



SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION

Agenda Item# 10.1g

Meeting Date: November 21, 2019

Subject: Approve Minutes of the November 7, 2019, 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 November 7, 2019, Board of Education Meeting.

Background/Rationale: None

Financial Considerations: None

LCAP Goal(s): Family and Community Empowerment

Documents Attached:

1. Minutes of the November 7, 2019, Board of Education Regular Meeting

<p>Estimated Time of Presentation: N/A Submitted by: Jorge A. Aguilar, Superintendent Approved by: N/A</p>



Putting
Children
First

Sacramento City Unified School District BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING AND WORKSHOP

Board of Education Members

Jessie Ryan, President (Trustee Area 7)
Darrel Woo, Vice President (Trustee Area 6)
Michael Minnick, 2nd Vice President (Trustee Area 4)
Lisa Murawski (Trustee Area 1)
Leticia Garcia (Trustee Area 2)
Christina Pritchett (Trustee Area 3)
Mai Vang (Trustee Area 5)
Olivia Ang-Olson, Student Member

Thursday, November 7, 2019

4:00 p.m. Closed Session

6:30 p.m. Open Session

Serna Center

Community Conference Rooms

5735 47th Avenue

Sacramento, CA 95824

MINUTES

2019/20-9

1.0 OPEN SESSION / CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by President Ryan, and roll was taken.

Members Present:

President Jessie Ryan

Vice President Darrel Woo

Second Vice President Michael Minnick

Lisa Murawski

Members Absent:

Leticia Garcia (arrived at 4:05 p.m.)

Christina Pritchett (arrived at 4:05 p.m.)

Mai Vang (arrived at 4:15 p.m.)

Student Member Olivia Ang-Olson (arrived at 4:15 p.m.)

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

None

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:*

- a) *Existing litigation pursuant to subdivision (d)(1) of Government Code section 54956.9 (Black Parallel School Board, et al. v. SCUSD, et al., Case No. 2:19-cv-01768-TLN-KJN, SCTA v. SCUSD Case No. 011900028830, SCTA v. SCUSD 2019 – 80003250, and OAH Case No. 2019080715)*
 - b) *Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (d)(2) of Government Code section 54956.9 (One Potential Case)*
 - c) *Initiation of litigation pursuant to subdivision (d)(4) of Government Code section 54956.9 (One Potential Case)*
- 3.2 *Government Code 54957.6 (a) and (b) Negotiations/Collective Bargaining CSA, SCTA Government Code 54957.6 (a) and (b) Negotiations/Collective Bargaining SCTA, SEIU, TCS, Teamsters, UPE, Non-Represented/Confidential Management (District Representative Cancy McArn)*
- 3.3 *Government Code 54957 – Public Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release/Reassignment*
- 3.4 *Government Code 54957 - Public Employee Performance Evaluation:*
- a) *Superintendent*
- 3.5 *Education Code Section 54956.75 – Regarding Response to Final Draft Audit Report of Bureau of State Audits*
- 3.6 *Government Code 54957 – Public Employee Appointment*
- a) *Instructional Assistant Superintendent*

4.0 CALL BACK TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

4.1 *The Pledge of Allegiance*

4.2 *Broadcast Statement (Student Member Ang-Olson)*

4.3 *Stellar Student Recognition: Joanna Ramirez, New Joseph Bonnheim School*

- *Presentation of Certificate by Second Vice President Minnick*

5.0 ANNOUNCEMENT OF ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION

Superintendent Aguilar announced that, by unanimous vote, approved the appointment of Kimberly Mackey as Instructional Assistant Superintendent.

6.0 AGENDA ADOPTION

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

7.0 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.

*Janice Durall
Trudy Mohr
Frank DeYoung
Cecile Nunley
Sarah Williams Kingsley
Cherilyn Dalton
Ian Arnold
Kenya Martinez
Alison French-Tubo
Bernie Evangelista*

8.0 COMMUNICATIONS

8.1 Employee Organization Reports:

Information

- *SCTA – David Fisher reported on behalf of SCTA*
- *SEIU – Ian Arnold reported on behalf of SEIU*
- *TCS – No report given*
- *Teamsters – No report given*
- *UPE – No report given*

8.2 District Parent Advisory Committees:

Information

- *Community Advisory Committee – Sarah Williams Kinglsey and Kenya Martinez reported on behalf of the CAC*
- *District English Learner Advisory Committee – No report given*
- *Local Control Accountability Plan/Parent Advisory Committee – Scott Graves reported on behalf of LCAP/PAC*

8.3 Superintendent's Report (Jorge A. Aguilar)

Information

Superintendent Aguilar spoke about the LCAP/PAC meeting he recently visited, acknowledged the good work of the committee, and thanked everyone that was at the meeting. He asked the community to stand firm in holding District staff accountable on issues related to student achievement and student outcomes. He gave an overview of upcoming Item 9.1 and asked all to stay for the entire presentation.

8.4 President's Report (Jessie Ryan)

Information

President Ryan said she was happy to hear the Superintendent recognize that there are pockets of excellence throughout the District, yet for the majority of students quite often there is inequitable opportunity. She noted that one bright spot has been elementary athletics and how extracurricular activities make a full student experience. She shared that today a partnership was launched with Sac Republic, Bank of America, USA Soccer, and the City of Sacramento in having a first full-service soccer field at the Maple Elementary School site. There will be at least one more soccer field in each area provided to the District over the next few years.

8.5 Student Member Report (Olivia Ang-Olson)

Information

Student Member Ang-Olson spoke about the recent high winds and resulting fires in the State. She feels that air quality was poor enough to warrant school closure at times and believes that a set standard should be established regarding when school should be closed due to poor air quality. Student Member Ang-Olson also spoke about concerns with pesticides being used at school sites.

8.6 Information Sharing By Board Members

Information

Member Murawski reported on a school community forum that was held on October 28th at Bret Harte Elementary School. She noted that they have a very active PTA and congratulated them on their work. They are launching a friends of Bret Harte PTA also, which is a way for community members to affiliate with and financially support the PTA. Member Murawski also reported on a forum held at C. K. McClatchy High School, noting several issues that were addressed.

Member Vang brought up two recent school visits that she made and noted how she was struck by what the teachers and school site staff are able to do with the little resources that they have. She stated that she understands that, as one of seven Board members, she has a shared fiduciary responsibility to ensure the long-term financial health of the District and to also hold the Superintendent accountable for improving student achievement. She also stated, regarding the tentative contract reached two years ago as announced by Mayor Steinberg, SCTA, and the District, that although there have been honest disagreements on components of that contract, the changes to the healthcare plan was clear to her. That is, that any healthcare savings would be reinvested into the classroom and for additional student services. She said that using the healthcare savings for additional student services was a good idea then and is still a good idea now. Her hope is that her colleagues, labor partners, parents, and students come together to work to protect resources for neighborhood schools.

Member Pritchett noted that a headline from the morning was about possible school closures at Twin Rivers district. She spoke about school closures the District had in 2013 and the fact that no health care savings has been achieved. She said that Superintendent Aguilar has given the Board and community more information than any other so that we can do

what's right and move forward together. She feels that state takeover and school closure is not what's right for students.

Member Murawski reported that there will be a community meeting on safe routes to school, focusing on the Land Park/South Land Park area. This will be hosted by Council Member Steve Hansen and herself at Sutterville Elementary School on November 12th at 6:00 p.m.

9.0 BOARD WORKSHOP/STRATEGIC PLAN AND OTHER INITIATIVES

9.1 Review Smarter Balance Results (Ed Eldridge, Christine Baeta, and Vincent Harris)

Information

The Item was presented by Mr. Harris (Chief Continuous Improvement and Accountability Officer), Ms. Baeta (Chief Academic Officer), Mr. Eldridge (Director of Strategy and Continuous Improvement), Aprille Shafto (Principal of Tahoe Elementary School), and Matt Turkie (Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction). They presented District core value and guiding principles, areas of concern, and data aggregated as comparative, grade level, ethnicity and race, and by attendance. They also looked at top growth schools in English and Math and went over next steps.

Public Comment:

*Sarah Williams Kingsley
Alison French-Tubo*

Board Member Comments:

Member Pritchett addressed comments made by Ms. Williams Kingsley regarding Isador Cohen. She asked staff how the data reflects families that transition in and out of a school. Mr. Harris replied that this is not a filter as part of the standard presentation, but it is studied and a more detailed communication will be provided to the Board. The Superintendent said that an overview can be provided from a growth perspective which looks at the same students as opposed to overall data. Member Pritchett asked if we can track students that move to a different school within the District. Mr. Eldridge said yes. Member Pritchett also wanted to know how many of those students are staying within our District.

Second Vice President Minnick thanked staff for bringing the positive points of data to the Board. He also recognized staff and site leaders present.

Member Garcia thanked staff for highlighting achievements and the hard work being done at school sites. She asked staff to share some of the impacts that are causing a difference in terms of an increase, stagnation, or decline. Mr. Harris answered in general terms and said that the core of her question they are studying, and they will get back to her with some context around this. Member Garcia asked what some of the disruptions look like in the classroom. Ms. Baeta answered by sharing one of the improvement

science team meetings that she attended last year at Tahoe Elementary School. Principal Shafto replied to the question from the perspective of the classroom.

Member Murawski asked about the role of early literacy and intervention in the primary grades. Ms. Baeta gave information on what is being done at the grade levels through the fourth grade. Principal Shafto also spoke to many areas that are being worked on in tandem.

Member Woo congratulated those schools that are doing well and doing better. He asked what is planned for those schools that are failing or not doing nearly as well. Ms. Baeta said that some of the disruption occurring has been shared, gave some more examples, and noted that it is a deep concern.

President Ryan said that what is troubling to her is that the lowest performing sub-groups are black or African American and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander for both English and Math. She asked, because of the level of disparity that we are seeing for these two sub-groups, is staff beginning to develop a plan based on where other Districts have defied the odds and what is their theories around the low educational attainment rates and the size of the gap. Ms. Baeta said that looking at other Districts that are making growth in these areas is an important place to frame our work. She has been looking at what growth data looks like and how to continue to implement that for all students. She spoke to the needs of individual students and at particular schools. President Ryan said one of the things that helps us with this is the early intervention information system. She noted that the greatest growth for economically disadvantaged is at Father Keith B. Kenny Elementary School and Albert Einstein Middle School, and she asked to what is that attributed. Ms. Baeta spoke to the high level of structure and expectations of instruction at Father Keith B. Kenny. She also noted that every moment of instructional time is utilized. President Ryan thanked Tahoe Principal Aprille Shafto for her work.

Superintendent Aguilar acknowledged the Board's compliments around the growth and bright spots of data, but wanted to be clear that the data presented should be disturbing to all, as large populations of District students are not achieving at the level they deserve to achieve. He also said that we should not have this discussion once a year based on an assessment that happens only once a year. Superintendent Aguilar said that we have to be committed to looking at data by name, by need, and by the inequity that they are still suffering in our system. He recognized all site leaders and said that we have fallen into the trap of coming up with solutions far too quickly without studying the root causes that are manifesting themselves in the outcomes. He is looking forward to sharing with the Board every individual SPSA plan; that calls for every site leader to do a comprehensive root cause analysis to unpack why it is that we think we are getting the outcomes that we are getting and how the SPSA will inform the LCAP. We are going to be studying what's happening on an ongoing basis so that we can assess quickly if an introduced change is working or not.

9.2 Approve Modified Non-School-Site-Based Resource Officer Contract (Lisa Allen, Raoul Bozio, and Nathaniel Browning)

Action

Nathaniel Browning (Manager, Policy and Governance) and Raoul Bozio (In House Counsel) presented. The presentation focused on Sacramento Police Department Sergeant and non-school-site-based Resource Officer scope of work, the roles and responsibilities of site administrators and non-school-site-based Resource Officers, data tracking and sharing, and an update on the Questioning and Apprehension Board Policy (BP) 5145.11. Deputy Police Chief Kathy Lester, Lt. Steven Moore, and Sgt. Justin Brown were also available to answer questions.

Public Comment:

*Tania Muskopf
April Meszaros
Cecile Nunley
Donielle Prince
Stephani Lopez
Brenda Chagolla
Franceica Lopez
Alma Lopez
Tracy Cruz
Lamaia Coleman
Cha Vang
Angel Garcia*

Board Member Comments:

Superintendent Aguilar said that there was a community forum to determine what characteristics the community was looking for in a new Director of School Safety. He said we are in the last stage for bringing the leading candidate to the District.

President Ryan said she appreciates all the community members that took time to be part of the hiring process based on the community meeting.

Member Pritchett reminded everyone that not all of the schools are in the City of Sacramento and that it can take a half an hour for police to get out to these locations. She feels that the City of Sacramento is in a disarray and that there is a clear bias on each side. She agrees that school sites need better training and also more counselors. She shared that data shows School Resource Officers (SRO) on campuses build relationships. She hears the voices, but would like to see data on how many incidences we have had since we have not had SROs. She does not agree that having only three floating SROs is a good choice, but she is willing to make a compromise to try it and see how things work. She feels that the Policy Committee should include the Sacramento Police Department and members of the community. She feels this should be a whole Board conversation and not just a policy conversation. Member Pritchett asked some questions about the contract. She asked if the SROs will be doing data tracking and sharing. She also asked about training. She noted that the first SRO will represent 30 schools, the second will represent 39 schools, while the last SRO will represent

24 schools. She asked how this was broken out; she is concerned because some of her schools are the furthest out east. Mr. Browning replied that the contract speaks to the ability or potential inability for police officers to be able to respond to incidents on campus as there are 39 sites for which one officer is responsible. We do not have non-school-site-based SROs within the District right now; we have been relying on one officer, and we do not know what response times look like. This is why they would like the matter to be brought back to the Board in three months' time to give an update. Mr. Browning, in response to the question on training, said that we have a list of trainings that SROs go through. The list was provided to the Board and copies were also placed on the back table. The reason that the contract states that SROs "may" attend training (rather than "shall") is because the District is partnering with the police department, which has their own collective bargaining agreement. Mr. Browning said therefore, that is for their superiors to identify and address. Mr. Browning referred to the list and noted that they have an extensive list of trainings. Regarding data, he noted that the SROs will be collecting data components as spelled out in the contract. He added that we will also be collecting other data points as necessary once we have a Director of School Safety. Deputy Chief Lester gave more detailed information on how data will be collected, assignments, and trainings. Member Pritchett asked how the number of sites per SRO was determined. Mr. Browning said that the breakdown on numbers of school sites was not based on the number of school sites, but on the number of calls received in a geographical area. Member Pritchett asked that, when this is brought back in February, that the response times be provided as part of the data.

Second Vice President Minnick thanked Member Pritchett for her comments and said he appreciated that she talked about the willingness to compromise. His feeling is more in line with some of the young people, that is, to not have a contract with SROs at all; he stated that he too is compromising and looks at this as an opportunity for the District to try this and see if it works. He said he feels that the list of the data tracking piece is sufficient and appreciates the idea of this information being reviewed in the community with the new safety director. He asked if the listed trainings are required by the police department before an individual can be in the role of SRO. Mr. Browning said that is correct. Lastly, Second Vice President Minnick asked if there is any concern about confidentiality of student level data. Mr. Bozio answered that he believes there is not; his understanding is that if the police department were to receive a records request for educational records, they would then tender that request to the District and the District would then determine how it should be handled for confidential student records.

Member Vang thanked Mr. Browning and the students that spoke. She asked if we have a supplemental contract. Mr. Browning said that is correct. Member Vang asked for the timeline. Mr. Browning said he believes it is continuing until we have a full contract approved and that it helps us bring in other support for after school enrichment activities such as athletics. Deputy Chief Lester said that it is not a supplemental contract like an MOU that has been signed, but is basically that the District has contract with their supplemental employment unit for the sergeant, which is Sgt. Brown, from noon to 5:00 p.m. during school days and also for athletics; it is a day to day contract at this point that can be terminated at any time, and if this contract were to be approved it would supersede. Member Vang said that the Policy Committee has been working hard on the Board policy around questioning and apprehension and the roles and responsibility of administrators. Currently it is an eleven page document. She feels it is important to have a policy that comes to the Board before the actual contract because she would like there to be alignment between data collection by administrators and the SROs. She also has concerns because we have not yet

hired a safety director. She would like this person to be able to weigh in on the contract. Finally, she challenged the Board to imagine school safety from the perspective that we not use our educational dollars to fund law enforcement. She shared that the top recommendation from ACLU for local school districts is that local jurisdictions prioritize school based mental health before using funds for law enforcement. She said as a District we talk a lot about data and best practices, yet we are also often making decisions off of fear or the unknown; therefore Member Vang said that she cannot vote on a contract given that she does not have data in front of her to prove that having police officers, even though they are not at the school site, showing that this improves school climate. She asked her colleagues to rethink, when the students, parents, and community say reimagine school safety, to reimagine in the light of using those dollars for critical resources that students need inside the classroom and in the neighborhood school. She stated she will take a no vote on the contract.

Mr. Browning said that the contract is through the end of this school year, June 30, 2020. He stated that they are working on the policy to get it right; it is going through some changes. He said the committee is continuing to vet it with administration leadership and community groups. He said that ACLU also says there are a lot of policies out there that are somewhat similar or that try to get to the same intent, but actually do not end up having any kind of gravity. At the same time, we have witnessed a number of issues and concerns where SROs are a needed resource. In trying to address going from having eight SRO officers to zero, the Board decided to rest on three. In order to get the Director of Student Safety hired, work on the policy, and bring the contract up to the Board, all pieces are being worked on simultaneously, and sometimes we get a little more movement in one area than another.

Member Garcia said she aligns her sentiments and comments with Board Member Vang's. She said she is troubled by how we procedurally do things and make decisions; there is a policy that is still evolving with stakeholder input, and we are voting on a contract to be implemented even though there is a supplemental contract that does not have an expiration date, per se. A critical component for her in the wish to have a broader, more comprehensive conversation about what school safety looks like, is that the safety director is not yet hired. Therefore, she feels we are making decisions backwards. She had submitted 16 or so questions to staff on the contract (as there are areas of great concern to her), such as the training piece, how complaints are submitted and to whom, which complaints are only available for the District to see, the "may" versus "shall" regarding attending community meetings, and the type of data collected and its evaluation. She asked about additional training that the District might want; she would like to see specific training on de-escalation tactics. Due to these concerns, she said she will not be supporting this contract.

Mr. Browning said that the complaints are not outlined and we do not have the ability to look at those complaints because of protections within the collective bargaining agreement with the police department. Mr. Browning said that, pertaining to the training, it is in the contract as "may" because we do not have the authority to dictate from that higher level. He noted that the training is quite extensive and said that some of the "mays" and "shalls" come from the fact that the police officers are not our employees, but rather a partnership through the contract. They may attend community meetings because if there is an issue happening at one of our comprehensive high schools right before a planned community meeting, that officer has a duty to go to the issue that needs to be addressed at a school site; they have every intention to attend the community meetings, but sometimes it might not happen because of other duties. Deputy Chief Lester spoke to the de-escalation training; she

said that all Sacramento Police Officers receive about 40 hours of crisis intervention and de-escalation training. And SROs receive additional training on how to interact with minors and students. Regarding complaints, there is a government code that does restrict what information can be released, but anyone can make a complaint through several channels with the City of Sacramento because these are City of Sacramento police officers. Regarding “may” versus “shall” for community meetings, Deputy Chief Lester explained that the District may not want law enforcement at some community meetings; it gives the District the right to include or exclude law enforcement. However, if the District has a request for them to appear at a meeting, somebody from their office will be there to represent the police department to address any concerns.

Member Murawski thanked the Sacramento Police Department for working with the District on these important pieces and building toward a new model that will work for everyone. She is happy to see that mental health, first aid, and trauma informed practices are part of the training. She thanked the community members that she has spoken with about this issue. She also thanked staff. She supports the plan to reimagine school safety but said we are just not there yet. She echoed Member Garcia’s procedural concerns and some of the timing issues and said that the way she sees it is that this is a 2019-20 contract, a placeholder, to get us through to where we are actually doing the work through this school year and to then really implement the plan next year. This has taken a long time as there is a lot of considerations, and we cannot make our system move faster than it is ready to move. There is too much to do and too few people to do it. Member Murawski asked for a description of how site administrators can access SROs. Mr. Browning said the Director of School Safety will be the liaison between SROs and site administrators, but there are also other contact points. Deputy Chief Lester said that Deputy Superintendent Lisa Allen has been filling that position; she is in direct contact with Sgt. Brown who is assigned to the District on a full-time basis daily. Right now the school site administrator communication protocol is that the administrator will contact Ms. Allen if there is a concern or an issue that requires some type of law enforcement support. They are also directed, in case of an emergency, to utilize the 911 system. Member Murawski asked on what issues administrators are able to access SRO support. Deputy Chief Lester said she thinks the intent is that the school site administrator will contact Ms. Allen, or whoever the new school safety director is, and that is the clearinghouse for the request. This adds an additional layer of oversight for the request to make sure that this fits in with what the District is trying to do. Sgt. Brown also spoke to a non-emergency number for fights or arguments that site administrators may not be able to handle. Sgt. Brown also mentioned calls that involve weapons and disturbances as examples of types of issues under this new model in which to partner with school mental health resource personnel. Member Murawski suggested striking “the District desires to limit our SRO presence on District campuses and as a result understands that this agreement will limit the ability of the Sacramento Police Department to respond to critical incidences and any other emergencies on District properties” from the contract. She feels this is vague and not accurate to what we are trying to accomplish in terms of identifying appropriate duties for law enforcement versus site. It is not a categorical limitation of SROs on District campuses; there are many reasons, in an appendix, of what other types of things would be. Chief Deputy Lester replied that their understanding is that the District wanted to be very clear in the fact that officers would not be permanently assigned to school campuses, and this is why that clause is included in the contract. Mr. Browning said he thinks the first part of that clause is that the District desires to limit SRO presence on District campuses. He believes that this was discussed and decided upon at the Board meeting of August 15, 2019. Member Murawski said that she believes he is referring to when the Board talked about non-school

site based SROs. She does not feel that the language is helpful or necessary. President Ryan asked if Member Murawski is suggesting an amendment to correct the language. Member Murawski asked what are the available avenues as she would be open to striking it if there was agreement to do so. Mr. Bozio said that could be a motion, but then the City would have to take up that language as well. They would have to review, and that could delay their decision. He said he thinks that was our intent and understanding, at least for the first part, and as for the second part, it may not be necessary, but he thinks it was something the police department was asking to include. He does not know that it makes much difference in the end, as the duties are what they are in the agreement. Superintendent Aguilar asked if Member Murawski is searching for greater clarification about the decision of limiting the stationary effect of the old model on campuses as opposed to the roving nature of it. Member Murawski said it could be clarifying; she does not see the usefulness to having the second part in terms of where it says we are limiting. Member Pritchett suggested adding another phrase about “by having non-school site SROs”. Member Murawski asked if there is any procedural way to move forward with this tonight and see if the City and the District can either agree on clarifying language or striking some of the language that she thinks does not belong there. Mr. Bozio said that if the Board does not adopt the contract as is, we can go back and try to further discuss, but it will take a little more time; the Board could adopt it with an amendment but then the police and the City will have to evaluate that. Member Murawski asked if a contract amendment can be brought back to the next meeting if the Board votes on this contract tonight.

President Ryan stated that, because of the Board concerns that we continue to adjust and respond to whether or not this is effective or not in meeting the needs of our students and community, we will be doing a quarterly review which includes a February addendum. Mr. Browning said that an addendum could be possible; they do intend to come back with updates to the Board on reimagining school safety. President Ryan said that her understanding is, regarding the safety director position, that part of the commitment is that we will have a regular review committee that will look at and question the data and, if in fact, we are having disproportionate impact on certain student populations or areas, we will make appropriate adjustments. Mr. Browning said that is correct. President Ryan said that, in looking at non-school site officers, the intention was to be able to meet the needs of critical safety incidents where we would not want to be in cue with the general police populace but would instead want to have SROs that have secured the necessary training to be effective in interacting with our youth when they are called. She is very appreciative of the data that we are now committed to gather, but the reality is that this will only be effective if we are working with the same constituencies that are helping to hire our school safety director so that we are reviewing this and making the commitment to the necessary changes. She feels that, as we continue to move forward, she is very happy with the work we have done with the ACLU model policy and feels that will continue to need to evolve too.

Member Murawski had originally thought that the reimagining school safety proposal would include other staff. She feels that what we are lacking is trusted, trained adults around kids, especially in those critical, after school time periods. She said there are administrators that are taking their time every day, and this is not an appropriate use of our resources either. She asked what we can do in the meantime as she does not think three is enough because we do not have other resources in place. She asked if there is some part of the supplemental contract that we can keep in place. Mr. Browning responded that at the August 15th Board meeting an outline was given on training, and the first step was hiring a safety director. Regarding the concern with addressing school altercations, depending on Board action

tonight, the contract will be in place the week after next; this coincides with the week after the City council takes action. Getting the SROs on board will help out considerably. We also have the supplemental contract for after school and hot spots. Member Murawski asked if the supplemental contract will stay in place. Superintendent Aguilar said that the District will work with the Sacramento Police Department because as we identify and hire the individuals that have the right fit for our communities, then he would anticipate that part of our efforts will be that we are meeting the needs on a daily basis; we are aware of those hot spots. He said they can come back after discussing if they foresee the need for having a separate set of individuals. This is an area where we have heard from administrators who are dedicating a lot of time after school. Our priority right now is to bring on these officers so that we can begin the process of meeting the needs of our students; at least making sure that we continue to have a safe learning environment. The Superintendent said he thinks it is important to come back in terms of a more imagined plan; in this case we are bringing a contract with the Sacramento Police Department because that is a separate part of a larger plan that we think is foundational. He said that there will be a conversation whether they foresee a need to have to continue that supplemental contract. Deputy Chief Lester said that, yes, the District can certainly continue the supplemental contract while there is a bigger plan put in place. She also said that, concerning the contract, there is not a termination or waiting period. So if there is some reason that the contract is not suitable to District needs it can be terminated at any time or amended by mutual agreement. Member Murawski asked that we take a look at continuing the supplemental contract to make sure that we have those resources in place.

President Ryan noted that, as we have a very limited pool of resources, we need to do a better job as a school community in advocating for the City to provide after school hours and week-end support to our communities for our youth. On the mental health front, she is appreciative of comments made as we do need social workers and mental health providers in every school site. There are multiple conversations happening with the County. She asked for a motion for a vote. A motion was made by Second Vice President Minnick and seconded by Member Pritchett. The motion passed five to two with Members Garcia and Vang voting no and a student preferential vote by Student Member Ang-Olson of no.

10.0 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.

10.1 Items Subject or Not Subject to Closed Session:

10.1a Approve Grants, Entitlements and Other Income Agreements, Ratification of Other Agreements, Approval of Bid Awards, Change Notices and Notices of Completion (Rose Ramos)

10.1b Approve Annual Developer Fees Report for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2019 (Rose Ramos)

10.1c Approve Personnel Transactions (Cancy McArn)

10.1d Approve Minutes of the October 17, 2019, Board of Education Meeting (Jorge A. Aguilar)

President Ryan asked for a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda. A motion was made to approve by Second Vice President Minnick and seconded by Member Vang. The Board voted unanimously to adopt the agenda.

11.0 BUSINESS AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION/REPORTS Receive Information

11.1 Business and Financial Information:

- *Enrollment and Attendance Report for Month 1 Ending September 20, 2019 (Rose Ramos)*

*Public Comment:
Cecile Nunley*

The business and financial information and reports were received by President Ryan.

12.0 FUTURE BOARD MEETING DATES / LOCATIONS

- ✓ *November 21, 2019 4:30 p.m. Closed Session, 6:00 p.m. Open Session, Serna Center, 5735 47th Avenue, Community Room, Regular Workshop Meeting*
- ✓ *December 19, 2019, 4:30 p.m. Closed Session, 6:00 p.m. Open Session, Serna Center, 5735 47th Avenue, Community Room, Annual Organizational and Workshop Meeting*

13.0 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned back to Closed Session, and Closed Session adjourned at 12:55 a.m.

Jorge A. Aguilar, 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