



SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION

Agenda Item 9.1g

Meeting Date: March 17, 2016

Subject: Approve Minutes of the February 18, 2016, 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

Department: Superintendent's Office

Recommendation: Approve Minutes of the February 18, 2016, Board of Education Meeting.

Background/Rationale: None

Financial Considerations: None

LCAP Goal(s): Family and Community Engagement

Documents Attached:

1. Minutes of the February 18, 2016, 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

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

Thursday, February 18, 2016

3:30 p.m. Closed Session

6:30 p.m. Open Session

Serna Center

Community Conference Rooms

5735 47th Avenue

Sacramento, CA 95824

MINUTES

2015/16-16

1.0 OPEN SESSION / CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 3:40 p.m. by President Pritchett, and roll was taken.

Members Present:

*President Christina Pritchett
Second Vice President Jessie Ryan
Ellen Cochrane
Darrel Woo*

Members Absent:

*Vice President Jay Hansen (Arrived at 4:40 p.m.)
Gustavo Arroyo (Arrived at 5:30 p.m.)
Diana Rodriguez (Arrived at 3:50 p.m.)*

A quorum was reached.

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 54957.6 (a) and (b) Negotiations/Collective Bargaining CSA, SCTA, SEIU, Teamsters, UPE, Unrepresented Management*
- 3.2 *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*
- 3.3 *Government Code 54957 – Public Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release/Reassignment*
- 3.4 *Government Code 54957 – Public Employee Appointment*
 - a) *Principal, American Legion High School*

4.0 CALL BACK TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called back to order at 6:43 p.m. by President Pritchett.

Members Present:

President Christina Pritchett

Vice President Jay Hansen

Second Vice President Jessie Ryan

Gustavo Arroyo

Ellen Cochran

Diana Rodriguez

Darrel Woo

Student Member Elizabeth Barry

Members Absent: none

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Tanner Michael-Bond, a Senior from American Legion High School. He represented the American Legion Men’s Leadership Academy. Certificates of Appreciation were presented by Second Vice President Jessie Ryan to him, lead teacher Pedro Garibay, and the American Legion Men’s Leadership Academy as a group.

5.0 ANNOUNCEMENT OF ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION

Counsel Jerry Behrens announced that, by a vote of 5-0 with Board Members Hansen and Arroyo absent, the Board adopted Resolution No. 2015/16-D regarding a certificated employee dismissal. Superintendent Banda announced that the Board, by a vote of 5-0 with Members Hansen and Arroyo absent, approved the appointment of Richard Baronowski as the new Principal of American Legion High School.

6.0 AGENDA ADOPTION

A motion was made by President Pritchett to change Item 11.1 from an Action Item to an Information Item which will be brought back at the next meeting as an Action Item. This was seconded by Member

Cochrane. Before this was voted on, Member Woo motioned to change the Item to Conference/Action. The motion was seconded by Vice President Hansen. A roll call vote was taken on Member Woo's motion, and the motion did not pass as follows:

*President Pritchett – no
Vice President Hansen - yes
Second Vice President Ryan - yes
Member Arroyo – no
Member Cochrane – no
Member Rodriguez – no
Member Woo - yes*

President Pritchett brought back her original motion which Member Cochrane seconded. The Board voted to adopt the agenda with Item 11.1 changed from an Action Item to an Information Item which will be brought back at the next Board meeting. The motion was unanimously approved.

7.0 SPECIAL PRESENTATION

7.1 Recognition of Tahoe Park Neighborhood Association (Ellen Cochrane)

Member Cochrane spoke about and introduced the Tahoe Park Neighborhood Association, telling how they donate their time, supplies, and money to help support students of the District. One of their missions is to provide scholarships to deserving students at Hiram Johnson High School. They are able to do this through fund-raising events and contributions from people in the community. Last year the group awarded \$10,000 to Hiram Johnson High School Seniors who were going to college. The group has agreed to work with Tahoe Elementary School to see how they can further develop participation in public schools through support. She thanked the association members. The founder then spoke about the program and introduced other association members. Member Cochrane presented them with a Certificate of Appreciation.

Public Comment:

None

Board Member Comments:

None

7.2 Approve Resolution No. 2870: Recognition of National African American History Month (Jessie Ryan)

Second Vice President Ryan began by speaking about Ethnic Studies and how important it is to students that they have a sense of their history. She introduced Youth Development Coordinator Monroe Howard and a group of students from Luther Burbank High School that are members of Blacks Making a Difference (BMAD). They spoke about their program and then Second Vice President Ryan read the resolution. Member Rodriguez motioned to approve it, and Member Arroyo seconded. The resolution was approved unanimously. Member Ryan then presented a framed copy to Mr. Howard.

Public Comment:

(Board Minutes, February 18, 2016)

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.

Public Comment:

Josh Gonzalez and Isaac Rodriguez, Seniors from Sacramento High School, invited the Board to the boys' basketball playoffs that started February 19th. They presented a basketball signed by each team member to Second Vice President Ryan.

Aliceah Hernandez, a Senior from Sacramento High School and a Varsity basketball player for all four years of high school, invited the Board to attend the girls' basketball playoffs which started February 19th. She presented a basketball signed by each team member to Superintendent Banda.

Jessica Arriaga has concerns about supports and services that her child may or may not be receiving. She feels that more efforts are being put into average daily attendance statistics than into educating the students and said children are looked at as numbers rather than human beings. She said teachers need support.

Member Cochran thanked Ms. Arriaga for her comments and said she wants to make sure that issues with her child are being addressed. She gave Ms. Arriaga her card so that she can call if they are not resolved. President Pritchett said that she has been working with Ms. Arriaga as well.

The following speakers spoke in favor of a competitive wage package and support for teachers:

LaShanya Breazell

Felipe Ferraz

Nikki Milevsky

Fabrizio Sasso

Anna Molander

Kathy Buxton

Victoria Carr

Chesshuwa Beckett

Shana Just

Hasan McWhorter

Sandy Allen

Sandy Olson

Debbie Watson

Alice Mercer

Robin Durfee

Jenny Thomas

Jean Seto

Erin Duarte

Harold Fong

In response to the above comments, President Pritchett read the following statement from the Board: “Across the state we know virtually every large district is struggling to fill vacancies given the dearth of young people entering the field of teaching. This is, and has been, critically important to the Board and the District; it is one of the reasons that we proposed moving the school calendar earlier this year. We also share the desire to have our teachers and all District employees be well compensated for their work. As a Board, we also have a statutory and moral responsibility to look after the long-term financial health of our District. The last thing we want to do is spend beyond our means, only to turn around and have to lay off teachers when the economy inevitably takes a downward turn. We must also make responsible decisions to protect our ability to fulfill the promise of lifetime benefits that we have already to current and former teachers. I know these discussions can be difficult, but it is our hope that the two sides will come together and thoughtfully and responsibly consider all options in an effort to make the best decision for teachers and students for the future.”

Student Board Member Barry commented that we make our decisions on what we value whether you are a district, government, or person. Money is put towards whatever is valued. The argument can be made that we put money toward benefits. We speak about how we want to be a destination school district. She feels we want to be a destination school district not only to our students, but to our teachers too. She knows teachers are hard working. But it alarms her that on the survey it says a lower reason that teachers chose to stay is the District’s leadership. She feels this is a bigger problem than pay because the District leadership rolls down to all other leadership, and this should be one of our main concerns. Another thing she has noticed is that if those under management, such as students under a teacher, are not doing well, it is usually because those in charge are not doing something right. She feels that the teachers present are all saying that something is wrong, and it is not their fault but the fault of the administration. She feels it is not just about compensation, but about making people feel valued.

President Pritchett called for a five minute recess.

9.0 PUBLIC HEARING

9.1 Public Hearing on the Renewal of the Charter for California Montessori Project Conference – Capitol Campus (Jack Kraemer and Gary Bowman)

Charter Oversight Coordinator Jack Kraemer began the presentation by introducing Executive Director Gary Bowman of California Montessori Project. Mr. Kraemer gave an overview of the school, the process for charter renewal, the purpose of the public hearing, and our next steps. Mr. Bowman, with some staff and community members, then gave a presentation on the California Montessori Project, Capitol Campus.

Public Comment:

None

Board Member Comments:

Member Rodriguez asked for the school demographics. Principal Bernie Evangelista gave the demographics as 55% white, 24% Hispanic, 5.5% Asian, 3.04% African American, and 11.85% multiple. Member Rodriguez noted that the Montessori way of teaching was created for children who are at-risk. Our most at-risk students in the District are of a different demographic than that which they serve. She asked why the

African American population is significantly lower than the rest. Principal Evangelista replied that they are a lottery school, and children are picked based on the lottery. Mr. Bowman said he is not exactly sure why this is; at their different schools they see different demographics. In Elk Grove, for example, they have a much higher percentage of African American students. Looking at the history of the mid-town Capitol Campus, he would say their demographics reflected that area. When they relocated to the College Green area, they brought some students and families with them, but it was a lengthy commute for a number of the families. So within a few years many chose to attend neighborhood schools, and they maintain the students and families that could drive the distance from mid-town. Then they started absorbing more of the local families within the College Green area. Therefore, yes, their African American population is half of that at nearby Hubert Bancroft Elementary School. Member Rodriguez commended Sacramento High School for hiring someone to recruit a more diverse population; she encouraged California Montessori Project, Capitol Campus to do the same. She thinks they are doing a fantastic job, but she would like to see more diversity. Mr. Bowman said they absolutely agree, and maybe they can work with Sacramento High School's admissions and enrollment department to look at ways in which they can increase those specific demographics.

Member Arroyo spoke about the achievement up until 2013 and noted a difference in achievement between different demographic groups. All groups' scores are still high, but he does see a little bit of a lag. He asked if this is systemic for whatever reason and asked for feedback. Mr. Bowman said that he does not know if it is systemic, and they agree that high 700s are good scores for the subgroups. Their goal, however, with the old accountability standards would be that all of their students exceed 800. Having said that, what they really strive to do is, when they get the results back from the state, aggregate the information for all students. They look at where the skill set deficits are and try to create strategies to provide intervention. Under the new testing and funding formulas, they are specifically looking at targeted groups to provide interventions on their early release days so that those students get additional tutoring. They have also offered an after school program called Star Power which is a no-fee tutoring and skills set intervention program. Member Arroyo said that he hopes that as we go to a new methodology of testing students and measuring their progress we can start seeing that gap lowered. He would love to visit the school.

Second Vice President Ryan pointed out that the school reported about 12% of the student population as two or more races and that students might not fall into the category of African American, Hispanic, or white, but are two or more races. She would, therefore, suggest that this would probably significantly diversify the statistic for the number of African American students being served. She also pointed out that the variance across ethnic subgroups is not a significant variance; there are many of our schools that would be thrilled to have a 785 or 787 score. She notes they only began tracking multiple races in 2013 and asked if that is why they only have data for their performance for that year. Principal Evangelista said that the subgroup probably was not big enough to track. Second Vice President Ryan said that she values diversity and agrees with the idea that we need a focus on recruitment. The after school tutoring model is very impressive; she is interested in visiting that portion of their model to find out what year to year gains they see with those student cohorts. Mr. Bowman said two years ago they hired a half time testing coordinator. Part of that job is to look at subgroups and analyze where they are successful and where they are challenged so that they can bridge the gap.

Member Rodriguez asked, regarding the lottery system, does everyone go into the same pot or are they doing something to ensure that they have a more representative sampling. Mr. Bowman said that they have preferences with staff and siblings. There was a Montessori preference when he joined that he pulled for a number of years with the justification that if any preference is pulled perhaps one is increasing the likelihood of adding diversity into the student population. At the same time, for families who are so committed to a methodology that they have sent their kids to Montessori pre-schools, it is great to bring those families in as well so that they can strengthen the presentation of the methodology. Having said that, their kids basically

enter in the Kindergarten level because they do have extensive waiting lists. Also, because they know that a foundation is very important and very linked to Maria Montessori's methodology, they generally do not bring kids into the upper grades. Therefore Kindergarten is a critical entry level year. The way that they can increase the diversity within their program is by recruitment and increasing diversity within the pool from which they draw. He feels that is the best strategy, to recruit and bring families into their school at the earliest levels to help them matriculate into the upper grades and actually change those demographic ratios. Member Rodriguez thanked him for sharing that and said she may have some further information for him to discuss later.

President Pritchett thanked her colleagues for bringing up the issue of race. The school sits on the border of Member Cochran and her areas at the old Thomas Jefferson Elementary School site. She asked how many kids from the old Thomas Jefferson school site and neighborhood attend the school. Principal Evangelista said they currently have about 64 students living within the neighborhood; this is about 20%. In-district students, or about 282 students, make up the other 80%. President Pritchett asked how many children are being served under an Individualized Education Program (IEP). Principal Evangelista answered that the number is 56 students currently, which is about 16% of their population. Mr. Bowman said that they generally have a higher special education ratio than a lot of traditional public schools.

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 (Gerardo Castillo, CPA)**
- 10.1b Approve Personnel Transactions (Cancy McArn)**
- 10.1c Approve Luther Burbank High School Field Trip to Tacoma, Washington from March 3 – 8, 2016 (Lisa Allen and Chad Sweitzer)**
- 10.1d Approve School of Engineering and Sciences Field Trip to Flagstaff, Arizona from March 6 – 13, 2016 (Lisa Allen and Tu Moua-Carroz)**
- 10.1e Approve Business and Financial Report: Warrants, Checks, and Electronic Transfers Issued for the Period of January 2016 (Gerardo Castillo, CPA)**
- 10.1f Approve Appointment of Board Member Ellen Cochran to the California School Board Association (CSBA) Delegate Assembly (José L. Banda)**
- 10.1g Approve Minutes of the January 21, 2016, Board of Education Meeting (José L. Banda)**

President Pritchett asked for a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda. A motion was made to approve by Member Woo and seconded by Member Rodriguez. The Board voted unanimously to adopt the agenda.

11.0 BOARD WORKSHOP/STRATEGIC PLAN AND OTHER INITIATIVES

11.1 Approve Real Estate Advisory Proposals for Three Sites (Cathy Allen)

Action
Information
(item type
changed
during agenda
adoption)

Chief Operations Officer Cathy Allen began the presentation by introducing Chad Wakefield, Senior Project Manager of Overland, Pacific, and Cutler. She said that in the third quarter of 2015 we talked about hiring a firm to help evaluate some of our properties that might be declared surplus, and Mr. Wakefield's firm was chosen to help us with real estate advisory matters. They have been meeting, toured sites, and met with the adhoc committee. What is being presented tonight are the results so far of what they have been able to ascertain through analyses, studies, phone calls, conferences, and reaching out to others that have done this. There is a very thorough report in the packet. Ms. Allen noted that the three sites identified are 2401 Florin Road, 1619 N Street, and 2718 G Street. She described the assignments given to the firm hired. She then turned the presentation over to Mr. Wakefield. He went over primary initial findings, the schedule and progress to date, the work remaining for his firm, and alternatives to sale or lease of assets. He gave recommendations and went over a potential disposition schedule. Ms. Allen then summed up the seven different options available for the three sites. She said they are now at the point where they need some Board discussion and to get direction from the Board. Referring to the potential schedule, she said that almost all has to happen in Open Session and with Board resolutions.

Public Comment:

William Burg, a board member with Preservation Sacramento, encouraged the Board to move forward with the proposal to sell the properties, but to retain the historic Thomas Jefferson and Old Marshall schools. He said demolition as highest and best use is a flawed assumption as these buildings are a non-renewable and valuable historic resource that adds to the value of the sites. All three of the 2014 proposals for these sites wanted to re-use the buildings. He encouraged the Board to extend the lives of these buildings for tomorrow. Danny Yost, co-chair of Midtown Neighborhood Association, said that his association wants to be informed of what goes on with these properties, and they also want to work with the Board as decisions are made. He lives near the Thomas Jefferson School site and often wonders what will be done with the site.

Tom Quasebaryn lives across the street from the Old Marshall School site and feels it should be preserved so it can be an asset and benefit to the community. However he has seen it decline slowly but steadily and feels it is on the brink of becoming blighted and unable to be restored. He urged the Board to consider the condition of this particular facility and its historic status so that a decision can be expedited. He offered the support of the neighborhood and said they would like to be involved in the decision making process to the extent that they can.

Patrick Stelmach encouraged the Board to act to preserve these historic assets in a way that contributes to the community's fabric. He assured them that they would get top dollar. He is on the board of directors for Preservation Sacramento and is a real estate broker. He feels demolishing these structures would be a disastrous wasted opportunity. His company specializes in adaptive reuse of historic buildings in the urban core of midtown and downtown. He said there is a huge demand in the marketplace for these kinds of spaces.

Julie Murphy, co-chair of Marshall School/New Era Park Neighborhood Association, lives across the street from the Old Marshall School site. She feels demolition of the building would be a tragedy for the community. She urged the Board to act quickly on a decision. She also stated that the community wants to be involved.

Board Member Comments:

Vice President Hansen asked if the 7-11 Committee requirements have been met with these three facilities. Ms. Allen answered that they have been able to ascertain that there was a recommendation to the Board at that past time to surplus the properties, but she does not believe a resolution was ever done. She said we would want to go through that process again and all the proper notifications that would entail. So if the Board decided to surplus, we would bring it forth with a resolution. Vice President Hansen thanked Ms. Allen and the contractor for fulfilling the Board's requests. He wants to keep the ball rolling; he knows this is an information item tonight, but he stressed to his fellow Board members that a decision must be made on how to give staff further direction at the next Board meeting. Looking at different options, he would like the District to be involved in the development and reuse of these projects. Anything that is an asset that can generate money for the District should be kept. It would be a shame to lose any building that is part of the legacy of the District. A joint occupancy that allows for a 66 year partnership with a developer does make sense to him. He feels we should look at a request for quotation for two facilities to see if we have interested real estate development partners. That could be looked at during the next Board meeting to determine if there is interest. This would be fairly expeditious, and if there is no interest in that, then we can take a different step. On the other property, 24th and Florin, he said this seems more like a simple sale. It could be divided into four parcels so that it is easier to sell. Community involvement also is key, and he appreciates the work that Old Marshall School/New Era Park Neighborhood Association has done. We are still at some of the beginning steps, but a lot of work has already been done. Because the 7-11 Committee is done, that represents a year of completion.

Member Cochrane thanked Ms. Allen for the presentation and said that she agrees there is urgency to have a building that is repaired and functional in the neighborhood, especially at 28th and G Street, but we want to make sure that we do not go too fast; we must have full Board knowledge, vote, and not be in a situation where we are releasing or selling a property which may be needed in the future. New property cannot be created. Therefore any property in which sale is a consideration must be done so with great thought. She asked Mr. Burg what type of historical preservation designations 1619 N Street and Old Marshall School have. Mr. Burg said that in both cases they are listed as individual landmarks in the Sacramento Register, but nothing else. They have been identified in state surveys but neither have been nominated or listed in the California Register or National Register. Member Cochrane asked if it is possible someone could be nominating one of the buildings. Mr. Burg said yes, they certainly could be as both are strong candidates for eligibility. Member Cochrane asked who nominates. Mr. Burg replied that anyone can. Member Cochrane asked if Preservation Sacramento has any plans to do that. Mr. Burg said that they do not, but supposed it is not out of the question. Member Cochrane requested Mr. Burg to send her any information he has on this.

Second Vice President Ryan thanked the presenters for their review and recommendations. She concurs with the comments of Vice President Hansen and Member Cochrane regarding demolition. She asked for a description of functionally obsolete and for the cost of on-going maintenance year to year. She also asked if any cost analysis has been done to reopen either Old Marshall or Thomas Jefferson school sites. Mr. Burg described functional obsolescence as a building that no longer meets market desire or its ability to serve its current purpose. An office building, for example, that finds itself in the middle of a high intensity industrial area is probably no longer usable to the market as class A office space. In these cases, the two downtown properties are smaller, old school sites. In the case of Old Marshall, the surrounding neighborhood is beautiful with nice older homes, so the building could be made more useful and marketable in that area. The situation is similar with 16th and N Streets. It is an old school building that has a five story apartment property across the street being developed. Its zoning allows for 150 units per acre. It therefore now has a higher and better use than it did when it was developed. Ms. Allen said that, regarding on-going maintenance, the buildings are still assets for us, so we treat each like an asset. If we find a problem, we go out and address it although we do not put a lot of money into a closed school site. We are still required to

maintain an active fire alarm system there, and we spent quite a bit on the roof at the Old Marshall site not too long ago. She said she can get the dollar amount for a year's worth of maintenance at the next Board meeting. To renovate the buildings to bring them back to use as schools would be very prohibitive. The state has a guideline that says if the cost to renovate exceeds 50 percent of the replacement cost of the building, then the state will not provide funding for it. She will, however, also get the cost to renovate 16th and N Streets ready for the next Board meeting. Second Vice President Ryan asked for confirmation that what she is saying is the likelihood of the property being able to reopen as a functional public K-12 school site is very small. Ms. Allen answered that is correct. Second Vice President Ryan said she worries about how we materialize resources that would allow us to see some of the great reuse visions come to fruition. She is interested in the comments made regarding disposal of the properties being done in a thoughtful way by working with an entity that commits to the historic preservation of the Thomas Jefferson and Old Marshall sites; apparently this entity would help us secure the resources to restore them to the stature of a community gem and use them in a way that benefits the community as a whole as well. She also asked a question about recent discussions regarding the potential swap of these two properties for property that has been identified as a strong fit for a central kitchen on San Juan Avenue. She asked if there was a willingness to preserve the Thomas Jefferson property in its current form, or was the discussion for demolition. Ms. Allen said there has never been a discussion about demolition. It is included in the report only because it is a methodology by which to come up with an appraisal. The three proposals received over two years ago from interested developers all were going to incorporate the existing building and then build on either side of it as well. Second Vice President Ryan said she wants to see the best possible uses that benefit our community and students; she believes a top priority is historic preservation.

Member Rodriguez said she respects historical value and appreciates cities that preserve historical areas. She asked if the analysis for the 16th and N Street site included air rights. Mr. Burg said that air rights were not considered in their report as a separate bundle. They considered the value of the land and if the existing improvements contributed anything to the value of that land. They looked at the structure and the parcel at this point; part of the appraiser's assignment could be to give a valuation of air rights as well. If we were to do a long term ground lease, this is something that can be negotiated in a lease agreement, i.e., preservation of those rights. Whether or not they have any value in the future would be determined later, but a lease can put an appraised fair market value on air rights. Member Rodriguez said that she wants to make sure this is part of the evaluation process for the two downtown buildings. Ms. Allen said that if the direction of the Board is to include that, they will incorporate it into the appraisal. Member Rodriguez asked if it will be part of the package two weeks from now. Ms. Allen said no as we need to narrow the focus on both properties. It has been discussed in the Facilities Committee meetings about doing a request for quotation that would reach out to interested developers who would want to come to a community meeting and hear comments about the properties. This way we can hear if they want to do this type of work and, if so, in what type of capacity. Two weeks from now what will only happen on our end is that Ms. Allen will answer some of the questions that she was not able to answer tonight. They are hoping also in two weeks to have clearer direction for each of those sites. Mr. Burg said a full blown real estate appraisal has a six to eight week turn around delivery time. Adding something unique like air rights may lengthen that. They may have to subcontract the air rights piece. President Pritchett said the Board can vote on air rights in two weeks. Member Rodriguez asked about the potential of doing a special tax for the immediate area to be able to keep the buildings for joint use. Ms. Allen said that has not been considered yet. Member Rodriguez said she would like this to be looked at also. She requested to talk to Ms. Allen later about the 24th and Florin site as it is in the area she represents. She may want to pull this site off the proposal pending their discussion. Community input is also very important to her.

Member Arroyo commended Vice President Hansen for his leadership in bringing this matter along. He feels it is premature to talk about specific projects and wants. Ms. Allen said she would like the Board to have a discussion and consensus on a concept. For example, if the concept for the Old Marshall site is some

sort of a joint occupancy program, then they would move forward with next steps to see what that looks like, but that does not mean they would partner with a particular person or agency at this point. Member Arroyo spoke about past discussions on the 16th and N Street property; what he learned from that is there are developers that can come up with creative and interesting models for use. As long as we spell out what it is we are seeking, being very transparent with the public at the same time, an opportunity is opened for people to apply and be considered. Therefore he does not want to spend time with his vision of what he would like to see at each site tonight; this is the conversation that will be had at the next Board meeting. He is trying to narrow down tonight what it is we want the public to know, because by the next meeting the Board will start refining, so the community needs to start contacting the Board to let Members know their wishes. He asked at what point the Board would start to consider specific developers and/or partners in these concepts. Ms. Allen used Old Marshall as an example and stated that Member Cochrane did a request for ideas which generated response from a lot of people; if we were to be presenting that tonight to the Board and giving the most popular idea, we would then receive direction and follow up with a request for quotation to interested developers to do that specific thing.

President Pritchett asked Ms. Allen to send the Board the previous 7-11 Committee recommendations and to bring that in two weeks. She clarified with the Board that in two weeks they should determine what direction each would like to take. Ms. Allen asked if it will come back as a Conference/Action Item next time. President Pritchett said yes.

11.2 Monthly Facilities Update (Cathy Allen)

Information

Ms. Allen gave an update on class size reduction progress. Staff visited all elementary schools to assess the needs of each site. Ten sites were identified as in need of additional classrooms. Work is scheduled to start in the Spring upon Department of State Architect approval.

Public Comment:

Angie Sutherland, a parent at Hollywood Park Elementary School, said she is not clear on what the criteria is to determine which schools are getting extra buildings. She asked if this is going to displace any programs or classes or move teachers.

Board Member Comments:

Superintendent Banda said staff did a thorough review of the school sites. They spoke to each principal about their programs and needs. And in some cases it is displacing. For example, at Crocker Riverside Elementary School the Transitional Kindergarten class is going to be moved due to capacity. In some cases Principals were able to maneuver to keep from bringing in additional classrooms and to also sustain the programs that they have. Each principal was contacted and part of the decision. Ms. Allen said that we are not displacing programs.

Second Vice President Ryan thanked Ms. Sutherland for her comments and appreciates that Principals were consulted. Not all principals in her area were happy with decisions that were made. Hollywood Park Elementary is not getting a portable, but neighboring Leonardo da Vinci is getting four or five. Hollywood Park Elementary, in an effort to grow enrollment, extended their Kindergarten day. As a result of class size reduction and not receiving the one portable requested, however, they might have to create a Special Education wing if they cannot relocate the early childhood education program. This would be very unfortunate, and she would like to see the District move forward in a commitment to address this issue. She asked if it is feasible to take surplus portables from surrounding districts. Ms. Allen said that all portables

being relocated are coming from our stockpile or school sites; we are not purchasing any portables. Some need to be repaired. She also noted that growth needs to be separate from class size reduction. Second Vice President Ryan asked what the timeline is for Hollywood Park Elementary School. Ms. Allen said that Assistant Superintendent Mary Hardin Young has been working with Principal Luke; Ms. Allen will follow-up with Ms. Hardin Young.

President Pritchett was going to ask if we are displacing any Special Day Class students, and hearing about the use of a Special Education wing appalls her. She does not like the idea of isolating special education students in a wing, and she hopes the Superintendent addresses this.

11.3 Strategic Plan Review (Dr. Al Rogers)

Conference

Dr. Rogers began the presentation by introducing LCAP/SPSA Coordinator Cathy Morrison and Will Jerrell of Pivot Learning Partners. Ms. Morrison gave an overview of the presentation. Dr. Rogers then went over findings which included status, process and focus groups, surveys, and community meetings. Ms. Morrison went over findings in a timeline format. Dr. Rogers went over the first cycle of engagement and what was learned from it. Ms. Morrison then addressed how they interpreted all of the sources providing information on the plan. Dr. Rogers then went over revisions and recommendations to core values. Ms. Morrison completed the presentation by going over timeline and next steps.

Public Comment:

Angie Sutherland thanked staff for all of their work on the Strategic Plan and said she attended an input session in November. At that time she felt the plan did not speak to students with disabilities. She asked that students with disabilities be listed as a subgroup along with students of color, low-income, English learners, and foster and homeless youth. She thanked staff for including a review of Special Education services under expanding and improving interventions and academic supports for all students; she said this is vague however. She is disappointed with the survey as it does break down all the ethnicities among parents, students, and teachers, but we do not know what parents of students with disabilities say.

Board Member Comments:

Member Rodriguez thanked staff for doing this work. She noted that this is the first survey and that there will be more. She said we are not reaching out to the Latino community in a sufficient manner. They represent nine percent of survey respondents yet they are the largest ethnic group in the District. Also, she is concerned because she cannot find the core values on the website. She feels that if all in the District do not feel valued we will have actions like we had earlier this evening. She feels we need to understand and find out why we are having a lack of participation from the parents, students, and staff when surveys come out. If it is because we truly do not have a value system, then let us fix it. She has gotten feedback from the community saying that they are not being given the flexibility of picking their own priorities due to the way the survey is set up. She is partnering with Keith Herron of Target Excellence to use a survey that goes out through a mobile devices app. They will keep track of what ethnic group is responding and at what rate. They also discussed bringing people in at Rosa Parks K-8 School for a community meeting for a dot vote. She wants to see community responding genuinely; she does not want them to be fed a response.

President Pritchett asked for a motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes. A motion was made by Member Arroyo and seconded by Member Cochrane. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Morrison reported a clarification just received that the overall demographics of the survey reflect a lower Latino population because they had a high population of staff responding who are primarily white. Breaking demographics down to the parent population, there were actually 24 percent of parents who took the survey in Spanish. Additionally, the Student Advisory Council was very involved with the survey this year; 5.6 percent participated last year while this year student response represented almost 18 percent. The student response was extremely diverse. Member Rodriguez said we have a problem when we have more Caucasian people responding to a survey that does not match our District demographic. She would like us to acknowledge that.

Student Member Barry said she knows staff really tried to go out and get student voice, which she appreciates. She provided Dr. Rogers and Ms. Morrison with student feedback on the goal of College, Career, and Life Ready from a Youth Council Meeting that was held today at the Student Activities Council.

Second Vice President Ryan thanked staff for their efforts and underscored the importance of how we make the framing, messaging, language, and surveys accessible and relatable to families of all ethnicities, demographics, and socio-economic status in the District. She feels that Operational Excellence is too vague and that we should change the frame to be more specific. Regarding the survey, she noted 20 percent of respondents did not complete the survey. She wonders why that happened. She suggests having a small focus group do a field test of these important surveys. Have a focus group that talks about language and breaks down Operational Excellence, College and Career Ready, etc. She asked why taking out specific program names from the Strategic Plan is being considered. Dr. Rogers said he feels that they will get there as a Board as we get closer to the final document; we are at a point where it is time to be a little bit more specific. We did not want to limit the conversation too much to specific programs. Using brand names immediately leaves out other ideas, but we will get more specific as we proceed. The next survey will show a lot more in the way of specific language for people to react and advise on. Second Vice President Ryan said she understands that equity is being looked at as being interwoven throughout the document, but she hopes as we flesh out the tangible goals around equity that we are not just looking at equity across ethnic subgroups but also in our Special Education, foster youth, and English language learner populations. She would like some tangible metrics by which we can measure closing achievement gaps so that there is a real commitment so that when we say College and Career Readiness we know what it looks like. Does that mean that equity at the center of that is an expansion of priority schools and what we have seen work within that model? Does that mean we offer A – G as the default curriculum so that all of our kids are at least given an option to be four year college ready? She would like to really break into those details that allow us to have teeth to the vision we are putting forward. Regarding the parent engagement and empowerment piece, she feels we have an office that is doing really well on the ground and should be our best allies in fleshing out those goals, but unless those goals resonate with our families, they are meaningless. She put forth the idea of going back to them and asking what are we doing right now that works, what needs to happen so that we are being culturally responsive, and how do we incorporate their feedback into this final draft.

President Pritchett thanked staff for their work on this, and she looks forward to what comes out of it. She asked if the survey is still open. Dr. Rogers said it is closed, but there will be a second survey as part of the next phase. President Pritchett asked that a board communication be sent out when the new survey is ready so that the Board members can engage their communities.

Superintendent Banda acknowledged the work done by Dr. Rogers, Ms. Morrison, and the rest of the staff. He noted that a lot of things brought up by the Board are similar to discussions they had in Cabinet around language, goals, equity, etc. He said we still have a way to go, and for us it is going to be determining what are the goals, subgoals, and metrics. It is a process, and we appreciate the feedback given here. We have to have goals that resonate with and have meaning to the greater community. It is a work in progress and will end with something we are proud of that speaks to what we want as a community; it will guide us with a

created blueprint in how we educate our children in the District so that they are successfully ready for college, career, and life.

12.0 BUSINESS AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION/REPORTS

Receive Information

12.1 Business and Financial Information:

- *Purchase Order Board Report for the Period of December 15, 2016 through January 14, 2016*
- *Enrollment and Attendance Report for Month 4 Ending December 18, 2015*

The Business and Financial reports were received by President Pritchett.

13.0 FUTURE BOARD MEETING DATES / LOCATIONS

- ✓ *March 3, 2016, 4:30 p.m. Closed Session, 6:30 p.m. Open Session, Serna Center, 5735 47th Avenue, Community Room, Regular Workshop Meeting*
- ✓ *March 17, 2016, 4:30 p.m. Closed Session; 6:30 p.m. Open Session; Serna Center, 5735 47th Avenue, Community Room; Regular Workshop Meeting*

14.0 ADJOURNMENT

President Pritchett asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting; a motion was made by student member Elizabeth Barry and seconded by Second Vice President Ryan. The motion was passed unanimously, and the meeting adjourned at 10:42 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