## MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Special Meeting

June 16, 1975 4:00 P.M.

Council Chambers
301 West Second Street

The meeting was called to order with Mayor Friedman -presiding.

## Roll Call:

Present: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Hofmann, Trevino,

Mayor Friedman, Mayor Pro Tem Snell

Absent: Councilmembers Lebermann, Linn

Mayor Friedman announced that this was a Special Called Meeting of the City Council for the purpose of meeting with the School Board to discuss the proposed "Community School" concept. He noted that this was only a Work Session, and no decisions would be made at this time.

The following School Board members were present:

M. K. Hage, President Carole Keeton McClellan, Vice Pres. Will D. Davis DeCourcy Kelley Jerry Nugent Rev. Marvin C. Griffin

MR. JEFF MALLEY, Chairperson of the Community Education Task Force, stated that the Task Force had been appointed in February, 1975, by the School Board and consisted of 28 people to study in depth the need for Community Education. After review of the Becker and Cook Community Educational models and similar programs across the United States, they recommended that the following action be taken jointly by the Council and Board:

- 1. Resolve to support the concept of Community Education within the district and City.
- Authorize staffs to make the necessary arrangements for inclusion of the cost of six pilot Community Education Centers in their budget for program year August 1975 to July 1976.

3. Appoint representatives to the proposed district-wide Austin Community Education Council.

He reviewed the programs at Becker and Cook by the use of slides and brought out some of the advantages of Community Education.

MS. SALLY NELSON, Cook Community School Council, reviewed the effect the School had on the area and noted that the program with 1,500 participants began on January, 1975. She suggested that this concept was helping people and giving them the opportunity to find out what they had to offer.

MR. MANUEL NAVARRO, past President of the South Austin Neighborhood Council, suggested that the discussion should be based on how to best utilize tax dollars and utilize the facilities after closing hours. He submitted that these facilities could be used by the community to benefit the parents of the children. He felt that the concept should be opened up to all parts of the City and that tax dollars could be saved.

Mr. Malley noted that the Task Force had broken down into three different subcommittees; and representatives of these subcommittees would address themselves to several items.

MS. JOAN BARTZ, representing the Needs and Goals Committee, reviewed some of the needs identified by the Task Force:

- 1. Meeting places.
- 2. Information for services and assistance.
- 3. Recreation facilities.
- 4. To reduce neighborhood crime rates.
- 5. Manpower training.
- 6. Developmental programs for neighborhood people of all ages.
- 7. On-going a viable communication between the schools and each community.

MR. DAVID WILSON, representing the Funding and Support Committee, noted that the Committee was composed of a cross-section of the business community. They determined that for 12% additional operating costs, a traditional school could become a community school which could serve about 1,500 people each year and thus increase the facility usage by 300%. He indicated that they had reached the following determinations:

- 1. Both of the present community schools were sound and practical programs, and they felt it would be wise to let the program grow slowly.
- Locations should be made with care and classes designed to meet the true needs of the neighborhoods.

 Felt it would be successful that this program require the joint participation of the School District and City government both in operation and financing.

MR. ALVIN BURGER, representing the Funding and Support Committee, stated that they had determined the following cost areas would have to be met:

1. Costs of conducting classes.

Would be self-supporting either by volunteer instruction, modest tuition for instruction and materials, contributions from businesses and industries, neighborhood fund raisers, and in-kind and/or monetary contributions from agencies and institutions sponsoring specific Community Education Program components.

2. Community Education Center administration costs.

Estimated that total costs for each program would amount to not more than \$43,736 per program for 1975-76 program year. Funding level for the six recommended sites would come to \$262,984.

3. Central administration costs.

Total costs for one program year of 11 months would be \$45,000, to be met from tax sources.

MR. HORACE WILLIS, representing the Administration Committee, stated that they had prepared recommendations in the following areas:

- 1. Administration of Community Education Programs at the neighborhood level.
- 2. Administration of the Community Education Program at the district-wide or central level.
- 3. Selection of Phase One (Pilot) Community Education Program sites.

Board member Jerry Nugent asked about the possibility of other federal funds, and Mr. Malley indicated that there were funds that they could go after and commented that the amount would be no more than the estimated figure. In connection with this, Mr. Burger noted that there were Texas Education Agency grants passed by Congress. Board member Will Davis suggested that there were funds under Title III.

MR. TOM HATFIELD, Austin Community College, endorsed the concept of Community Education and noted that the Community College had funds available to it, both vocational and academic which would be made available to citizens through these community schools.

Board President M. K. Hage, Jr., asked that Mr. Hatfield meet with the Task Force to present some of the possibilities. He commented that as far as the Board was concerned, their interests in the Community College concept was fairly selfish in that they had committed a lot of money to support programs to try to encourage children to stay in school. He added that it did not do any good if the parents were not involved. Personally, he believed they should be responsive to the program and suggested it was a good way to spend tax dollars more effectively. He noted that the Board would appreciate any help the Council could give them in evaluating the future of this program.

Mayor Pro Tem Snell asked whether or not this would provide jobs for the parents who would be participating and asked whether or not it would be competing with the private industries in connection with the kindergarten level.

Mr. Malley commented that at Becker they were approaching the situation where they were finding jobs for the people even though it had not been part of the design.

MS. ELLA SALAZAR, a member of the Task Force and Child, Inc., indicated that Child, Inc., was very interested in exploring all possibilities and establishing more programs in the declining enrollment schools.

In response to a question from Board member Rev. Griffin, Mr. Malley indicated that the Task Force had not specifically addressed itself to any priorities concerning the possible sites for the schools.

In response to Board member DeCourcy Kelley's question, with regard to the possibility of assistance from the County Commissioners, Mr. Malley indicated that the Task Force could give them this presentation and test their interests.

Vice President Carole Keeton McClellan felt that Community Schools more than any other vehicle was a way of bridging the gap between the School District and the City and the people they jointly served. She asked for more clarification of the responsibilities of the Austin Community Education Council in that she wondered whether or not recommendations were made to the District Coordinator or directly to the Council and School District. She commented that she would be willing to cut in other areas to implement this concept, and she was ready to endorse the three recommendations presented earlier.

Mayor Friedman thanked the School Board for appearing and the Task Force for the presentation of the report. He commented that he was very much aware of the need for community aspects, and the Council and the citizens welcomed the opportunity to work together with the Board. He looked forward to processing this on a high priority level.

## ADJOURNMENT

The Council adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

ATTEST:

Citv Clerk

APPROVED

Major Med