

<p style="text-align:center">Community Committee on Neighborhoods and Schools Summary of Meeting February 26, 2008</p>

Member Attendance:

(See attached list)

Others in Attendance:

Jennifer Bennett, AISD Planning & Community Relations
Joey Crumley, AISD Planning & Community Relations
Dr. Janis Guerrero, AISD Planning & Community Relations

Proceedings:

- The meeting was called to order at 5:43 p.m. in Conference Room A-230 of the AISD Carruth Administration Center.
- There were no citizens communications.
- Joey Crumley drew attention to upcoming scheduled events including briefing the Joint Subcommittees on March 7th, the joint meeting with the Facility Use and Boundary Task Force on March 6th, and the community meeting on March 25th. Also, he reminded members that recommendations need to be ready by the beginning of next week in order to post them online for public comment and to receive input from the Joint Subcommittees and the Facility Use and Boundary Task Force. Lastly, he asked the committee if they wanted to have a planning meeting next week for the upcoming public meeting on March 25th. The committee decided to let staff propose some options, and they would correspond through email to plan the meeting.
- Rachel Proctor May then provided a brief overview of the draft recommendations. The committee focused first on the Action Plan for Involving School Communities in Major Decisions.
- Discussion points on the decision-making process included:
 - The process flow chart that was created at the last meeting should be aligned with the written decision-making steps.
 - The review criteria should also be aligned with the decision-making process.
 - The committee is recommending a minimum of three years for major decisions affecting under-utilized or over-crowded schools.
 - There was some concern that the timeline on the existing flow chart (which illustrates the decision-making process) is too short and may not provide enough time for the community to be involved.
 - Because the review criteria indicators will change each year, a new process may be needed to address each year's circumstances.
 - Committee members determined that, although the overall process will take at a minimum three years, a new process to address each year's indicators would recur every year.
 - By January of each year, the community should brief the Board of Trustees on the status of the process and with preliminary recommendations. This brief should also include any budgetary implications for the next budget cycle.

- The briefing to the Board of Trustees in the process should include at least three community members.
 - There is a process for ongoing communication and a process if changes are needed.
 - The second information gathering stage should be divided into “additional data gathering” and “additional community outreach.”
 - The second meeting would involve the community coming back together to determine preliminary recommendations and action plans.
 - Some members emphasized action that a community can do on its own to address facility issues.
 - The initial community meeting should be co-moderated by a trusted community member and the corresponding Board member that represents that area. Also, an Associate Superintendent should be in attendance.
 - The Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) for each school should have a communications plan component. A template of a recommended communication plan for Campus Advisory Councils could be included in the appendices of the report.
- Members and Joey Crumley then commented on certain phrases that could be changed in the existing draft recommendations.
 - Members then briefly discussed the review criteria chart.
 - Discussion points on the review criteria included:
 - There should be no blanks in the chart.
 - Some members expressed concerns over using the maximum student to teacher ratio under state law. The ideal teaching environment is somewhere less than the maximum capacity, and criteria should instead be based on an optimal amount of students in each classroom.
 - Certain members said they would look at the criteria again to finalize the list.
 - Andy Anderson said he would make changes to the review criteria chart and process flow chart and send it Rachel Proctor May to include in the recommendations.
 - Rachel Proctor May said she would format and clean up the document in general to be ready by the beginning of next week.
 - The meeting adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

CCNS Member Attendance Record:

	2007													2008				
	5/22	6/12	6/26	8/14	8/28	9/11	9/25	10/9	10/23	11/13	11/14	11/27	12/4	1/8	1/29	2/12	2/26	3/25
Andy Anderson	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Sally Brackett	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓	
Terry Clark	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Christiane Woodley Erwin		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓										
Chiquita Watt Eugene																		
Lourdes (Lulu) Flores	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓										
Linda Gibeaut	✓	✓		✓	✓							✓		✓	✓	✓		
Rev. Sterling Lands	✓			✓	✓			✓	✓									
José Marrero	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓							
Rachael Proctor May	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Susan Moffat	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Leroy Nellis	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Yolanda Pedraza	✓	✓		✓														
Rev. Ivie Rich	✓		✓															
Paul Saldaña	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓			
Alfredo Santos	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓		✓							
Kathie Tovo	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Jim Walker	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	

✓ = Present