; and with Mrs. Oleszek not present for the vote.

2. **MEETING OPENING**

TAPE REFERENCE: 1-0049

2.01 **Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance/Moment of Silence/National Anthem – Hughes Middle School Chorus**

Chairman Moon convened the meeting at 7:00 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 (dep. 9:30).

Chairman Moon thanked the members of the Hughes Middle School Chorus, under the direction of Margaux Bookbinder, for their performance of the National Anthem.

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

2

February 9, 2006

2.02 Certification of Closed Meeting Compliance (Exhibit A)

Mr. Gibson moved, and Mrs. Strauss seconded, that since the Fairfax County School Board convened a closed session meeting on February 9, 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 were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered. The motion **passed unanimously.**

2.03 Announcements

There were no announcements.

2.04 Recognition of National Career and Technical Education Week (Exhibit B)

Mrs. Oleszek recognized those associated with the career and technical education program in attendance at the meeting, and invited them to join her and the Board for photographs.

2.05 Resolution Naming the Cafeteria at Garfield Elementary School (Exhibit C)

Mr. Center offered the following resolution:

RESOLUTION NAMING THE CAFETERIA AT GARFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL "THE PAUL KNOTT CAFETERIA"

WHEREAS, Paul Knott has served Garfield Elementary School as building supervisor and custodian for 23 years, earning numerous custodial accolades, preparing the building for summer programs and the start of school, and maintaining a safe environment for students and staff members; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Knott interacted positively and patiently with all students, using the proper blend of friendliness and authority, rewarding cafeteria table washers with popular stickers, and being constantly aware of and responsive to students' needs in the school and cafeteria, particularly, special needs students; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Knott eagerly shared his horticultural expertise with staff members and students, which contributed to the beautification of Garfield Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Knott willingly volunteered to help before anyone requested his assistance, and the suggestions he provided to help make after-school activities flow

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

3

February 9, 2006

more smoothly and his daily presence in the cafeteria during breakfast and lunch helped to instill a sense of respect and responsibility in the students;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the School Board of Fairfax County, Virginia, honors Paul Knott by the naming the Garfield Elementary School Cafeteria "The Paul Knott Cafeteria" in recognition of his service to the entire Garfield community through the caring way he has maintained the school and served the students during his time as custodian at Garfield Elementary School.

Mr. Center moved, and Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner seconded, to adopt the Resolution naming the cafeteria at Garfield Elementary School "The Paul Knott Cafeteria." The motion **passed unanimously.**

Mr. Center announced that Mr. Knott was unable to attend the meeting this evening, but the Garfield Elementary School community would be having a celebration in his honor in the near future.

3. PRESENTATIONS TO SCHOOL BOARD

TAPE REFERENCE: 1-0408

3.01 Spotlight on Learning – Videos from Scenes Night, Irving Middle School (Exhibit D)

Dr. Dale introduced Mr. Timothy King, drama teacher at Washington Irving Middle School, who discussed the showcase of some of the top ten scenes from Theatre Arts Appreciation classes, and a short video was viewed.

3.02 Citizen Participation (Exhibit E)

No speakers addressed the Board in the time reserved for public comment.

3.03 2004-2005 Strategic Target Report – Target 1, All students will be reading at or above grade level by the end of second grade. (IS; Exhibit F)

Superintendent Dale noted that the Board had adopted the current strategic targets two years ago; that approximately six months ago the Board had begun a strategic planning process that would focus on student academic achievement and how well they were prepared when they graduated; that staff would present progress toward achieving targets at the next ten regular Board meetings, and tonight was the first presentation on Target 1, "All students will be reading at or above grade level by the end of second grade"; that Ann Monday, Assistant Superintendent of Instructional Services, would make a brief presentation; and then she and her staff would respond to questions; that tonight's presentation would help the Board and the public understand the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), which was the measure for Target 1, and how teachers used it to make instructional decisions for students.

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

4

February 9, 2006

After the video featuring Franconia Elementary School was shown, Ann Monday introduced staff members who were present to discuss reading at the primary level: Dr. Judy Jackson, principal, Franconia Elementary, Mary Ann Ryan, elementary education; Teddi Predaris, English for speakers of other languages (ESOL); Mary Peterson, early childhood education; Pat Fege, K-12 language arts; and Joyce Suydam, elementary special education. She then presented the 2005 outcomes for Target 1, noting that reading was the foundation for learning and was critical to the achievement of students; that the measures for this target were met in 2005, and factors contributing to this success included: 1) the leadership of principals like Dr. Jackson, who established strong reading programs in their schools and developed skilled teachers; 2) the required training on the DRA assessment for first and second grade teachers, and the use of the information to match instruction to the needs of individual students; 3) the collaboration among general education, special education, and ESOL teachers in the teaching of reading; and 4) the provision of free summer school programs for students who needed more time and support to learn to read. In providing the details; that Target 1 had four distinct measures; that all general education students were given the DRA and 93.9 percent of second grade general education students read at or above grade level at the end of the 2005 school year; that students in every group were provided instruction that included phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary fluency, and comprehension and; that the DRA was given to Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students in all English proficiency levels; that LEP students had met and surpassed the goal, with 57.4 percent reading at or above grade level by the end of second grade; that 97.2 percent of second grade LEP students who had recently exited the ESOL program were reading at or above grade level by the end of second grade; that LEP students' special needs were met by reading instruction differentiated based on individual needs and matched to their English proficiency levels; that, with the exception of students with significant cognitive impairments, the expectation was that all first and second grade students with disabilities would participate in the DRA; that in this target year, 96 percent of first grade students with disabilities and 99 percent of second grade students with disabilities were tested using the DRA, meeting the measure with a 51.1 percent pass rate; that it was the expectation that the majority of students with disabilities would participate in the FCPS general education reading program but, in addition, the required specialized instruction and materials in all components of reading; that special education students were also supported through specialized staff development related to reading for special education teachers with an emphasis on the use of assessment, as well as summer intervention programs; that the gap between economically disadvantaged second grade students and others had been reduced by 5.9 percent and, thus, the measure was achieved; that in looking more closely at students in poverty as a subgroup, achievement of this measure included use of DRA online to obtain data quickly, the expansion of all-day kindergarten, and free summer school as an intervention; that planned action for the future included development and implementation of student support process to document early intervention in reading, to prepare for compliance with the

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

5

February 9, 2006

reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA), continued and increased collaboration and professional learning for ESOL, special education, and general education teachers, expanded and strengthened summer interventions, and measured student growth both by established benchmarks and growth over time; that staff was determined to make sure that every student in FCPS learned to read.

Questions and comments included the following: the question whether including students with disabilities, who were measured separately, gave an accurate measure of the factor being measured (Center); the response that she was unsure (Monday); that excluding those students would give a different measure and it might be appropriate to change it, but this measure had been intended to determine the impact of poverty (Dale); that staff would pull out the special populations and look at the poverty rates only (Monday); that, as the Board was deeply concerned with the gap in each target, the question whether any of the planned actions targeted the specific area to reduce the gap further (Center); the response that staff was in the process of creating new measures for the strategic targets; that imbedded in all of the analysis was the review of the achievement of students in different ethnic groups (Monday); the question whether there was anything in the planned actions specifically targeted for economically disadvantaged students (Center); an affirmative response; that the reading of every child would be monitored and interventions documented (Monday); that there was a difference in performance on the DRA and performance on SOL tests (Center); that correlations between DRA results and SOL results had been reviewed, and some changes had been made to the way students were invited to participate in the summer reading program, that 80.5 percent of 2003-04 second grade students had passed the DRA, and of that same group 79 percent had passed the SOLs; that staff would continue to look at the DRA to see what could be learned in preparation for the SOLs, although the DRA was not intended to be a predictive instrument; that the third grade SOL would change drastically this year, and would no longer include a writing portion, that in the future, both tests would focus more on reading (Monday); that it had been suggested that because African American students in FCPS did not do as well on the third grade English SOL as African American students in Richmond, that we were not teaching African American students how to read, and the question how staff would respond to that (Gibson); the response that FCPS was teaching many African American students how to read, but was committed to doing a better job (Monday); the question whether it was fair to say that the third grade SOL test did not measure just how well a student decoded words on a page (Gibson); an affirmative response (Monday); that he had requested a white paper on how the DRA differed from the SOL; that he believed that the SOL was more interested in inductive reasoning skills and experiential reasoning skills than how well students decoded words and understood what they meant; that he would like to show why you could not draw a conclusion about how long it took to teach students to read based on the third grade SOL; that after seeing this presentation and then looking at SOL scores, one would think that two different groups of children were

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

6

February 9, 2006

being tested, that he agreed FCPS needed to do a better job of teaching poor children and children of color how to read, but he would like to get beyond the accusation that “because you don’t teach phonics, black kids don’t learn how to read,” which was not true; that he wanted to move the debate to the level of how to teach children to achieve and away from how pure the phonics program was; the question what percentage of general education students left second grade reading at a third grade level or higher (Gibson); that a response would be provided (Monday); that the data he requested was an incredible success story for students and teachers and got lost in the message that 94 percent were reading at or above second grade level; that if past experience was any guide, somewhere near 40 to 45 percent of our students left second grade reading at a third, fourth, or fifth grade level—a success story that people needed to hear (Gibson); congratulations to Ms. Monday, staff, principals, and teachers for their success; that since coming on the Board, he had come to appreciate the significance of in-school leadership—principals, teachers, and support staff; that emphasizing high expectations was an intangible that was not measurable in the methodologies discussed; that FCPS had been admonished for not following the scientifically-based NIH (National Institute of Health) methodology for teaching reading and for not taking advantage of millions of dollars of support available; the question why FCPS had not embraced that program (Niedzielski-Eichner); that one FCPS school had a Reading First grant; that FCPS had obtained one of the limited grants available; that several FCPS schools had been eligible but for various reasons only one had become involved in a new program; that it had been determined that the program had not met the needs of the school’s students because they had not made gains, and therefore the school no longer had the grant; that using all of the components discussed tonight—including phonemic awareness and phonics instruction—the students were now making gains because of the school system’s support (Monday); the question how the teacher worked within a methodological framework with each child (Niedzielski-Eichner); the response that the teacher would work within a framework, but that—as all good teachers did—when something did not work, the teacher made changes according to what was best for the individual child (Fege); that the FY 2007 proposed budget recommended more funds spent on summer programs—remediation and community based schools; the question whether this was an indication of an unsuccessful regular school year and that time had to be programmed into the summer months (Niedzielski-Eichner); that anyone who had watched a child grow knew that development was uneven and that some children just needed more time; that the five weeks of summer school could be critical for students, that early results showed gains for students in the summer reading programs (Monday); that she understood the need for intervention and remediation, but was concerned that the planned actions outlined were not necessarily supported by the budget; that in a number of elementary schools that offered after-school remediation the school system could not provide transportation home for those students, which cut down on the number of students who took advantage of the programs; the question whether from 2003-04 to 2004-05 there were more or less students who were in poverty in any age

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

7

February 9, 2006

bracket (Kory); that a response would be provided (Monday); the request that a few of the sample questions from the third grade SOL test be shared with Board members and the public (Kory); that students heard a narrative story, and then were asked for example “what happens just after hot wax mixture is poured into the molds” and then the list were things that happened after the wax was poured—that the key word was “just”; that this was a thinking skill, which was a discrete skill that students who were just acquiring English/reading skills might not have; that the Board had recently seen a demonstration of the Benchmark Assessment Resource Tool (BART) system, which helped teachers see these kinds of questions and practice them with students (Monday); congratulations to the hard-working principals and teachers, as well as students and parents; that she was pleased to see the progress with LEP students and with the ability to close the gap somewhat; that the observations about summer school and time was critical; that many youngsters who had been taught at home came to school already reading, and with that came the understanding of phonics and phonemic awareness, to say nothing of the advantage of a language-rich environment; that the school system made sure that reading instruction was sound, focusing on all aspects of reading, and on each individual child; that she believed at some point there would need to be year-round learning for many children, particularly if they were just learning English; that community-based summer schools seemed to be working well; the question what the projection was for summer school at the primary grades this year (Strauss); the response that summer school programs at first grade were being expanded based on a study by the Department of Accountability (Fege); the request for information on the numbers of those who were invited or encouraged to attend summer school and how many had actually attended; how much growth they had experienced, and whether they retained that knowledge in September (Strauss); the response that the information would be provided (Monday); the question how many summer school sites there would be (Belter); that more community-based sites were being added this year in addition to the central sites (Monday); the question how the school system had reached out to the parents of children in poverty (Belter); that one way for parents to participate was through Partners in Print, where parents learned strategies to use at home; that staff members stressed the importance of showing students the habit of reading by seeing their parents read, even if they read to the children in another language; that adult ESOL class provided babysitting and the teacher worked with the parents and children at the end of the class (Judy Jackson); the request for clarification that on Measure 1.1 students with disabilities and LEP were not included in the numbers (Hunt); an affirmative response (Monday); the question whether there was a level of subjectivity to the DRA, an element of interpretation of what the teacher heard (Hunt); the response that in the DRA’s running record each word and fluency was noted (Monday); that the video specifically mentioned the need for comprehension (Hunt); that there was a rubric that had been developed for comprehension by FCPS in collaboration with the publisher (Monday); the request for confirmation that a child who immediately stated that a “book was lost” would get the same evaluation as one who had to be prompted with a

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

8

February 9, 2006

follow-up question (Hunt); that the difference was in the scoring rubric, where an unprompted re-telling scored a four and something prompted scored a three (Fege); the question whether there were guidelines for teachers to judge what was a three or a two (Hunt); that teachers received 15 hours of mandatory training in order to administer this assessment (Fege); the question whether the third grade reading scores could be considered as one indication of the minority student achievement gap (Hunt); an affirmative response (Monday); the request for confirmation that there was still relevance to the third grade SOL reading score (Hunt); an affirmative response (Monday); the question how the reading program in Richmond was different from FCPS (Hunt); that there was perhaps a difference in some of the resources used; that in Richmond they did whole-group instruction, to ensure that all children had access to the same concepts, as well as small-group and individual instruction; that Richmond used running records and leveled books as FCPS did (Mary Ann Ryan); the question whether the instruction that was provided was different, not just the mechanisms (Hunt); the response that that there were some differences in the materials, but based on what she had observed, the way they were using the materials was very similar to FCPS (Ryan); that the materials themselves were his area of concern; the question whether phonics was a critical skill for reading and one of the areas/skills that should be emphasized as a skill for reading (Hunt); an affirmative response (Ryan); the question whether it was more important to provide that skill for an LEP student than for a non-LEP student (Hunt); that in her experience as the previous principal at Annandale Terrace Elementary, a school made up largely of second/multiple language learners, when students were tested with the DRA in first grade and end of second grade, it was not the decoding that was a problem for these children, but the comprehension; that the children could read almost anything—meaning they could letter-call and decode—but they did not have the comprehension because of their language issues (Ryan); the confirmation of Ms. Ryan’s comment; that phonics was one component of the comprehensive reading program that was necessary for all children to succeed in reading, but that for LEP students, along with phonics—which they did learn at a rapid rate—the critical need was in the area of comprehension, which was essential to becoming successful readers; that the reading program provided in FCPS included all five of the essential elements—phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension (Predaris); the question whether the DRA results were broken down by subgroups (Hunt); the response that the information would be provided (Monday); that she was pleased that measuring growth of students was included under planned actions; the request for a little further explanation of “develop and implement a student support process to document early intervention in reading” (Smith); that this was a joint effort in development between Instructional Services and Special Services, working with certain schools to ensure that all of the assessments and interventions provided were documented (Monday); the question what the teachers did after administering the DRA (Smith); the response that the teacher used the information to plan instruction; that a student who read with accuracy but had difficulty in re-telling the story or in picking out salient points of the story, would

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

9

February 9, 2006

be one the teacher could work with on comprehension (Fege); the request for confirmation that the valuation of the test was not so much the score the child attained, but the information that the teacher learned from giving the test, so instruction could be modified to help the child (Smith); an affirmative response (Fege); the question how full-day kindergarten would improve the ability of students to learn to read (Oleszek); the response that there were benefits from time, and that staff were advocates of full-day kindergarten, which allowed more time to be well spent on language acquisition, literacy, and math (Monday); that while there was no hard data available related to LEP students, principals said that when these students left full-day kindergarten they were at a higher level for entering ESOL programs; that full-day kindergarten helped students to internalize and integrate the concepts that were introduced (Mary Peterson); that this presentation was very interesting and she appreciated it; the question whether all teachers who administered the DRA test were trained (Wilson); an affirmative response; that there was mandatory DRA training for first and second grade teachers, and they hoped to extend that training to kindergarten and upper grades (Monday); the question what cut score on the DRA was currently being used (Wilson); the response that Pearson had first recommended levels of books and FCPS conformed to those levels; that there had been a misinterpretation of a page in the manual that stated that school divisions should determine a cut score and had used an illustration of a school division that had used 94; that FCPS had chosen 90 because it was consistent with the individualized reading inventory, including PALS at kindergarten; that at that point, Pearson had worked with FCPS to develop a comprehension rubric that they now used; that the current score was now a combination of word accuracy and comprehension, with 84.5 percent of students at every level reading with word accuracy at 95 percent or higher (Monday); that regarding Measure 1.2 on LEP students, the Board periodically saw students in discipline hearings that did not progress at a consistent rate out of ESOL classes—some were in level A for three years and level B for another two or three; the question whether there was any correlation between reading scores and the number of years students were in ESOL (Wilson); the response that the average amount of time that ESOL students were at individual levels was approximately 1.1 years per level, which was consistent with second language acquisition research and true proficiency levels (Predaris); the question whether there was a correlation between that information and the students' scores on the DRA (Wilson); an affirmative response; that 97.2 percent of the highest level of ESOL students—those just exiting the ESOL program—were reading at or above grade level; that 70 percent of beginning level students were reading at mid-grade level or below; that the LEP category contained a broad spectrum of students (Predaris); that she agreed that the Board as a whole was very concerned about the minority student achievement gap and it was wonderful that, based on the DRA, so many students were reading on grade level, but that there was another kind of disconnect that needed to be addressed and this was a very high priority of the Board (Wilson); that he also agreed with the importance of time—not just after school and during the summer—especially for second language learners; that when they went home, those students did not

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

10

February 9, 2006

have the same language opportunities being reinforced by their parents; that it was critical to provide more time for learning opportunities for them; and that from his personal experience, he knew that comprehension was a critical element for second language learners (Moon).

Dr. Dale concluded the presentation by noting that everyone had learned more about a critical component of the instructional program—early English acquisition/literacy skills; that it was important to note the comparison of this year's third graders to this year's fourth graders to this year's fifth graders; that there might be changing demographics from one grade to another and students' progress needed to be monitored over time to see those who were making grade level to grade level progress; that at the kindergarten level, a child in the middle class or above had a greater vocabulary than the mother of a kindergarten child in poverty; and that this was a daunting task to overcome but was the school system's mission.

4. **ACTION ITEMS**

TAPE REFERENCE: 2-0924

4.01 FY 2007 Advertised Budget – Approve the FY 2007 Advertised Budget as detailed in the agenda item (FS; Exhibit G)

Mrs. Strauss moved, and Mrs. Kory seconded, that the School Board adopt the FY 2007 Advertised Budget with the following revisions: 1) that the budgeted beginning balance be increased from \$15 million to \$30 million, with funding to be identified and set aside in FY 2006, thereby reducing the increase in the transfer request from the Board of Supervisors from 9.85 percent to 8.81 percent; and 2) that \$4 million be reallocated from the Teacher Leadership initiative to fund an additional .25 percent market scale adjustment for all employees.

Mrs. Strauss explained that the School Board had requested that the Superintendent review current year fund balances, particularly the salary files—lapse, turnover, and vacancies; that the metropolitan area was suffering from a very tight labor market and salary assumptions were running ahead and, therefore, an additional \$15 million could be saved from the current budget year and moved forward to help fund the FY 2007 budget and, reduce the transfer request from the Board of Supervisors; that \$4 million from the teacher leadership initiative placeholder of \$6.5 million could be added as a .25 percent addition to the market scale increase which was recommended to keep pace with surrounding jurisdictions and the federal government; that in addition to the 3.25 percent market scale increase, the Board would be picking up payment of an additional .5 percent of the Virginia Retirement System (VRS) payment, thus offering most employees the equivalent of a 3.75 percent increase; that the Superintendent's proposed budget was based on the Governor's proposed budget, and any further adjustments by the General Assembly were expected to

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

11

February 9, 2006

be small; and that the School Board would approve the final budget in May after the Board of Supervisors had determined the tax rate and the transfer amount to the School Board.

Discussion and comments included the following: that the original proposal in the Superintendent's budget for teacher leadership was \$6.5 million; that the motion would re-direct \$4 million of that, leaving \$2.5 million for teacher leadership; the question how much the teacher leadership initiative would cost once fully implemented (Gibson); the response that he had initially envisioned approximately 75 percent of the teaching force participating in this initiative at an estimated cost of \$50 million; that his phase 1 proposal had been approximately \$10 million (Dale); the request for confirmation that it had been a request for \$10 million the first year, to be phased in over five years (Gibson); an affirmative response (Dale); the question whether the reduction to \$2.5 million the first year would mean a phase in over 20 years (Gibson); a negative response; that if the Board decided to reduce the amount to \$2.5 million, staff would select specific schools to begin the process and then determine how to proceed strategically; that to complete this effort in one year would be too monumental (Dale); that the Superintendent had indicated that the initiative would be kicked off through competitive grants for individual schools, and the question how that would work with \$2.5 million (Gibson); the response that he was limited by the amount of resources the Board was willing to allocate and support; that \$10 million would cover the cost of extending the of approximately six teachers in every school; that another option was to begin the initiative by funding it more completely in a limited number of sites; that both versions were on the table and his goal was to work with all parties—teacher organizations, principals, and Leadership Team members; that there was prudence in moving slowly (Dale); the question how many schools could be enriched for the smaller amount (Gibson); the response that it depended on the number of stipends that could be re-directed, but they could begin with 10 schools, although if some schools wanted to start more slowly, a few more schools could be funded; that he wanted a consortia of schools within a pyramid possibly working together; that teachers needed to devote time and energy to support transitions from level to level (Dale); the question how taking \$15 million out of salary accounts to carry over to begin FY 2007 would leave the budget between now and the end of the year, given the possibility of needing additional funds in utility and fuel accounts (Gibson); the response that the amount of money available was similar to last year, as utility expenses could be covered at third quarter, and still end the year in a positive position (Deirdra McLaughlin, Chief Financial Officer); the question how much had been available at year end last year, excluding the beginning balance set aside (Gibson); the response approximately \$22 million (McLaughlin); the question whether the salary accounts were similar to last year (Gibson); an affirmative response (McLaughlin); that the federal budget proposed a 2.2 percent cost of living increase, so FCPS would be doing about one point better than the federal government (Gibson); that he supported the Superintendent's approach to the teacher leadership initiative; as the pilot program was not yet

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

12

February 9, 2006

defined (Niedzielski-Eichner); that the plan would be included in his Friday memo to Board members, and would outline the steps for schools to apply for the 'grant'; that the rating scale against which a school's readiness would be evaluated was based on the tenets of Professional Learning Communities—clear goals, high expectations, thoughtful planning process, engaged community, and engaged faculty (Dale); that although there was great potential, further analysis was required before extending the investment to the magnitude described; that in reviewing this proposed budget, his first question had been whether there was a correlation between the programs listed in the program budget and the Quality Program Assurance System (QPAS), the accountability process, which reported the effectiveness of programs; that tools were not available to provide a correlation between program effectiveness and the budget requests; that one program example was Success by Eight, with five positions and a budget request of \$526,000, yet given the attractive approach to the staffing formula he understood that the program would be phased out; the question whether this program was still being implemented (Niedzielski-Eichner); the response that this was a coding error, as the positions were no longer serving that function (Dale); that although there had previously been five positions associated with Success by Eight, the coding had not been changed with the implementation of the new elementary staffing model to return the positions to the Instructional Services Department staff to support the elementary curriculum (Brad Draeger, Deputy Superintendent); the question whether any program would be harmed by not having the Success by Eight designation (Niedzielski-Eichner); a negative response; that the coding error would be corrected, and Success by Eight would not appear (Dale); that another program was Project Excel, which was more substantially invested; that one of the key elements of the Excel program was full-day kindergarten, and if the Excel program no longer existed, the question whether those schools designated as such would lose their full-day kindergarten status (Niedzielski-Eichner); the response that all of those schools would fall within the guideline for poverty that qualified a school for full-day kindergarten, and he was confident they would retain full-day kindergarten even with removal of the title Excel (Draeger); the question what elements were included in the Excel program that would not be addressed by the new staffing formula (Niedzielski-Eichner); the response that pay differential for employees to cover a longer day for Excel schools, a full-time substitute assigned to each school to provide the best continuation of learning, and one full-time equivalent position for curriculum implementation (Draeger); that when the Department of Accountability report on Excel had been delivered last fall, she understood that staff had support from the Board for not expanding this model at other schools; that bonuses had also been eliminated; that staff had determined that these were still struggling schools and resources would not be removed; that overall the results were positive (Monday); the question whether the differentials in school performance attributed to the characteristics of the Excel program, and drove performance (Niedzielski-Eichner); the response that a range of outcomes had been found, and no particular factor could be isolated as making the difference; (Monday); that when the program had been started, the Excel schools had been

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

13

February 9, 2006

identified because they were lower-performing schools; that he did not think the changes could be attributed to just the uniform school day or full-day kindergarten (Dale); the question if there were schools that had improved and others that were not performing as well, would the Excel model be shifted from some schools to others (Niedzielski-Eichner); the response that the system was moving toward an equitable distribution of resources, based on the school's need—driven by the percentage of children in poverty and children for whom English was a second language; that the staffing model would change annually, based on each school's changing demographics (Dale); the question whether the \$2.5 million student accountability program was still necessary since there were other programs to address similar issues—summer remediation, summer school remediation and enrichment, and community-based summer school, in addition to new assessment methodologies and coaches, or whether those resources should be re-directed into a more integrated remediation effort (Niedzielski-Eichner); the response that as the system made the transition to needs-based allocation of resources, there were a number of different programs at the high school level to support students who might not otherwise think about going to college; that staff would look more closely at those programs questioned (Dale); that it was necessary to break through the institutional inertia and look at programs in a thoughtful way to decide whether they were as valuable as other possibilities (Niedzielski-Eichner); that the original amount of funding listed in the four tiers was \$184.2 million and the question whether that was still the amount with the additional monies being realized (Center); that the motion recognized additional money that could be saved this year in order to fully fund the Superintendent's proposal and decreased the delta needed from the Board of Supervisors to fully fund the budget; (Strauss); the request for confirmation that the total amount was an 8.81 percent transfer increase to fully fund all four tiers (Center); an affirmative response (Strauss); the request for confirmation that the fourth tier had included the \$20 million supporting and rewarding excellence including the teacher leadership initiative (Center); an affirmative response (Strauss); that \$4 million would be taken from the \$20 million and moved to the market scale adjustment, leaving \$16 million, with \$2.5 million for the teacher leadership initiative (Center); an affirmative response (Strauss); the request for the detailed break-out of the \$13.5 million left (Center); that this would enhance the salary scale for beginning teachers with bachelor's degrees to \$43,050, and would increase the stipend for those achieving a master's degree (Dale); that the line item of \$13.5 million to reward and support excellence did not actually indicate the money was geared toward teachers, beyond the market scale adjustment; that it was specific to parts of the pay scale that needed adjustment to be more competitive; that he wanted every dollar available to go toward supporting the targets; that it was important to note that, although this money did not go to support student achievement, it was a necessary part of what the school system did; that he would have some questions in coming months about some programs in tier three, such as the International Baccalaureate Middle Years Programme (IBMYP) (Center); the request for confirmation that the \$15 million was a one-time cost and not recurring (Hunt); an affirmative response

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

14

February 9, 2006

(Strauss); the request for confirmation that if there was fuller employment next year, this money would not be available (Hunt); an affirmative response (Strauss); that this was not a recurring revenue that would be applied to a recurring cost; that once salaries were increased, it became part of the base (Hunt); an affirmative response (Strauss); that this year's amount was being applied to a recurring cost, and he did not think that was a good idea because it removed the Board's flexibility; that he was concerned about the size of the budget the School Board would be requesting in relation to the guidelines provided by the Board of Supervisors; that the taxpayers of Fairfax County had seen double digit revenue increases over the last few years, and 8.81 percent was a fairly ambitious increase for a school system with a relatively flat growth in the number of students; that he felt increased pay was needed for the instructional assistants (IAs) who worked with autistic children in a very challenging environment; that he supported an increase of two steps for those IAs for whom FCPS had provided training in a special education area for as long as they were working in that area; and he asked his colleagues to consider this prior to finalizing the budget (Hunt); the request for confirmation that while the School Board would be asking for an increase in the transfer from the Board of Supervisors of 8.81 percent, the overall growth of the budget was actually 4.5 percent (Strauss); that compared to the current year estimate, it would be a 4.67 percent increase (McLaughlin);

The motion that the that the School Board adopt the FY 2007 Advertised Budget with the following revisions: 1) that the budgeted beginning balance be increased from \$15 million to \$30 million, with funding to be identified and set aside in FY 2006, thereby reducing the increase in the transfer request from the Board of Supervisors from 9.85 percent to 8.81 percent; and 2) that \$4 million be reallocated from the Teacher Leadership initiative to fund an additional .25 percent market scale adjustment for all employees **passed 11-0-1**, with Mrs. Belter, Mr. Center, Mr. Gibson, Mrs. Kory, Mr. Moon, Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner, Mrs. Oleszek, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Storck, Mrs. Strauss, and Mrs. Wilson voting "aye"; and with Mr. Hunt abstaining.

Mrs. Strauss moved, and Mr. Center seconded, that the Division Superintendent be granted authority to make necessary minor changes to comply with the intent of the School Board and is further directed to prepare a fund statement reflecting all School Board approved changes, together with the estimate of funds required by Fairfax County Public Schools during FY 2007 in the format prescribed in Section 22.1-92 of the Code of Virginia, for submission to the County Board of Supervisors. Submission of these approved documents to the County Board of Supervisors fulfills the responsibilities of the School Board under Title 22, Chapter 8 (Section 22.1-92) of the Code of Virginia. The motion **passed unanimously**.

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

15

February 9, 2006

4.02 Amendment of Contract – Amend the contract for consultant services for K-12 pupil transportation services (FTS; Exhibit H)

Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner moved, and Mr. Center seconded, that the School Board amend the contract with Management Partnership Services, Inc., to further address K-12 pupil transportation services.

Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner noted that this motion was a product of considerable discussion of the Board and presented an opportunity to move forward with the development of new information that would be helpful to the Board's consideration of whether changes in the schedule for students would be appropriate or affordable; and that he had asked Mr. Center to chair a subcommittee of the Facilities and Operations Committee and he would ask other Board members to work with him on the subcommittee, if the contract was approved.

Mr. Gibson called for a point of information, saying that the motion did not contain an amount or scope of work; the question whether it was Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner's intent to move the agenda item for consultant services in the amount of \$45,600 or was there some other proposal on the table. Mr. Center responded that the motion in the agenda item was what was being addressed.

[Clerk's note: The correct motion read: Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner moved, and Mr. Center seconded, that the School Board approve amending the contract with Management Partnership Services, Inc. (MPS), 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.]

Mr. Center noted that the Board had discussed the matter at some length; that phase 1 of the transportation study had been completed and this motion would move the study to phase 2; that when crafted originally, phase 2 of the study included examining opening up the window of transportation from 1 hour, 35 minutes to 1 hour, 55 minutes; that MPS felt that would significantly impact and decrease the original estimate of \$44 million necessary to move the start times; that MPS would also examine the length of the school day being different at the elementary and high school levels; that based on the staff response to Mr. Gibson's questions related to the instructional costs of extending the window, he suggested that the Board move forward with the contract extension for MPS, but provide an opportunity for the Board to discuss with the consultant the possibility of exploring the 1 hour 55 minute window, but allow some flexibility regarding other options; that, for example, lengthening the school day at specific schools where there were conflicts, and flipping the high school and elementary school schedules, or look at combinations thereof; that Mr. Gibson had a substitute motion with some points that the Board should discuss to determine whether it was appropriate to tackle them now or later; and that he advocated moving

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

16

February 9, 2006

forward at this time, conducting a feasibility study for implementing later start times for high schools now to fulfill the original pact with the community about finding the least costly method for accomplishing this.

Mr. Gibson moved an amendment in the form of a substitute, and Mrs. Smith seconded, to defer consideration of the amendment to the contract with MPS, and direct staff to develop a contract amendment with MPS which would provide for a Phase 2 study of the FCPS transportation system, under which options would be developed for opening high schools at a later time than presently, under the following loosened constraints, or any combination thereof: 1) reduction or elimination of transportation that FCPS is not legally obligated to provide, such as transportation to GT centers, magnet schools, and high school academies; 2) adjustments to school attendance areas, to make them more compact, contiguous, and amenable to the development of more efficient transportation routes and schedules; and 3) consolidation and reduction of the number of bus stops.

Mr. Gibson stated that he had been working on later start times since 1997 and had written the resolution creating the task force that resulted in the 1998 report; that the key finding of that report was that 53 people, representing every conceivable interest group in Fairfax County believed that it was beneficial to open high schools later but it was very complicated; that the report had identified the following additional constraints in terms of presenting difficulties affecting the bell change: size of the school system interrelated and interdependent programs and activities across the county, locations of special programs and centers, anomalies in school boundaries, traffic patterns, limited transportation flexibility as a result of consolidating bus routes to reduce the number of buses to save money, lack of uniformity in the elementary and secondary school days; that the cost to buy more buses nine years ago had been about \$33 million, the delta today would be \$44 million, according to MPS; that there was considerable gain to be achieved from opening high schools later, but it would be at significant pain; that people were being misled if they believed that the school system could magically open high schools later without any cost to the instructional program or other constituencies that had an interest in the outcome of this discussion; that during the recent public hearing testimony it concerned him when people suggested that an amount of money be included in the budget next year and the transportation consultant be asked to run the study quickly in order to open high schools later in September and that everyone would be onboard; that it would not work that way; that the transportation consultant had told the Board last year was that the FCPS transportation system was like the levee system in New Orleans—that capacity had been built on top of the levee, and the water was rising and eroding the capacity underneath; that as the transportation system became more congested, it became more difficult to patch, and needed to be rebuilt; that the contract amendment in the main motion would direct the consultant to do three different studies—1) open the morning window from 1 hour, 35 minutes to 1 hour, 55 minutes, 2) expand the elementary school day by 30 minutes (at a cost

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

17

February 9, 2006

of \$32 million to extend the contracts of teachers and aides, and if done by extending TTT (Time to Teach)—physical education, music, and art teachers hired to give teachers time to eat lunch and plan—it would cost closer to \$45 million), and 3) a combination of the first two studies; that it was time to engage other elements of the community by telling them what would have to change if the bell schedules were changed; that he had asked the consultant whether the Board would have to consider not offering some transportation and changing school boundaries and the response was yes; that his proposed substitute amendment was not constrained by the \$45,600; and would allow staff to go back to the consultant and ask how much it would cost to do a study where all constraints were removed; that unless the system significantly reduced the number of buses used to transport students, the delta was incredibly high—two or three cents on the real estate tax or a couple percents on teacher pay; that although there were tangible benefits to starting high schools later, it was not the only consideration the Board would have to weigh in making a policy change of this magnitude; that he would continue to fight for later high school times, but it was delusional to think they could pay a consultant \$45,000 for a magical solution that would not require pain; that his substitute amendment was the direction the Board needed to go; that if the main motion passed, the consultant would be back in two months to say widening the window to 1 hour, 55 minutes would cost X millions of dollars for buses; that rather than paying \$45,000 to learn that those options were cost prohibitive, the Board should engage the community in the larger discussion they needed to have; and that he urged the Board's support for his substitute.

Mrs. Smith added that she supported Mr. Gibson's motion; that she had reviewed the consultant's report and wanted to mention a few highlights; that one of the key factors was the size the county and the system—transporting an average of over 117,000 students daily attending 242 schools and programs; that other factors influencing the results of the study had included moving high schools to the middle tier resulting in a significant increase in fleet size and transportation operating and capital costs, varying the lengths of instructional days which would cost over \$30 million to correct, and reducing the transportation window from 1 hour, 55 minutes to 1 hour, 35 minutes; that secondary factors that contributed to additional resource requirements included indistinct bell structures often limiting route-pairing possibilities and indistinct feeder patterns restricting pairing options; that she felt the reason the Board wanted a phase 2 was to find an option that would cost less money, but she did not see a way to do that unless other constraints were changed; that the consultant had stated: *We conclude from our evaluation that the present transportation system is operating in an efficient manner from the standpoint of optimal use of available passenger capacity. . . The analysis suggests that the present system simply has inadequate time or passenger capacity with which to absorb major changes, such as the one contemplated in this project without additional resources. . . To have high schools start and dismiss anywhere on the middle time tier will result in a very substantial increase in required fleet resources and the resulting costs;* that they also talked

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

18

February 9, 2006

about having more flexibility, such as a uniform length of the school day, allowing a wider transportation window, sliding all start times later to minimize effect of students waiting for buses before twilight, and adjusting small differences between the schools with the rolling bells; *Accordingly, it is our recommendation that a) the Board not implement a later high school start time under the conditions and constraints used in the final models, and b) that the Board authorize the conduct of another simulation that loosened the constraints or used the following assumptions . . . and the assumptions were the same; that the consultant had stated if we were not willing to work with these parameters it is not worth going forward with this study; that she thought the public wanted to hear the answer and the whole community needed to know what it would take to do this; that the main motion would not cover all of the areas necessary, because she thought the Board would end up looking at another study; that she had talked with Dean Tistadt (Assistant Superintendent of Facilities & Transportation Services) about possibly looking at walking distances; that this would all be a great change to the community; that if the real desire of the community was to change high school start times, perhaps there needed to be a depot system—you take your elementary child one or two miles to catch the bus; that something had to change because the system could not afford hundreds more buses to accomplish it; that Mr. Center had suggested that the consultant look at different areas; the question whether the number of things the consultant was being asked to look at would affect the cost of the study. Mr. Tistadt responded affirmatively.*

Further comments and discussion continued as follows: that if the elements in Mr. Gibson's substitute were added to the elements in the main motion, he could support them; that while the Board would probably not eliminate types of transportation, a review of adjustments to school attendance was something he would like to consider but he was not sure this consultant was appropriate to that task, because it was a different level of analysis and would probably not fall within the cost of the proposed contract amendment; that there was not one single "silver bullet" to fix this, as it would involve a number of small flexibilities—window, number of buses, length of school day—that when put in the proper order could accomplish the task; that a consultant could determine what the impacts and costs were, so they could be explained to the community; that it all came down to whether the benefits were a high enough priority that the school system should fund and this could not be determined until they knew the costs; that the consultant had specifically said that one issue was the length of the elementary day versus the high school day; that he supported the original motion; that George Mason University (GMU) graduate students had decided to work on the start times project and had the potential to go into some greater detail, that addressing middle and high schools affected half of the student population, who would have a more useful first period if the school cycle was in line with their biological cycles (Hunt); that he commended Mr. Gibson for his amendment, which brought up some important points related to the transportation system as a whole; that the Board had previously discussed the need for a long-term strategic plan for the transportation system; that he had

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

19

February 9, 2006

always seen this as a short-term and long-term project, as there was a need to revitalize and revamp the transportation system as a whole, and determine where the Board needed to make modifications to policies; that while he supported much of what Mr. Gibson advocated, he did not do so in the context of a substitute for the main motion; that to address the concern of lengthening the day, he suggested looking at where specific schools' length of day might need to be increased to accommodate specific conflicts on bus routes; that tonight's main motion was to ask the consultant to bring back information and analysis with which to begin to base a decision; that he thought the Board was on a two-pronged track—to find the most inexpensive method of doing later start times and to address the systemic problems in the transportation system (Center); that she supported the substitute motion; that at a work session a year ago the Board had reviewed optional transportation information and at that time there was nothing Board members were willing to give up; that they were deluding themselves if they thought some tweaking here and there would solve the problem; that it would be solved either by drastically changing the existing parameters or by pouring a lot of money into it; that if that was truly where the Board wanted to go, they needed to loosen constraints and decide to go there, and she did not think the Board was ready for that (Wilson); that she supported the main motion; that it was important to maintain the momentum, and if the Board thought Mr. Gibson's points were valid, they should be amended into the main motion, but she saw no need for a substitution; that it was important to have community dialogue and input as much as possible in phase 2 of the study; that they had erred in phase 1 by not having such a dialogue; that she was tired of hearing Board members talk about how the public did not understand this issue; that the Board had an obligation to explain this issue to the public; that it was not necessary for the process to be stopped and the contract re-worked with different parameters and constraints; that she again emphasized the need for community interaction (Kory); that Mr. Gibson's proposal addressed many things that the community had asked the Board to take seriously; that the challenge with changing the bell schedule was that the system was short about 300 buses in order to do this in a rational way, and she was not willing to go to the Board of Supervisors for \$40 million to buy 300 buses; that one question was whether the 300 buses could be reallocated; that if the Board approved the main motion to have the consultants look at a window of 1 hour, 55 minutes, it would get the same answer it had now, since that time frame was basically what was used now; that she would support Mr. Gibson's motion because it did explain that if there was to be a change, there would be trade-offs; that she had been disappointed in phase 1 to find that there was not a way to gradually change the bell schedule, and that it appears to be all or nothing (Strauss); that this effort was a very important one to the School Board and the community, because the benefits were potentially widespread if they could find a way to do this economically—what was possible, what would it cost, and what were the trade-offs—which was not clear at all; that if Mr. Gibson wanted to make his amendments cumulative, he could support it; that there was not enough data, and the first step in any decision-making process was to ensure there was

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

20

February 9, 2006

enough data to make a good decision; that he could not support Mr. Gibson's motion as it currently stood (Storck); that one of the main reasons she agreed with Mr. Gibson's motion was because it had the most direct affect on reduced costs—the cost of more bus drivers, which were scarce, and the cost of more buses; that Mr. Gibson's changes effected those resources; that staff had estimated \$31 million because they believed that was what it would cost, not because they wanted to make the cost out of reach; that the Board had heard previously that it would cost \$40 million to do this and the consultant had estimated \$44 million; that if the Board included Mr. Gibson's suggestions into the main motion, she would expect a larger cost for the contract, which the Board would need to know before voting (Smith); that he agreed there was a need to educate the community regarding what was possible and what was not; that FCPS was not going to put young children on the streets before the sun rose; that a suggestion had been made that the problem might be solved with adjustments here and there, but if they were going to do this, they needed to look at all the options; that \$15 million of salary lapse had been used in the budget adoption tonight in order to keep from cutting other things; that there was an incredible potential benefit to middle and high school students if their schools opened later, but the question was what would we cut to pay for it; that he was happy to offer his motion as an amendment, with the parameters in the MPS letter of December 2005; that the reason he offered a substitute was because he thought lengthening the elementary school day was unrealistic from a cost standpoint and tinkering with the morning window would probably not get them where they needed to go; that some Board members had indicated they wanted to act tonight, but they did not know how much the contract would cost to do it; that he was willing to expand the scope of the contract to add these criteria to the main motion if that was the Board's wish; that his intent was to find an effective solution that the Board could live with financially; that if his motion failed, he would offer it as an amendment; that the original proposal had contained delivery dates that had already passed; and that if this was worth doing, it was worth doing right, even if it meant going back to re-bid the contract (Gibson).

Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner moved, and Mr. Storck seconded, to postpone action on this item until the next meeting in two weeks.

Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner pointed out that the motion passed a year ago to fund this study was to examine the student transportation study in the following respects—ways to improve the retention and recruitment of bus drivers and ways to improve the effectiveness of the student transportation system, and to find cost-effective alternatives which would enable the system to align school start times; that he referenced this because he was attracted to the content of Mr. Gibson's motion but not as a substitute; that he believed the Board should review the full range of issues associated with the transportation system, and if the Board decided that those efficiencies could be applied toward changing the bell schedule, then he would be more receptive; that he also believed the study would provide value to the Board as they evaluated the potential of changing the

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

21

February 9, 2006

schedule; and that postponing the motion would give staff time to explore incorporating Mr. Gibson's concepts into the main motion for the Board's consideration.

Mr. Storck agreed with the postponement rationale as the objective was to ultimately figure out a way to do this; that if the motion passed, he thought they should consider having an advisory committee to ensure the whole community was included in the deliberation.

Mr. Gibson called for a point of information; the question whether the intent of the motion was to ask facilities staff to take these parameters to MPS and find out what the cost would be, so the Board could be prepared to vote on the contract in two weeks. Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner responded affirmatively, and that, procedurally, he would advocate Mr. Gibson and Mr. Center collaborating on what they would like staff to take to MPS.

Further discussion included the following: that he had just asked Mr. Tistadt whether this could be bid in two weeks' time and he was not sure it was doable; that he wanted to be sure that they were being realistic about the time frame (Gibson); the request for confirmation that staff might not be able to determine a price consistent with the scope within two weeks (Niedzielski-Eichner); an affirmative response; that he thought it was unrealistic, considering the complexity of the parameters, that the consultant could assimilate it, determine a price, and respond in two weeks (Tistadt).

With the agreement of the seconder and after some discussion, Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner said he would amend his motion by deleting "in two weeks at the next meeting" and insert "at the earliest possible date not to exceed the second meeting from tonight." Mr. Tistadt said he would need to talk with the consultant before he could make a specific commitment on the time frame, because he did not know what their workload would allow. Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner said he would make the date "not to exceed March 9," and Mr. Tistadt agreed.

Additional comments included: that Mr. Gibson's request dealt with the heart of some of the issues with the transportation system and the Board should not expect the cost of the study to be in the same ballpark, as this scope would look at the entire system; that if they were committed to this, he would expect Board members' support when they brought it back for a vote (Center); that she was disappointed in the turn of events; that they had been working with the community, staff, and consultants for a long time; and an effort to revise the scope was counterproductive and she was opposed (Oleszek).

The amendment to revise the motion to postpone to read "no later than March 9" [instead of "the next meeting"] passed 10-2, with Mrs. Belter, Mr. Center, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Moon, Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Storck,

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

22

February 9, 2006

Mrs. Strauss, and Mrs. Wilson voting "aye"; and with Mrs. Kory and Mrs. Oleszek voting "nay".

The motion to postpone action on this item to no later than March 9, 2006, 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".

4.03 Additional Appointments

There were no additional appointments.

4.04 Confirmation of Action Taken in Closed Meeting

Mrs. Strauss moved, and Mr. Center seconded, to expel a student for possession with the intent to distribute imitation marijuana on school property. The motion passed 11-0, with Mrs. Belter, Mr. Center, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Moon, Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner, Mrs. Oleszek, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Storck, Mrs. Strauss, and Mrs. Wilson voting "aye"; and with Mrs. Kory away from the table.

Mr. Gibson moved, and Mrs. Wilson seconded, to expel a student for assaulting a staff member. The motion passed 10-0, 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 away from the table.

Mrs. Smith moved, and Mr. Hunt seconded, to expel a student for possession of controlled substances, drug paraphernalia, and weapons on school property. The motion passed 10-0, 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 away from the table.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

- 5.01. **Minutes** – Approve minutes of January 26, 2006, regular School Board meeting (Exhibit I)
- 5.02. **Easement** - Grant an easement at Burkholder Center to Dominion Virginia Power with no compensation (FTS; Exhibit J)
- 5.03. **Sale of House** - 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 K)
- 5.04. **Fairfax County Purchasing Resolution** - Adopt the revised Fairfax County Purchasing Resolution (FS; Exhibit L)
- 5.05. **Easement** - Recommendation to (i) approve the agreement for the granting of public street and related easements ("Agreement") with the City of Fairfax ("City")

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

23

February 9, 2006

– 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 (FS; Exhibit M)

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

6. **NEW BUSINESS**

- 6.01 Award of Annual Contract** - Recommendation to award the annual contract for lease/purchase of classroom trailers to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder and authorize the Division Superintendent, or his designee, to execute the contract on behalf of the School Board (FTS; Exhibit N)
- 6.02 Award of Contract** - Recommendation to award the contract(s) for electrical work for the eight-classroom modular building at Cooper Middle School, and the ten-classroom modular building at Churchill Road Elementary School, to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder(s), and authorize the Division Superintendent, or his designee, to execute the contract(s) on behalf of the School Board (FTS; Exhibit O)
- 6.03 Award of Contract** - Recommendation to award the contract(s) for site work and concrete slab for the eight-classroom modular building at Mantua Elementary School, and the twelve-classroom modular building at Forestdale Elementary School, to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder(s), and authorize the Division Superintendent, or his designee, to execute the contract(s) on behalf of the School Board (FTS; Exhibit P)
- 6.04 Award of Contract** - Recommendation to award the contract(s) for site work and concrete slab for the eight-classroom modular building at Cooper Middle School, and the ten-classroom modular building at Churchill Road Elementary School, to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder(s), and authorize the Division Superintendent, or his designee, to execute the contract(s) on behalf of the School Board (FTS; Exhibit Q)
- 6.05 Award of Contract** - Recommendation to award the contract(s) for electrical site work for the eight-classroom modular building at Mantua Elementary School, and the twelve-classroom modular building at Forestdale Elementary School, to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder(s), and authorize the Division Superintendent, or his designee, to execute the contract(s) on behalf of the School Board (FTS; Exhibit R)
- 6.06 Award of Annual Contract** - Recommendation to award the annual time and materials contract(s) for hazardous material removal services to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder(s) and authorize the Division Superintendent, or his designee, to execute the contract on behalf of the School Board (FTS; Exhibit S)

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

24

February 9, 2006

- 6.07 Award of Annual Contract** - Recommendation to authorize staff to negotiate the contract for surveying and civil engineering services with the selected architectural and engineering (A&E) firm for the elementary school site at Coppermine Crossing, and authorize the Division Superintendent, or his designee, to execute the contract on behalf of the School Board (FTS; Exhibit T)
- 6.08 Modified Calendar Waiver** - Recommendation to authorize Annandale Terrace, Dogwood, Franconia, Glen Forest, Graham Road, Parklawn, and Timber Lane Elementary Schools, Glasgow Middle School, and Falls Church and Stuart High Schools to continue a modified calendar for the 2006-2007 school year, contingent upon approval from the state Board of Education of a waiver to allow a pre-Labor Day opening (S; Exhibit U)

7. **SUPERINTENDENT MATTERS**

7.01 **Superintendent Matters**

Dr. Dale said he was proud to announce that Deputy Superintendent Brad Draeger had accepted the position as Superintendent of Livingston Public Schools in New Jersey; that Dr. Draeger had had a long and distinguished career in Fairfax County and would be missed. Dr. Dale noted that February was School Board Appreciation Month and that on behalf of the staff, students, and the entire community, he would like to thank each of the Board Members for their dedication and commitment to Fairfax County Public Schools.

8. **SCHOOL BOARD REPORTS**

8.01 **Committee Reports (Exhibit V)**

Resource Management & Evaluation; February 6; Jane Strauss, Chairman

Discussion of FY 2007 Proposed Budget, and contract amendment for the transportation consultant study with Management Partnership Services, Inc.

Legislative Update; Stuart Gibson, Chairman

That Senate Bill 545 that would have created a private voucher program for special education students had been defeated in the House Education Committee; that a companion bill for contributions had been heard today but the outcome was unknown; that Senate Bill 410 asked the Virginia Board of Education to develop a plan to eliminate initiatives or conditions that were currently being funded by *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB); that he and Mr. Moon had attended the Federal Relations Network Conference and had lobbied for common sense changes to NCLB; that the final FY 2006 House budget had cut funding to Title I and Special Education; that President Bush's proposed FY 2007

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

25

February 9, 2006

budget included less than a one percent increase to Title I and Special Education funding; that he served as the Virginia School Board Association's representative to the Virginia Committee of Practitioners; that the committee would meet on February 10, to consider proposed amendments to the Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan.

Forum on Board Topics; February 9; Ilryong Moon, Chairman.

Discussion included School Board Office staffing; use of professional development funds for Board members; and Board support and logistics for community engagement.

8.02 Board Member Announcements

Kathy Smith, Sully District

Ms. Kunkel had asked her to announce that the election for Student Representative to the School Board would take place on February 21 at 8:30 a.m., at Robinson Secondary School.

Daniel Storck, Mount Vernon District

Thanked the Board for their work at the February 3 and 4, 2006, strategic planning work session; and hoped that the community engagement campaign would be launched in the next few weeks.

Janet Oleszek, Member at Large

Thanked the principals at Mountain View and Bryant Alternative High Schools for their invitation to their inspiring graduations; that the students who had spoken were not only inspiring in the context of academic achievement, but had had life experiences that were incredibly challenging.

Phillip Niedzielski-Eichner, Providence District

He and Mr. Storck had recently attended a Base Realignment and Closure Commission (BRAC) Board of Advisors meeting that had been very productive and worthwhile; and it would be beneficial to FCPS to have staff participate in future meetings.

Kaye Kory, Mason District

Compliments to colleagues on passing budget that was wise and fair.

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 13

26

February 9, 2006

Stephen Hunt, Member at Large

He had been pleased to attend graduation ceremonies for the adult education and adult high schools; that students from other countries were excited to have earned an American high school diploma; thanked the students at George Mason University who had accepted a project to look at the FCPS bus route issue and population projections within Fairfax County.

Tessie Wilson, Braddock District

Thanked the staff members of Bryant Alternative and Pimmit, Herndon, and Annandale High Schools, and all those who had recently participated in Super Saturday.

Brad Center, Lee District

Thanked staff for their support, and Board members' families, who knew how long they worked.

Mrs. Belter, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Moon, and Mrs. Strauss had no comments.

9. CLOSED MEETING

9.01 Closed Meeting

Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner moved, and Mr. Center seconded, that the Board go into closed session to discuss and consider the acquisition and disposition of publicly held real property, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position on negotiating strategy of the public body pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(3). The motion passed 11-0, with Mrs. Belter, Mr. Center, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Hunt, Mrs. Kory, Mr. Moon, Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner, Mrs. Oleszek, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Storck, and Mrs. Wilson voting "aye"; and with Mrs. Strauss not present for the vote.

9.02 Certification of Closed Meeting Compliance (Exhibit W)

Mrs. Kory moved, and Mr. Storck seconded, that since the Fairfax County School Board convened a closed session meeting on February 9, 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. 13

27

February 9, 2006

were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered. The motion **passed 10-0**, with Mr. Center, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Hunt, Mrs. Kory, Mr. Moon, Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Storck, Mrs. Strauss, and Mrs. Wilson voting "aye"; and with Mrs. Belter and Mrs. Oleszek not present for the vote.

10. ADJOURNMENT

9.01 The meeting was adjourned at 1:05 a.m.