

Fountain Valley School District
Superintendent's Office

REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

10055 Slater Avenue
Fountain Valley, CA 92708

June 28, 2012

MINUTES

President Ian Collins called the regular meeting of the Board of Trustees to order at 6:01pm.

CALL TO ORDER

The following board members were present:

ROLL CALL

Ian Collins	President
Christine Allcorn	President Pro Tem
Sandra Crandall	Clerk
Jimmy Templin	Member
Judith Edwards	Member

Mr. Collins noted an addendum to the agenda with addition to Item 4B Personnel Items as follows:

AGENDA APPROVAL

4-B. Personnel Items

Addition of item 1.2 to Employment Functions as described in the attached.

Motion: Mrs. Allcorn moved to approve the meeting agenda with the addition to Item 4B Personnel.

Second: Mrs. Edwards

Vote: 5-0

There were no requests to address the Board prior to closed session.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Collins announced that the Board would retire into Closed Session. Action was not anticipated. The following would be addressed:

CLOSED SESSION

- Personnel Matters: *Government Code 54957 and 54957.1*
Appointment/Assignment/Promotion of employees;
employee discipline/dismissal/release; evaluation of

employee performance; complaints/charges against an employee; other personnel matters.

- Negotiations: *Government Code 54957.6*
Update and review of negotiations with the FVEA and CSEA Bargaining Units with the Board's designated representative, Mrs. Cathie Abdel.
- Conference with Legal Council: Anticipated Litigation: *Government Code Section 54954.5 & 54956.9*
Update on initiation of litigation pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 54956.9: one case. Attorney Karen Van Dijk will join Support Services Director Abby Bickford and WOCCSE Program Director Robyn Moses in updating the Board of Trustees.

The public portion of the meeting resumed at 7:01pm.
Mrs. Allcorn led the Pledge of Allegiance.

PLEDGE OF
ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC HEARING

A public hearing was held for the purpose of discussing the proposed 2012-13 final budget prior to approval by the Board of Trustees. Public input was welcomed. There were no requests to address the Board and the hearing was closed.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR
2012-13 FINAL BUDGET

PUBLIC COMMENTS

One parent addressed the Board of Trustees on issues in our schools including sensitivity training for teachers and the treatment of students with 504 plans.
One community member addressed the Board of Trustees on Item 3: Resolution 2012-16 Resolution Ordering an Election and Establishing Specifications of the Election Order (Technology Bond).

PUBLIC COMMENTS

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McMahon provided the Board with a summary of the 2012-13 final budget noting that the legislature passed a budget for the State which now awaits the Governor's signature. The district budget is based on what was being heard in mid-May, including that a ballot measure will be presented to the legislature in November for their passing. If this fails, there will be a \$457/student reduction for the Fountain Valley School District and the option to decrease the school year up to 15 days each year for two years. Mr. McMahon noted that contingency language is in place with our bargaining units to allow for furloughs days if the ballot measure does not

APPROVAL OF THE
2012-13 FINAL
DISTRICT BUDGET

pass. He explained the Calculated Rate per ADA of \$4969.92 for 2012-13 which will be reduced to approximately \$4500 if the ballot measures do not pass. Enrollment next year is estimated to be similar to 2011-12 at 6250 students with class sizes increasing slightly to 30:1 in K-2 and 31:1 in 3-8. He noted that the only major change in Fringe Benefits is the increase in the PERS rate. He explained that the district still needs the take money out of our special reserve fund, Fund 40, in order to balance the General Fund. This includes a transfer for 2012-13 in the amount of \$2,309,701, largely due to a reduction in our revenue of over \$2 million. He noted that 2011-12's expenses total \$47,383,658 with a reduction to \$45,209,869 next year, largely due to the planned 5 furlough days in the 2012-13 year. He noted that even in the best of cases with the State tax measure passing, we will still be facing some tough times ahead, noting that despite the predicted slight improvements to the economy, the lag time will still cause the district to experience difficulties. He explained that as in previous years, we will adjust this budget based on the November initiatives as well as events that occur in the district.

Mrs. Crandall noted that since the Board was presented with this budget, the Trailer Bill was approved on June 25th, showing no COLA of 3.24% but what we see reflected looks like a positive COLA of 3.24%. She asked Mr. McMahon to provide some clarification on this. Mr. McMahon noted that the budget includes the COLA but that when looking at the revenue deficit, the deficit goes up, meaning that while the State seems to provide a COLA, it is then taken away with the deficit. Dr. Ecker noted that we live in a world of statutory COLAs, computations that come out of the Department of Finance and then funded COLAs, this deficit.

Mrs. Crandall also noted that the County recommended developing a contingency plan if the State tax initiatives fail and asked if this budget reflects this. Mr. McMahon explained that it does not as the County allowed districts that have a contingency plan to display such. So, in this district Mrs. Abdel and the bargaining units worked to develop a plan for additional furlough days to offset any cuts.

Mrs. Crandall noted the deficit spending in the district for the last three years. Mr. McMahon explained that yes we have been deficit spending for a period of time. Mrs. Crandall noted that this is challenging.

Motion: Mrs. Edwards moved to approve the adoption of the 2012-13. Final District Budget

Second: Mrs. Allcorn

Mrs. Crandall noted that she is grateful that we have the special provision of Fund 40, given that without this we would be looking at huge reductions. Mr. Collins concurred noting that there has been a need to go into this, but there has also been an attempt to preserve this to the extent possible.

Vote: 5-0

Mr. McMahon introduced bond counsel David Casnocha from Stradling Yocca Carlson and Rauth and Ann Nock from George K. Baum, joined by Alan Gafford and Randy Merritt.

He noted regarding the resolution that it is a legal document, and as such there are reasons for the wording as it stands. He explained that we did receive a draft tax rate statement and estimate of payments. He explained the bond is projected to be a two series bond, series A and B, each for 15 years. Series A will be a 15 year bond to fund the first phase of initial purchases and infrastructure updates. With this has been built into the projections the replacement of equipment as needed over time. Series A will be sold at \$11.5 million with a cost to the taxpayers of \$14.50 per \$100,000 of assessed tax evaluation. Voters will be informed of this and be able to see the potential cost to their household. The tax rate statement shows interest rates not to exceed 4% and the assessed evaluation not to exceed \$14.50 over the life of the bond. It will start in 2012 and bonds will be paid off by 2035, a 25 year time period. The idea of this is to cover the needs of the district for 15 years and the lifespan will carry it on beyond that. The products will still be serviceable for the time period that the bond will be in place, something that the bond counsel is required to affirm to potential bond buyers and provide in the tax statement. Mrs. Crandall thanked George K. Baum and our bond counsel for the preparation of the materials this evening. She noted that when Exhibit A is put forward it is listed as the full text ballot proposition, and asked if it is the full text ballot proposition, why is the proposed assessment per \$100,000 and the full length of the bond not dealt with. Mr. Casnocha explained that Exhibit A is 75-word ballot statement, what voters vote yes or no on, and the contents of such are statutorily driven. This includes the par amount of the bond, the purposes of the bond, the maximum interest rate, the name of the issuer, etc. Legal requirements for Exhibit A do not include the estimated tax or anything regarding the assessed evaluation, just the par amount of the bond. Exhibit B is the result of the passage of Proposition 39. Many years ago school districts had the opportunity to sell GO bonds for a variety of capital improvements and equipment. This ended in 1978 with the passage of Proposition 13, causing districts to lose the ability to

RESOLUTION 2012-16
RESOLUTION
ORDERING AN
ELECTION AND
ESTABLISHING
SPECIFICATIONS OF
THE ELECTION
ORDER
(TECHNOLOGY
BOND)

ask voters to approve GO bond because Proposition 13 took away the ability to levy a tax to secure those bonds. Between 1978 and 1986, there were no school bonds. In 1986, the State Constitution was amended to state that a school district could pass a GO bond with 2/3 voter approval, so long as the proceeds were only used for the acquisition and improvement of real property. This remained in effect between 1986 and 2000. During this time, districts passed bonds and all voters saw was Exhibit A, the 75-word statement. But as we approached 2000, various groups worried that the 2/3 vote threshold was too high and began bargaining to reduce the passage rate and develop an alternative source of authority for school districts to pass GO bonds. Part of this legislative compromise was the recognition that there are three primary goals the legislature wanted to get out of school GO bonds including student safety, class size reduction and information technology. The amendment of the law to lower the passage rate was with the legislative intent that those three sectors of district business activities would be considered before placing a bond on the ballot. Among the other Proposition 39 amendments included the requirement that districts provide more information about the projects that would be funded with the bond, bringing in Exhibit B, which is an attempt to comply with the project specificity requirements of Proposition 39. In 2008, the Foothill Deanza Community College case is the only example interpreting the project list requirement of Proposition 39. He noted that the full ballot text and the project list are synonymous terms. The California Appellate Court ruled in the Foothill Deanza Community College case, where the district was sued on the grounds that their project list was so broad there wasn't a project that they could not fund with the bond and therefore it was alleged that it failed the specificity test. The court ruled in favor of the district, stating the Proposition 39's requirement for Exhibit B is to describe the types of projects that the district would like to undertake with the bond. The project list's purpose in the law is to give the Citizen Oversight Committee and the independent accountants that audit the expenditure bond funds guidance as to what is an authorized project. The purpose of Exhibit B is to describe the types of projects that will be authorized by the bond measure. The law has other provisions to inform the voters as to what the tax rates will be, the tax rate statements. In the voter pamphlet, the law requires several items to be addressed separately and side by side in the voter pamphlet, including the 75-word statement in a box, Exhibit B below this and on the right side the tax rate statement and the County counsel impartial analysis of what a yes or no vote would mean and then space for the pro ballot argument and any arguments against the bond. The way that the

law is configured, voters find out about the tax rate by looking at the tax rate statement. Mr. Casnocha explained further that the law does direct to include this information in the project list, as it is not a project and there are other vehicles by which this information is communicated to voters.

Mrs. Crandall noted her calculations that it costs about \$531,300 for the estimated underwriting fees and the cost of insurance for both bond series as well as the cost of the election between \$61,000 and \$73,000. She asked what the cost of writing the preliminary and final official ballot statements will be to which it was explained that it will be \$18,000, including the receipt of a statement of independent analysis stating that these comply with all applicable laws.

Mrs. Crandall also noted her understanding that in case of any default, there is usually a third party guarantor to the bond. She asked what is recommended regarding this and what is the cost for this, either insurance or a letter of credit. Mr. Casnocha explained that for many years, district GO bonds were guaranteed by the purchase of a bond insurance policy from a triple A rated bond insurance agency. He explained though that unfortunately all such agencies have been down-graded, with the most highly-rated rated such that it will be equal to the district's own rating, on its own credit. He explained that a district would only buy bond insurance to make its bond more attractive to the marketplace and so if paying a premium will lower an interest rate to a degree that it is cheaper for voters if the district buys insurance, the district will buy it. Although, he explained it is very unusual today for districts to buy bond insurance and instead they sell bonds on the strength of our own credit.

Mr. Collins asked Dr. Ecker what the cost to the district would be to place the bond on the ballot. Dr. Ecker explained that originally it was estimated to be similar to the cost of our board election at \$52,000-\$65,000. Mr. McMahon confirmed that it is now the understanding after speaking to the Office of the Registrar that the cost will only be \$8,000 since we are already running an election.

Motion: Mrs. Allcorn moved to adopt Resolution 2012-16 Resolution Ordering an Election and Establishing Specifications of the Election Order (Technology Bond)

Second: Mrs. Edwards

Mr. Templin noted his own struggle with placing the bond on the ballot. He agreed with the need for the technology and that the future of education is through technology. He noted that the cost

to the district does appear to be a gamble and given that we have just closed a school is feels somewhat risky. He explained that knowing that the cost is less than we originally thought does make him feel better. He noted speaking to families in the district and the mixed support that he found, with some noting the other taxes that are being raised while others see the necessity. He noted that the Technology Plan does address the lifespan of equipment and goes much deeper than just iPads and computers. He noted that in the end he realized that if it is not a huge cost to our district, it makes sense to allow the community to decide.

Mrs. Edwards noted that she too agrees with the concerns over the cost to the district. She noted that last week she attended the common core standards training and that when looking at these new standards that will be part of our curriculum very soon, so much includes technology, something that we are not currently prepared to do. She explained that we do not have the machines, equipment or even the programs to run. She noted that current graduates come out with such great technical ability to bring to the classroom and if we do not have the capacity to do this we are shooting ourselves in the foot. Despite her initial concerns over the cost, she feels we need to try it.

Mrs. Allcorn noted that in her 8 years as a board member, we are \$2000 less per student funding while expectations and requirements of students have gone up. She noted that we have done a wonderful job with our students, keeping standards where they are and performing at the top of the county, but it is frustrating because so much of our funding is out of our control. She noted that we do what we can, including closing a school and being the stewards of the funds that we are given the responsibility to manage. She noted that she sees this bond as an opportunity to bring something extra to the students of Fountain Valley. She noted that a house in Fountain Valley holds it value better than a house elsewhere, much having to do with the management of the schools and the management of the city. She noted that while this will not have any effect on her own children in the district, she will still be a resident here and wants to live in a community with a school district that attracts people so that we can continue to be an outstanding city in Orange County and the State. She noted that for \$8000 it is something that she is willing to try.

Mrs. Crandall noted while much of what she prepared to say is out of our control, it clarifies the reality of what the residents and commercial residents of Fountain Valley will be facing. She explained that, according to the Heritage Foundation and based upon the lower tax rates expiring January 1 and with today's Federal health care ruling, the average family will encounter a total of \$4138 in extra taxes. She noted that on the State level this

initiative would be competing with two initiatives, and it will affect the tax rate of some while in the case of the sales tax rate it will affect all. She explained that there is a third tax initiative on the ballot that will not directly affect all of us, affecting only those with businesses, but will indirectly affect the price of goods that we will all be paying for. At the local level, regarding the overlapping taxes on Fountain Valley residents and commercial business owners, she explained her research that the Huntington Beach Union High School District in 2004 floated a bond, which there are 22 more years to pay on. Coast Community College District floated a bond in 2002; there are also 22 more years to pay on this. The Orange County Sanitation District will enact a 10% increase in sewer fees as a result of a vote 4 years ago, and within 5 years there will be a 25% increase also voted on 4 years ago. Coast Community College District is also taking action over the next few weeks to float a \$700 million GO bond between \$15 and \$19 for \$100,000 for 30 years on the November 2012 ballot. With buildings around 50 years old, this would cover technology as well as brick and mortar. She noted as well that unemployment continues to be high, the economy is not improving as we have hoped, we have seen fundraisers generate less revenue and the November ballot will be filled with two statewide tax initiatives as well as potentially these two local initiatives. She noted that on the George K. Baum survey, question Q4, section G, dealt with whether or not district voters cannot afford additional taxes. 62% responded that they strongly or somewhat agree with this statement when considering technology being iPads; dropping to 53% when considering technology in general. She noted that this is the reality of what our tax payers are going to be looking at. Given this, she asked herself if she can be an effective trustee, support students in advancing their learning, embrace the well thought-out Technology Plan and not be in a support of a bond measure to which she feels that she can. She met with Dr. Hoefer, and found that 4 of 10 schools are on their way to achieving the goals of the Technology Plan and this has been accomplished through various means including categorical funding, ARA and ERA monies, inheritance of the newly closed school's lab and the generosity of fundraising efforts to start the process. She explained that this leaves 6 schools in various states of need. She noted her understanding of the 14% "die" rate of computers district wide, indicating that this should be at the top of our list. Although, she explained her feeling that by prioritizing our other projects, using accrue accounting and more of a pay as you go approach and perhaps a slower timetable, we can accomplish these projects over time. She noted that in the Technology Plan is a provision that if the Board were to not pursue a bond, a committee would be established to make suggestions on

the plan by June 30, 2013. She also explained that as we move to the 1:1 learning with mobile devices the plan has addressed the two pilot programs with the feedback that these two pilot programs would be the guide for implementation across the district on a more slow and steady pace. She noted that perhaps a lease to own program for parents would be a possibility to provide these tools as is done in other districts in the county. She noted that Fountain Valley is one of 4 out of 28 districts that have never floated a bond, something that she feels is a badge of honor, indicating that the current and previous boards have met the district's needs without having to do so.

Mr. Collins noted that as an educator who has seen things change over the years, he sees an engagement with students using technology that is not seen in the former way of learning. He explained that he sees other districts throughout the county really advancing themselves with high technology purchases for the purpose of teaching and learning. He noted that while he also has a problem with increased taxes as it is tough, he questioned if as a trustee he wants to stand in the way of the students in the district. He noted that we are not going to stop the way of technology and have to embrace change. He noted that student funding in California is a disgrace. He noted that he can't bring himself to be polarized when it comes down to a bond. He noted that only 15% of our electorate has children in our schools and it will come down to other members in our community. He explained that he doesn't want to deny our students this opportunity or have an inequity amongst our sites. He noted that our PTA/Os are wonderful and highly involved in the education of our students, but that's not what their role is. He noted his feeling that we need to offer the community an opportunity to decide and that if the decision is a "no" by our voting public, we will put a committee together. He questioned though if this will be good enough and will allow the district to compete with other districts. He noted that he would like to see the opportunity for the voters to decide.

Mr. Templin clarified that if he were to vote no, it is not due to his lack of support for technology.

Mr. Casnocha reminded the board that voting on this resolution is different than others and in order to call for a GO bond, the resolution requires 4 yes votes.

Vote: 4-1 (Crandall)

Mrs. Crandall noted that regarding the projected \$75,000 campaign budget where public funds cannot be used, the memo to the Board noted that these funds would be raised outside the district from private businesses that include our bond advisors, bond counsel

and future and current vendors and supportive organizations. She asked if bond advisors and bond counsel walking us through this process would be paid both by the political action committee formed to pass the bond as well as with district fees that are rolled into the bond. Ms. Noch explained that no, they would not as the campaign committee expenditures are strictly for communication purposes including mail costs and materials that go to voters. Mrs. Crandall noted her understanding that seeking support for a political campaign from those that are advising us is legal, but she questions the wisdom of this as it might be a conflict of interest. She stated her preference that the campaign is financed by those that support the bond so that the wishes of the local community are realized rather than those whose motivation is making money off of the bond.

Dr. Ecker noted that this is the first bond campaign that he will have the pleasure to participate in and certainly in speaking with Ms. Noch, we will be looking for a variety of sources to support the campaign fund, outside of the district. He noted thought that he certainly feels that efforts to try to raise the money from individuals willing to support who will be a direct benefit of the bond, will not be overlooked. Dr. Ecker noted as well that the district's estimated campaign is \$75,000, while Tustin Unified School District's campaign is at \$150,000. He noted that over this time he will be speaking with Dr. Franklin from TUSD as well as other superintendents that have already gone through this process. He emphasized that the local immediate community will not be overlooked in this endeavor and while it will not be exclusive to them, it will definitely include them.

Motion: Mrs. Allcorn moved to approve the Consent Calendar.

Second: Mrs. Crandall

Vote: 5-0

CONSENT
CALENDAR/
ROUTINE ITEMS OF
BUSINESS

Mr. Collins noted that he is still alarmed at the expense of Special Education, not on behalf of the students but because of the need to pull from the General Fund as Federal funding leaves a balance.

The Consent Calendar included:

- Approval of Adoption of the 2012-13 Final District Budget
- Adoption of Resolution 2012-16 Resolution Ordering an Election and Establishing Specifications of the Election Order (Technology Bond)
- Board Meeting Minutes from June 14th board meeting

- Personnel Items (Employment Functions, Workshops/Conferences, and Consultants)
- Donations
- Warrants
- Purchase Order Listing
- Budget Transfers
- Adoption of Board Policy 6163.4: Student Use of Technology/Acceptable Use Policy (Second Reading and Adoption)
- Approval of Authorization to Use Ocean View School District Dairy Bid (Bid #05-23)
- Approval of Authorization to Use Santa Clarita SD Food Bid Frozen/Dry RFP #11-12-31012012-01
- Approval of Agreement for Special Services with School Services of California
- Approval of Agreement for Professional Development in Small Group and Differentiated Instruction
- Approval of Notice of Layoff for Classified Positions
- Non-Public Agency Contracts

Non-Public School/Agency	100% Contract Cost	Effective Dates
Cornerstone Therapies	\$600	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Cornerstone Therapies	\$300	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Cornerstone Therapies	\$5100	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Cornerstone Therapies	\$1700	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Cornerstone Therapies	\$600	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
HealthBridge Childrens Hospital	\$1300	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Cornerstone Therapies	\$1000	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Cornerstone Therapies	\$7200	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Cornerstone Therapies	\$300	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Cornerstone Therapies	\$7000	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Cornerstone Therapies	\$3600	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Adamo Natasha Irene	\$3000	6/14/2012-10/30/2012
Cornerstone Therapies	\$8000	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Cornerstone Therapies	\$2200	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Speech and Language Path. Serv.	\$9020	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
SKY Pediatric Therapy	\$7560	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Cornerstone Therapies	\$8000	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Devereux Florida	\$107,475	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Therapeutic Education Centers	\$44935	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Speech and Language Dev. Center	\$58714.50	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Therapeutic Education Centers	\$47025	7/1/2012-6/30-2013
Therapeutic Education Centers	\$44935	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Speech and Language Dev. Center	\$36036.50	7/1/2012-6/30/2013
Cornerstone Therapies	\$650	6/13/2012-6/30/2012
David M. Lechuga, Ph.D.	\$1600	5/1/2012-6/30/2012
Therapeutic Education Centers	\$1125	6/22/2012-6/30/2012
Therapeutic Education Centers	\$11180	4/16/2012-6/30/2012

BOARD REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mrs. Allcorn very much enjoyed Fulton's promotion ceremony, noting that Mrs. Perkins did a wonderful job. She also met with Dr. Hoefer regarding the Technology Plan, noting that this was very helpful.

**BOARD REPORTS AND
COMMUNICATIONS**

Mr. Edwards enjoyed Moiola's promotion ceremony, noting that we are all saddened that this will be their last. She also attended Masuda's promotion with Ms. Silavs and noted how great it was to see lots of happy parents there. She also met with Dr. Hoefer regarding the Technology Plan. She attended the staff development on the common core standards, and enjoyed William Habermehl's retirement celebration with Mrs. Lucchese.

With the mention of the common core standards, Mr. Collins asked Ms. Silavs to provide some additional details. Ms. Silavs noted that the district did conduct training for the K-1st grade teachers, the first of three sessions, as they will transition from California content standards to new common core State standards this year. Students in Kindergarten and 1st grade this year will be the first cohort to take the new assessments when they are in 3rd grade.

Mrs. Templin met with a number of families on the bond issue and thanked staff for meeting with the Board as well. He attended a CSBA webinar on cyber citizenship in our schools and the integration of technology in schools. He also attended a common core standards webinar.

Mrs. Crandall enjoyed Moiola's promotion ceremony, noting that it was done with dignity. She also attended Talbert's promotion which she noted was also done well. She met with Dr. Hoefer to revisit the Technology Plan and attended the common core training presented by the Orange County Department of Education. She also attended a ground breaking ceremony for a new Japanese firm in Orange County, Yakult, noting the company plans to offer fieldtrip opportunities for our students. She also noted that in reference to the Board's interest in becoming their own PLC, she prepared copies for the Board and Dr. Ecker of CSBA's *Call to Order: A Blueprint for Great Board Meetings*, noting that at Mr. Collins' pleasure the Board can reflect upon this material at a future meeting.

Mr. Collins thanked Mrs. Crandall for these materials. He also enjoyed Moiola's promotion ceremony, agreeing that the students

and Mrs. Bains did a great job. He enjoyed Fulton's promotion as well, noting that it was amazing and so well done. He also was able to see the end of Talbert's promotion afterwards and noted that he was glad to get to see it. He participated in the opening of the Dr. Ralph Bauer Park in Huntington Beach. He also noted as a part of the National Children's Study at Newland School, he was able to go to UCI for a summary meeting and breakfast. He noted that budget cuts have forced a 25% reduction in the study but the information generated is already assisting in offshoot studies.

NEW ITEMS OF BUSINESS

Dr. Ecker Noted that this marks the end of another year and we continue on with the challenges that we are all facing with the budget. He noted that he can't recall a time when funding in education was this grave. He thanked the board for engaging in their discussion tonight, noting that it is a difficult topic, indicative of the times, on what we want in terms of services, not only for ourselves but those that will follow us and our changes. He noted that there are many tax measures on the ballot, but none that will impact our children quite the same, except this one, as our children will be the direct beneficiaries of this bond. He noted his desire to see our district remain competitive. He noted that he was struck with some information shared by Ms. Silavs and Dr. Hoefer regarding our similar school rankings. He noted that most of what gets into the papers deals with how well our students do in comparison with the state in general. But when looking at just the kind of schools that compare to those in our district and considering how well we compare to those schools with the same affluence, ethnicity, etc., based on a 1 to 10 scale, our district's average ranking is a 5.3. There are 21 school districts in Orange County, elementary or unified. He noted that when taking the high school districts out, there are two others that score as well as we do, Tustin and Westminster, two scoring below us and 16 scoring above us. Districts like Irvine, Savannah and Buena Park, have advantages from one source or another.

He noted that in the summer of 2009, *Money* magazine ranked Fountain Valley as one of the top 100 small cities in the United States largely because of our police and safety and our schools. He noted that regarding the bond, we will do everything that we can to present information that is convincing to our voters. He thanked the board for their debate, noting that the district values and appreciates each and every one of them.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Mrs. Edwards moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:45pm.

Second: Mrs. Allcorn

Vote: Unanimously approved

/rl