

**SACRAMENTO COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION**

**Minutes of the Special Meeting of May 17, 2011**

Agenda

- I. Call to Order and Roll Call
  - II. Pledge of Allegiance
  - III. Adoption of Agenda
  - IV. Official Correspondence
  - V. Visitor Presentations
    - A. General Public
    - B. Employee Organizations
  - VI. New Business
    - A. 2011-2012 Community Schools Budget
  - VII. Adjournment
- 

I. President Fong called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m. at the Board Room of the David P. Meaney Education Center, Sacramento Office of Education, 10474 Mather Boulevard, Mather, California. Board members present were Greg Geeting, Brian Rivas, Brian Cooley, Harold Fong, Eleanor Brown, John Scribner, and Jackie Levy. Also present were Sue Stickel, Acting Superintendent and Acting Secretary to the Board; Teresa Stinson, General Counsel; Robin Pierson, Tammy Sanchez, Tim Taylor, and John Fleischman, Assistant Superintendents; Judy Holsinger, SELPA Executive Director; Effie Crush, Chief Administrator-Human Resources; Tim Herrera, Director of Communications; Gary Barker, SCOETA; Bill Mullen, CSEA; other staff and visitors; and Carla Miller, Recording Secretary.

II. President Fong led the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. Mr. Scribner moved to adopt the agenda. Mr. Cooley seconded the motion, which carried.

IV. There was no official correspondence.

V.A. Dawn McCarron, SCOE employee, stated it is her belief throughout her life experience that those that pursue a career in education do it more as a calling than simply as a job. Here at SCOE we pride ourselves in providing education and taking in the children that nobody wants. We provide learning experiences, give them direction and provide a whole window onto the world that they otherwise would not receive. There's been a lot of talk about going into charter schools to benefit. There seems to be no evidence that charter schools do any better than other schools, but they cherry pick those kids who have parents that are already involved and take an active interest. Those aren't the kids we serve here at SCOE. Our kids are the ones that are left behind whether the parents deliberately or without good practice or because they don't know any better. She spoke to this Board the night that they approved the Fortune School Charter and stated her objection because her kids had gone to a school when the charter school law was first passed and we were the leftover school. There was a student whose family couldn't see that she got to the county's spelling bee competition that she qualified for – it was her teacher. It's more important as we have limited

resources rather than splintering them up and taking away from what little we already have for education. We need to provide support for the programs that we provide at SCOE and provide an education for the kids we serve that they normally wouldn't get.

V.B. There were no requests for presentations from employee organizations.

VI.A. President Fong introduced Budget Committee Chair Jackie Levy to present her report on the budget meetings.

Ms. Levy presented the following:

The Budget subcommittee held meetings on April 26 and May 2. Each meeting lasted approximately two hours. At these meetings, the committee heard extreme detail about two different topics. She will try to summarize four hours of those details in her report. She would also like to thank Tammy Sanchez and SCOE staff for their hard work in helping us understand the complexities of the budget and thinking outside the box in terms of leveraging our scarce dollars to maximize the value of our student programs.

The May 2 meeting was about the SCOE administration budget. This is the general budget for all items that are not part of a special grant or otherwise categorical. Basically, all the core functions that SCOE is expected to perform. From 2007-2008, to the present, 15% of the total budget has been cut (from approximately \$95.4M in 2007 to \$81M now). And we have to plan for additional cuts for next year. Out of 113 current employees, there will be cuts of 14.5 FTE for next year, a 13 % cut. Some of these cuts have been accomplished by natural attrition, for example, not replacing an employee who leaves voluntarily. But it may not be possible to realize all the cuts in that manner. And, it makes no financial sense to cut positions that are funded by grants, especially since SCOE receives income from the indirect costs in the grant budgets. The committee did not have any recommendations to staff at this time.

The focus for tonight is the April 26 meeting, which was devoted to our court and community schools. The El Centro program is very expensive for us because the type of student in that program necessitates small class sizes, with not enough additional funding to pay for it, but we are mandated to provide it. Therefore, our county office must subsidize that program from the general fund. Community schools are also very expensive to operate, given that they serve students who have extreme educational and other challenges. At the current rate, we will not be able to continue that program as it currently exists. Everyone agrees that SCOE does a great job with the community school program and it appears that the districts would like us to continue that role. So it is essential that we come up with a plan that is sustainable over the long run and that will hopefully avoid having to issue layoff notices to teachers and other staff every year. We couldn't stress enough the part about coming up with a plan that's sustainable.

One possible way to accomplish this is to scale down the community school program and use ROP and Title I dollars differently. The LINKS model will move away from a classroom-only model to a classroom-based model with credit recovery and GED labs. Students aged 14-16 will be in an extended school day (6 hours) with the goal of returning them to their home districts. Academic teachers will be paired with ROP instructors in an academy-like model that allows for higher enrollment per academic

teacher, yet smaller class sizes for each class period. Students who are 17 and 18 years old will complete their high school education through credit recovery and GED labs in a daily four hour program. Staff believes that higher enrollment should make this program economically feasible. Ms. Sanchez will go over the details with you shortly.

There is one big caveat with this plan - in order to make it work three things must fall into place (we refer to this as the "three-legged stool"):

- 1) Participating school districts must be willing to guarantee enrollment and fund a per student excess cost. Assistant Superintendent Tim Taylor can meet with districts to discuss their willingness to do so.
- 2) SCOE management must work with employee associations to change the current LINKS model.
- 3) The May revise of the state budget must provide adequate funding for this program.

She would like to stress to everyone that this is just a preliminary concept at this point. Much work remains to be done. Teachers will be asked to become more involved to work out the specifics of how it might work in reality. At this time, staff is looking for the full Board to authorize them to further explore this plan. The budget committee recommends that the full Board do so. At this point, she would like to turn it over to Assistant Superintendent Tammy Sanchez for more specific details and after that she will be open for questions from the Board and members of the public.

Ms. Sanchez said she has a lot to cover tonight and she can do it in a very short time if everyone will hold their questions until the end. Ms. Levy outlined some of the problems with the community schools. We've reduced revenue limits since 2007-2008. Back in 2007-2008, we had over \$9,500 we received per ADA, now we are at less than \$8,500 so we've gone down to over \$1,000 and that count does not include any cuts we may receive in the 2011-2012 budget. The districts are paying attention to every student they send our way. We are seeing a very different student in our community schools. We are seeing more of the older students and more credit deficient students. So we have to look at what program we offer for this changing population. Up to this point we've been using one-time money to help make up for some of the structural deficit of the program. Those monies are gone and we need to look for some sustainability to go forward. We need to get down to a program where the expenses are less than or equal to the expenditures so we can go on year after year without having to make staff reductions and so forth. Currently the way our model is supposed to work, and it's in the associations' contracts, is that we try to enroll no more than 30 students per teacher which gets us an ADA of about 22 students per teacher. What actually happens throughout the year with the ebbs and flows of enrollment and attendance is we get an average enrollment of less than 27 per teacher which equals to an average attendance of less than 19 per teacher. It is not bringing in the enrollment and the attendance we need. What we are looking at today is a skeleton model of something we talked about in budget committee; it's a smaller model to be more in line with what students the districts plan on sending us. It has more opportunities for ROP; it will have more enrolled students per teacher. Right now what happens is the students come to school

and they go to their community school teacher; think about it more like a high school where you rotate classes and so you would go to your regular teacher one period and maybe go out to ROP another period and then rotate. While we could enroll more students per teacher, there would be a smaller class size per period for the regular education teacher because students would be rotating throughout the day. So you would never have all the students at once in the classroom; that would be the bigger role that we would have with ROP. Our actual class sizes per class per period would be smaller. We would have more of the classroom base with credit recovery and GED labs. We are working on three aspects of the three-legged stool we've talked about. The districts are currently working with us on getting MOUs, where they will guarantee to send us a number of students with a small excess cost. We haven't gotten to all of the districts yet but most of them have said they will hop on board as long as what we offer is classroom based instruction to their students. They don't want their students pushed into an independent study class waiting for a classroom to open. We will offer independent study should a student ask for it, but it has to be the option of classroom-based instruction and that's what the districts will pay for. Next, management must work with the association to change our LINKS model. She doesn't really want to talk much more about it because she doesn't want to be accused of negotiating in public. And finally, there's the Governor's budget. The May Revise came out on Monday and there seems to be a commitment to want to help schools and not cut schools but she doesn't feel like we know any more today than we knew back in January. Our skeleton plan would consist of four sites. The Marian Anderson site was for one year and will go back to Sac City. The four sites would be Hickey, Gerber, Boys and Girls Club, and North Area. In the presentation, you can see the number of academic teachers at each site, the number of ROP teachers at each site, and the number of students that would be enrolled at each site. If you add up all the students together we have 290 students enrolled. She will walk through building a budget with all of the four sites at once. This is very similar to what we did in the budget committee except she will do it much faster. In the budget committee we went through, made a lot of cuts, had a lot of discussion about this and would like to show you where we are right now and we've really cut our expenses back before we got up to this point. Under the skeleton model, we would have enrollment of 290 students that would achieve ADA of 191 students. This is not a conservative way of counting because this assumes we have 290 students on the first day of school, and they attend a certain percentage of the time. We have ebbs and flows but she wants to show that we have to start somewhere. This is a basic place to start. In the Budget Committee we talked about three different funding models for revenue. If we held at our current level, our rate would be \$8,489 per ADA; if we were to cut 5% it would reduce down to \$8,065, and a 10% cut would bring it down to \$7,641. When you multiply that by 191 ADA you get your revenue; about \$1.6 million under the one model, about \$1.5 million under the second, and about \$1.4 million under the third. Now let's look at expenses. We know how much money we have, so we will list the expenses in one column and keep a running balance so you can see how fast we go through the money. The first thing we need is teachers. Under this model, ROP teachers are going to be paid out of the ROP budget so we are only going to look at the regular academic teachers of which there are 8 in the four sites. The average salary and benefits is \$107,000 for a total cost of \$856,000. The next item we discussed is a principal. What we really want is a principal each for the North and South areas because these sites are spread out, but there's not enough money to cover two principals. Instead we thought of two principals – one in the north and one in the

south, but each spends half of their time doing regular administrative principal activities and the other half of their time doing Title I activities. We do have some money available in Title I that could pay for half of their salaries as long as they perform Title I activities. The amount of a principal that would go to this budget would be 1 FTE. We get two principals and 1 FTE. One principal's salary and benefits cost \$140,000. We would need a secretary or registrar type person; we are looking for one for the north and one for the south so 2 FTE – salary and benefits \$136,000. Then we have to look at the other costs of having employees. We have to hire substitute teachers when people are absent. We have a sick leave incentive when people don't use their sick leave and so forth. There are little things we pay for – most of it is substitute teacher costs. We've been in business long enough to know what kind of percent we need to add on for this. She's going to write down substitute, sick leave incentive and few other things in there also. It would come to \$130,000 for salaries of this size. The other thing we need to think about is the special education services that we need for these students. We have a small portion of a resource teacher that we would put in this budget. We are looking at about \$25,000. We also would have psychologist costs and need 77 days for this population. For 77 days, the cost is \$47,000. Do we want utilities, electricity, and water in the classroom? Currently, our utility bill is about \$80,000 but we realize this will be a smaller program so we're thinking \$45,000 for utilities. Do we want our teachers and classrooms to have pencils and paper? We looked at the current year budgets and we have about \$80,000 for supplies and we are thinking smaller and going to tighten our belts and cut that in half – down to \$40,000. Communications – this is for phones and computer lines and currently we have about \$48,000 budgeted and we should be able to reduce that to \$35,000 based on a lower need. The one thing she wants to bring up about utilities and communications is we don't have any control over this expense; if they want to raise our utility rates we will have to pay it. We have to provide meals for our students. We contract with San Juan and Elk Grove to prepare the meals, to do the paper work to get reimbursed from the federal and state. We don't get 100% of our meals reimbursed so we are out of pocket a little bit. The meals for students come to \$35,000. We don't have a transportation department to provide transportation for these students; therefore we provide RT bus passes. We don't give everybody a bus pass for the whole semester because they are going to come and go so we use the coupons and we give them out as the students are attending. If we don't provide transportation there's a good chance these kids won't make it to our school. We feel it's very important to put transportation costs in there. Transportation for this number of students is \$60,000. She knows it sounds like a lot of money but it's cheaper; think about what it would cost to have buses for four locations and bus drivers. We do have a little bit of equipment. We have computers and copiers; for computers and lab and so forth for the equipment to do equipment repairs and maintenance that cost would be \$12,000 if you want to continue to maintain them. One other cost is a safety officer – at the Hickey site we use a part of an FTE but from San Juan. They provide a safety officer to us at a cost of \$20,000 which is a very low cost for the services we received. And finally, she'll just throw a bunch of stuff in the other category: field trips, printing, postage, GED exam cost – for those of you on the budget committee this line item is changed a little bit from the budget committee because she forgot to add in the GED cost in there so when she put the totals on there so she decided to add the GED cost in the other category. There's \$85,000 in the budget for the others. That is the total cost we came up with. We talked about what kind of program we wanted to run; whether we wanted to have the Chevy of programs or the AMC Hornet and we realized that after we built this

budget we already have the AMC Hornet. We didn't know where else to cut. We felt we were already there. We thought we would go for the Chevy but ran out of money before we could get there. When you look at the total of where we are with these basic expenses and then compare them with different revenue scenarios you see that we are close. We cut back enough to get within a catch up basis so that's why we are saying with a small excess cost we think we can get these things to match and that's where we are. If the revenue limit isn't cut at all we are really close. If it is cut then we are going to have to get \$100,000 from districts; if it is cut 10% then she doesn't know how we will get there. You can see we cut back a lot and got this thing close. She would like to open it for questions or input from the Board. Do you want her to cut somewhere else? Do you see something we don't need? Do you see something she forgot to put in?

Acting Superintendent Stickel said this is a modest model and hopefully a sustainable model. It is not to say that this model cannot grow larger in the future but right now this is a model that our funds can support.

Mr. Cooley said this model would be for the entire community school program which we scaled down to two or three sites.

Ms. Sanchez replied four sites.

Mr. Cooley said the Boys and Girls Club.

Ms. Sanchez replied the Boys and Girls Club we currently have in the south area. They are not going to let us use that facility again but they have offered their downtown site to us so we are going to open a facility there.

Mr. Cooley said in looking at these line items and with the Boys and Girls Club downtown, there isn't a facility improvement cost, maintenance cost, or a janitorial cost but on some of the other sites there is – does that fit into the other scenario?

Ms. Sanchez replied that utilities we pay for here but if it's a site we own such as Hickey and also we have to pay some utilities and janitorial. For maintaining the sites we use the deferred maintenance funds for that so it doesn't hit this budget at all.

Mr. Cooley asked about actual physical improvement.

Ms. Sanchez replied yes and also for maintaining it; painting, carpets. Janitorial is included in utilities.

Mr. Cooley said that was his question on the expense side. On the revenue side, you are looking at the three scenarios: current, 5%, and 10%. In the past, we have charged districts up to \$900 or \$1,000 per student for excess costs.

Ms. Sanchez said she thought we were close to \$2,000 per student in the past, but now we are talking about up to \$500 per student; in fact we want to get it under \$500.

Mr. Cooley asked what is the number she thinks is saleable. In the Committee we talked about \$250 or \$500 per student and that would be an additional line of revenue to these three lines you have across the chart.

Ms. Sanchez said it depends on how you calculate it; depending on what revenue scenario comes in we would have to come up with the dollar amount that fits. It's really hard to come up with an excess cost model for these students because they come and go so quickly. Do we base it on enrollment? Do we base it on attendance? We will have to negotiate those details in the MOU.

Mr. Cooley said given that and he knows you've been talking to the districts about guaranteed enrollment numbers, have there been discussions on an excess cost number?

Ms. Sanchez replied yes. The districts said they do want our program and would consider an excess cost but it's classroom based.

Acting Superintendent Stickel said she has been to a couple of those meetings and as long as we are under \$500 the districts felt it was manageable. Before it was almost \$2,000 – it was too much.

Ms. Sanchez said she came up with a preliminary figure stating that if we did \$425 we could probably get \$100,000 out of that.

Mr. Cooley asked what the enrollment number was because her chart was off.

Ms. Sanchez replied 290.

Mr. Scribner asked if we will get the full 290.

Ms. Sanchez replied she doesn't remember how she calculated the \$425 to get to the \$100,000; if she used enrollment, picked a CBEDs date, something comparable to what we have done in the past.

Ms. Levy said it's now open to the Board members for questions and comments which she will moderate.

Mr. Rivas asked for clarification as to why the districts would be willing to pay the excess cost; is it because they feel ill-equipped to serve these students?

Ms. Sanchez replied absolutely. The districts are doing things a little bit differently now in that they are not just expelling the students and sending them off to the county program; they really are trying to keep every student they can. You are seeing things happening after expulsions; they will say if the student will do this and the parent will help them do this then we will let them come back to our school. They are trying to keep their students in their classrooms. We are getting a different and more difficult student than we've had before and we're probably going to get fewer of them, but if they come in and give us more we will accommodate; we'll open another classroom; we will do what it takes.

Mr. Rivas said we are going to see a needier student. He asked if that is reflected in the column of expenses. Will we incur higher different expenses in order to educate those students? This column to him looks like what he would have guessed is in our existing budget for community schools. He's wondering if we have to make any changes do meet the greater needs of the students.

Ms. Sanchez said that's where she thinks they came up with the idea of a lot more of ROP teachers on the site. She asked Ms. Stickel to help her out in explaining the new role of the ROP teacher.

Acting Superintendent Stickel said one of the things to try and engage students and make it a practical experience for them is to have the academic teachers and the ROP teachers. The ROP teacher would not be teaching every student welding but they would be learning workplace skills, entry level skills for jobs, and things that they could carry with them whether they return to their school or they finish with us. They could go out into the work world with some skills that are very marketable for them. We found in the past that when we've done this kind of program and we tried it and piloted it at a couple of our sites, it was very engaging for the students. It was something that they wanted to be involved in.

Mr. Rivas said the write up refers to using Title I dollars differently. He asked if that could be explained.

Acting Superintendent Stickel said in the past we have been pretty true to "old school" Title I. We have gone by the books. It's not that we are considering doing anything that would put us at risk but we are realizing that, for instance, a principal with these students is going to have to do some additional things beyond what a normal principal would do. We have one of our acting principals out there this evening and she would tell you that she does a lot of supplementary services for students; she tests and tutors students. That's a very legitimate use for Title I. We might bring in some transitional specialists, which is one of the things that the federal government wants to see more of. This is helping students transition back to school or into the work world or to college. Those are all legitimate uses of Title I. She thinks we are expanding what we see as possibilities while still being legitimate and keeping clearly in our mind what would be supplementary so that we won't be supplanting.

Ms. Brown said it sounds like it's similar to what a school district does. As long as the student attends four periods in the regular program then you get the full ADA.

Ms. Sanchez noted that's it called concurrent enrollment.

Ms. Brown observed that you get the ROP money as well so you get two funding choices for that. Now does this student we're anticipating here therefore have to attend four periods of the regular program in order to get the full funding or can they attend two?

Ms. Sanchez replied there's a minimum number of minutes and days. As long as we meet that requirement we could call it a period or day, but they have to meet those minimum minutes in the academic class.

Ms. Brown said so the academic day is longer.

Ms. Sanchez said it's an extended day.

Ms. Brown said so when they do that, there is no pass through money and all of it comes from chunks. When they do that, if they miss the ROP part or miss the academic part do we still get the full ADA or is that calculated and is that how you got your 191 instead of 290?

Ms. Sanchez said the 191 is based on the history we've had of the ratio of attendance to enrollment. If you see the whites of the eyes, you can count the kid. She's not sure if that's the case for this one but right now ROP is under the Tier 3 and so we get funded on what we were funded on the year before. We do take attendance, but we are not going to lose money by them not attending. In the future, if we lose that option we can go back to an attendance system and hopefully that would keep our attendance up in ROP because the kids are already there attending the other classes. She thinks it works either way.

Ms. Brown asked when they get their academic credit, is it for the full day? So many of the expelled students need those units so that when they go back, if they are enrolled in English or Language Arts, then they try to maintain that, is that what we would be doing? Would they receive academic credit for that?

Ms. Sanchez answered yes and this isn't her area of expertise, but she believes if we put them in an accelerated program then they get accelerated credit for finishing the program. Does that make sense?

Ms. Brown responded that she wants to be certain that we're not giving out credits that aren't earned, that it won't be seen as a program where they can go there and get 100 units and then go back.

Ms. Sanchez said we get them to catch up and if they're young enough they can transition them back to their old district. But if they are too old for that, because they are more deficient than before, then we'll try something else.

Acting Superintendent Stickel said the intent would be that this is not a credit mill; develop academic and work place skills. Serve them in a full robust program.

Ms. Brown commented that usually a student is expelled for the semester they're in and the following one. It could be a half a year. Most of those expulsions don't happen in September. It's light in the beginning and heavy at the end.

Ms. Sanchez said that is what we've always struggled with in community schools. We are light in the beginning and heavy at the end. We've tried to work out different models that work the best for that and it is a tough model. This year the staff we had in place did a great job of getting the kids back to school on the first day. Students from last year, if they still needed more work to do, some of the students just wanted to come back to our program the next year. Working with the districts and trying to get a lot of

the students we expected to get more up front. We did a pretty good job at keeping it balanced. We are seeing a big influx.

Ms. Brown asked if they can stay longer than their expulsion when the district commits to pay as long as the student stays. I'm asking all these questions because my concern is that if the districts renege and say we're out of money, we're not going to do it, and some may even say we are going to do it and then at the last minute develop their own program; will that throw the extra cost on our administration budget?

Ms. Sanchez responds that she thinks at any point when you enter a contract with anybody there's always a risk that something can go wrong. We haven't had that experience with the districts. They have been very good about paying what they owe. Once they sign the MOU, they're good about paying.

Acting Superintendent Stickel added we have been meeting with the districts; they don't believe that they have the resources to develop a program like this. They say we really need for you to exist.

Ms. Sanchez said to also think of it this way. Let's say Natomas sends us 20 students and they pay \$500 each, that's \$10,000 to Natomas; it would be \$100,000 to this program. We're hitting a lot of districts for small amounts of money.

Ms. Brown said a drop in cost to the district from \$1,500 - \$2,000 per student down to \$450 per student makes the situation much more agreeable from the district's perspective.

Ms. Sanchez responded that that goes back to her March presentation. She clarified that we used to charge an excess cost. The result was the districts stopped sending us kids because it was too much. We switched our excess cost model showing that if you guaranteed us a number of students and you meet that guarantee, we won't charge the district any excess cost. That model was working fine until our state revenue rates declined. So we went to a point where we had a high excess cost to very little excess cost because some of the districts didn't meet their guarantee. Now it would be a little higher.

Ms. Brown asked for clarification on excess cost and what we were doing before that cost us \$1,500 more per student. I'm hoping this isn't too optimistic because if it doesn't materialize then we're back to our own budget again. Were we talking about our own budget, because you indicated you've cut the budget 15%? Can we talk about or hear where you cut and where the FTE's are? We have a picture of where we are now so if something doesn't materialize, we know where we have to go back and see – where are our FTEs; where are our supply monies or whatever it might be? She's the only one who doesn't know where those cuts were and what FTE's.

Ms. Sanchez responded that because of what the agenda said we should stick to community schools so we don't break that rule, but we are currently scheduling a budget committee to review the full budget and the date isn't selected yet.

Ms. Levy added that the budget committee will be meeting on either June 6 or 7 but we're going to bring the entire budget to the June 21<sup>st</sup> Board Meeting.

Mr. Cooley said we had a chance to look at the administration budget as it relates to community schools and court schools and that gave us a better picture, as a committee. He would support two things: one, if we bring the full budget to the meeting on June 21, it should not be a summary, but should be the full budget. He would have liked to have more time tonight, but we don't, as we have this other obligation. So one option is to have the full detailed presentation that the Budget Committee received so that the other Board members could have the same information; two, as another option, is to have another follow up meeting like this on the admin and the court school budgets prior to June 21 Board meeting to adopt the budget. Because, he felt this even when we started today, we got a lot of good participation from our employee units here but we have to go through this fairly quickly.

Ms. Sanchez said if we wait until June 21 and a Board member wants it as a Study Session that would work. However, if we wait until June 21 and the Board says they don't like it and that she needs to make changes, then we may not be able to get the budget out by June 30, so she would suggest an earlier date.

Mr. Cooley said that looking at eight teachers multiplied by \$107,000, with benefits and salary, comes to \$856,000, and with a principal here and some of the other line items including classified staff, this budget could look different with modifications to the LINKS program. Again he knows that you don't want to go too far down that path, but what he's having difficulty understanding is that even if we modify the LINKS program and the benefit obligation for most of those same employees is the same, he's not understanding what an alteration to the LINKS program would do to the actual numbers.

Ms. Sanchez responded that she could give an example, but other options might come up in negotiations. An example would be a different enrollment to the class size. Right now we have 30 per class.

Mr. Scribner asked if we have any kind of vessel, such as a non-profit corporation set up for the acceptance of deductible contributions in this organization.

Ms. Sanchez responded that we don't have a foundation or corporation set up for it; we have one for Sly Park. But we are an equivalent of a 501(c)(3). If someone gives us donations, we can put it specifically to that purpose and we can write them a letter saying they can deduct on their taxes.

Mr. Scribner asked, regarding the \$35,000 for communications, who do you assign to that? Is the bulk of that postage?

Ms. Sanchez responded that postage was done in the "other" column. Communications includes phones, cell phones and it may even be connections to computers.

Mr. Scribner referred back to RT and asked Ms. Sanchez if she has compared the average RT cost per month compared to Los Rios, which has an arrangement for their

entire student body? Have you looked at any kind of a joint purchasing agreement with some of the other educational bodies to engage a discount?

Ms. Sanchez answered that we have, though we haven't done it in the last year. The problem we come across is that we have too few students going to too many places to make it worth anybody's while. And you'll see school districts right now turning to RT because it's the best deal out there.

Mr. Scribner asked about getting together to form a bulk purchase, like a transportation JPA.

Ms. Sanchez replied that we haven't looked at it from that standpoint.

Mr. Scribner said Los Rios has a fee on every student. Every student is capable of having an RT pass for the entire semester and it costs them \$5 a student. That's what the students are charged.

Ms. Sanchez offered to look into that.

Mr. Scribner asked, regarding utility rates rising, is that related to power or water or sewage? What do we have built into our contracts in terms of freezing those city or county utility rates? Or do we leave everything open in our contract? When we lease the property, what arrangements do we have for the sewer/water/trash or are you talking about energy rates?

Ms. Sanchez replied that the Boys and Girls Club doesn't charge us anything and neither does Gerber, so we're down to Hickey, which we own. And for North Area Community School, she doesn't know if we pay Twin Rivers for that or if we cover that bill ourselves.

Mr. Scribner asked, in terms of assignment of benefits, are we still involved in a health JPA or are we on our own? At one time we had coverage through Schools Insurance Authority (SIA).

Ms. Sanchez answered SIA does not do health benefits. The best deal is the PERS plan and because it works with our trust and with our retirees. Their rate raises will be significantly less compared to the other carriers. That wouldn't change this budget because everybody gets a dollar amount max. For example, if people are getting health and it's \$500 – I don't know what it is off the top of my head - and their cost is \$600, they're out of pocket that extra money. What we review in negotiations is, and it comes up quite a bit, whether this is the time to leave CalPERS. We took informal surveys and determined that this is not the time to leave. Every other year we do this type of survey to see if this is the time to leave and whether we can get better benefits.

Mr. Scribner asked whether this is where all the districts are at. Are they all similarly situated so that CalPERS is the better deal?

Ms. Sanchez answered that is not always true for other districts. A lot of districts do not have the retiree benefits we do and so they have a different scenario.

President Fong asked about the size of this model program, as it compares to our current programs. Our community schools currently have how many teachers? He believes we are laying off all but seven, but the scaled down version has eight teachers.

Ms. Sanchez answered we have about 400 students and approximately 13 or 14 teachers right now.

President Fong asked whether this new scaled down program already takes into consideration that we are not going to bring back six teachers.

Ms. Sanchez replied that right now we do not have enough students to keep 14 teachers. Marian Anderson is closing because it was a one year contract with Sac City. It was always understood that it was a one year contract. Acting Superintendent Stickel has an appointment with Jonathan Raymond, SCUSD Superintendent, to discuss options tomorrow morning.

President Fong said when we were talking about trying to do something with our community schools, he asked for options for the Board to consider so that we could give direction to the staff about what we wanted to do. Right now we have one option in front of us that looks like it may pencil out and may be short about \$250,000, and it's something that may be doable. He also wanted to ask staff if we could have more options. If this is Option A, he would like Option B and possibly Option C really looking outside of the box to try to bring back the six teachers and additional staff. If this is the only plan in front of us, then he really would like to request that there be some shared sacrifices by everybody at SCOE so it's not just our Classified and Certificated employees that bear the brunt of what's happening. He thinks if this is the only option available, then some shared sacrifices would allow us to bring back a few Classified or Certificated staff members. He really encourages that at the next Budget Committee we have some options. We are currently dealing with the expelled students and it's been brought to his attention that there are hundreds and hundreds of dropouts that weren't expelled from their schools, they just quit. They have no interest in school. They voluntarily just left. And they're out in the community. And he knows of one program and Trustee Cooley also knows of that program where they're able to recruit hundreds of kids and if they had more classrooms they would fill those classrooms, too. It may not be something we would initially want to do as it appears to be a semi-independent study classroom situation; but he thinks it has elements that would draw kids there. Over an extended period of time partnering with these groups, there may be an opportunity to have our teachers and other staff to go out to these facilities and work with them so that we don't have just one option in front of us. But he thinks there are other options out there, and maybe Plan B is a shared sacrifice amongst everybody here at SCOE and we look at ways to reduce conference and travel budgets. Give us some options. If the Board is not going to any conferences, and if the staff is not going, maybe we withdraw our memberships of these groups.

Ms. Sanchez replied by summarizing President Fong's requests: options would bring back more teachers. We've looked at options, we've looked at bringing more teachers; we don't have the work or the students to sustain that and we don't have a place to put them. What she's looking for from the Board tonight are options you would like us to look into. At the Budget Committee, we came to this and we just couldn't find anything

else that was feasible but we're still open to suggestions. And as far as shared losses go, Ms. Levy talked about that in her summary and we'll talk about it quite a bit in the next Budget Committee Meeting. She doesn't have all the data in front of her, but travel for instance was cut, maybe 60%. Some travel has to exist because we have grants and the way we get the grant is that we travel up and down the state to teach people how to do something. If we don't do that travel, we can't have the grant. We've looked at those things, but anywhere we could cut, we did. What we're hoping is that when we close our books maybe we'll lose \$1 million instead of losing \$3 million. We still have a way to go before we're even close to bringing back teachers. We're not at a zero balance - we're still at deficit spending. But we're happy to talk about more options.

President Fong added that he would like us to consider doing what state workers did with furlough days. He thinks people would take a furlough day over completely losing their jobs. If you were furloughed a few days in the summer along with the administrators there would be savings that we could use. You could negotiate that with the collective bargaining units. He thinks you don't need to negotiate that with administrators. That's something that could be done at will.

Mr. Cooley said this is the point he was trying to make earlier. There are folks in the audience that want to speak, but he would like to have a better understanding of the community school budget. Also the budget committee had the understanding that the court school budget is in much worse shape and we're probably going to have to deficit spend there. But the Budget Committee has knowledge of the admin budget and he thinks that will help frame this discussion better and give further options. This isn't a motion, but he recommends that at our next regular Board meeting on June 7, we have an agenda item on the Court school and admin budgets and look at how they relate to the community school budget. He thinks it's very difficult to give direction without the benefit of understanding the entire SCOE budget.

President Fong supported Mr. Cooley's request. He said that he actually proposed that idea a few weeks ago about a meeting of the committee as a whole, but it could just be a budget presentation on the agenda for both the court school and the admin budgets so that we all have a better picture. He thinks this is a critical year in terms of the budget; much more so than the last two. We could maybe ask more informed questions of the staff. Now, however, we have something we need to attend to and there are speakers that want to speak. At 6:30 pm we need to move to the regular meeting, so let's go ahead and hear the speakers.

Speakers:

Joyce Zygelman, Special Education Technician, SCOE:

Ms. Zygelman stated that, at a recent Board meeting, she listened to parents, community members, and civic leaders passionately present their arguments in favor of the Board taking legal responsibility for their previous decision to support the goals of the Fortune Charter School. She expressed concern that the students in our programs do not have access to that type of powerful eloquence and community support. She pleaded with the Board to not take anything from the children in our court and community schools and to apply that same passion to all of SCOE's at-risk youth.

Trixie Jones, Office Assistant, SCBC, SCOE:

Ms. Jones stated that SCOE union employees provide a higher standard of education than charter schools' non-union employees. She stated that at-risk youth needs our programs and staff, and urged the Board to reconsider the closure of community schools.

Connie Palatinus, Printing & Production Specialist, Print Shop, SCOE:

Ms. Palatinus described the dramatic improvement in quality and efficiency of their work as a result of new equipment purchased last year. The equipment took three years to get approved. She expressed concern that the cost of the purchase is now threatening the very existence of the print shop, and asked the Board not to let SCOE's foundation crumble.

Martha Penry, Classified Employee, Twin Rivers USD; Member of the Board of Directors, CSEA:

Ms. Penry stated she is appalled that the Board would approve a one million dollar defense fund to defend the creation of a charter school. She expressed support for SCOE's community schools, asked the Board to return those dollars to the general fund and suggested that SCOE negotiate other options with the collective bargaining units.

Gary Barker, Social Worker Liaison, SCOE; President, SCOETA:

Mr. Barker thanked the Board for placing this item on the agenda. He stated that this is a community problem. These kids will not just go away; they will need to be served somewhere, and SCOE is experienced at providing the education and services they need, and districts are committed to our program. He expressed that the proposed model needs adjustments and that SCOETA is willing to negotiate this issue. He also thanked Administration for being willing to work collaboratively with both collective bargaining units.

President Fong stated he would recess this meeting at 6:24 p.m. and reconvene after the 6:30 p.m. meeting for Operation Recognition.

Trustee Cooley moved to recess the meeting. Trustee Levy seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

President Fong reconvened the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

Mr. Cooley said some speakers urged the Board to take action tonight. He commented that for the proposal Ms. Sanchez laid out before the break, two of the three elements are already in place: there have been discussions with the districts about a commitment of students going forward with the community schools; there's been discussion about excess cost and districts' willingness to pay that; and the third piece, which really hasn't occurred in an official way, would be incorporating the elements of the proposal in your collective bargaining negotiations. In terms of getting direction from this Board to move forward, we don't have control over directing you to negotiate particular elements within the collective bargaining agreement though he wishes we did. He would like to come back to the June 7 Board meeting and have an agenda item on the budget. We could talk about the admin and court school budgets to get perspective of this community school budget as we make decisions moving towards June 21. He understands that negotiations will occur on May 31 with certificated collective bargaining unit.

President Fong responded by asking if any other Trustees have comments. He would prefer to move forward with questions from Board members on the current proposal on the table, which is this modified version of the community school. And the others we could add as an Option B or should we bring this budget to the June 7 Board meeting? We can take those on as separate motions.

Ms. Levy said if Board members think this proposal is worth pursuing, staff would like to know. That doesn't preclude us from doing anything else. There could be other options out there as well. But she personally thought this was a good, creative proposal. She liked it because it helped us leverage our scarcest dollars as far as we possibly could. She is hoping the Board will give staff the go ahead to pursue this further.

Mr. Rivas agreed with Trustee Levy. Along those lines, the way he's thinking of this is that there are actually a couple of options before us. There's the "do nothing" option which means the community schools go out of business. And he just wants to remind everyone that the revenue we get per student is \$2,000 too short to cover our costs. He thinks we need to proceed with a plan that keeps the community schools up and running and, as Trustee Levy said, it doesn't preclude us from looking at other options. The way he's thinking about this is staff has put together a plan to save jobs by keeping the community schools economically viable. He'd like to continue that, but is also curious about revisiting the issue that President Fong raised about this other student population which doesn't show up through expulsions: the dropouts who are just out there being served by a gentleman down in the Pocket area. Trustee Cooley and President Fong have met with him and he is curious about how we might be able to work with him in a creative way.

Mr. Geeting added, in relation to our budget committee hearing and on behalf of the employees who were represented there, there was a very strong statement about independent study not being a desirable model. That was made very clear and he just wants to make sure that's brought forward to the full group. Regarding this specific proposal, what really makes it work is that the students are in small groups and rotate from career to academic back to career and they do not get in large groups. Our staff told us when you get large groups, students walk away. It is not an effective model. They made that very clear. He wants to make that point as well.

Mr. Scribner said that with respect to the Independent Study Program, he concurs. He thinks that it's a false image and perception that a child is receiving a real education through independent study and he wishes to point out, unfortunately, that his personal experience bears this out. Some in Valley High are burglars who have been enrolled in independent study. And he knows that from the Sacramento Police Department and from having discovered who burglarized his rental unit last month. He doesn't like the course of action kids wind up in through independent study.

President Fong said the model that we looked at is a sort of independent study and what he envisions is that it is a beginning. What exists out there has some good components, especially the drug, alcohol and gang prevention part. The education part may start out with independent study, but the goal is to get them into a four hour, five day per week program. And he believes that with the program we have to offer, it can

happen and it will save maybe one or two teacher's jobs. If it works, then he thinks it's a model to expand to go out and get the dropouts to come back to the program, which would help change the lives of those young kids who are doing nothing educationally. So the idea is to start with this and to grow it.

Ms. Sanchez asked to clarify something. We do currently and we will in the new model offer independent study, to the students that would like to have independent study. We offer it right now and almost every one of our teachers is trained in doing independent study. Each teacher takes on a small case load. We do even have a teacher that does independent study only. We do have that option for those few students that would rather have that than the classroom-based instruction.

President Fong asked Ms. Sanchez if we could grow that program.

Ms. Sanchez responded yes that if students want to go in, we can hire the teachers to take them.

President Fong added that it's not a program that expelled kids go to. It's a program for kids who have already dropped out. They weren't going to school at all and they were expelled. From what he understands some of them may have been expelled, but their year expired and they never turned back to go to school. Or they just voluntarily dropped out. Getting a handle on the figure is difficult because there is no way to track them right now. It's possible we could fill that classroom and two, three more classrooms because there are so many dropouts out there. He is amazed why we can't partner with this group to do something and save some jobs, and maybe even grow our community school program.

Ms. Sanchez reminded the Board of the effort that we put in at the beginning of this year. It was a huge recruiting effort where we went after those very students that you are speaking of. We were very successful at it, and I can't imagine us not doing that again. She believes that's why our numbers were so high for Marian Anderson is because we were so successful at recruiting.

President Fong stated that we were guaranteed 100 kids from Sac High at Marian Anderson. We didn't have to recruit to fill those 100 slots. Did we get beyond that?

Ms. Sanchez replied that we never got 100 at Marian Anderson, ever. There are 50 there today, but we were guaranteed 100. They just didn't do it.

Acting Superintendent Stickel emphasized that two of the superintendents we met with last week were very clear they do not want their students to go to an independent study program.

President Fong stated that those expelled from their schools will not be going there, they are going to one of the current existing programs but for those that are not even going to school the option is something else. They are not even going to their schools right now so they are not even their students. Their students that get expelled will be in this modified community school program. That is the guarantee that they will be in that type of program, but there is an opportunity to do something else with dropouts that are

not going to anybody's school. They are not anybody's student right now; they are just out there waiting to be claimed by somebody who can offer a good education program. If it works, it is because we have a good program to offer and it is something that they would go to because they see it as something that would help them, not because they are this district's or that district's kids.

Acting Superintendent Stickel stated that we did bring you some different options tonight. We brought you the program for 14 to 16 year olds that pairs ROP teachers and academic teachers together. We also brought you the option of a credit recovery program for 17-18 year old students, the ones who are not going back to their school but we want to help them graduate. That is a credit recovery lab and in the credit recovery lab they spend four days with a teacher so it is not an independent study program. That is a program that could easily grow and we would have the capacity to do that if we had more students. So we did actually bring you a couple of options tonight that are different than what we have in place right now.

President Fong explained that what he understood was basically that we have an option to save our community schools and these are the different components. They were all geared towards the people who have been expelled by their neighborhood school and their districts. If the credit recovery lab is available to anybody else who drops out of class then that is an option but it wasn't made that clear in the presentation. He heard that this is a part of our community school and how we can save it with this different structure. So it is still geared toward those students that are expelled.

Ms. Sanchez replied that if we recruit a student that is not enrolled anywhere we still go through a process with the district that the child lives in. We work with that district to get that student into a program. It still works the same way, except we recruited that student ourselves instead of them being referred directly from the district. It would still be a district child and the district would still pay an excess cost on that student just because they live in the district, and we would work with the district to do that

President Fong asked that if a child lived in a particular district and they weren't going to school anywhere and we recruited them then we have to give that student back to that district and work out a deal with them?

Ms. Sanchez answered that the district will work with us to keep them, but the district owes the student an education. They are happy to let us provide that education for that student so they will work with us to do that. No student is originally ours, all students come from a district somewhere so even if they are not attending school they live within a district. If they lived in downtown Sacramento we would work with Sac City to make sure that they know we have that student and keep records between the two.

Ms. Brown stated that she thought that after so many days, if you haven't received a request for a transcript then that student officially becomes a dropout and is no longer counted in the district. She didn't realize we would still have to be accountable to the district in which he lives if he has been in fact deemed a dropout which to the district means you are no longer in our system, we no longer have to report you any more, we reported you as a drop out.

Ms. Sanchez clarified that if the student resurfaces then they can still become a student of that district and we just work with the district.

Ms. Brown asked whether we have to give them back to the district. She is curious about the money behind the student.

Ms. Sanchez stated she doesn't think we are going to turn a student away because the district somehow didn't pay us an excess cost, but it has never been a problem. The districts typically take responsibility for the students that live in their area.

Ms. Brown asked even if they have to pay you \$450?

Mr. Scribner commented that our conundrum is that we lose on every student even with the excess cost because of the cap we have placed on the excess cost. Don't we wind up recruiting ourselves into trouble then to a certain degree until we have a certain volume?

Ms. Sanchez replied that is the issue here and that is the presentation I did for you back in March. We are losing money on each student that we have; if we grow, we will lose more, and that is the problem with growing this program – we will lose more. What we tried to bring to you today is a scaled down program that we want to try if you give us permission. We are trying to break even. If we can break even then maybe we can expand it into something else, but it is kind of a process. I think we need to start small, see what we start out with and as the program goes along then maybe we would expand it or maybe we would choose not to. Right now we are trying to come up with a program. What we discussed today, we think we can get balanced; we are very close to being balanced right now.

Mr. Scribner stated, to follow up on that, we can view this as a pilot project, given the size that we are envisioning; if we are not able to control the immediate cost then our loss is limited within the parameters of that enrollment per student.

Mr. Rivas stated he just wanted to bring up the Greg Scott program because he is intrigued by a possible partnership that that may help us financially. He asked Acting Superintendent Stickel to elaborate. He thought that some of our folks had gone down and looked at the program that he is referring to, and determined that Mr. Scott's strengths were actually in the counseling and substance abuse counseling part of the services, because the kids he is working with tend to leave school because they have alcohol problems. That perhaps there was a partnership where he could provide the non-educational counseling, and we could provide the educational component. He wasn't thinking about that program in lieu of our community schools or as an alternative.

Acting Superintendent Stickel commented that Tim Taylor has met with them a couple of times. She has not met with this person herself. Part of that is if we bring that program in to be a part of what we described tonight, we have to be able to provide some financial support to that gentleman for the services he is providing. We have also been approached by a few other folks that would like to do something similar, and come in and support our community schools. With the other folks that came to meet with both Tim and her, our answer was that right now we are trying to re-shape our community

schools so that there is something we can envision. We need to see how the budget goes. If there are funds to bring in a program like that to work with our community schools that is something we can look at, but right now we have to see if there are funds available.

Mr. Cooley stated that he thinks the suggestions to approach Mr. Scott's programs, look at other independent study programs are good suggestions to have at the table for the discussion. He also thinks the proposal that was brought tonight, and was taken to the budget committee about a month ago, is probably the best game plan we have going right now to save the community schools. Staff has asked the question in a bunch of committees: in lieu of this proposal, what other proposal looks good to have these community schools at least break even? There really isn't one. It is his recommendation that we give staff the go ahead to continue to explore this proposal, which they are doing now. They want to get this blessing that they are going in the right direction. At the June 7 Board meeting, we will have a discussion of the admin and court school budgets. We haven't even talked about that, which is way worse than this budget and we are mandated to fulfill that requirement.

Mr. Cooley moved to direct staff to continue moving forward with the ROP/community school three-legged stool approach, in concert with negotiating with the two collective bargaining units and come back on June 7 with a new update on where they are at with it, also at the same time give the Board an update on the admin and court school budgets so we have a broader perspective as we make a decision.

Mr. Rivas seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Cooley confirmed that clarification of the date of June 7 to have a budgetary item is incorporated with that motion.

Ms. Brown asked to follow up on your suggestions about thinking outside of the box. It shouldn't stop this from going on but the idea, and she hopes when we do that we stay away from labels (charters, ISP), the idea we should be looking for is successful programs. With that in mind - whatever it is - we might find some elements that we could incorporate and that would work if we could see them work successfully some other place. She hopes that is a real target out there for us because, as you say, there are programs that are capturing these kids.

President Fong stated he would like for a Plan B or Plan C to be presented so we have more than just this one option on the table. If that is something that staff could come up with he would really appreciate it.

Ms. Sanchez asked President Fong to clarify B and C.

President Fong replied that it is a request for additional options to consider. It is up to staff to come up with that for us, just like you came up with this one when we are talking about how to save our community schools. The other picture of this is what we are going to do with our court schools because the county budget is going to get cut even more, and he is assuming that because of those cuts Probation will also be cut more; therefore they won't be able to staff the juvenile hall and that will have an effect on the

120 kids that we thought we were going to get there, and it will probably fall below 100 kids. There is a larger picture for us with court and community schools to become an advocate for the kids and if we have to use our resources and sue the county to provide an education for the kids then he thinks maybe we should look at a way where we can file a class action lawsuit against the county for not providing the public safety requirements that the public expects of them. The capacity of the facility is 350 kids - not that every kid should go to juvenile hall - but for those who could benefit from being in juvenile hall and receiving an education there, he thinks that is something we should look at. Along the same lines if the National Guard is not going to pursue the Boys Ranch let us look at it again and see if we can get it for a dollar from the county and open it up as a facility we could run partnered with somebody else in the community who could provide security, and we will do the education part. Is there anybody out there like that? The education part can pay for our part if it becomes a really large group home or facility that is something like a residential group home. Could that kind of money pay for it from the social service end as a means to balance both of these out? At one time we looked at a real high level special education facility, that San Pasqual Academy model. There are advantages and disadvantages to that model. There are still grants out there to do this kind of stuff for juvenile justice, it just requires us to go out and look at what is a good program to rehabilitate kids who are in the juvenile justice system. Can we use some of these facilities? He just feels like there are other alternatives out there and wishes that we could ask people in the community, talk to people to come up with ideas so we can continue to serve these kids in a way that I know that we can do it. We have had staff work through a model that works but if we can't employ them they are going to go somewhere else. Five years we have worked this program up to where we have it now, and it is going to get lost. Then when good times come back we will be starting from ground zero again.

Ms. Sanchez asked whether the goal is to just bring back people at whatever the cost, or is it to serve more students.

President Fong stated his goal is to use the crisis and the opportunity at hand to build something better that would actually break even if we were able to get some grant or foundation money or partner with people in the community or if we were to partner with the Board of Supervisors in a low-rent situation where they give us a facility to use. They have an RFA out there for that Boy's Ranch and he believes that a lot of the people are not going to go for it because one of the requirements is that you have to use county staff to do the maintenance. That is what happened with the National Guard, they wanted to buy the place outright and the county didn't want to sell it. They want to keep it and use it to generate money over a long term lease and to save jobs on their side by requiring maintenance be done by county employees. Among all of us here, do we know enough of the Board of Supervisors to be able to talk to them about voting to give the use of the facility to someone else?

Mr. Scribner asked whether we have a motion on the floor.

President Fong responded that we do, and we voted on it already.

Mr. Scribner asked where we were on the agenda.

President Fong was reminded by other Board members that because this is a Special Meeting there are no committee or Board Member reports.

Mr. Cooley moved to adjourn.

Ms. Brown asked about the National Guard proposal. She was very pleased to see that topic was followed up, but it looks to her like they are still negotiating.

Acting Superintendent Stickel answered that they are still negotiating, as was indicated in the Board Communication sent last Friday. Right now they are willing to settle for a longer lease and the County does not want to give them a longer lease. She thinks what the National Guard is hoping for is that there would be no bidders as you predicted and then the County will be in a different negotiating stance because the National Guard is still very interested in the property.

Ms. Brown clarified that if we had the opportunity to talk to someone there, the issue is about a longer lease?

Acting Superintendent Stickel responded affirmatively that the issues are a longer lease and using some of the county staff. There were a few issues, and Tim has been involved in some of the conversations so we can get him to expand on that. Both Marty and Tim met with the National Guard a couple of times. They are still interested in the property and would like us to be the educational providers.

Ms. Brown thanked Acting Superintendent Stickel and stated that at least we know if we have the opportunity; that seems promising.

Mr. Scribner added that there is legislation to assist in expediting that process.

President Fong asked if there were any further questions.

VII. Mr. Scribner moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Geeting seconded the motion, which carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Stickel  
Acting Secretary to the Board

Date approved: June 21, 2011