

SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION

Agenda Item# 12.1d

Meeting Date: October 7, 2021

<u>Subject</u>: Approve Minutes of the September 8, 2021, Board of Education Special 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

<u>Recommendation</u>: Approve Minutes of the September 8, 2021, Board of Education Special Meeting.

Background/Rationale: None

Financial Considerations: None

LCAP Goal(s): Family and Community Empowerment

Documents Attached:

1. Minutes of the September 8, 2021, Board of Education Special Meeting

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



Sacramento City Unified School District BOARD OF EDUCATION SPECIAL MEETING

Board of Education Members

Christina Pritchett, President (Trustee Area 3) Lisa Murawski, Vice President (Trustee Area 1) Darrel Woo, Second Vice President (Trustee Area 6) Leticia Garcia (Trustee Area 2) Jamee Villa (Trustee Area 4) Chinua Rhodes (Trustee Area 5) Lavinia Grace Phillips (Trustee Area 7) Jacqueline Zhang, Student Member Wednesday, September 8, 2021 5:30 p.m.

Serna Center

Community Conference Rooms 5735 47th Avenue Sacramento, CA 95824



1.0 OPEN SESSION / CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:33 p.m. by Vice President Murawski, and roll was taken.

Members Present: Vice President Lisa Murawski Second Vice President Darrel Woo Chinua Rhodes Jamee Villa Lavinia Grace Phillips

Members Absent: Leticia Garcia (arrived during Closed Session) President Christina Pritchett Student Member Jacqueline Zhang

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT FOR AGENDA ITEMS ONLY

NOTICE OF PUBLIC COMMENT AND DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION:

Public comment may be (1) emailed to <u>publiccomment@scusd.edu</u>; or (2) submitted in writing, identifying the matter number and the name of the public member at the URL <u>https://tinyurl.com/SCUSDcommentsspecialSept8</u>; or (3) using the same URL, submitting a request for oral comment. <u>Regardless of the method by which public</u> <u>comment is submitted, the submission deadline shall be no later than noon, September</u> <u>8.</u> Individual public comment shall be presented to the Board orally for no more than two minutes, or other time determined by the Board on each agenda item. Public comments submitted in writing will not be read aloud, but will be provided to the Board in advance of the meeting and posted on the District's website. The Board shall limit the total time for public comment on each agenda item, including communications and organizational reports, to 15 minutes in length. With Board consent, the President may

September 8, 2021 – Special Board Meeting

increase or decrease the length of time allowed for public comment, depending on the agenda item and the number of public comments.

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 Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (d)(2) of Government Code section 54956.9 (One Potential Case)
- 3.2 Government Code 54957.6 (a) and (b) Negotiations/Collective Bargaining SCTA SEIU, TCS, Teamsters, UPE, Non-Represented/Confidential Management (District Representative Pam Manwiller)

Public Comment: Rosita L.

4.0 BOARD WORKSHOP/STRATEGIC PLAN AND OTHER INITIATIVES

4.1 Facilities Master Plan Update (Rose Ramos) Information

Chief Business Officer Rose Ramos, Assistant Superintendent of Facilities Ron Hickey, and Leigh Sata presented. Representatives from the DLR Group were available for questions. They went over the facility master plan, methodology, assessments and facility condition index (FCI), educational assessments, the four principles of core planning group, equity index, and criteria to establish priorities.

Public Comment: Mo Kashmiri Wendy Reynolds

Board Comments:

Member Phillips asked to clarify that legacy projects are vision projects. Mr. Hickey said they are different, and he gave examples.

Second Vice President Woo asked where John F. Kennedy High School field repair falls within the context of the plan. Mr. Hickey said the list has not yet been developed, but said that fields with holes and tunnels would fall under safety, and so would have appropriate priority.

Member Garcia asked if the legacy projects discussion, depending on the assumption that the District finds savings or brings in additional revenue, comes back to the Board to figure out what is considered a legacy project. She also asked how the legacy projects are prioritized. Mr. Hickey said nothing would be done in isolation of the Board. Member Garcia said she is trying to find an element of fairness, while at the same time committing to equity. She asked for clarity on the type A, must-do projects

versus vision projects. Mr. Sata explained how some criteria applies to all schools and some applies to certain schools, as well as the impact of various funding. Member Garcia clarified that the A-1 projects are the highest priority based on condition of the facility. Mr. Sata said that there are two types of projects, those that depend on the condition and those related to equity indicators. Mr. Hickey gave an example using Sutter Middle School. Member Garcia asked how school capacity plays into the planning for sites that are at capacity vet have additional high demand. Mr. Hickey spoke about the value of a school to a community and said that improving facilities in the neighborhoods where families reside may have an impact on schools that are at full capacity. Mr. Sata added that once schools are modernized he feels it will encourage communities to flourish. Ms. Ramos reminded that the District does have a very high transfer rate, and that student transfer rates hurt certain neighborhoods, as was covered in the presentation. Member Garcia said it would be helpful to hear if it is possible to use some of the one-time funds such as CARES dollars to address some site needs. Member Garcia then asked where Hiram Johnson High School, that needs a baseball field and football field completed, would fall within the planning. Mr. Sata replied that the school does have a high amount allocated and that staff would go through a sorting process to assess and prioritize. Lastly Member Garcia reminded that one percent is to be set aside for early education classrooms, per a prior resolution.

Member Phillips asked how the dollars fit into areas that do not have a middle school or high school, as she does not have either in her trustee area. Mr. Hickey answered that there would have to be an assessment made to suggest that we are eligible to build a middle school or high school in any part of the District. Also, he noted that the District has capacity for 68,000 students, and therefore we would be hard pressed to qualify at the state level to receive approval to build a new middle or high school anywhere in the District. Member Phillips asked if the District should then think about not being an open enrollment District.

Vice President Murawski asked what the current investment pattern of the District looks like and reflects. Ms. Ramos said she can provide past expenditures, but also she can see that, in terms of schools that are rising to the top in terms of need, it is pretty apparent that there has been more investment in facilities modernization in certain parts of the District. She said data is available and that she would put it together so that it can be provided by area and school site. Vice President Murawski said that she was thinking about not only bond dollars allocated in the past but also about where we are starting from in terms of the condition of facilities overall. She noted that although her schools are in more high income areas, the schools are old and appear to be not in the best shape. She said she feels it is important for the community to understand where we have invested and where fallen short.

Member Rhodes said he enjoyed reading through the document and feels it is great as a tool to use to make changes in the trustee areas, not only for the District but as a system. He also spoke about the importance of allowing community member voices to be heard.

Vice President Murawski asked for clarity on the next step. Her understanding is that the plan includes not only the assessments but also a prioritization methodology that ends up in a list of projects that would all be approved as a package; then the board

would weigh in on the priority order of where they put the projects. Mr. Sata replied that the intent is actually to approve the tool, assessments, and all the things that go into making that tool; the board is not approving the specific projects that will launch first as those are going to come back with a project initiation form so that they can be approved and the board can have the appropriate dialogue on an on-going basis. Ms. Ramos added that in approving the tool, the assessments are very specific, so by approving the plan, the board is approving the tools. Vice President Murawski asked if the board is approving, along with the plan, a list of projects. Mr. Sata responded by expounding on what Ms. Ramos said and also said no, the Board will have choices but is not approving a list of projects as the staff will have flexibility. Mr. Hickey said the Facilities Master Plan is a tool that staff needs to be able to create a list. Vice President Murawski asked if there will be an opportunity for the Board to add to the list. Mr. Hickey spoke to the equity and safety lense that will be applied. Vice President Murawski asked that, when this is brought back to the Board, it be very clear on what the Board is voting. She also noted that she does not see a link to the plan on the District website. Mr. Sata said a website is developed but it is still under password protection that was shared with the Board at the last meeting, but will be shared again. He said it is to be made a live document after Board input.

Member Phillips asked if the purpose of this particular product is to provide a calculation to make sure that the neediest needs of the schools are met. The presenters responded yes. Member Phillips said it could come down to a battle between the haves and the have-nots, and she believes that what Vice President Murawski is saying is that we need to have more community input regarding what needs are most urgent, as people know firsthand what is most needed at their particular school site. She asked if the input will happen after the tool generates the list. She asked if the Board will have a discussion about approving this as a packet after the list comes to the Board. She wants to make sure that the list will be one that is not changeable. Mr. Sata said the team will bring forward more than one list as there is not enough staff to complete all projects at one time.

Member Rhodes asked how many District stakeholder groups were part of the formation of the document, and is it aligned with the LCAP due to those meetings and conversations. Anton Blewett of the DLR Group answered by citing student groups that they spoke to associated with the LCAP and other core planning groups, and others from a wide cross section.

5.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

Vice President Murawski asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting; a motion was made by Member Garcia and seconded by Second Vice President Woo. The motion was passed unanimously, and the meeting adjourned at 8:59 p.m.

Jorge A. Aguilar, Superintendent and Board Secretary

NOTE: The Sacramento City Unified School District encourages those with disabilities to participate fully in the September 8, 2021 – Special Board Meeting 4

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 24 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 24 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 <u>www.scusd.edu</u>