A regular meeting of the Board of Education of the Santa Barbara High School District was called to order by President O'Neal on Thursday, May 16, 1963, at 4:00 P.M. in Room 6 of the Administration Annex.

Present: Bruce D. O'Neal, President
        C. E. Sovine, Vice-President
        Mrs. Elisabetta P. Henderson, Member
        David S. Licker, Member

Absent: Arnold W. Jacquemain, Member

Others present for all or a portion of the meeting included:
        Dr. Norman B. Scharer, Superintendent and Secretary-Clerk to Board
        G. E. Browne, Associate Superintendent and Assistant Secretary-Clerk to Board
        Douglas C. White, Assistant Superintendent
        R. V. Jackson, Assistant Business Manager
        Gleeola M. Brun, Executive Secretary
        Harry Trimborn, News-Press Reporter
        Ed Murphy, Gazette-Citizen Reporter
        Robert E. Kallman, Member-Elect, Board of Education
        Mrs. Richard M. Polsky and Mrs. John S. Kendrick, League of Women Voters' representatives
        Peter Johnson and Charles W. Marshall, City Schools Bus System
        Mrs. Ruth Cardona, Mrs. Forrest T. Gutshall, Mrs. Silvio Varni,
        Mrs. Armand P. Queihe, and Mrs. William L. Poulin, PTA representatives
        Dr. Jerry O'Brien

Several staff members, including Dr. Robert E. Barry, Kenneth G. Johnson, William E. McLaughlin, Thomas J. Murphy, Dr. Thelma J. Damgaard, Guido Dal Bello, Mrs. Alice Boettner, Charles Rheinschmidt

Several parents, including Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. Tschupp,
        Mrs. Margaret Foster, Mr. and Mrs. John Stassinos, a Mrs. Krause, and others

Minutes:

Minutes of the regular meeting of April 18, 1963, were approved as submitted.

Welcome to Guests and Staff Members

Mr. O'Neal welcomed guests and staff members present at the meeting.

Hearing of Citizens and Petitions: None
Communications

Upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, the following subdivision maps from the City of Santa Barbara were received and ordered filed:

Cielito Oaks - 28 homes in area of Mountain Drive, El Cielito Road, and Sheffield Reservoir; school attendance areas - Jefferson, Santa Barbara Junior High and Santa Barbara High Schools

Town and Country Estates - 11 homes between Barker Pass Road and Eucalyptus Hill Road; school attendance areas - Cleveland, Santa Barbara Junior High, and Santa Barbara High Schools

The Superintendent reviewed the Board's discussion on March 21 and April 18 regarding the report of the Advisory Committee on Pupil Transportation Services. He stated that the Board had set the meeting on this date as the time at which the Committee's recommendations would be discussed further and a determination made on them.

Dr. Scharer reported that a number of communications had been received concerning the proposed transportation policies, and that copies had been sent to individual Board members. He also reported that a number of interested parents were present in the audience.

Dr. Scharer stated the administration had made a very careful analysis of the Committee's recommendations, and he presented a written summary of the Committee's conclusions, together with the administration's recommendations concerning them.

At the request of Dr. Scharer, Mr. Jackson outlined the transportation services presently provided by the city schools
and the effect on such services of both the committee's and the administration's recommendations.

Mr. Jacquemain entered the meeting.

There was lengthy discussion, particularly concerning the committee's recommendation that free transportation in the high school district be discontinued beginning September, 1963, and the administration's counter recommendation that this proposal be studied further next year, the study to involve opening of the Goleta Valley Junior High School early in 1964-1965.

Following is a summary of statements made by participants in the discussion:

Mrs. Aaron B. Nadel: "There has been some concern expressed that discontinuance of free transportation in the high school district might encourage drop-outs among children in families of lower economic levels. Mrs. Ruth Cardona, Chairman of the PTA Intergroup Committee, represents a voice for these families, and she is here today to express herself on their behalf."

Mrs. Ruth Cardona: "I can see the point in discontinuing free transportation service, especially if the money saved is going to be used to provide smaller classes, or things that are needed. We are getting to the point where a lot of people can afford to pay for school transportation, and they probably should pay for it. My concern, however, is for the group that cannot afford it. We want their children to stay in school and do not want their excuse to be that they 'have no money for transportation.' I understand there will be provision for this group that cannot afford transportation costs, and I hope you will keep them in mind when the study is made next year."

Dr. Scharer: "Mrs. Cardona's understanding may be misleading. There may have been some discussion regarding students who cannot afford bus fare, but it has never been discussed by the administration or the Board. No one should have any preconceived ideas concerning it. Nothing has been done to guarantee that this group would be taken care of."
Mr. Edward J. Tschupp: "I was one of the members of the Advisory Committee that studied this entire problem during the past year. Postponing a decision now means doing the same thing all over again. The present system makes no allowance for the family with several children in school who live in a fringe area and have to pay. This was one of the things about the present system that this Committee felt was particularly bad."

"I disagree with the arbitrary decision by the administration to recommend study for another year. Another year will not drastically change the situation one way or another. All you are saying is that 'we have a poor system, but let's continue it.' I believe the Board of Education should establish an equitable system."

"When the Committee first considered the question, we felt it would be most desirable for all students to have free transportation. When we examined the costs, we found this would be an extremely expensive proposition. The only other equitable solution was for all students to pay. The basic question is to pay or not to pay. The present system of part-pay and part-free transportation is grossly inequitable."

Mr. Licker: "There is no such thing as an equitable compromise. Whether transportation should be all pay or all free seems to be a matter of opinion, depending on where one lives or whether one has children in the schools."

Mrs. Krause: "What sort of line would be drawn for pay areas for San Marcos High School? We are now supposed to have a two-mile limit around the school, but natural boundaries make it impossible to abide by the two-mile limit. My children enjoy free transportation, but students living one and one-half blocks closer to the school than we must pay. I do not agree that everyone should pay. If you do have mileage limits, I would suggest two-miles 'within reason', or 'two walking miles by existing roadways that children may walk upon in safety'."

Mr. Tschupp: "It takes about 40 minutes to walk two miles. This is rather extreme."

Mr. Licker: "The line must be drawn along some kind of fixed boundary, but it cannot be drawn in such a way as to be equitable to everyone."
Mr. Jacquemain: "It is impossible to draw a line that will satisfy everybody."

"In answer to Mr. Ischupp's statement objecting to continuing the matter for another year, it seems to me that it would be much better to wait until the Goleta Valley Junior High School is erected before making any drastic changes in our transportation set-up. The Advisory Committee has done a wonderful job in recommending a program we can work toward. All we want to do is to work gradually toward the point where the Advisory Committee recognizes we should be."

"Perhaps a special fund could be set up to take care of the people who cannot afford to pay for bus transportation."

Mrs. Nadel: "It would seem that more study is needed by administrators and principals to determine whether there are children who would be deprived of hot lunches in school cafeterias if they had to pay for transportation."

Mr. John Stasiobos: "I represent the thinking of 40 or 50 people whose children attend the Fairview School. We feel there are several reasons why free bus transportation should be provided to those who require transportation to school. Whether this fits in with the budget is a question we are not in a position to determine. I feel personally that we have established the precedent of free public education, and that it should be upheld. By introducing a bus fare of 10¢ a ride, or 20¢ a day, we would be backing away from this principle by taking the position that only people who have children in school are responsible for their education. Our tax structure recognizes that everybody benefits from education, whether or not they have children in school."

Mr. Sovine: "Isn't there discrimination now in a system which provides for some people paying for transportation, while others do not pay?"

Mr. O'Neal: "The Board's function is to set up standards, but without discrimination."

Mrs. Henderson: "The most serious criticism which has been made of the proposal to discontinue free transportation is that the children would have to walk long distances along dangerous highways. It is our responsibility to
Mrs. Henderson (continued): see that children meet with as few accidents as possible. As far as children being deprived of hot lunches is concerned, I feel that they can take their lunches to school. My children never used the cafeterias, and they are not undernourished, and never have been. I do not agree that the argument about hot lunches is a valid one."

"The situation will be simplified in another year because we will have another junior high school. For that reason I think it would be best to wait for another year."

Mr. Licker: This is not the first time the Board has considered the question of pupil transportation, nor will it be the last. The time is here, however, for the Board's decisions on the recommendations before it now. I feel the Advisory Committee's recommendations with regard to equity are basically sound. There is no equitable solution, excepting for us to go all the way one way or another—all free or all pay. On the other hand, the question of safety comes down to the location of schools. What some people are saying is that education is compulsory, and our children are forced to go to school, then give us schools within walking distance. The new junior high school will not eliminate the problem. It may lessen it, but the problem will still be there."

"Emotionally I do not feel that I would be able to vote to deny free transportation to people who live substantial distances from the nearest schools. On the other hand, we cannot build a school every mile or so. We do not have the funds to build them, or to run them economically. We have to have a minimum of 700 to 1000 students to be able to run junior high schools economically, and at least 1500 students for a high school. I agree in principle that our present set-up is not equitable, but I cannot in good conscience force people in the outlying areas to spend their personal funds in getting their children to school. I am in favor of postponing the decision for a year, even though I know we will have the same problem next year."

Mr. Tschupp: "In view of the fact that the Board members feel the way they do, I feel this way: I live in an area which is beyond the Board's criteria for free transportation; I would like to have the pay routes changed to free routes by next September."
Dr. Scharer: "A problem has been brought up by Mrs. Cardona and Mrs. Nadel. It is our recommendation that the status quo be maintained for another year, but we would like to know specifically if there are hardship cases now."

Mrs. Cardona: "There are no hardship cases that I know of at the present time."

Mr. Jacquemain: "It is not very often that the Board goes against the recommendations of an Advisory Citizens' Committee. However, if the members of this Committee had seen the letters the Board has received concerning their recommendations, they would probably concur with the recommendations of the administration."

Following further discussion involving repetition of many of the points noted above, it was moved by Mr. Jacquemain, seconded by Mrs. Henderson, and unanimously carried, to approve the recommendations of the administration concerning pupil transportation services for 1963-1964, as set forth below:

1. Continuance of free transportation of pupils in special education programs for which transportation reimbursement is provided by the State (concurrency with Committee recommendation).


3. Maintenance of pay routes only on basis of qualification that they be at least 50% self-sustaining (concurrency with Committee's recommendation).
4. Approval of Committee's recommendation that "Upon payment of fare at established stops, all students be entitled to transportation, regardless of mileage zones now prevailing", with Board limitation to student pay routes only.

5. Stipulation that further study be given during 1963-1964 school year to Committee's recommendation that all free transportation in Santa Barbara High School District be discontinued, said study to involve the attendance area to be applicable to the Goleta Valley Junior High School which will be ready for use in 1964-1965 (Committee recommended discontinuance as of 1963-1964).

6. Continuance of contractual arrangements for pupil transportation services rather than purchase, maintenance, and operation of buses by school districts (concurrence with Committee's recommendation).

7. Continuance of annual surveys on transportation needs in accordance with Committee's recommendation.

8. Approval of Committee's recommendation that transportation not be provided for students living outside established attendance area of their schools (please see #2 below).

It was also moved by Mr. Jacquemain, seconded by Mr. Sovine, and unanimously carried, that the Board approve the following additional administrative recommendations concerning pupil transportation services for 1963-1964:
1. Transportation at District expense of junior and senior high school students in areas now designated be continued for 1963-1964, with the exception of those students residing outside the attendance areas of the schools they attend, with details to be subject to Board approval of transportation routes prior to opening of school term in September, 1963.

2. The Board reaffirm the following general policy which it adopted in July, 1959:

"Transportation to and from school at any School District expense shall not be provided for students who are voluntarily attending schools outside their respective districts or areas of residence effective 9/63."

3. No pupil transportation services at School District expense be provided for students residing within the immediate proximity of the schools in their respective attendance areas. The minimum radius within which this policy is to be applied at the various educational levels will be recommended to the Board following further study.

4. Existing attendance areas for the respective junior and senior high schools be continued for 1963-1964.

Mr. O'Neal made the following statement:

"It is difficult to believe there are no hardship cases among the 4000 - 5000 students now getting to junior and senior high schools without free bus transportation, We have before us about 30 letters from parents whose children are being transported free, and who feel it would be a hardship on them if they have to pay bus fare. Nothing is being taken away from the people who do not have free transportation, and they are not bleeding because they are facing a new hardship. On the other hand, the persons who have written have been given an opportunity to see how removal of free transportation will bite into their budgets, and they think they are facing a hardship."

"I will not be here to vote on transportation next year, and I did not think it would be fair to make this statement before the vote was taken. However, I contend that, as a group of individuals in a free country, if we can't look after ourselves a little bit more than we do now, we might not have the
Mr. Murphy of the Gazette-Citizen and a number of other persons left the meeting.

Mrs. Henderson pointed out that very few footpaths were available for pedestrian traffic on Foothill Road in the vicinity of La Colina Junior High School. It was moved by Mrs. Henderson, seconded by Mr. Jacquemain, and unanimously carried, that a letter be written on behalf of the Board of Education to the State Department of Highways requesting installation of footpaths along Foothill Road as it approaches La Colina Junior High School Personnel.

Upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, it was moved by Mrs. Henderson, seconded by Mr. Löcker, and unanimously carried, to approve changes in certificated personnel assignments in accordance with details of Attachment #1 to Minutes of this date in the Santa Barbara School District.

Upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, it was moved by Mr. Sovine, seconded by Mr. Jacquemain, and unanimously carried, to approve changes in classified personnel assignments in accordance with details of Attachment #2 to Minutes of this date in the Santa Barbara School District.

The Superintendent presented a proposed salary schedule for 1963-1964 for cafeteria personnel. There was discussion, during which Mr. White reported on the number of positions in
this service and the estimated cost of the proposed salary schedule, which reflects an increase of about 4%.

It was moved by Mr. Licker, seconded by Mr. Sovine, and unanimously carried, to approve the recommended salary schedule for cafeteria personnel for 1963-1964, subject to the availability of funds.

(Please see Attachment #3 to Minutes of this date in the Santa Barbara School District)

Curriculum and Instruction

In response to questions raised by Mr. O’Neal at the Board meeting on March 21, 1963, the Superintendent reported briefly concerning the extent and handling of scholarships for students at the two senior high schools and the City College.

Dr. Scharer called attention to the functions of the Santa Barbara Scholarship Foundation in both coordinating and attracting scholarship awards for worthy high school and City College students.

There was brief discussion, during which Mr. Hardesty and Mr. Boettner, principals of Santa Barbara High School and San Marcos High School, respectively, answered questions by Board members.

The Superintendent presented proposed senior high school graduation requirements and curriculum offerings, and recommended their adoption by the Board of Education, effective 1963-1964.

Dr. Scharer reported on the procedure followed in developing these recommendations, stating that, while the
graduation requirements at the two schools have been technically different in the past several years, they have been practically the same, since students at Santa Barbara High School have been counselled into taking subjects that were required at San Marcos High School.

There was discussion, during which Mr. McLaughlin summarized details of changes included in the recommendations. Following the discussion, it was moved by Mr. Jacquemain, seconded by Mr. Licker, and unanimously carried, to approve senior high school graduation requirements and curriculum offerings, effective 1963-1964, in accordance with details of Attachment #1 to these Minutes.

School Plants and Property

Mr. Federick Noel of Noel-Henderson, Architects, presented final plans and specifications on the rehabilitation project at La Cumbre Junior High School. He also presented an analysis of budget appropriations and cost estimates for said project.

There was discussion, during which Mr. Noel outlined the scope of nine alternates proposed for inclusion in the bid form. It was then moved by Mr. Sovine, seconded by Mr. Jacquemain, and unanimously carried, to approve final plans and specifications on the rehabilitation project at La Cumbre Junior High School; and to authorize advertisement for bids thereon, with the bid opening to be Tuesday, June 18, 1968, at 2:00 P.M.
The Superintendent presented a tabulation of advertised bids received and opened May 7, 1963, on furniture and equipment for the new library at Santa Barbara High School (please see Attachment #2 to these Minutes).

Upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, and following discussion, it was moved by Mr. Licker, seconded by Mr. Sovine, and unanimously carried, to accept the low bids noted below, and to authorize the Business Office to proceed with contract documents for purchase and installation of the items indicated, the payment therefor to be from High School Bond Fund:

Austin-Bentley Company - wood furniture $6,095.00
County Stationers, Inc. - metal shelving 9,552.53

Plans and specifications for kitchen equipment in cafeteria installations at the three older secondary schools were presented for the Board's approval. Mr. Browne reported the estimated costs for said equipment to be as follows:

Santa Barbara High School $33,000
Santa Barbara Junior High School 17,000
La Cumbre Junior High School 8,000

There was discussion, following which it was moved by Mr. Jacquemain, seconded by Mr. Sovine, and unanimously carried, to approve said plans and specifications, and to authorize advertisement for bids thereon, the bid opening to be on Tuesday, June 4, 1963, at 2 P.M.

Upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, and following brief discussion, it was moved by Mr. Sovine, seconded by Mr. Jacquemain, and unanimously carried, to
approve change orders #2 and 3, as summarized below, to
the contract with Colombo Construction Company for construction
of the Cafeteria-Instrumental Music Building at Santa
Barbara High School:

Change Order #2: Lower footing at southeast
corner of Cafeteria-Instrumental
Music Building...........ADD $488.00

Change Order #3: Provide additional conduit and
two additional outlets for
food warmers.............ADD $ 89.70

Total contract to date $371,877.70

The Superintendent recommended that the Board give
consideration to retaining a landscape architect to work
with the building architects for the Goleta Valley Junior
High School. There was lengthy discussion, during which
Mr. Browne outlined the advantages to be derived from taking
this action at this time in order to coordinate site planning
and development with the construction project.

In response to questions, Mr. Browne reported that the
fee for such services would probably range between 8% and
10% of the cost for landscaping, depending upon the amount
of supervision required. Mr. Jacquemain asked Mr. Kallman
for his reaction to the recommendation. Mr. Kallman stated
that his firm, Kallman's Garden Nurseries, works with
landscape architects in this area, but that he felt the project
might be done with existing school system personnel.

On a suggestion by Mr. Sovine and Mr. Licker,
President O'Neal requested Mr. Browne to get more information,
and to report further to the Board at an early meeting.
Mr. Browne reported on details of a request by the State Division of Architecture that the Board adopt a resolution limiting the capacity of Studios #1 and 2 in the City College Cafeteria-Classroom Building to a maximum of 49 persons each. He called attention to three stipulations by the State Division which were discussed by the Board at its adjourned meeting May 9, 1963, and reported that two of them had been handled by Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall, Architects, through minor changes in planning details.

It was moved by Mrs. Henderson, seconded by Mr. Sovine, and unanimously carried, to adopt the prescribed form of resolution for this purpose, and to authorize Mr. Browne to sign said resolution on behalf of the District. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Ayes: Mr. Jacquemain, Mr. Sovine, Mrs. Henderson, Mr. Licker, Mr. O'Neal
Nays: None
Not Voting: None
Absent: None

Mr. Browne reported that, following the Board's action on May 9, 1963, escrow closed on Tuesday, May 14, 1963, on sale of the Riviera Campus to Mr. and Mrs. R. D. Lewis. He reported that proceeds from the sale had been received by the Business Office, and were being processed according to legal requirements.

Business and Finance:

As requested by the Board at its adjourned meeting on May 9, 1963, Mr. Browne presented an analysis of
anticipated Bond Fund cash needs in the High School District
during the 1963-1964 school year (please see Attachment #3
to these Minutes).

There was discussion concerning the amount of funds
needed, the schedule for selling the bonds, and other details.
It was then moved by Mr. Jacquemain, seconded by Mrs. Henderson,
and unanimously carried, to authorize the County Counsel to
prepare the necessary form of resolution requesting the
County Board of Supervisors to sell High School District
bonds in the amount of $5,868,000, and to authorize the Associate
Superintendent to execute said resolution on behalf of
the District.

Mr. Browne reviewed the action of the Board on
March 21, 1963, in referring to the County Counsel a claim
dated March 15, 1963, from Dan B. Wright, Realtor, in the
amount of $12,995. for services allegedly performed by his
firm, and, in particular, by Mr. Jon Baker, in connection
with the District's purchase of certain property on Stow Canyon
Road from the Mound Investment Company.

Mr. Browne presented an opinion dated May 9, 1963, from
Robert D. Curiel, Deputy County Counsel, which stated that
said claim for a broker's commission was not a valid claim
against the Board of Education or the Santa Barbara High
School District. Upon the recommendation of the Superintendent,
it was moved by Mr. Licker, seconded by Mr. Sovine, and
unanimously carried, that said claim be denied.

Upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, and
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following discussion, it was moved by Mr. Sovine, seconded by Mrs. Henderson, and unanimously carried, to authorize and/or ratify the purchase of supplies, equipment and services on purchase orders numbers 1847 through 2013 in conjunction with the Santa Barbara School District.

Upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, it was moved by Mr. Licker, seconded by Mr. Sovine, and unanimously carried to authorize payment of the following claims from the High School District Bond Fund and to authorize and/or ratify the payment of the following claims in conjunction with the Santa Barbara School District: General claims on warrants numbers B-6090 through B-6137, and B-6140 through B-6344 (warrants numbers B-6138 and B-6139 were approved at the adjourned Board meeting on May 9, 1963);

Serifo John Menegon, architects services on Santa Barbara Junior High School Multi-Purpose Building $4,095.48

Arendt/Mosher/Grant, architects’s services on:

Santa Barbara High School alterations 2,043.64
La Colina Junior High Auditorium- 906.68
Classroom Building

Pupil Personnel: No report

Community Relations

Upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, and following brief discussion, it was moved by Mr. Jacquemain, seconded by Mr. Licker, and unanimously carried, to grant the request of Goleta Amvets Post #55 for use of the swimming pool and tennis courts at San Marcos High School for a summer recreation program during the 12-weeks' period June 18 to September 3, 1963, said use to be according to the same
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terms and conditions as prevailed last year, with the rental to
the High School District to be $80.00 a week.

Mr. Rheinschmidt answered questions of Board members
regarding the extent of the use of the summer recreation program
by Goleta Valley Residents.

Upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, and
following brief discussion, it was moved by Mr. Licker,
seconded by Mr. Sovine, and unanimously carried, to appoint
the following persons as members of the City College Adult
Division Advisory Council for a two-year term, beginning
July 1, 1963:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wallace W. Arendt</th>
<th>Dr. Michael J. Lemus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert Brotherton</td>
<td>Mrs. Rudolph D. Lindquist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard D. Buffum</td>
<td>Mrs. Alma Beaver MacGregor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Vernon L. Cheadle</td>
<td>David Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John A. Davis</td>
<td>Donald L. McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dilot</td>
<td>Eric Maurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton C. Darick</td>
<td>Mrs. Aaron B. Nadel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Edwin H. Fairbrother</td>
<td>Mrs. Kent K. Parrot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Fillippini</td>
<td>Mrs. Catherine Peake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Edith Fotheringham</td>
<td>James M. Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lee Gray</td>
<td>Mrs. Clarence Phelps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Forrest T. Gutshall</td>
<td>Foster J. Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Eugene Harris</td>
<td>William W. Sears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Harry W. Heap</td>
<td>Elmer L. Shirrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Virgil E. Hepp</td>
<td>Mrs. Philip F. Siff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Emerson Hincliff</td>
<td>Judge C. Douglas Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Hallock Hoffman</td>
<td>Mrs. W. J. Van Spanckeren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Charles L. Jacobs</td>
<td>Mrs. Silvio C. Varni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank K. Kelly</td>
<td>Paul Veblen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jack Leiter</td>
<td>Mrs. John F. Youngblood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. O'Neal outlined details of an offer by the Roxbury
Carpet Company of New York to provide approximately 150
square yards of carpeting on a no-charge basis for
installation in a school location to be determined by
the Board.
There was lengthy discussion, during which Mr. O'Neal stated that the object of this experiment would be to determine first-hand the wearability, maintenance, and acoustical qualities of carpet installations in local schools. He also reported that the value of the gift would be approximately $1500., and that there were no commitments or obligations on the part of the Board or the District in accepting the offer. He stated that the only cost to the District would be freight and installation costs which he estimated to be approximately $175.00.

Mr. O'Neal suggested that this carpeting be installed in the central portion of the library at Santa Barbara Junior High School, and in the corridor immediately contiguous to the main entrance to the library.

Mr. Jacquemain questioned whether the carpeting could be installed in the new Library/Instructional Materials Building at Santa Barbara High School, rather than at Santa Barbara Junior High School, in order to save a portion of the cost of the flooring in this new building. Mr. O'Neal said he suggested the Santa Barbara Junior High School because of the great amount of traffic in the particular area he recommended at that school.

Mr. Trimborn of the News-Press asked whether the Company would use as promotional material information regarding the use of carpeting in a local school. Mr. O'Neal replied that such information would undoubtedly be used for this purpose if the carpeting were determined to be advantageous for school use here in Santa Barbara, but that such information was not a condition of the gift.
Mr. Licker vigorously opposed the installation of carpeting on an experimental basis in any Santa Barbara school building. He stated that it would be the worst kind of public relations he could imagine, since many people do not have rugs or carpeting in their own homes. He stated that people are paying taxes to support the schools, but they are not willing to pay for any unnecessary items, and he thought that acceptance of a gift of carpeting which many people would consider to be expensive and unnecessary, would hurt the school system and the Board of Education.

Mr. Jacquemain stated that he had previously been opposed to installation of carpeting in a classroom, but that he felt differently about installation of carpeting in a library. He stated he was inclined to accept the gift.

Mr. Henderson asked whether anyone had heard any criticisms against the Board's accepting this gift. Mr. Browne reported he had received only one comment from a man who had been consistently critical of school programs and expenditures. This man had asked "what the matter was with the Board of Education" in not accepting the gift of carpeting.

Mr. Licker stated the Board is not obligated to accept any and all gifts offered, but that it must use good judgment on each of them. He voiced his belief that the best judgment in this case would be to refuse the offer.

Following further discussion, during which strong viewpoints were expressed, it was moved by Mrs. Henderson and seconded by Mr. Jacquemain, to accept the gift of approximately 150 square yards of carpeting from the Roxbury Carpet Company.
of New York at no cost to the District, excepting for freight and installation, and to install said carpeting, if possible, in the new Library Building at Santa Barbara High School in lieu of the hard surface flooring presently specified, said installation to be on an experimental basis; and to direct that detailed records be kept on all factors regarding such use of the carpeting, including noise factors, maintenance required, cost of upkeep, wearability, etc.

Mr. Licker stated he intended to make a motion at the next Board meeting he attended that the action to accept the gift of carpeting be rescinded.

Roll call on the motion to accept the offer was as follows:

Ayes: Mrs. Henderson, Mr. Jacquemain, Mr. O'Neal
Nays: Mr. Licker, Mr. Sovine
Not Voting: None
Absent: None

Mr. O’Neal observed that a majority of the Board members had voted to accept the offer. He questioned, however, whether the carpeting should be ordered in view of Mr. Licker’s expressed intent. Mr. Licker observed that a formal offer on the part of the Carpet Company should be in the Board’s possession before any order was placed. There was a further exchange of comments.

Adjournment

There was brief discussion concerning the availability of the Board members for an adjourned meeting on Thursday, May 23,
following which the President adjourned the meeting to Wednesday, May 22, 1963, at 4 P.M.

Atttest:

Bruce D. O’Neal, President

Norman B. Scharer, Superintendent and Secretary-Clerk to Board of Education

Approved by Board of Education on ________________, 1963