Call to Order
Meeting was called to order at 6:00 P.M. by Dr. Don Brann

Approval of Minutes
Minutes from October 20, 2014 were approved:
First: Israel Mora; Second: Cheryl Cook; Motion carries: 4-0

Board Approvals
1-8 & 11
First: Jennifer Morgan; Second: Cheryl Cook; Motion carries: 4-0

Board Approvals Pulled
9 & 10
First: Israel Mora; Second: Brian Meath; Motion carries: 5-0
(Discussed and voted on in Closed Session)

Note:
Mr. Meath arrived at 6:45 P.M., after the voting occurred.
From the Board

Mr. Mora reports that he is anxiously awaiting to hear the outcome on the facilities award that Da Vinci is hoping to receive.

Ms. Morgan reports that her children are getting ready for Exhibition and that it’s exciting to hear them preparing at home.

Dr. Brann introduces his guest, Angela Fajardo, Principal of Beulah Payne Elementary School in Inglewood Unified, Board member at Lennox Elementary School District, and doctoral student at USC, there on assignment for school.

Program Update

Dr. Jones

Da Vinci College Program

A couple of school leaders raised concerns about the DV College Program to Dr. Wunder. Dr. Wunder shared that he had confirmation bias and wanted someone unbiased to interview school leaders to get their thoughts and concerns, and bring these concerns forward to the trustees before they make a decision as to whether to proceed with the program or not.

Dr. Jones reports that he had the opportunity to meet with each Director and Assistant Director at all four schools, and also Scott Weatherford and Kim Merritt. He asked the following open-ended questions about the DV College Program:

- What is your understanding of the DV College Program? Who is the target audience to be served? What does it look like? (AAT, IGETC, 13th Year, 14th Year, 4 Year Degree?)
- Is there Mission Alignment for Da Vinci?
- Do you have any specific concerns about moving forward with the DV College Program?

There was not a general understanding of exactly what the DV College Program entails. The concept of the 13th Year was most clear, but not what the end goal would be or who would be served. For some, this involved providing remediation and support to our most needy students, while others saw this as targeting the students who are on the bubble between community college and the CSU system. Some further clarification of students to be served would be helpful. The end goal of fulfilling the requirement of IGETC seemed to be the biggest draw, although the AA degree was also listed as a stated option for DVC students. There was not any indication of a high priority for a 4-year program, and there were concerns that each additional year beyond Year 13 could be pushing beyond our level of expertise.

There was general, but not unanimous agreement about mission alignment. Most indicated that there was a great alignment with the often-stated goal of getting students to-and-through college and into well-paying careers. The concerns in this area are related to dilution of resources and energy without a clear internal indicator that this is a specific need for our students. In other words, there is a general problem with not enough students successfully graduating from four year schools coming out of community colleges, but not enough Da Vinci data that shows this is a concern for our students. Most interviewees felt, however, that the national data in this area was pretty compelling and that our local 2-year school enrollment rate of 32-38% was an indicator of a need in this area. Cost as a barrier for students was also cited as a reason for pursuing this program and that this program aligns with the college and career mission of Da Vinci.
Most specific concerns revolved around the nuts and bolts details about getting the program up and running. As long as the program will collect ADA funding, there was not a major concern about dilution or encroachment on other programs. The roll-out for this summer would need to be on the fast track to be ready for the upcoming college decision period in the spring. The biggest area of concern related to the Paid Internship program and whether there would be enough options for all students in the program. Additionally, there were a few questions about whether we were being presumptuous to simply assure that we could create a better program than the community colleges. Some felt that there should be a focus on providing support to Da Vinci graduates at local community colleges and CSUs.

Dr. Jones ended with this final thought: Several interviewees felt very strongly that this type of bold move, creating a project-based 13th Year was exactly within the Da Vinci DNA - we have developed successful programs in the past and could extend this to the Early College level.

Dr. Brann and Mr. Mora agree that the reason for starting research into a Da Vinci College Program was based on the escalating costs of college tuition in America. The thinking is that it would be helpful if Da Vinci could provide the first two years of college for free to help supplement the overall college costs. Dr. Brann further states the second reason for considering a college program is based on the dismal record across the country of people obtaining a bachelor’s degree who are also the first ones in their families to go to university. Citing that in a nutshell, the major thrust of the college program is to A) help students with the costs of college, and B) help students get through college to degree completion.

Ms. Morgan states that she is aware of a bit of confusion in the community regarding a Da Vinci College Program. Ms. Morgan further shares that some of the parents she’s spoken to about the topic believe that the Da Vinci College model is only an option for Da Vinci Communications students.

Dr. Wunder shared they are choosing DVC over the other highs schools specifically for this program.

Financial Update

Mr. Cox

Mr. Cox discusses Da Vinci’s Budget Revision process. Additionally, Mr. Cox reports the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Board Approved Budget</th>
<th>Actuals to Date</th>
<th>Balance Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal LCFF</td>
<td>10,571,353</td>
<td>3,570,079</td>
<td>7,001,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total State Revenue</td>
<td>11,185,009</td>
<td>3,580,498</td>
<td>7,604,510 (on target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Federal Revenue</td>
<td>522,614</td>
<td>102,311</td>
<td>420,303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Total Local Revenue
- Local Revenue: 1,232,549
- Revenue: 12,940,172
- Total: 12,940,172

### Total Revenue
- Revenue: 12,940,172
- Total Revenue: 12,940,172
- Approved: 3,825,588
- Actuals: 3,825,588
- Balance: 9,114,584

### EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certificated Salaries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 1</td>
<td>6,005,701</td>
<td>1,150,554</td>
<td>4,855,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classified Salaries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 2</td>
<td>1,532,124</td>
<td>500,184</td>
<td>1,031,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPLOYEE BENEFITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 3</td>
<td>1,712,356</td>
<td>463,060</td>
<td>1,249,296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Personnel Expenses
- Total Personnel Expenses: 9,250,180
- Subtotal: 9,250,180
- Remaining: 7,136,382

### Books and Supplies
- Books and Supplies: 914,999
- Subtotal: 914,999
- Remaining: 50,593

### Services and Other Operating Expenses
- Services and Other Operating Expenses: 2,191,113
- Subtotal: 2,191,113
- Remaining: 1,394,768

### CAPITAL OUTLAY
- Capital Outlay: ---
- Subtotal: ---
- Remaining: ---

### OTHER OUTGOING
- Other Outgoing: 317,141
- Subtotal: 317,141
- Remaining: 317,141

### Total Non-Personnel Expenses
- Non-Personnel Expenses: 3,423,252
- Subtotal: 3,423,252
- Remaining: 1,762,501

### TOTAL EXPENSES
- Total Expenses: 12,673,433
- Subtotal: 12,673,433
- Remaining: 8,898,883

### Operating Surplus/(Deficit)
- Operating Surplus: 266,739
- Deficit: 215,701

### Total Estimated Contingency
- Total Estimated Contingency: 266,739

### Total Beginning Balance
- Total Beginning Balance: 2,117,735

---

**Board is requesting an approval item be brought forth at the next meeting addressing Da Vinci Schools Budget Revision Policy.**

---

### Closed Session
Meeting entered into Closed Session at **7:20 P.M.**

### Adjournment
Meeting reconvened from Closed Session and was adjourned at **8:21 P.M.**

---

**Denotes action item**