



APPROVED

SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION

Agenda Item 8.1e

Meeting Date: August 6, 2015

Subject: Approve Minutes of the June 18, 2015, Board of Education Meeting

- Information Item Only
- Approval on Consent Agenda
- Conference (for discussion only)
- Conference/First Reading (Action Anticipated: _____)
- Conference/Action
- Action
- Public Hearing

Division: Superintendent's Office

Recommendation: Approve Minutes of the June 18, 2015, Board of Education Meeting.

Background/Rationale: None

Financial Considerations: None

LCAP Goal(s): Family and Community Engagement

Documents Attached:

1. Minutes of the June 18, 2015, Board of Education Regular Meeting

Estimated Time of Presentation: N/A

Submitted by: José L. Banda, Superintendent

Approved by: N/A



Putting
Children
First

Sacramento City Unified School District BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING AND WORKSHOP

Board of Education Members

Darrel Woo, President (Trustee Area 6)
Christina Pritchett, Vice President (Trustee Area 3)
Jay Hansen, Second Vice President (Trustee Area 1)
Ellen Cochrane, (Trustee Area 2)
Gustavo Arroyo, (Trustee Area 4)
Diana Rodriguez, (Trustee Area 5)
Jessie Ryan, (Trustee Area 7)
Asami Saito, Student Member

Thursday, June 18, 2015

4:30 p.m. Closed Session

6:30 p.m. Open Session

Serna Center

Community Conference Rooms

5735 47th Avenue

Sacramento, CA 95824

MINUTES

2014/15-26

1.0 OPEN SESSION / CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:36 p.m. by President Woo, and roll was taken.

Members Present:

Second Vice President Jay Hansen

Vice President Christina Pritchett

President Darrel Woo

Diana Rodriguez

Ellen Cochrane

Jessie Ryan

Members Absent:

Gustavo Arroyo (arrived at 4:45 p.m.)

A quorum was reached.

2.0 ANNOUNCEMENT AND PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED IN CLOSED SESSION

No Public Comment was requested on Closed Session items, and the Board retired to Closed Session.

3.0 CLOSED SESSION

While the Brown Act creates broad public access rights to the meetings of the Board of Education, it also recognizes the legitimate need to conduct some of its meetings outside of the public eye. Closed session meetings are specifically defined and limited in scope. They primarily involve personnel issues, pending litigation, labor negotiations, and real property matters.

3.1 Government Code 54956.9 - Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation:

a) Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (d)(2) of Government Code

section 54956.9

- b) Initiation of litigation pursuant to subdivision (d)(4) of Government Code section 54956.9*
- 3.2 Government Code 54957.6 (a) and (b) Negotiations/Collective Bargaining CSA, SCTA, SEIU, Teamsters, UPE, Unrepresented Management*
- 3.3 Government Code 54957 – Public Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release/Reassignment*
- 3.4 Education Code 35146 – The Board will hear staff recommendations on the following expulsions:
 - a) Expulsion #13, 2014/2015*
 - b) Expulsion #14, 2014/2015*
 - c) Expulsion #15, 2014/2015**
- 3.5 Government Code 54957 - Public Employee Performance Evaluation:
 - a) Superintendent**
- 3.6 Government Code 54957 – Public Employee Appointment
 - a) Chief Strategy Officer*
 - b) Principal, Ethel I. Baker Elementary School*
 - c) Principal, John F. Kennedy High School**

4.0 CALL BACK TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called back to order at 7:32 p.m. by President Woo.

Members Present:

*President Darrel Woo
Vice President Christina Pritchett
Second Vice President Jay Hansen
Gustavo Arroyo
Ellen Cochrane
Diana Rodriguez
Jessie Ryan
Student Member Asami Saito*

Members Absent:

None

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Kaitlin Renehan. Kaitlin will be a Junior at C. K. McClatchy High School in the Fall. A Certificate of Appreciation was presented by Second Vice President Jay Hansen

5.0 ANNOUNCEMENT OF ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION

Counsel Jerry Behrens announced that by a vote of four to three, the Board adopted a Personnel Resolution No. 2014/15-E. Vice President Pritchett, Second Vice President Hansen, Member Arroyo, and Member Ryan voted in favor. President Woo, Member Cochrane, and Member Rodriguez voted no. Mr. Behrens then deferred to the Superintendent regarding appointments. Superintendent Banda

reported that, by a vote of six to one, approved the appointment of Dr. Richard Al Rogers as Chief Strategy Officer. He also announced that the Board approved, by unanimous vote, the appointment of Amber Carter as Principal of Ethel I. Baker Elementary School and the appointment of David Van Natten as Principal of John F. Kennedy High School.

6.0 AGENDA ADOPTION

President Woo asked for a motion to adopt the agenda. A motion was made to approve by Vice President Pritchett and seconded by Second Vice President Hansen. The Board voted unanimously to adopt the agenda.

7.0 SPECIAL PRESENTATION

7.1 Acknowledgement and Recognition of Outgoing Student Board Member Asami Saito (Darrel Woo)

President Woo said that over the years we have had some very stellar students who have served as Student Board Members, but the Student Board Member that we are recognizing this evening, Asami Saito is truly outstanding. She is the most junior of any of the Student Board members of which President Woo has had the pleasure of serving. All others have been Seniors, and she is a Junior. She has shown the highest leadership qualities and skills with her colleagues at the schools. She led, through the Student Advisory Council, the first resolution to this District that really changed the future of education. He was very proud to sign the resolution bringing Ethnic Studies as a graduation requirement in the future to our schools. This shows real thinking, real leadership, and the ability to work with others to get things done. She will still be in our District next year as a Senior, and President Woo said he is extremely proud to recognize Asami Saito and thank her for her service as the outgoing Student Board Member.

President Woo presented Student Member Saito with a Certificate of Appreciation.

Public Comment:

Terrence Gladney thanked Student Member Saito. During the last year of his term as Sacramento Council of PTAs President, she raised the narrative for them to engage students. She reminded them that students can make a tremendous impact. He has seen more students come to the podium at Board meetings during her time than at any other time.

Board Member Comments:

Second Vice President Hansen thanked Student Member Saito for joining the Board this past year. He is counting on her to help train the incoming student Board member because he has relied on her for advice and hope the new person can do so as well. He looks forward to seeing her as a Senior next year at West Campus.

Member Arroyo commented that it has been a delight and an honor to have Student Member Saito on the Board. He thinks her student voice is one of the most exemplary we have had on the Board. She has really brought the perspective of the students to the Board, and he is proud to say that when she spoke, the rest of the Board was listening. We need more people like her. He said to please mentor the new person next year. He sees that the future of the District and the State is in good hands, and he hopes after college she will come back and become a fully elected Board member, bringing leadership and talent back to Sacramento.

Vice President Pritchett said congratulations on a job well done. She said Student Member Saito has

blossomed over the course of the past year and left big shoes to fill for the next person. She is excited to see what her future holds, and hopes she will come back to visit. Vice President Pritchett then presented Student Member Saito with a marble apple and a gift from the Board.

Member Ryan said it has been wonderful to watch Student Member Saito find her voice over the last six months and see her growth in her role as a student Board member. She noted the importance of her leading the Ethnic Studies initiative work and doing it in a manner that was sophisticated, politically astute, and, most importantly, student led. She is very proud of her accomplishment. She also noted that Student Member Saito's mother was also a student Board member when in high school. She knows that her mother is very proud. Member Ryan also noted that Student Member Saito has made it a commitment to attend every Board meeting, no matter what else was going on in her life.

Member Cochrane thanked Student Member Saito. As a new Board member, Student Member Saito helped out and welcomed her and Member Ryan. The work she did on Ethnic Studies may be seminal in the Country. She noted how Student Member Saito did effect change and that it will go forward.

Member Rodriguez said that one of her most cherished memories of student Board members is when they come back. Therefore the Board has the gift of time with her for another year. Member Rodriguez looks forward to her coming back with more advocacy on behalf of students.

Superintendent Banda thanked Student Member Saito and said she has been a great contribution to the Board. Her leadership is exemplary, not just by being there at every Board meeting, but at other functions in the community as well. He noted the passion that she brings to her work. She has been a great leader in the Student Advisory Council where a lot of planning was done behind Ethnic Studies.

President Woo announced that the new Student Board Member for 2015-16 is Elizabeth Barry of West Campus High School. She is in the Twelfth grade and is not present tonight as she is in Ghana, Africa for a month.

Student Member Saito thanked everyone for their comments. She also thanked her high school, West Campus, her friends, her mother for her support, her fellow Student Advisory Council members, Mark Carnero of Youth Development, and the members of Ethnic Studies Now Coalition. She spoke about what she has learned during her time on the Board and the new perspectives she gained. She thanked the Sacramento City Unified School District, the Board of Education, and the community.

7.2 A. Warren McClaskey Adult Center Students' Project Green Presentation (Cathy Allen)

Chief of Operations Cathy Allen introduced Rachel King, Project Green Specialist. Ms. King spoke about her background and introduced the students. She reported that the District has received a Green Ribbon Schools Award, Bronze level, and, at the beginning of this month, she also presented A. Warren McClaskey with an award for Project Green. They have been selected to receive funding this year for their project. Students Princess, Mark, Christopher, and Charles presented and explained to the Board their recycling program and showed a related video. Staff members Susan Gilmore, Kathy Harris, Cathy Ramirez, and Christopher Johnson were also present. Ms. Allen thanked the team for bringing their presentation and sharing it with the Board.

*Public Comment:
None.*

Board Member Comments:

Member Cochrane said that she recently visited the site and had a tour. She noted that the facility is a hive of activity for recycling. The neighborhood can use this recycling program as well. She congratulated the team and their hard work. She is very proud that they are in her Trustee Area.

Superintendent Banda also thanked the students and staff. He was present when they presented at Camellia Basic and to see them accept their award. He congratulated the team.

7.3 *Deloitte Recognition of Impact Day at Caroline Wenzel Elementary School (Darrel Woo and Erminja Maganja)*

President Woo reported that on June 5th he welcomed 90 Deloitte professionals to Caroline Wenzel Elementary School where they spent the day volunteering. Deloitte, an international business firm, has made an annual commitment to service its local communities where member firms around the world hold Impact Day activities. Caroline Wenzel Elementary School and the community benefited from this great day of service. Deloitte helped to build gardens, clear pathways, and paint two inspirational murals. A slide show of the activities on June 5th was shown. Ms. Maganja and the Director of State Government at Deloitte were presented with a Certificate of Appreciation. Principal Yang was also present; he and Ms. Maganja spoke.

Public Comment:

None.

Board Member Comments:

None.

8.0 PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public may address the Board on non-agenda items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board. Please fill out a yellow card available at the entrance. Speakers may be called in the order that requests are received, or grouped by subject area. We ask that comments are limited to two (2) minutes with no more than 15 minutes per single topic so that as many people as possible may be heard. By law, the Board is allowed to take action only on items on the agenda. The Board may, at its discretion, refer a matter to district staff or calendar the issue for future discussion.

Darlene Anderson reported that, while helping a student, she found that John F. Kennedy High School's Single Plan for Student Achievement was not complete. Other Plans she downloaded from the website were also not complete. She is trying to understand how after school, extended day, or summer school program services are coming into the community. She is concerned that there is not enough data included for the public to view that shows the work is being done. She is concerned that there is little oversight. She said she knows there are resources in the community, but often parents do not know how to connect with those resources.

Claude Joseph spoke about school buses that the District has donated to children in Haiti. He thanked the District and Board, and especially Gabe Ross and Cathy Allen.

Nikki Milevsky reported that this morning she joined Superintendent Banda, Jay Hansen, Ellen Cochrane, and City Councilmember Steve Hansen regarding the re-opening of Washington Elementary School. SCTA have been strong advocates of this re-opening and believe it will be viewed as a first significant step in reversing the trend of declining enrollment in the District. They look forward to working with the District to make Washington Elementary School a destination school as part of an

overall plan to make the Sacramento Unified School District a destination school district. They believe it is possible, due to the May Revise, for the District to move faster in reducing class sizes to the 2008 staffing levels, and they have made a proposal to the District to do that.

Tim Tautz referred to a recent Sacramento Bee article about the re-opening of Washington Elementary School. He has two children at David Lubin Elementary School and is concerned that the plan is to open Washington Elementary School as a STEAM school. David Lubin Elementary has been working toward opening as a STEAM school as well. He noted that the schools are in close proximity and is wondering if the schools will be in competition with each other. He would like assurance from the Board that the District will still support David Lubin Elementary School's attempts at becoming an accredited STEAM school.

Jennifer Aten, a parent of two children at David Lubin Elementary School, also has concerns about the proximity of their school to Washington Elementary School, considering the program planned at Washington Elementary School. She noted all of the positive things going on currently at David Lubin Elementary School and that the award winning Robotics Team recently presented to the Board as Stellar Students.

Jessica McLaughlin, one of the Robotics coaches at David Lubin Elementary School, also addressed the STEAM issue.

Christina Reyes, has two children at David Lubin Elementary School, and also is concerned about the STEAM issue. She spoke about the great parent involvement at the school.

Christina Stevenson, a parent at David Lubin Elementary School, also is concerned about the recent plans for Washington Elementary. Also, she would like to see class sizes reduced at all schools.

Libby Augusta, a parent from David Lubin Elementary School, is also concerned that a STEAM program is also being planned for Washington Elementary School.

Leslie Oberst, a parent at David Lubin Elementary School, spoke of the community at the school and the STEAM program. She would like the Board's support in having David Lubin Elementary School become a STEAM school.

Mary Odbert, a parent at David Lubin Elementary School expressed her surprise that Washington Elementary School may be re-opened as a STEAM school. It is her understanding that the District has provided little support in the process so far, and is surprised that Washington Elementary School will be re-opened when two years ago it was closed due to lack of enrollment. She asked that the Board support David Lubin Elementary School's quest to become a STEAM school.

Maria Medina, a parent at Edward Kemble Elementary School, has concerns that the grass area has grown too big and is dry. Maintenance did come out to cut it. She brought before and after photographs of the area. However, it was not cleaned up properly as shown in the after photographs. She asked what she can do to get the help to have the area cleaned up properly. President Woo assured her that she has been heard, and it will be taken care of.

Board Member Comments:

Member Cochrane said that she supports 100% the re-opening of elementary schools and is rooting very strongly for the re-opening of Washington Elementary School. However, she would like the parents and community of David Lubin Elementary School to be noted. They have been working to become a STEAM school quietly and unrecognized for more than a year. She supports their work 100%. David Lubin Elementary School has lost a lot of students to Phoebe Hearst Elementary School; they have struggled with their GATE identity and creating equity on the campus. They have come through a lot, and STEAM is going to give them the opportunity to go further. She would like to receive the list of accomplishments and things they have done toward becoming a STEAM school as mentioned by one of the speakers. She urged them to put it to the attention of Superintendent Banda and Area Superintendent Mary Hardin Young. While it is her hope that Washington Elementary School does open, it will not be at the detriment of another nearby school. Member Cochrane also noted that there

is nothing concrete about Washington Elementary School right now except a desire to have it open. There is no direct funding for a STEAM program at that school. Nine teachers at David Lubin Elementary are in special project training right now for new Science standards. More teachers wanted to go, but there was no room. This is their vacation time, and the District is not funding their training; it is something that they have chosen to do themselves. The School Site Council has identified technology instruction as a school-wide goal. They have written grants and proposals to support STEAM instruction. They have a math vision that unifies all math instruction at the school. Four to six teachers of grades four to six specialize in Math and Science. There is a teacher that is getting a Master's degree in STEAM, and she will be able to provide education and training for others. Member Cochrane also spoke about the Robotics Team and their recent presentation. She is in contact with Principal Dixon and will continue working with the District. She assured the speakers present that she will work with them, and they will have the STEAM program.

Member Rodriguez thanked parent Maria Medina from Edward Kemble Elementary School for bringing the issue of the campus not being kept up and assured her that she will follow up with staff to make sure it is done. She then spoke about David Lubin Elementary School and school closures. She supports re-opening schools, but also supports processes and equity.

Second Vice President Hansen thanked the David Lubin Elementary School students and families for the support and enthusiasm for the programs that are happening at their school. He hopes that if we move forward with Washington Elementary School that they will be a role model and help Washington Elementary School be successful as well. He spoke about declining enrollment in the District. Some of it is due to demographics, but our challenge is to have great academic programs. David Lubin Elementary School has traditionally been one of the highest scoring schools in the District and currently has over 600 students. He noted that 100,000 workers come into the central city of Sacramento every day which translates into a lot of families with students. If they can bring their children to our schools, that is an opportunity to increase the number of students at our schools. We should be endeavoring to raise enrollment at all of our schools and making them better. Competition against other schools in other parts of the greater Sacramento area is how we are going to keep our enrollment high. He encourages all of us to grow together to raise our economic standards and programming at all of our schools.

Member Ryan addressed her comments to the family and educators that come out tonight from David Lubin Elementary School. She feels they raised several very good points, one of them being the need for us to better support programs like the STEAM program at David Lubin Elementary School. We should use it as a way to attract families back to our neighborhood schools. She has heard great things from families about the school. She appreciates their passion and commitment and wants to be a support for them as they work to realize the vision of STEAM.

9.0 CONSENT AGENDA

Generally routine items are approved by one motion without discussion. The Superintendent or a Board member may request an item be pulled from the consent agenda and voted upon separately.

9.1 Items Subject or Not Subject to Closed Session:

9.1a Approve Grants, Entitlements and Other Income Agreements, Ratification of Other Agreements, Approval of Bid Awards, Change Notices and Notices of Completion (Gerardo Castillo, CPA)

9.1b Approve Personnel Transactions (Cancy McArn)

- 9.1c *Approve Business and Financial Report: Warrants and Checks Issued for the period of May 2015 (Gerardo Castillo, CPA)*
- 9.1d *Approve Appointment of Board Member Ellen Cochran to CSBA Delegate Assembly (José L. Banda)*
- 9.1e *Approve Operational MOU, Special Education MOU, and Facilities Use Agreements for Capitol Collegiate Academy and Yav Pem Suab Academy (Sue Lee)*
- 9.1f *Approve Staff Recommendations for Expulsion #13, #14, and #15, 2014/2015 (Lisa Allen and Stephan Brown)*
- 9.1g *Approve Resolution No. 2847: Resolution Regarding Board Stipends (Darrel Woo)*
- 9.1h *Approve New Board Policy No. 5147.27: Food Allergies (Barbara Kronick and Raoul Bozio)*
- 9.1i *Approve Revision to Board Policy No. 3260: Fees and Charges (Raoul Bozio)*
- 9.1j *Approve Revision to Board Policy No. 5125: Student Records (Raoul Bozio)*
- 9.1k *Approve Amended Minutes of the February 19, 2015, Board of Education Meeting (José L. Banda)*
- 9.1l *Approve Minutes of the May 21, 2015, Board of Education Meeting (José L. Banda)*
- 9.1m *Approval of Theodore Judah Expansion (Cathy Allen and Mary Hardin Young)*

Items 9.1a and 9.1m were pulled to be voted on separately at the request of Member Rodriguez.

President Woo asked for a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda with Items 9.1a and 9.1m pulled. A motion was made to approve by Vice President Pritchett and seconded by Second Vice President Hansen. The Board voted unanimously to adopt the agenda.

Public Comment:

Rob Ferrera, a parent of students at Theodore Judah Elementary School and President of Theodore Judah Elementary School PTA, said that the PTA supports the construction of a new building as a long term investment in the school. With new facilities, the school has the capacity for the estimated 75 students that McKinley Village would add to the elementary school population. The PTA Board supports the students attending Theodore Judah Elementary School. This development is part of the East Sacramento neighborhood, so it stands to reason that the kids from this new neighborhood should attend the school that is within biking and walking distance to keep traffic down and to feel as part of the community. If McKinley Village students were designated for Caleb Greenwood Elementary School, they would have to travel 2.2 miles. This project also supports the vision of the school's Project Green initiative. Four years ago a group of students developed a plan that included an energy efficient building. They feel that using the Project Green funds would be very appropriate in helping to make this project cost neutral.

Ron Vrilakas, an architect, spoke on the Theodore Judah Elementary School building. His wife is a teacher there, and his daughter is a student there. He is therefore familiar with the facility through direct contact over the past five or six years. He feels this is an opportunity to showcase how a facility can be added to, modified, and changed. He is grateful to be representing the District.

Board Member Comments:

Member Cochrane noted that this is a very important project. She asked Cathy Allen and Mary Hardin Young to answer questions. She asked why we should build at Theodore Judah Elementary School when it is one of the most privileged schools by virtue of the area which it is in. She also noted there is a web of funding that has gone into the planning for this project, and asked Ms. Allen to explain the funding. Ms. Allen referred to a graph that the Board received. She said that they have been working with Mr. Vrilakas and representatives from Hilbers, Inc. They have been helping to price this project as we move forward. We went through several re-designs, but ultimately ended up with a building that will give a net six classrooms after we demolish three existing ones. So it will be a nine classroom building with restrooms. The estimated hard and soft building costs are \$4.9 million. Some other costs to allocate for are any of the expenditures done to date, requirements we do not know about yet in terms of impacts we have to mitigate, furniture and equipment, and the Project Green area of the campus will be folded into the project as well. She referred to the graph which shows \$3.37 million from Measure Q. The developer fees from McKinley Village are roughly \$1.3 million. Encore McKinley Developers actually are donating \$175,000 to the project and the community has agreed to raise funds. Including the other estimated project costs the total will be about \$5.5 million dollars for the project. Any shortfall would come out of Measure Q. Member Cochrane asked Ms. Hardin Young to speak about community engagement at this point. She replied that the project conversation started in the Spring of 2012, but over the past year there have been four large community meetings which included canvassing the neighborhood. Community outreach included e-mails and other avenues from March of 2014 to earlier this month. After the first large community meeting, it was evident they wanted a smaller group that would meet and guide the process. Therefore a small working group, including Ron Vrilakas, was formed. It was open to everyone, and attendance varied. The group included neighbors, parents, and staff members. They helped design the larger public meetings and the communications to the community. They gave District staff feedback on things that were coming forward. The small working group met 10 to 11 times within the past year. Member Cochrane gave a few additional facts. She said that the building is not going to be built all the way out initially. There will be the possibility to add additional classrooms to the structure. So often in the District we use modulars and portables, but this is an opportunity to have a "stick-built" building by one of the premier architects in Sacramento who is regionally known. Community members have promised to earn \$55,000. This is in addition to the \$175,000 being donated by the developer. She feels this is an opportunity that cannot be missed. It will be the realization of children who did the initial design and gave the initial ideas for the building. Theodore Judah Elementary is known as a Green School, and this will be a Green Building. She urged her fellow Board members to support the project.

Member Ryan thanked Mr. Vrilakas for all of his efforts as well as Board Member Cochrane and District staff. She noted that the conversation started with talking about spending more than \$3 million dollars to relocate portables, which are not long-term. She feels this is a great example of someone stepping forward, having a vision, and saying it does not make sense to spend multi-millions of dollars on relocating portables when with some vision, partnership, and planning actually have permanent structures. This is also a community that is very active and engaged. One of her challenges to the stakeholders that have been involved in this process is to help us determine a process for developing a master plan so that some of our other communities, particularly poorer communities, can roll out these types of projects as well.

Member Rodriguez referred to Ms. Allen's earlier statement that the developer fee money is to follow the students and asked what that means in terms of the potential re-opening of Washington Elementary School. Ms. Allen answered that the resolution passed by the Board did not solely limit the funds to Theodore Judah Elementary School. It just said the funds would follow the students, and the school sites were listed. At the time, Washington was not listed as it had already closed. She said that does not mean seven through twelve developer fees that come through on McKinley Village and other developments that are in that area

could not be spent on needed work elsewhere. She was hesitant to have the resolution go forward because we do not typically tie hands on developer fees, but it was one way to work collaboratively to be able to fund the project. She does not know where the funds will go. Member Rodriguez said that makes her uncomfortable. She would rather see us hold and wait to see what happens with the re-opening of the other school site before we go forward with any planning.

President Woo said that was discussion on Item No. 9.1m. There were no speakers on Item No. 9.1a. Member Rodriguez said that she merely wanted to pull it so that she could vote on the other Consent Agenda Items.

President Woo asked for a motion to approve Item 9.1a. Vice President Pritchett made the motion and Second Vice President Hansen seconded. The motion passed 6-1 with Member Rodriguez voting no.

President Woo then asked for a motion to approve Item 9.1m. Member Cochran made a motion to approve and Second Vice President Hansen seconded. The motion passed 6-1 with Member Rodriguez voting no.

10.0 BOARD WORKSHOP/STRATEGIC PLAN AND OTHER INITIATIVES

10.1 Approve Continuous Improvement of Special Education Services: 2015-2016 Annual Service Plan and Annual Budget Plan (Dr. Olivine Roberts and Becky Bryant) **Action**

Becky Bryant presented on this Item that was brought back due to the request of the Board. She gave a brief recap of the presentation given at the June 4th Board meeting and more specificity to the items requested. She went over the five SELPA goals. Actions to assist staff in meeting the goals were included per Board request. She noted there was an oversight during the last presentation regarding the alignment of SELPA goals to LCAP Goal 2, clean, safe, healthy, physically and emotionally safe environment. SELPA Goals 2 and 3 both align to LCAP Goal 2. She reported on service delivery models and reported that they have finalized the placements of the new Special Day Classes (SDC). She went over the 2015-2016 Annual Service and Budget Plan, noting that expected expenditures match projected revenue.

Public Comment:

Darlene Anderson said that she thought we would get some information back about the disproportionality of African American students being placed in Special Education. But mostly she is concerned about the program description of the SDC classes. She feels the SDC children should be on the same pathway as general education students. However when students are in SDC and have gotten two to three grade levels behind, they are not in the same general education text books and do not have the same goals. Their Individual Education Programs (IEPs) are also not complete. She is concerned that the District is hiding children that are below grade average. She would like to hold the Board accountable, and she has filed a complaint for a couple of children, but she said she is thinking she needs to file a Federal complaint because the District is not providing the same level of services to the children in SDC as they are providing to kids in regular education.

Angie Sutherland, a parent at Hollywood Park Elementary School and the Chair of the Community Advisory Committee, spoke as a parent. She was happy to see some strategies are now listed with the five goals. She commented on each of the goals and strategies, talked about the measures of effectiveness, and early intervention.

Grace Trujillo said that she agrees with everything said by Ms. Sutherland. She spoke about early intervention and feels that this is the key to being successful. She shared her personal experience with her son who is Special Education.

Board Member Comments:

Member Ryan discussed a data request sent in May that was discussed at the last Board meeting. She asked Ms.

Bryant how many staff in the District office are deployed to be responsive to families and to oversee the management of this work. Ms. Bryant answered that there are three management staff, and there will be four. There are three Supervisors that assist Ms. Bryant. In addition, there are ten program specialists who are the direct liaison to the school sites and families. Member Ryan asked to what we attribute the increase in Special Education in the District. She wanted to know if there had been analysis done to look at the disproportionality of Special Education student referrals and if there were any thoughts as to why the numbers have grown so substantially. Ms. Bryant answered that when there is not a clear system of pre-intervention support across the organization, often schools look to Special Education. There has been a very legitimate increase in some categories of disabilities over the years such as autism. In the past five to seven years we have probably tripled our enrollment of students. Many more students are receiving diagnosis very early in life, so we have many more preschoolers than we have previously. Due to advances in medical science, many students who previously would not have survived come to us with very significant needs. We are also a very large, centralized, urban school district where multiple families live together, and there are multiple children in families that have disabilities. Member Ryan asked if anyone in the department has ever done an analysis over the referrals themselves and how they are being generated, and has there been an analysis done of the percentage of teachers compared to the percentage of referrals they are generating. In other words, she has seen in other districts where 20 percent of teachers are generating 90 percent of the referrals. Ms. Bryant said that we have not found that. We do keep yearly data on our referral rates at each school. We also keep data on the number of preschoolers coming in through those schools, as well as parent requests. We keep this data on an annual basis. We do not keep data by teacher; it is per school site. Member Ryan asked if there is reason that it is unfeasible. Ms. Bryant answered that we do many assessments during the year, and we have many transfers in and out, so although we have 6,700 students currently, we probably begin assessments on several hundred more than that. So we have not kept data in that way, but it is something we could look into. Ms. Ryan said she would be very interested to see that data. She also asked if there has been any strategy, intervention, or successful models looked at regarding closing the disproportional impact and achievement gap for African American students in Special Education. Ms. Bryant answered that when we were disproportionate previously, we did do some of that work. We exited disproportionality within a year, so perhaps our focus drifted to another place. Many of our neighboring districts are in the same situation we are in terms of disproportionality in some fashion. When we have looked at the data currently, for this disproportionality, it appears to be because we have lost a lot of general education students who are African American. Member Ryan said even though we have lost a lot of general education students who are African American, recognizing that this is still a huge challenge for the District, she would hope we would elevate it to a high priority as we are trying to evaluate how we serve this population moving forward. As we do the LCFF and LCAP work, we cannot overlook the need to focus on intervention and strategies for this group. Member Ryan also pointed out, regarding the parent education and communication piece of this and how parents feel unsettled in not knowing what school site their child will attend until often late into the summer prior to the school year, that this is something we have to be able to address. She knows it is difficult to do projections on the number of students that we are going to serve, but she would like to see a more cohesive form of communicating with our families. She suggested a better utilization of resources, such as our phone messaging services to make sure families understand the routes they have ahead of them and what their options are. She feels that this is a segment of the community that has a high need, yet does not feel that, even with the best efforts of an under-resourced staff, they understand where to go.

Member Rodriguez addressed a couple of points that Ms. Sutherland brought up. She said we have been doing inclusive practices for five year now and asked what types of data has been collected, and what is it telling us about inclusive practices? Ms. Bryant replied that most of the data we have collected is more affective data regarding how the students have done socially. Behaviors have improved, and they feel more included in their school community. Parents report that their children are happier going to school with other students that are in general education. We had some survey data last year where we surveyed the students to ask them how they felt about having two teachers. They responded that it felt normal to them. In terms of achievement data, she has analyzed some work from various settings and sites over the years and found that the improvement in writing and the level of the rigor in the co-teaching settings is sometimes higher than some of our Special Day Classes. Member Rodriguez asked Ms. Bryant if she felt inclusive practices should be expanded upon. Ms. Bryant said yes, she would like to see inclusive practices expanded. Member Rodriguez then asked if we have more lawsuits based on IEPs or 504s. Ms. Bryant said she does not directly deal with the 504s, so she is not aware of the statistics of litigation around 504, but she is quite versed in the litigation around Special Education however. She would say that litigation around Special Education occurs at a higher rate. Member Rodriguez asked what types of remedies we have in place to avoid those types of occurrences. Ms. Bryant said that we spend a lot more time on IEPs because the key is in the development and implementation of the IEP. Management staff is often at

IEPs so that decisions can be right there and documentation can be provided. In past years that often was not the case. We have also worked hard to improve relations with parents, but she does not think we will ever see a day where we do not have disputes. It concerns Member Rodriguez when children have to change school sites. She knows some schools are more fit and have a better support system for Special Education needs and some just do not have it. She asked how we are going about providing that type of equity throughout our District. Ms. Bryant said that this year when we needed to open new classrooms for next year, it was very much a focus for us to put those classes so that we have a range of options at school sites and begin to develop continuum of primary and intermediate options of same kinds of classes on school sites. We were able to do that at the elementary segment. We also looked at adding programs at the secondary level in different areas of town so that there would be more of a continuum of service. If you were in an East area school for middle school that you would continue at an East area high school for the particular kind of SDC class that you had. Member Rodriguez requested that the data on inclusive practices be shared with the Board. Ms. Bryant said that we have surveys from last year, but have not analyzed the surveys from last year yet. They will be done before June 30, and so she will provide the information in July.

President Woo entertained a motion to approve. A motion was made by Vice President Pritchett and seconded by Second Vice President Hansen. The motion passed unanimously.

10.2 Approve 2015-2016 Local Control and Accountability Plan (Gabe Ross)

Action

Chief Communications Officer Gabe Ross presented the 2015-2016 Local Control and Accountability Plan along with Coordinator of LCAP and SPSA Cathy Morrison. Ms. Morrison spoke about the final LCAP composition, engagement summary, updates to the plan since the public hearing (which included a technical review from the County Office of Education), and next steps. Mr. Ross made some final comments before taking questions.

Public Comment:

Darlene Anderson said that some time back she filed a complaint with the State of California regarding the achievement for African American students. She asked what has the State of California held accountable for the achievement of African American students. The State referred it to the District and the District said we have Title I and the LCAP. She is concerned, however, that Title I and the LCAP do not follow African American achievement.

Sue Vang, of Hmong Innovating Politics, stated that the LCAP has very much improved from the draft, however she urged the Board not to support the LCAP without increasing instructional services to English learners. She noted that English learners are significantly behind the rest of the student population and graduation rates are eight percent lower. She discussed how the District has also not met Federal targets and other statistics illustrating the strong need to provide more academic services to English learners.

Liz Guillen, of Public Advocates, agrees with Ms. Vang's comments. She highlighted the letter that Public Advocates and the ACLU sent to every Superintendent in the State. She forwarded it to the Board via e-mail and also brought printed copies tonight. The letter highlights some of the minimum requirements of the LCAP process that they thought needed focus based on what they saw in the first year and through the second year. She said that the District has done a lot of it, especially in comparison to other districts. She pointed out that it is not clear what need of the targeted students we are trying to address. She said the regulations require us to identify what need of unduplicated students we are addressing and how those services or expenditure meets that need. She looked at Linked Learning as an example. She said we are spending supplemental and concentration dollars for the program but are providing it to all students. It is not clear what need of English learners, low income students, and foster youth we are addressing. And not just the need, but what goal have we set for those students that this program will help them address. She said also it should not come as a Consent item.

Board Member Comments:

Member Arroyo said this year, because of timing, we were running a process concurrently with the development of our internal budget. Ideally, we want this process to wrap up by December or January because this is when the District staff is working on budget. If our internal budget reflects those priorities, the LCAP work should come earlier. Mr. Ross addressed the concern by saying that we struggle with this timing issue; the LCAP needs to inform the budget, but the budget needs to inform the LCAP. They almost have to be operating concurrently. One thing experienced through the engagement process is that it is a lot harder to engage with people in the

theoretical. There is always a lot of interest in wanting to see the numbers; what are the dollars and expenditures? So to have really robust conversations before we have any sense of a State budget in January is really challenging. However Mr. Ross concurred that we should start earlier. One thing he is sure the new Chief Strategy Officer will be looking at is how do we start in the Fall, having a bigger conversation around goals, the annual update, and pieces that we can do without the budget component. By laying that ground work in the Fall and early Winter we will be in a good position when we get information from the State around the budget and resources to align those dollars to our goals. We can then have a conversation with the community about what that looks like in the second half of the year. He does not think we can look at it quite so linearly, as the LCAP comes first and then the budget. It is a constant cycle throughout the process, making sure that the two pieces reflect each other. By law the LCAP and budget have to be adopted together. Member Arroyo asked to what degree our current budget as adopted would be any different had we not had to do an LCAP. A lot of the budgets approved are formulaic; they are based on expenditures, trends, and demands that are expected for the following year. So in many ways, staff and the Superintendent consider what is coming up and what is approved is an adoption of a previous year's budget adapted for the next year. He is not convinced, therefore, that this year's budget would have been very different had there been no demand for an LCAP. So, to what degree is the LCAP really influencing the budget? His guess is that if the input comes earlier then we know what priorities need to be kept in mind and give direction to the staff. This is part of the work that will need to be done between August/September through May of next year. So perhaps use the Spring to consolidate who the team is so that we do not have to wait until September, for school to start, and then select a team. Member Arroyo asked if we could select an LCAP committee around this time next year, in the Spring, that will start in earnest in the Fall. He would rather see a lot of input earlier in order to see it reflected in the budget that staff puts together. This would allow time for priorities to be reflected. For example, he agrees with the comments made by Ms. Vang regarding English learners, but at this point we will not re-open the budget. He said the Spring could be used to have hearings and presentations about what would be a more robust program, seeing what resources are available, and what we can change to really address some of the concerns. Mr. Ross said that these are good points. The timing and sequencing are pieces that are still being worked out. We know for certain we will be starting far earlier next time. As far as alignment with the budget, there are always going to be things that are out of our control. This year was a bit of an anomaly in that we had the May Revise come out with an extraordinary amount of new resources. Mr. Ross spoke about leading the school site councils to have conversations around single plan as a year-round conversation. The conversation should be on-going about priorities and resources. Mr. Ross feels we need to eventually get to where it is not about the beginning and end of a process, but really is an on-going process. The LCAP is a three year plan that we update every year; we do not have to start with a blank slate every year, but there is an opportunity every year to revisit and have conversations early. He understands Member Arroyo's point, agrees, and feels we will get there. Member Arroyo said that he does not bring this up as a criticism but as part of the learning process. In terms of working on the LCAP in the Fall, the group could be using the previous year's budget the same way staff uses the budget to make projections. There could be adjustments, but it would not inhibit a robust conversation amongst members of the LCAP given that there is a previous year's budget that they can work on, review priorities, and then as the Governor's proposal gets submitted adjustments could be made later on.

Member Rodriguez likes the summary that was provided. She appreciates the efforts mentioned about getting the English learner committees more aligned. She understands it is time to approve the LCAP, however she finds the comments from Ms. Vang extremely valid and feels there needs to be a commitment from the Board level about making the placement of English language learners a priority. We need to build on the asset of having a bi-lingual culture in the District. She asked if some of these comments and desires can be implemented when the LCAP comes back from the Sacramento County Office of Education. Mr. Ross asked if Member Rodriguez means changing the budget allocations. She noted that there will be a revision on the budget, and she would like to place a priority on English language learners. Mr. Ross noted that the LCAP is snapshot of the work that is happening in the District, it is the goals and the metrics that drive our work, but it is not inclusive of all the work that is happening with our English language students and in the English language department. He suggests that when Dr. Roberts is back, she can provide the Board and community with some information to get a more holistic sense as to what the needs are and the work that is currently going on so that we can really approach it strategically. As far as the timing, that is at the Board's discretion with budget allocations. If the Board desires to allocate more money into supporting the needs of English language students, they will certainly adjust the LCAP to accommodate.

Member Rodriguez made a motion to extend the meeting until 11:15 p.m. Vice President Pritchett seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Member Rodriguez said she is advocating for her request to happen; she would like to see English language learners in the LCAP. Her vision for the next LCAP is that we will have the metrics and the team of parents looking at what this year's LCAP group did and then adding in some columns and some ways to measure. We will then start with a benchmark.

Member Ryan, in looking at the LCAP Advisory group comments and recommendations, as well as the comments of Ms. Guillen and Ms. Vang, she said the request to increase bi-lingual instructional assistants that are trained in ELA-ELD seems very consistent with the intention of LCFF. She pointed out a note that said adding instructional assistants will be used as a strategy to improve student outcomes moving forward, though not currently outlined in the 2015-16 budget. She asked if there was any cost analysis about what it would look like if we were to increase bi-lingual instructional assistants by 25 percent. Mr. Ross said he does not know the answer to that. Mr. Castillo said no, we did not do that analysis. Member Ryan said that, consistent with the intentions of LCFF and recognizing what Mr. Ross said earlier regarding the atypical financial situation we have this year, how do we know that this will in fact be a priority that will have funding in subsequent years? Especially if we cannot find a way to invest in growth for instructional bi-lingual assistants now? She would like thought to be given to what a plan could look like for funding the expansion of these positions while recognizing that it is consistent with the LCFF priorities.

President Woo asked for a motion to approve this Item. A motion was made by Vice President Pritchett to approve and seconded by Second Vice President Hansen. The motion was unanimously approved.

10.3 Adopt Proposed Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Budget for All Funds (Gerardo Castillo, CPA) **Action**

Chief Business Officer Gerardo Castillo presented. He gave a summary of the budget process, discussed community priority coalition recommendations, additional general fund revenues and expenses, gave a summary of the General Fund, went over the General Fund balance, gave a summary of other funds, explained the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) calculation, and went over the fiscal condition, and next steps.

Public Comment:

Karen Swett, of Making Cents Work, said that they recommend approval of the budget presented two weeks ago. They also urged the Board to reference the budget as the Board considers revenues and expenditures. She said there are some differences between the budget and the PowerPoint presented tonight. Although minor, they may have significance if there is a new revised budget in 45 days. They feel that Mr. Castillo and Mr. Smith have reached an almost perfect balance between austerity and investment. However, they would like the Board to consider the expenditure for books and supplies. Printed materials were provided to the Board. They feel parking funds in the 4000 object codes does not provide for austerity or an investment. The hope to see more and greater investment in the students.

Grace Trujillo has a concern that projection should be made ten years out rather than two. She has a concern also regarding the unfunded liabilities. She feels the only thing keeping us afloat is the improved stock market.

Board Member Comments:

Member Rodriguez commented on slide 22 of the presentation. In comparing the years 2013-14 and 2017-18, she pointed out the significant decrease in fund balance. She asked how we generate revenue as a school district. Mr. Castillo answered that the majority of revenue is from Average Daily Attendance (ADA). Member Rodriguez said that the biggest way we can encourage people to bring their children to our district is through innovative programs and availability of neighborhood schools. She likes that we are placing a priority on having conversations around the possibility of opening a particular school, but she feels that we can do more. She would like to see research done for another area school and feels we do the District a disservice to not go into neighborhoods and find out what they look like and learn if students that have experienced a school closure in their area are getting to school. Her informal survey shows that they are not. When a child misses one or more days per week, our revenue goes down. She is going to request that we put into a revised budget some funds to hire an outside, independent source to survey the Maple Elementary School neighborhood. She would like to do this so that we can ask parents from an objective point of view. She suggested covering this cost by reducing publications and marketing, Board staffing, and the reserve for economic uncertainties. She feels the consultant

will not cost more than \$20,000, and by her informal calculation the school would bring in another \$2 million dollars if re-opened.

President Woo entertained a motion to approve this Item. A motion was made by Vice President Pritchett to approve which was seconded by Member Arroyo. The motion passed unanimously.

10.4 Monthly Facilities Update (Cathy Allen)

Information

President Woo postponed this Item due to the lateness of the hour.

Public Comment:
None

Board Member Comments:
None

11.0 BUSINESS AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION/REPORTS

Receive Information

11.1 Head Start/Early Head Start Reports

The Head Start/Early Head Start reports were received by President Woo.

12.0 FUTURE BOARD MEETING DATES / LOCATIONS

- ✓ June 27, 2015, 9:00 a.m. Board Retreat; Shriners Hospital, 2524 Stockton Boulevard, 2nd Floor
- ✓ July 16, 2015, 4:30 p.m. Closed Session; 6:30 p.m. Open Session; Serna Center, 5735 47th Avenue, Community Room; Regular Workshop Meeting

13.0 ADJOURNMENT

President Woo asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting; a motion was made by Student Member Asami Saito and seconded by Vice President Pritchett. The motion was passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.



José L. Banda, Superintendent and Board Secretary

NOTE: The Sacramento City Unified School District encourages those with disabilities to participate fully in the public meeting process. If you need a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the public meeting, please contact the Board of Education Office at (916) 643-9314 at least 48 hours before the scheduled Board of Education meeting so that we may make every reasonable effort to accommodate you. [Government Code § 54953.2; Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, § 202 (42 U.S.C. §12132)] Any public records distributed to the Board of Education less than 72 hours in advance of the meeting and relating to an open session item are available for public inspection at 5735 47th Avenue at the Front Desk Counter and on the District's website at www.scusd.edu