

SACRAMENTO COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 7, 2011

Agenda

- I. Call to Order and Roll Call
 - II. Pledge of Allegiance
 - III. Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting of April 19, 2011
Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting of May 3, 2011
Approval of the Minutes of the Special Board Meeting of May 10, 2011
 - IV. Adoption of Agenda
 - V. Official Correspondence
 - VI. Visitor Presentations
 - A. General Public
 - B. Employee Organizations
 - VII. Superintendent's Report
 - VIII. New Business
 - A. Adoption of Consent Agenda
 1. Report on Personnel Transactions
 2. Award Diplomas to Community School Students
 3. Approval of Revisions to the 2010-2013 Local Education Agency Plan (LEAP)
 - B. Approval of Contracts
 - C. Authorization to Submit Grant Applications/Service Contracts and Accept Funding if Awarded; and Approval of Contracts, Positions, and Other Expenditures Associated with the Grants as Outlined in the Proposed Budgets
 1. \$339,400 TEACH California grant from the California Department of Education for the period July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2014
 - D. Public Hearing, Discussion and Action on Visionary Institute of Math and Science (VIMS) Academy Charter School Petition
 - E. 2011-2012 Administration and Court School Budgets
 - F. Adopt Resolution No. 11-13 – Nomination of Senate President pro Tempore Darrell Steinberg as the 2011 CSBA Outstanding Legislator of the Year
 - G. Second Reading and Adoption of Revisions to Board Bylaw 8000 (Renumbered 9300) – Parliamentary Procedure
 - IX. Board Reports, Comments, and Ideas
 - A. Board Members
 - B. Board President
 - C. Committees
 - X. Items for Distribution
 - A. June/July Events
 - B. June/July Visits
 - XI. Schedule for Future Board Meetings:
 - A. June 21, 2011 – End of Year Report
 - B. July 12, 2011 – Annual Organizational Meeting
 - XII. Adjournment
-

I. President Fong called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. in 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 David W. Gordon, Superintendent and Secretary to the Board; Sue Stickel, Deputy Superintendent; Teresa Stinson, General Counsel; Robin Pierson, Joyce Wright, Tim Taylor, John Fleischman, and Tammy Sanchez, Assistant Superintendents; Judy Holsinger, SELPA Executive Director; 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. On a motion by Mr. Geeting and seconded by Ms. Levy, the revised minutes of the Regular Board Meeting of April 19, 2011, the revised minutes of the Regular Board Meeting of May 3, 2011, and the revised minutes of the Special Board Meeting of May 10, 2011 were approved. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. Mr. Scribner moved to adopt the revised agenda. Ms. Levy seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

V. There was no official correspondence.

VI.A. There were no requests for visitor presentations from the general public.

VI.B. Gary Barker, SCOETA President, welcomed Superintendent Gordon back. He reported that things went well in negotiations. Everyone wants to move forward and there has been some progress and some success with developing an appropriate model that works well for us and the students.

VII. Superintendent Gordon reported on the following:

- Personally thanked everyone at SCOE – and in our local community - for all of their good thoughts and kind words during his absence. He greatly appreciated it.
- Thanked SCOE staff for doing such a great job in handling all of the necessary duties during his absence.
- Congratulated SCOE Multimedia Sound Engineering teacher Joe Clark for being named the 2011 Instructor of the Year at the 3rd Annual California Voice Film Premiere on May 25. Joe received the award for a video produced for the California Voices program by his students at the LINKS Academy at Marian Anderson. In addition to teaching the highly technical subject of sound engineering, Joe works with 9-12 graders in developing resumes and completing job applications.

- Thanked the teachers and staff at Leo A. Palmiter High School for hosting a wonderful graduation ceremony on Friday, June 3. We awarded diplomas to 13 students during a heartwarming ceremony. Thanks to Trustees Brown, Geeting and Levy for joining us and helping to hand out diplomas.
- On Wednesday, June 8, 2011, we will be hosting our first GED ceremony for students who participated in our Boys and Girls Club Program. That event will be at 3:00 pm at the Palmiter campus.
- On Thursday, June 9, 2011, we will hold a graduation for students in the ROP Chiropractic Assistant program. The ceremony will be held at the Washington Unified School District Auditorium in West Sacramento beginning at 6:30 p.m.
- You also are invited to join us on Thursday, June 16, 2011, at 10:00 a.m. at the Sierra Health Foundation for our community school graduation. We will honor students from the following campuses: Hickey, North Area, Gerber, Marian Anderson and the Boys and Girls Club. Our commencement speaker is former Sacramento Monarch and Olympic Gold Medalist Ruthie Bolton.
- On Monday, June 20, 2011, we will be hosting our annual Shining Moments ceremony where we honor the men and women who have successfully completed their programs through the SCBC program. The event will be from 9:00 a.m. to noon at the Holiday Inn Sacramento Capitol Plaza, located at 300 "J" Street. Participants will be honored for completing different phases of the program and will receive GEDs, as well as LINKS awards.
- You are invited to attend the ceremony honoring the first group of graduates from our Leadership Institute, the program overseen by Dr. Steve Winlock. The event is Saturday, June 25, 2011. Participants will present their final projects throughout the day. The graduation will begin at 1:30 p.m. in the Mather Room. We have 28 graduates this year. We expect nearly 30 participants next year, and we also will operate a second cohort in the Elk Grove District as well.
- Our office did the superintendent search for the Elverta Joint Union School District. Many thanks to Effie Crush and Judy Holsinger for their hard work. Dr. Mike Borgaard was selected.

VIII.A. Mr. Geeting moved and Mr. Scribner seconded adoption of Item VIII.A.1. – Accept Report on Personnel Transactions. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Rivas moved and Ms. Levy seconded the motion to move Item VIII.A.2. – Award Diplomas to Community School students. Motion carried unanimously.

President Fong asked Assistant Superintendent Tim Taylor to read the following names of the diploma recipients:

Boys and Girls Club Community School – Areanna Nunnelly
Gerber Community School – Efren Hernandez, Lachelle Miller
LINKS Academy – Raymond Lavato, Hermila Sanchez
North Area – Laureen Wynne and Tiekarian Troutman (posthumously)
Elinor L. Hickey Jr/Sr High School – Elijah Alfafara, Jose Blanco, Abraham Cervantes, Coralisha Cunningham, Christopher Estrella, Sebastian Flores, Julian George, Kenyatta Manning, Jose Mares, Louis Montoya, Alina Placencia, Alisia Placencia, Arrick Powell, Trent Rash, Ernesto Williams and Gerardo Yahuaca.

Mr. Cooley moved and Ms. Levy seconded the motion to approve the revised LEAP.

Mr. Taylor shared that this is the plan that the Board approved last year, with some revisions. The major revision was some additional focus on our performance goals. We piloted NWEA last year; this year we are looking at 20-day and 90-day testing windows and protocols. We wrote it broadly, as we are uncertain which programs will be in the community schools. The majority of our revisions were in targeted instruction. It is a breathing document and we will work with our site councils and site plans to align to this LEA plan and bring the site plans back to you for approval in the fall.

President Fong asked whether there were any questions by fellow trustees. He commented that we have done extraordinary work with our community schools and our LINKS program, but one of our schools – El Centro Junior/Senior High School - is in Program Improvement (PI) year five. What are the consequences of being in PI year five?

Ms. Stickel replied to President Fong's question with reference to SCOE as a district and an LEA. She stated that last year we brought forward our plan for being in PI year three and this year we are actually in PI year four. When we were in PI year three we were sanctioned by the state, and the sanction was to fully implement a curriculum, which is in fact what the LEA plan contains. It shows how we are going to implement our instructional materials, the training we are going to provide for teachers, the training we are going to provide for administrators, the data we are going to use, and how we are going to have people like the academic intervention teachers work with our staff to continually work on and get better at providing instruction for our students. After PI year three, we provide quarterly reports to the State of California, and we did that all last year. The quarterly report is basically just the LEA plan with an additional column for notes regarding our progress. Ultimately when we get to being in PI year six, if there hasn't been a re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), then the State Board of Education (SBE) would look at our progress. They are doing that with Cohort 1 Districts now. Those Cohort 1 Districts are by and large making good progress, and the ones that haven't made progress are having additional conversations. Now let's talk about the school. Once a school is in PI year four, you plan for alternate governance. Principal Mike Borgaard, Tim Taylor, and Wendy Harris, our Director of Prevention and Intervention for Schools and Districts, met and put together a plan for how they are going to respond to that. That plan became part of our LEA plan which is

required by the SBE. PI year five and so forth is about implementing and improving on that plan. So those are the consequences and that is how SCOE met them. We have followed the letter of the law and it is evident our students are making progress, so that is a good thing.

President Fong thanked Ms. Stickel.

Mr. Rivas asked how we rank among most community schools run by county offices of education and whether it is typical to be in PI.

Ms. Stickel answered that many of the community schools and court schools – more court schools than community schools - are in PI. She hasn't seen a ranking of county offices in reference to scores or anything. Most counties that have court and community schools are in PI year three or greater now. The last couple just came in this year. She thinks we are all struggling to respond to the requirements that grow ever higher every year. She thinks county offices are, by and large, doing a pretty good job.

President Fong noted that he thinks we are doing a tremendous job with the kids we have, given that so many of them come to us with deficiencies and probably reading at a level that is three or four years from where they should be age appropriate. If they are with us for 90 days, they make improvement in terms of increasing their reading and math levels. To be able to make up all of those deficiencies in that short time is a hard thing to do, but they do make progress if they stay with us for a 90 day period or for the year. He thanked the staff for the tremendous work that they do, but also pointed out the reality of the law and how it applies, sometimes inappropriately to our students. There is a motion and second on the floor for approval of this item. Motion carried unanimously.

Each item in VIII.A. was individually moved, seconded and carried. By such actions, the Board:

1. Accepted Report on Personnel Transactions
2. Awarded Diplomas to Community School Students
3. Approved the Revisions to the 2010-2013 Local Education Agency Plan (LEAP)

VIII.B. Mr. Cooley moved and Mr. Scribner seconded approval of the contracts as listed.

Mr. Scribner observed that ModSpace indicates we will be reimbursed through the CDCR contract, but the source of funds still shows general support and Support Operations. He asked whether that should reflect CDCR.

Ms. Sanchez replied that SCOE is paying for it out of general support, but is charging the program rent. The money they pay for rent for that portable, along with using the rest of our building, is all included in one rent contract to us.

Mr. Scribner sought clarification that we are being indirectly reimbursed by CDCR.

Ms. Sanchez replied yes.

Mr. Scribner asked, for the transitional housing contract in the Student Programs section, whether we put out an RFP on that, given the size of that contract is \$140,000.

Ms. Sanchez replied that we did go out to RFP on that.

Mr. Scribner asked a question regarding the Safety Center. The description says that services can only be provided by the Safety Center; that we can only go the Safety Center because of guidelines. Is "guidelines" an accurate word, or is it actually a requirement? The term "guidelines" seems permissive to him.

Ms. Sanchez replied that it is a requirement.

Mr. Scribner commented that the county creates a monopoly here. Even though it is our own grant, the county tells us how to spend our money.

Ms. Sanchez responded that in that one instance, yes. She believes that is the only one.

President Fong asked if we are ready for the motion.

Motion to approve the contracts carried 6 ayes, 1 no (Scribner).

VIII.C. On a motion by Mr. Scribner, seconded by Mr. Rivas and carried unopposed, the Board authorized staff to submit the grant applications/service contracts and accept funding if awarded; and approve contracts, positions, and other expenditures associated with the grants as outlined in the proposed budgets as follows:

1. \$339,400 TEACH California grant from the California Department of Education for the period July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2014

VIII.D. President Fong announced that we will now conduct the public hearing on the charter school petition appeal by the Visionary Institute of Math and Science Academy (VIMS).

He stated that the purpose of the public hearing is to provide the opportunity for petitioners, school districts and citizens to provide public testimony and input to the Board on the proposed charter school petition. The hearing enables the Board to receive public input as related to the conditions set forth in Education Code section 47605 but not to provide a forum for public debate.

The purpose of this hearing is not to analyze the findings of the Sacramento City Unified School District in denying the VIMS Academy charter petition. Instead, this Board's responsibility is to conduct an independent review to determine if this charter school petition meets the requirements of the law. A copy of Education Code section 47605 has been provided to the Board members, copies of which are in the back. The Board

would greatly appreciate it if speakers would focus their comments on whether or not the charter petition meets the requirements in Education Code section 47605.

President Fong read the format the Board would be following in conducting the public hearing and noted that copies of the guidelines are available on the counter in the back with the blue speaker cards. After the Board has heard background information from the petitioners and SCOE staff, testimony will be received from anyone wishing to speak under those guidelines.

President Fong opened the public hearing at 7:02 p.m. First we would appreciate hearing from representatives of the Visionary Institute of Math and Science Academy. The representative will be allotted 15 minutes to present the charter school petition. It would be most helpful if the representative would use this time, at least in part, to respond to the issues raised by SCOE staff in their analysis of the petition. The clock on the podium will inform you of the time remaining for your presentation and the timekeeper will inform you when you have only one minute remaining in your time to address the County Board of Education.

Melda Gaskins, Shelia Gibson, and Dr. Jack Bray of the Visionary Institute of Math and Science Academy presented their petition to the Board via PowerPoint presentation. Copies were distributed to the Board.

President Fong asked the petitioners to respond to staff's evaluation of the petition and to talk about how they would rectify any of the shortcomings.

Ms. Gibson responded first regarding budget. They are working with Connections Academy, an online charter school, who has offered them \$10,000 once they are approved. She also clarified that the location of their facility is at the Depot, which previously was a charter school.

Dr. Gaskins indicated that they have the first floor the first year, and then the next year it will gradually get larger according to how many students there are.

Mr. Cooley asked the petitioners to address the lease amount.

Dr. Gaskins replied that the amount of the lease is for the first school year.

Mr. Cooley asked whether that \$7,500 is a budget line item for maintenance.

Dr. Gaskins replied that money is for repairs which they don't anticipate needing to use because the school is ready to be occupied.

Ms. Brown asked about square footage.

Ms. Gaskins replied that the square footage is a little over 30,000.

Ms. Brown asked whether that is in the budget.

Dr. Gaskins clarified that it is listed in the budget, but in the first year the footage is less and it gradually grows each year. She added that the special education budget is based on El Dorado totals, that they provided in order to make the application to their SELPA, and they let us know what we needed. El Dorado also talked with them about working with the other charters when needed in order to work with services and help with cost.

Ms. Gibson stated that for ill achieving students, we are using Rtl and the teacher is the first intervention for all of our students whether special education, English language Development (ELD), or students with special needs.

Dr. Gaskins stated she felt they were very specific in their proposal and that everything is covered within its 300 pages, and that they did address all the issues required of the 16 elements. It is just that SCOE wants more detail, and they are willing to do that if that is what is necessary - within an MOU.

President Fong thanked the petitioners and stated that we will now hear from SCOE staff, who will provide a summary of the analysis contained in the SCOE Recommended Findings of Fact regarding the charter school petition.

Tamara Sanchez, Assistant Superintendent of Business Services, and Sue Stickel, Deputy Superintendent, presented SCOE's analysis.

Ms. Sanchez started with the budget section and said she will then turn the presentation over to Sue Stickel to cover the other findings. She wants to bring attention to those areas that were of great concern and that need clarification. When she's reviewing the petition, she looks for items in the petition and promises in the program, and then looks for those items in the petition to also be in the budget, so the consistency needs to be between the petition and the programs they offer. Overall, the lack of consistency throughout the petition, the inattention to detail and the fact that the findings we have this time are very similar to the findings we had last time make it difficult to have confidence that the petitioners can implement the program that's been submitted. The inconsistencies are very difficult to deal with especially when you are looking at it from a budget standpoint. She stated she always tries to give the petitioners the benefit of the doubt. Similar to the findings that we found last time they have the same shortfall in funding in special education. She was pleased to see they did have money set aside for special education. It wasn't adequate to cover the cost, but it was close so she gave them complete credit for it. She has prepared a financial summary that starts with the petitioners' own budget; and adds in the shortfalls that she has found. More problematic is the fact that, above and beyond these shortfalls, if the school opens with fewer than 150 students attending 95% of the time from the very first day of school all the way through the year then the budgetary shortfalls would just be greater. In summary, the budget submitted does not support the program. She stated she will turn it over to Sue to discuss the rest of the findings now.

Ms. Stickel stated that this portion of the presentation talks about the review of the petition to determine if the program described is a sound educational program. The SCOE reviewers examined the petition to see if the instructional approach enables the

school's pupils to master the grade level academic content standards and progress through the grade levels. The petition proposes many promising educational practices and ideals but it lacks specificity or meaningful examples of how these practices and ideals will be implemented. For instance, when looking at the petition you get a sense that they want to absolutely have an intervention program. What you don't get a sense of is how it works, how it fits into the school day, what is covered, how they use a diagnostic process to determine if a student is benchmark strategic or intensive, and what it is that will happen with those students as a result. There's mention of an individualized learning plan, but we don't have a sense of how that would work for the students. The petition does not clearly demonstrate how VIMS Academy will meet its goals of serving low achieving students, preparing them for high school, ready for reverse instruction, and preparing students to succeed in the twenty-first century. In the area of English learners, the criteria used to determine whether a student is an English learner doesn't always adhere to state guidance, particularly in some of the upper levels. The petition lacks detail as to how ELD instruction will fit into the school day. ELD is a core subject, it's something that English language learners must have every day. There is not an accounting for it, and when you look at the population that they serve its clear there will be an abundance of English learners. The petition also lacks statements regarding the expectations for the annual progress of English learners. Reclassification descriptions and procedures are also problematic. In the area of special education it's unclear how the charter school will meet the needs of students that require additional services. The petition does not reference any type of program with a full continuum of program options such as resource specialists or special day classes. So, in conclusion, based on the staff analysis and the legal reviews set forth above, it is recommended that the petition submitted for the VIMS Academy Charter School be denied for the following reasons: the petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the programs set forth in the petition; the charter school presents an unsound educational program for the pupils to be enrolled in the charter school; and the petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of four of the sixteen required elements - Element A, educational program; Element B, measurable pupil outcomes; Element C, measurement of pupil progress; and Element E, staff qualifications.

President Fong thanked Ms. Sanchez and Ms. Stickel and stated that at this time he would begin to call up any individuals who have signed up to speak in favor of granting the charter petition. He asked the person whose name is called to please come forward and introduce yourself to the Board of Education. Please remember you have two (2) minutes for your presentation, and please try not to repeat points that others have already made.

The following persons addressed the Board in support of the VIMS Charter petition:

Reverend Benny R. Ellis
Dr. Jack Bray
O.J. Swanigan, Oak Park pastor
Jerry Simmons
Miles Denniston
Ron Lewis

Debravon Lewis
Pastor Chris Baker
Deanna Dyer
Travis Parker
Marc Surrey

President Fong stated that at this time he would begin to call up any individuals who have signed up to speak in opposition to granting the charter petition. Would the person whose name is called please come forward and introduce yourself to the Board of Education. Please remember you have two (2) minutes for your presentation, and please try not to repeat points that others have already made.

There were no speakers in opposition to the VIMS Charter petition.

President Fong closed the public hearing at 8:15 p.m. and stated that we are now ready for Board questions and deliberations.

Ms. Levy asked about the Special Education budget. There is \$70,000 shown for certificated salaries, which is basically the cost of a teacher. There is also \$44,000 for classified.

Mr. Miles Denniston responded that the \$70,000 is for a Special Education Director and the \$44,000 is for the Resource Specialist Program (RSP).

Ms. Levy noted that adds up to \$114,000 but then you've got \$15,000 in benefits. Her training is that one should usually count on about 33% for benefits, so she wonders how that number was reached.

Mr. Denniston replied that there is no particular requirement on their benefits, but their particular benefit percentage is approximately 22%. When he looks at the numbers, which are ever so slightly different from what the Board is looking at, he finds \$25,000 worth of benefits using the 22% figure.

Ms. Levy asked what evidence there is that 150 students will be ready to roll on day one.

Ms. Gibson replied that there are 95 students that have already applied, tonight they received another application, and they have other people waiting in the wings.

Mr. Denniston added that though it might seem very reasonable to challenge the initial enrollment of the school, and he is very glad that we are able to substantiate our number, it is a very broad type of criticism. If there was that same sort of criticism of every charter school that came up, no charter school would get approved.

Mr. Geeting noted that the startup is now postponed until the fall of 2012, so this would mean going out to parents and generating new applications. He also asked about the start up grant from the Connections Academy.

Dr. Gaskins replied that they applied for the grant probably two years ago along with the Walton grant.

Mr. Geeting asked whether there is any obligation to use their services.

Dr. Gaskins replied there is no obligation.

Mr. Scribner asked if the site they are looking to use was the same one that was formerly occupied by another charter, Northern California Construction Training (NCCT).

Ms. Gibson responded that it was previously occupied by the Visual and Performing Arts Charter (VAPAC), which closed four years ago.

Mr. Scribner shared that we did approve a charter that used The Depot as a site and one of the challenges they were confronted with was the lack of transportation and the remoteness of the site to the target community. He asked how the recent approval of the number of the Fortune Charters may impact VIMS ability to recruit from what may be a similar market.

Ms. Gibson stated that Fortune is looking at a K-3 right now and VIMS is for grades 6-8. She thinks there is enough failure in Sacramento to fill probably a whole university of students. They have spoken with Fortune and Fortune will work with them on identifying a Principal for their school and on staff development and trainings, so we see ourselves as partners with Fortune.

Mr. Rivas noted that he considers our staff to be experts and they seem to think that the petition doesn't adequately explain how to assess, identify and educate English Language Learners.

Ms. Gibson stated that they are a public school, we use the CELDT scores, the CST scores, and how the student has done. They look at teacher recommendation based on that student; we identify the student with the CELDT within 30 days after that student has come in. With all new students, they look at their home language survey and that is the first indicator that this student may have a second language need that we may need to address. When we find out that a student is L1 or L2, we provide 30-50 minutes of additional instruction for that student, the same as any traditional public school. If a student is L3 or L4 then that student has access to the core curriculum along with those L1's and L2's who are still in core curriculum but we're using a variety of different strategies to work with them along with Avenues. At the end of March, we assess the students again to see if those students are proficient. We are also looking at a writing assessment. We're looking at the same for listening, speaking, and writing skills as any other student. We expect those students to be proficient. We follow students once they are redesignated for two years. If that student should begin to have difficulty then we provide an intervention for that student. Our goal is to get students into English and speaking English as soon as possible.

Mr. Rivas asked Dr. Bray if he is a former County Superintendent, and from which county.

Mr. Bray replied that he served over 20 years ago at Sierra County.

Ms. Levy stated that one of the concerns she shares with SCOE staff was the lack of specificity in terms of lesson plans, and of the curriculum. She asked if there is a reason why you did not want to get into that level of specificity. Perhaps not an everyday lesson plan for 180 days, but a couple of days' worth of lesson plans, just to give us the flavor of how your program would be different than the traditional schools.

Jerry Simmons stated that he thinks this is the fundamental divide between SCOE staff and the petitioners. This question of what level of detail is required to be part of the petition itself. The statute says that there must be a reasonably comprehensive description of each of the required elements. Authorizers look at that very differently across the state, so we have many clients who have, for example, two paragraphs or less on English learners in the entire charter petition. School districts across the state deem that reasonably comprehensive. We represent charter schools whose entire educational program is three pages or less, and that satisfies some school districts. One of the dilemmas with this is that this standard of reasonably comprehensive is always in the eye of the beholder. So it's a very difficult thing when you're a charter petitioner because you're trying to determine what level of detail to look at and what to address in this petition. The statute doesn't say that you need to address what your RtI program is going to be and describe what that looks like. It doesn't say that you need to describe what your English learner program is and how that will work or where that fits in the bell schedule. It just says you need to have a reasonably comprehensive description of your educational program.

He wants to share that it's a struggle that you will continue to encounter with all charter petitions that come before you. Charter petitioners, as they attempt to address this legal requirement, will do so in varying different ways, but in a good faith attempt to meet the standard and what you have here are petitioners who have a demonstrated track record through their prior educational service of success and that is one of the factors that you need to take into consideration. Another factor is that as we have had these discussions with your staff, he can't think of a single thing that came up in any of the conversations that we had with them where there was any substantive disagreement about tactically how would these programs be implemented in the school, it has only been a question of do we need to put that in writing and put it as a part of the charter petition or not. So he shares that as background to answer your question. Shelia can address more specifically the specific nuance questions you asked.

Ms. Levy stated it sounds like the specificity was deliberately not included because you wanted more flexibility. She was a very enthusiastic supporter of the Fortune School petition, and one of the things she liked about it was even though the school hadn't opened yet she could visualize what it was going to be like because it was based on an existing model of a school that is very successful, the PS7. Is there a school upon which this school will be modeled, that you know works?

Ms. Gibson replied that they did a lot of research on Middle Essential Schools Model. They did a lot of research on inquiry, standards based education, and as you look at students for the 21st century they are a little different in that problem solving, critical thinking and good communication skills are uppermost in any curriculum. They looked at several schools in Michigan because Michigan looked a lot like Sacramento in terms of low achieving students and modeled their program after those schools. When you ask if there is another exactly school like it, the answer is no. They have visited many schools and we're both WASC reviewers, we do charter school reviews and we see lots of models and so our model meets the needs of the community that we believe we will serve.

Mr. Geeting expressed appreciation for Trustee Levy taking up the models question because that was on his list. He wanted to clarify that Dr. Bray is not the school principal, because it says on page 11 that he is.

Dr. Bray replied that he is the proposed principal. He has asked the proposed Board of Directors, as soon as the approval process is completed, to immediately advertise for qualified administrative applicants that would meet the specifications for the VIMS charter. His responsibility as an interim building principal is to make sure that the transition is not only made smoothly but is made within the framework of what we need to do. During the startup but also during the implementation phase so that staff begins to work immediately with the administrator at hand.

Mr. Geeting stated he had concerns surrounding the decision to include grade 6. Sixth grade is not a natural break point in the Sacramento City District. For most of the schools, the local neighborhood schools are K-6 and there are some K-8 schools. The city district did try an experiment with Kit Carson Middle School of adding the sixth grade in 1997 and struggled with that. They tried arranging for special buses to go from Oak Park to Kit Carson. They did some of the things that Shelia was talking about in terms of grouping together and block schedules. They struggled with that and even with the backing of the Sacramento City District they had to give up on that experiment in 2004. They just could not maintain the numbers that they needed to make that work. The other concern is on page D.VI of the staff findings that there is a charter in Sacramento City District that covers grades 2-8. That's actually not correct, it is grades 5-8, and it is the Sol Aureus College Preparatory School. He is familiar with it and has visited that school several times. It is based on the KIPP model and it struggles with the 5th and 6th graders. By struggling, he means that there are fewer than 20 students, perhaps 14-15 students enrolled in those grade levels. It picks up a bit in the 7th and 8th, but with so few 5th and 6th they don't have the numbers carrying on into 7th and 8th. When he checked last year, the school overall had enrollment of 66. He doesn't understand how that could be a viable school. It is a great concern of his about the viability of the charter to say that 75 sixth graders will show up.

Ms. Gibson replied that if we don't have the numbers we wouldn't open even if we were approved. If we didn't have the numbers we would not open because we are not looking for failure. We want to be a part of the solution not the problem. Because it is a school of choice and because of the recent budget cuts and because of the large class sizes of sixth grades in the traditional schools parents are looking for other options.

There are parents who have expressed to us they really would like their 6th grader to be with their 7th or 8th grader. For students who are failing and for students who are GATE; the teachers don't have time to get to those students with those special needs at either end of the spectrum. Our classes are 25 to 1. We believe in combination type classes where a 6th grader could take an 8th grade math class, a 7th grader could take an 8th grade class, and looking at individual learning plans. We believe the 6th, 7th, 8th grades would be successful. If it were not, we would come back to you at the end of the year to say we would like to change our petition and we might want to drop the 6th grade and add a 9th grade because there are so many students that are going to high school that are not prepared. We're flexible and that's what a charter school is, flexibility.

Mr. Geeting asked for the record to reflect that he is concerned that the Sacramento City Unified School District is not represented here tonight. If the Board were to turn this charter down and if the petitioners were to appeal to the state he would expect that our staff would be at the state hearing to defend our action.

President Fong asked about one of the sixteen requirements, which has to do with when a charter opens in an area, and this one will be in Sac City, that the charter reflects the ethnic composition of that school district. He asked the petitioners what they will do in terms of outreach to ensure that the recruitment of students will reflect the ethnic composition of Sac City Unified.

Ms. Gibson replied that everything they do is done in three languages. We print everything in Vietnamese, Spanish and English. One of our elective classes will be Rosetta Stone, Vietnamese and Spanish. Our outreach is that we've attended the Vietnamese church; we've gone to the Buddhist temple also on Florin Road. A charter school is open to anybody. If they find an imbalance, they'll do everything they can to recruit.

President Fong thanked the petitioners for their comments, and stated he is glad to hear that this is not an ethnic specific charter school. Regarding an MOU, and the deficiencies that staff presented to us, can those be addressed in an MOU to staff's satisfaction?

Ms. Stinson replied no. One of the things that VIMS counsel brought up was that the only difference between staff and the petitioners was that we wanted more specificity. She would respectfully disagree with that. Staff is not looking for detail and length for lengths sake. We are looking for a demonstration of the ability to deliver a sound educational program and the ability to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition. We don't believe this petition meets either standard. We don't believe it, with all due respect, and given the fact that those fundamental aspects are not there, she cannot imagine fashioning any sort of MOU that would address those things because you must have those fundamentals. Again, one of the things that has been said is that there are 16 required elements that need to have a reasonably comprehensive description, but that's not all that is required by the Charter Schools Act. What is required is that the petitioners have a sound educational program that petitioners are reasonably likely to be able to successfully implement the program, that petitioners meet other technical requirements, and satisfy the 16 required elements. It

is not just the 16 technical elements we are talking about, we are talking about the fundamental aspects of demonstrating to us that this is going to be a successful operation. Unfortunately, we cannot recommend approval. Therefore, we respectfully recommend that the Board adopt staff's recommended findings and deny the petition.

President Fong noted that the petitioners applied to the El Dorado SELPA and asked whether they meet that requirement of getting into a SELPA so that they can participate in a special education, or are they really just self-financing this on their own?

Ms. Stinson replied that her understanding is that they have applied to become members of the El Dorado SELPA, and they have not received word one way or another, but that they have submitted an application and at some point they would be hearing back.

President Fong asked whether the budget for this special education is self-funded right now.

Ms. Sanchez replied they did it is as if they were in the El Dorado SELPA. She thinks they had the revenue that was consistent with being accepted into the El Dorado SELPA.

Mr. Geeting clarified that they couldn't be accepted into the El Dorado SELPA without a charter number.

President Fong asked what the petitioners would do if they were not accepted into the El Dorado SELPA.

Mr. Geeting stated it is his understanding that no public school in the State of California can exist without being in some SELPA.

Ms. Stinson confirmed Mr. Geeting's remarks and added that part of our Board policy requires that if the Board were to approve, as a condition of approval, the petitioners must be accepted into a SELPA.

President Fong asked whether that question could be actually addressed in the MOU.

Ms. Stinson clarified that if they were approved then a condition of approval would be that they be accepted into a SELPA. If they didn't get into a SELPA, then the approval would be terminated.

President Fong stated that if there are no other questions from the Board, he will entertain comments and then upon finishing the comments the Board will be ready for a motion. Trustee Brown has been patiently waiting.

Ms. Brown stated she had comments but didn't have questions because her questions were answered. She welcomed Ms. Gibson and commented they had worked together a long time ago. She wanted to talk a little bit about her overall impression of the petition. She is sorry that the arena we are in is to talk about what is wrong as opposed

to what is right, and hopes that the public understands that is our responsibility which we cannot ignore. The Board must be certain that we feel there is evidence of success in a program. That is why we spend the time on some of the weaker aspects rather than lauding you for being interested in and trying to help kids. She would agree with Ms. Gibson's statement that there is no dearth of kids that need help. Because of that, in her mind, part of the responsibility of the Board is to work with the petitioners but not do the work of the petitioners. The role of the staff is to help support, but she was trying to find the specificity in there that showed the culture that's going to be developed at that school through what they do. That's why the response of the staff and her own response to it is that it needed more details. In the specificity, she was trying to find proof that when you say here is our lesson plan, it is going to be solid, the teacher is going to be well trained; she wanted to know how are you going to structure that lesson, not to tell the teacher how to see it, but what are the important elements in there. Are you going to talk about how it is related to the standards, are you going to unwrap the standards so we know what proficiency looks like, are we going to have a list of the vocabulary that is going to be important to the kids, because that changes the quality of the instruction? There are certain elements there that she was looking for that would make her comfortable knowing that you will be applying those, and that would be how you are going to do it. You have wonderful discussions about interventions, but the intervention is not the solution. Is it going to be related to the classroom instruction, are you going to use the data and tie it to the student, are you going to give more information to the kid that is further behind or are you just going to move all of them up? Some kind of understanding of what the standards or the quality of the school is going to be. Otherwise, how will you be able to establish consistency in quality? If we don't have sessions where teachers talk about and agree where that standard is, that instruction is going to be very different for all the students. One of the characteristics of successful charter schools or any successful school is that they can tell you these things. They can pull in all of those elements and that is what she was looking for in the charter and couldn't find. All the words were right, the direction is right, and there is passion and that is good, but we have to know how we do it. We all know there are lots of good teachers out there who are working really hard, but the kids aren't always learning. In her mind, we needed to find a way to pull together the specifics or the detail of what that school is going to look like, so if someone asked her what they are doing at that school she could be very clear about the direction they are going. The effort here on the law actually is trying to force us to be as sure as we possibly can at the potential for success there. For her, that specificity is one of the reasons to do that.

Mr. Cooley stated that for the consideration of this charter he would imagine that we are going to have to vote on the findings of fact and then ultimately vote on the charter. He asked Ms. Stinson to explain that process.

Ms. Stinson replied that normally, if you are talking about approval, then the process would be an approval motion subject to particular conditions. If you are talking about denial, there would be two motions: the motion to adopt the recommended findings of the staff or adopt them with revisions, and then the second motion would be to deny if that's the route the Board takes. There are only two motions on this particular type of charter.

Mr. Cooley asked, because this is coming to us on appeal not directly, on the first motion would we be considering those staff findings individually or is it inclusive?

Ms. Stinson replied that the Board could certainly do it as a whole, there is no need to consider them individually. What the statute says is that in order to deny a petition of this type you have to have written findings justifying it, on the denial, so our recommended findings give what we believe are the justifications for denial. If you were to deny it, you can adopt those written findings as your own, and then move to deny that way.

Mr. Cooley commented that one of the issues that this and a lot of boards in California grapple with when it comes to charters, is the degree of specificity that needs to be in charter petitions vs. the MOU. He thinks boards also struggle with looking at a very well intentioned proposal, with passion, with coming from the right perspective, with the qualifications of the leadership team, with a good structure of an educational program, and a good structure of a budget. The law is unclear on this. This Board has dealt with a variety from charter to charter and he has struggled in reviewing this and even this evening to get to what level of specifics we should require in a charter.

Ms. Levy asked a question of Assistant Superintendent Sanchez. Based on what Ms. Sanchez has heard from the petitioners in response, has that changed anything in her mind?

Ms. Sanchez replied no. She stated that, from the petition we have received, we can see where their changes are, we can see what they considered, we can look at all the things that were submitted to Sac City and what was submitted today. We also have a really good Board policy and ARRs that spell out what we are looking for, and what we are expecting and those are the things we didn't get. She would say no, nothing has changed.

Ms. Levy stated she would like to make one comment. Notwithstanding that there may be a difference between the legal point of view of what is enough detail and the educator point of view, that she was very impressed with the goal of this petition and their goals and mission statement are wonderful. She is just concerned about some of the details.

Mr. Geeting shared that if this charter came up at the state level back in the time when he was there, this would be a marginal call and it could potentially be acceptable, but only with lots of work. He seconds everything that Trustee Brown talked about in terms of additional detail. Pointing to models is another way of addressing that. The Fortune Charter that we received pointed to a model, which is a very comfortable way, because then you can go and actually see something in existence and see how it works. This charter, for him this is the second time around, is feeling a little overburdened, as though more and more things are being added. He wonders if we are better off allowing the petitioners some additional time here to work over things and keep submitting things to our staff or are we better letting them go ahead to the state and take their chances there.

Mr. Rivas thanked the petitioners for coming tonight and for caring about our kids. He feels your passion but is unable to cast a vote approving the petition; he sees too many concerns that make him question whether the proposed school would succeed. That is ultimately the question that we have to ask ourselves, so respectfully, he appreciates your willingness to help and he shares your concern about serving disadvantaged students, but he is going to support the recommendation that we deny the petition.

Mr. Scribner commented that he wants to focus on a different aspect of it, but one that is central to him because he works downtown in the Legislature. He sees what has happened, and what may happen financially. He is troubled by the position that says we will find a way; it is a position which, in this financial situation we find ourselves, is very risky. Someone once said it was immoral to think about the dollar sign, but he would say that it is almost immoral what happens to those kids whose charters have failed, and their lives are disrupted because they and their parents gambled on that future. We have had a charter that failed and we had to try and re-integrate these children back into other schools and other classes mid-term. From our personal experience with one charter, in which we did override our staff's recommendation on the financial issues; we watched it fail, and we watched the kids have problems, including making sure their grades and credits were all able to get back to their home school. He is fearful about the conditions in which you are going to be trying to open this up. He is concerned about the location because that was where this one was. The RT programs are less successful and more costly than they were when we tried to do that then. He has yellow caution lights popping up when he looks throughout the budget, so he wanted to share that.

President Fong stated that with the Visionary Institute for Math and Science Academy, one of the things that he looked at is that it is visionary. A lot of the things that are being proposed to work with the students here are really kind of out of the box types of things; in many ways you have to have passion and experience and sometimes you may have to take a calculated leap of faith that something is possible with passion and experience. If there was a way where it could be fixed with an MOU he would be much more supportive of this. He also respects staff's recommendation here; it is not always the case that they are right, but most of the time they are and when we do disagree with them there are compelling reasons why we do so. With the population that we are talking about, they could be our future mathematicians, our future scientists and our inventors, they just need the opportunity to do so. He knows that their learning styles are different from the traditional schools that they have to go to. He has a lot of empathy for what you are trying to do, but feels he must go with the staff recommendation. With that, if a trustee wants to make a motion on this, we are ready because each of the trustees have made their comments.

Ms. Brown moved to adopt the recommended Findings of Fact as presented in the staff report, Mr. Rivas seconded the motion. The motion carried with 5 ayes, 1 no, and 1 abstention, based on the following roll call vote:

Mr. Rivas – aye
Ms. Levy – aye
Mr. Scribner – aye

Mr. Cooley – no
Mr. Geeting – aye
Ms. Brown – aye
President Fong – abstain

Ms. Brown moved to deny the proposed charter school petition, Mr. Rivas seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 ayes and 1 no, based on the following roll call vote:

Mr. Rivas – aye
Ms. Levy – aye
Mr. Scribner – aye
Mr. Cooley – no
Mr. Geeting – aye
Ms. Brown – aye
President Fong – aye

President Fong stated the petition has been denied, and thanked all of the petitioners for their hard work and the community that came out in support of the charter.

President Fong called for a recess at 9:31 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 9:43 p.m.

VIII.E. Budget Committee Chair Levy stated that the Budget Committee met earlier today regarding the entire 2011-2012 budget. That will be on the agenda for the next Board meeting on June 21. At the last Board meeting, she reported on the April 26 Budget Committee meeting, which focused on court and community schools. She is pleased that the full Board was in agreement with the Budget Committee recommendation that SCOE staff pursue the plan to make our community school program more financially viable in the future. Today she will give a report from the SCOE Budget Committee meeting of May 2, where Assistant Superintendent Tammy Sanchez explained the administration budget. She likened the administration budget to the center of a wheel, with all the spokes radiating out from it representing some 200 other budgets that make up the total SCOE budget. The administration budget, also known as Fund 1, represents the core functions that SCOE provides, and the spokes represent budgets for all of the special and grant-funded programs that SCOE manages. Overall, this budget has decreased by 15% since the 2007-2008 school year, due to the general state of California's economy and the need to cut expenses due to declining revenues. Ms. Sanchez will give more details, but here are a few salient examples: travel expenses have been cut by \$1.7 million, a 65% cut; capital outlay, primarily replacing computers, has been cut by over \$1 million, an 87% cut; rents and leases have been cut by 28%, achieved primarily by not renewing leases and putting programs together in one space; salary and benefit expenses have been cut by 10%, in large part by not filling vacancies, though also by layoffs. It was pointed out that it makes no financial sense to cut positions funded by grants, especially since SCOE receives revenue from the indirect cost portion of the grant budgets. Our goal is to leverage the funds in such a way that will allow us to continue as many programs as possible.

Ms. Sanchez provided more detail regarding the administration budget and possible options for court and community schools. She stated that tonight we will try to answer questions from the last Board meeting. Many of these areas are different and don't fit together well. Sometimes the way to show one budget isn't necessarily the way to show another budget, so there are different handouts for you, and things will be looked at in different ways because SCOE is a very diverse organization. The other thing is that the Budget Committee discussion lasted four hours, and today will be a much shorter summary of that discussion.

The first bullet is a summary of Fund 1, which is the county school service fund, similar to the general fund in a school district. It is where most of SCOE's programs are. There are some other funds - our retiree benefit fund, our child development fund - but most of what SCOE does and the majority of SCOE programs are through Fund 1. The summary of the administrative budget should really be called the general support budget. Administration is a portion of general support and could be considered as centralized services. SCOE has a lot of services: printing, accounting, and payroll, to name a few. Ms. Sanchez drew a visual picture for the Board and asked them to pretend there are 200 arrows going from this central wheel, which would represent all the mini-businesses throughout SCOE. Administration represents our centralized services and binds it together. If a change is made to one budget, it may have a dramatic effect on a different budget.

The first thing we are going to talk about is Fund 1. The handout shows four years of expenses and is what we handed out at the Budget Committee meeting. The 2010-2011 budget has had minor adjustments since then, but this is exactly what we handed out at the Budget Committee. It includes all expenses that we control; we did not include things like transfers, money that goes from us directly to school districts, and things like that because those are not expenses that we really control. The reason we put this together is because we were hearing a lot of talk that SCOE isn't feeling the pain and that SCOE hasn't made the cuts that the districts do. The Board needs to know that SCOE does make those cuts, they are just made differently than the districts do. Our cuts are not going to make the newspapers like the districts' do because we are able to do it a little more methodically and in different ways. First of all, salaries and benefits have gone down by 10%, and will continue to go down in the 2011-2012 budget because we have not been backfilling positions and there have been layoffs. Books and supplies went down 14%. Travel went down 65%, though it is important to note that as an organization, SCOE travels for a living. Many of the grants and contracts we have are for training people throughout California. Sometimes they will come into our building so we have expenses that have to do with conference here. Very few of our staff members are going to seminars, and most of our travel is cut way back. In addition to travel for grants and contracts, we have a lot of mileage because much of what we do is driving. In our entire infant program there is not an infant classroom; we drive to each person's home. The mileage that is left is mostly those kinds of things, which we have to do. To cut that would be penny wise and pound foolish, and would be cutting how we make our money. Memberships have been cut 32%. Insurance has gone up, which is something we can't control. We must have insurance and we don't set the rates. Operation and housekeeping costs have increased due to utilities, which again is out of our control. As long as we have lights and heating, we have to deal with those kinds of

things. Rents and leases have decreased significantly by 28%. As leases come up, we are not renewing any that we do not need. We are becoming a smaller organization so we are squishing those people into smaller spaces. Other operating services is a lot of contracts, probably the largest one is our Sacramento Community Based Coalition (SCBC). We have cut back on those 23%. Phones, internet and postage costs have gone up 15%; again, phones are a utility and utilities are going up. Finally, capital outlay went down 87%. The amount we are putting in capital outlay is minimal. We have really put a lot of cuts in this. If we were to add on the 2011-2012 budget, you would see that the cuts are more like 22% at this point.

Mr. Cooley asked if capital outlay is the cost for purchases and equipment.

Ms. Sanchez replied that it is for equipment and buildings. SCOE as an organization is a much smaller organization; we have gone from \$95 million to \$81 million in expenditures. We do have grants and contracts in Fund 1; what we don't have in there, for example, is SELPA. Money comes into our SELPA, and then we send the Special Education money out to the districts. It is pass-through money.

Mr. Geeting mentioned that insurance increased greatly between 2008-2009 and 2009-2010. Do rates come up every two years or something?

Ms. Sanchez responded that rates come up every year, and there are things happening right now in the insurance industry that aren't positive. For instance, the last administration really supported Workers Comp reform; now that has all turned around so we are starting to see those rates going back up. SIA gives us the rates annually.

She moved on to general support and the administrative budget. When you think of general support, you think mostly of positions. In the Budget Committee, we went through the positions and a lot of other expenses, things that we pay for in contracts; all the utilities for the whole organization are paid for in general support, and those kinds of things. The main part is the FTEs. In our effort to show you that we are feeling the pain, here is our centralized services of general support. In 2010-2011, we had 113.5 FTEs. Next year, that will decrease by 14.5 so we will go down 13% in the FTEs in this area. Some of it is by retirement, and what we do is not backfill the position and maybe move the function around a little bit, but this also includes some positions that have been laid off. The major portion of general support is salaries and you will see the salaries in 2011-2012 go down. This is only one years' worth of cuts; it doesn't include previous years. The contracts that we went over are all contracts that come to the Board so none of those would surprise you. A lot of it has to do with our services to districts in these tough times. That is the end of the feel the pain part of her presentation. Now she would like to switch over to community schools and court schools. At the last meeting, we went over the community school model. This green page is exactly what we went over that day. When we discussed this, we found that there is not a lot of fluff in this budget. The costs are reasonable and we have made cuts anywhere we thought we could, but we certainly are open to other ideas at that point. The reason she brings this up first is because she wants you to remember the format. The juvenile court schools budget will be a very similar format.

President Fong asked Ms. Sanchez to explain again the expense part for the teachers at \$107,000 - what does that cover?

Ms. Sanchez replied that is the average cost of a teacher for salary and benefits. It is their retirement, Workers Comp, employer cost, all things associated with the employee.

President Fong asked, minus all of that, what is actually the average base salary?

Ms. Sanchez replied you could probably take off 30%, so about \$70,000.

Mr. Cooley noted that during our charter discussion someone mentioned about 33% is the norm. He actually placed theirs at 23%.

Ms. Sanchez answered that 33% would be an average for all employees, but teachers are a higher paid employee, which makes the percentage of cost of benefits lower. She stated she wants to look at community schools before we go on. Remember in this model, you look at the revenue of the no-cuts model (or the 5% model), add on some excess costs, and then look at the total expenses. It is close to balanced, which is the one thing that is not similar when you look at the juvenile court schools budget.

Mr. Cooley asked what the current level of excess cost is.

Ms. Sanchez responded that if you look at the current model and add on the excess cost, it works. If you look at the 5% cut and you add on the excess cost we are just a little bit short, but we are close. Looking at the juvenile court schools, she explained some of the differences. This is based on enrollment of 120 students because we think that is a low number. Every day the number of students enrolled changes. When that number is higher, we will lose more money than we have on this budget. ADA here would be different than you would see in different school districts, the ADA is actually larger than enrollment and that is because we have a longer school year. Then you see the three assumptions - the current revenue, the 5% cut, and the 10% cut. The other major difference is the teachers are a higher cost because they work a longer year; they work 200 instead of 185 days. To get to those 200 days we negotiated with CTA this year. They did have a contract year of 220 and they took a 20 day concession to get us to the 200, so they have really stepped up.

Mr. Cooley asked whether negotiations were still occurring.

Ms. Sanchez stated negotiations for that item was finished long ago, and again, the teachers really stepped up there. The other difference you see in this budget is that the GED examiner is broken out, where before in the community schools it was in the "other" section. Other than that, we have gone through each line item, we are down to one clerical type position, and we have cut the supplies and phone to less than half. One area that we are still working on is Probation custodian services, for which they charge us \$25,000. We are negotiating to try to make that zero. There is very little money in copiers, interpreters, and travel. Software and all that other stuff is about \$7000 there.

Mr. Cooley asked whether Probation has janitorial for the rest of the facility other than the educational part.

Ms. Sanchez replied that they only charge us for the classroom portion.

Mr. Cooley stated that he assumes they also clean the rest of the Hall. He noted that principal and para-educator are bundled at 360.

Ms. Sanchez replied that we bundled that because what we are going to try to see what we can put together. This is not a conservative budget, it is on the cheap. If the Hall is this small we are going to have to go down, and we will still have special education services in there, so we are thinking of just one principal that will cover the special education and cover all the teachers so we kind of bundled all those costs into one line item.

Mr. Cooley asked whether that includes a para-educator for both special education and the regular program.

Ms. Sanchez responded that in the special day class, which is what SDC stands for, we have one para-educator. Any para-educators that have been paid for in the last year for that would be paid for going forward, which she doesn't know if that will exist or not, but they are paid for out of the Title I because it is not supplanting if we pay for them there.

Mr. Scribner asked, in terms of the ADA, have you any idea about what it costs us on lost revenue between the court days and the discipline days when these kids aren't in class?

Ms. Sanchez answered that when we have a captive audience, we should be almost 100%. She would estimate that we are between 85% to 90%, so that is the amount of revenue we are losing.

Mr. Scribner asked whether there has been any discussion with finance or with others about the fact that it is the county calling those shots.

Ms. Sanchez responded that is actually quite a common conversation down at the Capitol and our lobbyists are all over it. She thinks it will probably be more successful when there is money in the state to pay for this. We are looking at different models such as maybe a per bed count. If the bed is there, we have the teacher there, pay us for it or do something like the old special education models, or maybe count on enrollment. At the Capitol, every county office is having this problem, so these items are being covered. We are waiting to see how Probation is going to set this up. The way it looks right now is, we have a unit which holds up to 30 kids, and in that unit there are two classrooms of 15 each. There are never 30 kids in a unit, so estimate 25. Then estimate 90% of those go to class, so now we have 22 students, which is 11 each in two classes. So we have two teachers there for 11 kids in two classes. What we are working on is Probation filling units to 20 kids, and assume that we will open one class. That way maybe we could fill a class to 15, which we haven't seen since this model started. That would likely cost more for Probation, because they are going to have a lot

more units open, but we are looking at a one classroom model and a fuller classroom. We are hoping they will work with us on that, right now we are waiting to see what Probation is going to do before we even go forward with this.

Mr. Scribner asked if we are looking at whether part of that separation is due to safety concerns with different gangs or histories of violence.

Ms. Sanchez replied that has always been a big consideration and with the lower numbers, they are going to continue to do that.

Mr. Rivas asked when Ms. Sanchez says our lobbyist, does she mean the lobbyist representing counties.

Ms. Sanchez clarified she was not referring to a personal lobbyist but CCSESA. This is a big issue with LA County Office; they lose about \$5 million dollars a year on this. Our little half million is nothing compared to them. There are a lot of people out there fighting for this right now, but not our own personal lobbyist.

Mr. Cooley asked whether there is a bill that CCSESA is sponsoring that attempts to address this.

Ms. Sanchez replied she believes there is.

Mr. Rivas asked if the juvenile court school budget that we are looking at is status quo, because the community school budget we looked at was what we were considering under our reconfiguration.

Ms. Sanchez stated that with community schools, we have more options and we have worked to help make it so it is not deficit spending, and if we didn't, we have the option of closing it down. With juvenile court schools, we don't have the options, we can't move the kids, we can't make the class size bigger, so our constraints are a lot more, but yet we have to consider that this is a mandated program and we have to serve these children. This is a loss that our general support budget will have to continue to cover, and if it grows we will cover an even larger loss. When it comes down to it, she doesn't know that we can do it this inexpensively. There also might be other areas where we can save money once we see how Probation handles this. Maybe we can do some sort of rotation of our teachers since we can't rotate students. She doesn't know if we will be able to offer an SDC class because if there are only 120 students in there, will they move them into an SDC class? Right now they will come in and move those kids, but if we have nothing but the worst of the worst left they won't move them. Then we are going to have to close down the SDC, we are going to have to do new IEPs for every one of these kids, and we are going to have to find a new way of providing the service. A lot of it has to do with waiting to see what Probation throws at us.

Mr. Cooley stated that at the last Board meeting we covered community schools. One of the things you sought from the Board at the last meeting was some direction on this re-organizer approach. He knows that there are some letters of intent out there from the districts, they are buying off on our excess cost model, and agreeing to an

enrollment guarantee. You have also got negotiations going on with our teachers. He asked if she is seeking direction on what she is presenting tonight.

Ms. Sanchez replied that the Board did give us direction last time, and shared an update of where we stand. We are in the process of negotiating with the teachers and have a Tentative Agreement, though it hasn't been ratified yet. Because it has not been ratified, she is hesitant to discuss it. From our districts, we have about half of the MOUs signed, and we have letters of intent from the other half. Some of those MOUs have to go to the district boards.

President Fong asked what the actual number is.

Mr. Taylor affirmed that we have a letter of intent and MOU signed from all districts but one. On MOUs signed, we have two signed, we have four letters of intent, and one pending.

Mr. Cooley stated that he thinks we will get there with the districts.

Ms. Sanchez continued that the May revise was more positive than expected. We're hoping that it comes in at level funding, or not more than a 5% cut.

President Fong asked where the money is coming from to pay the half million dollar deficit.

Ms. Sanchez responded that what we have to do when we submit a budget to the California Department of Education (CDE) is cover that loss. We contribute from different areas in which we have flexibility. It could be with ROP money, it could be with the profits from SCBC, it could be from the general support, it could be that we have flexibility in tier 3 of our CAHSEE or instructional materials. All those grants - we take all that money and flush it all in there.

Superintendent Gordon explained this, comparing it to a school district. In a school district these days, the typical encroachment of special education will be 15-20%, which will not be covered by reimbursement for special education. The district simply takes it from what they get to provide other programs and they short the other programs by the amount they need to make up that deficit. We basically do the same thing with the flexible resources we have available to us.

President Fong asked, if we can make the conscious effort to say we are going to short certain programs, which programs got shorted last year to make up for this?

Ms. Sanchez replied that she doesn't know off the top of her head because it changes every year and comes from different sources. The first thing we do is flex out the CAHSEE, the Instructional Materials, the Block Grant, all those small grants that come in, we flex those out and push them through. Then we look for areas where we have flexibility of profits. Our SCBC brings in a lot of profits, so we will take the profits from that sometimes and send it over.

President Fong asked what their profit is from the SCBC indirect.

Ms. Sanchez answered that she doesn't recall and that she would have to look that up.

Mr. Cooley commented that the bottom line is if the budget goes to the 5% cut level, we are going to be cutting into the reserve.

Ms. Sanchez confirmed that is correct because right now we are able to use our flexibility options. When we built the community school model, we decided to build it on sustainability because we know that those flexibility options are going to start going away. We wanted to put a model out there that works and stop relying on one-time fixes. When those one-time fixes go away, there is only one place we can get the money and that is general support. The profits from SCBC would normally go to general support, so you're really taking it from general support. For sustainability purposes, when you think about what we can do in the future, that is where we are taking it.

President Fong said that he has been reading in the paper that the Governor is closing down the juvenile jails and sending them back to the counties and the counties are asking for money to take care of these kids. Part of that money goes to the correctional people; is there anyone lobbying for the education fund as well as the correctional fund?

Ms. Sanchez replied that is a good question and the answer is yes. We are not winning, but we are fighting for them. What has happened is we have a more complicated, more needy child in the Hall because these kids that we are getting are so much more effort and none of that money has been passed to that and we are working hard to try to get it and we have not yet received it.

Mr. Scribner remarked that there is no language, in any part of the realignment that ultimately made it to the governor, that guarantees any part of that dedicated flow to us.

Mr. Rivas asked, statewide, do you know how much money we are talking about?

Ms. Sanchez replied that she would have to look it up.

Mr. Cooley shared that when the May Revise came out, a lot of districts in the county were ringing the bell of a flat budget year cut. Even though the state gross receivables were up two billion dollars as of June 30, with no extension of the tax increases, those are going to go back to their past levels. How is that going to factor in going forward?

Ms. Sanchez stated the short answer is she doesn't know. The long answer is there are options out there. Once a real budget bill is passed, and, for example, says flat funding, and is based on the fact that these elections are going to pass, then what happens if they don't pass or if we don't get the tax extensions? If we don't get the tax extensions, the budget could be all cuts. They could cut other budgets and not schools; they could come back and do midyear cuts to schools. They could give us more flexibility, more options. They could do more deferrals; remember the deferral that was in January went away in May, so maybe they throw the deferral back in. There are different things out

there they can throw at us. From year to year we don't know what it is they are going to throw at us. At some point, this is going to be a gamble that we are going to go forward and we are going to assume this is our funding and we could be terribly wrong.

Mr. Cooley indicated that his point is we are not out of the woods yet because even though the May revise had a \$2 billion above and beyond increase, if you look at the current year, that revenue is going to revolve back to because those tax extensions are going to go away in a couple of weeks here. There is no election scheduled in sight.

Ms. Sanchez stated that is why she threw that 10% cut up there. She is hoping that is a worst case scenario. So we can see there is still a problem with the juvenile court school budget. One more item we need to talk about is our Plan B's, Plan C's, all the other things we are looking at for SCOE. We are still working with the National Guard. We are also continuing to work with Sac City on our community school model. We are hoping that they will give us a site closer to where the students are. Sac City students under our current community school model have to either go to Hickey or to the Boys and Girls Club. If we could get a site closer to them then our transportation could go down and our attendance could go up. If we could take a program we currently have and make it into a better site, certainly we would look at something like that, and we are working with Sac City right now on that.

President Fong asked if that site is still Marian Anderson.

Ms. Sanchez replied that Marian Anderson was only a one year deal. We put money in to improve it and now we are out of it. That is the other issue we have to think about when we take sites from Sac City.

President Fong asked what other sites we are thinking about requesting.

Ms. Sanchez responded that we don't have a specific site in mind. Currently, Sac City is inundated with charter schools that also want their sites, so they are doing a complete facilities review. They are looking at everything they are using, everything they have available, and everybody that is asking for it. We are in line with the charter schools and they are expecting to have answers somewhere in August. We are going forward with our plan at the Boys and Girls Club and at Hickey, not knowing if we are going to get a facility from Sac City or not. We do have room to expand at North Area, we could get a little bit larger under this plan if we have to. At Morgan Assessment Center, Quality Group Homes is running a small program. Right now, we are not running the education for Morgan, but we have before and want to again, so we are having those talks. The reason that is important to us, even though we just discussed how we lose money on every kid we get, this is different. With a group home, we get a per-bed allocation and that could bring in \$300,000-\$500,000. Only in the group home setting do we get that extra allocation, so in that is a setting we would look for. We have looked at a lot of other programs that haven't been viable. We looked at a community school in Galt; they don't have the students to do it nor the location. We have looked at opening for elementary students, but those students are not there. One issue that was specifically brought up was whether SCOE has considered furlough days. The answer is yes. She has tried to describe why furlough days don't work for SCOE and feels she

may not have been very successful at it, so she is going to try to walk through the furlough day and SCOE. She asked for patience because it is complicated, and referred back to that wheel and all the spokes around it. Remember how everything affects everything else, and this is a rough estimate. Starting at the top of the page, look at salaries. For Fund 1, they are about \$45 million. If we had five furlough days, five furlough days are a different percent cut for everybody at SCOE. Some people work 170 days, some people work 224 days, so that is a percent cut that is going to be different for everybody. If we use 2% and say overall it is 2% of \$45 million, the savings to SCOE from having five furlough days would be \$900,000. That looks like a lot of money, looks like a great deal. Now the devil is in the details - look at how this affects each budget. First, think about our grants and our contracts. Overall, what we do is we supply services to other places. We do trainings, tech services, services where people have to show up to do the work. If people don't show up to do the work, we don't get paid. If you look at five furlough days, which would probably be the number for about half of SCOE, half of the \$900,000 would be attributed to the grant and categorical budgets. What we would have to do is either spend that money in a different category which wouldn't save us any money, or we would have to send the money back. So what would happen is we would give those savings to another agency like the State or Federal government. Our savings to the grants and categorical budgets would be zero. When you look at SCOE we would have to reduce our benefit by \$450,000. If we keep a running balance, we started with a \$900,000 benefit, so now if you take the grants and categorical funding out we have a \$450,000 benefit that we are going to send away. That is still a lot of money so it might be worth looking at. Now let's look at special education. Five furlough days for special education is about \$260,000 - that is how much the budget would be benefited. Now we have to hire substitute teachers to come in and teach on those days because we can't close down our special education schools on those days. That would be at a cost of \$163,000. Remember that special education is a service that we provide for the school districts and they pay us an excess cost, so if we don't spend that money we send the money back to the districts because we won't really be collecting an excess cost. Is that a bad thing, no, if we let the districts save \$97,000 they would be happy but when you look at Special Education's bottom line you get zero. Again we have furlough days and it doesn't help SCOE out, and now our benefits from SCOE as an organization are \$190,000. Then let's look at the general support budget. Furlough days would save our budget \$130,000, but we wouldn't get indirect money on the \$900,000 that we didn't spend, so assuming that indirect is about 10% we would lose about \$90,000 in indirect, so our direct savings to the general support budget would be \$40,000. When you look at SCOE as a total you have to reduce this by \$90,000, so now our benefit of furlough days is down to \$100,000. Juvenile court and community schools, if we had furlough days their budget would save \$40,000. We are Type C funding and we don't get the shorter school year like other school districts do, so we would have to provide a program on those days. We would have to have substitutes, and the cost of substitutes is \$25,000; the savings to the court and community school budget would be \$15,000, so this reduces SCOE by \$25,000. Now if you look at our running balance of how much money SCOE saved, we saved \$75,000, the court schools saved \$15,000, and general support has saved \$40,000. Here is where this gets ugly. At Sly Park, if we had five furlough days, we could save \$20,000 in salaries. We have options, if we don't open the park we lose \$40,000 worth of revenue, for a loss to Sly Park of \$20,000. Could we do something like have the five

furlough days on rolling days and have substitutes come in that day? We probably could bring the revenue in, but we would have sub costs and stuff like that, so this could be adjusted in some way. It wouldn't necessarily be a loss of \$20,000 but it is complicated enough. In this scenario, Sly Park is actually losing \$20,000. Our adjustment for SCOE is \$40,000, so now our benefit to SCOE has reduced to \$35,000. You have to remember that Cabinet has already taken furlough days, last year we took five furlough days and next year we are going to continue to take five furlough days so that is already cut out of the budget, that is already done so we can't count it twice so we are going to take that out of here because we have already reduced the budget. Under this rough estimate this kind of scenario where you see how the different budgets are affected by furlough days you can see that SCOE might have a benefit of about \$8,000. That is why we looked at furlough days but decided that was not an option we wanted to go forward with. Any questions on this?

Mr. Fong asked for further clarification.

Ms. Levy explained that SCOE employees provide a lot of valuable service, obviously. A lot of the valuable service they provide brings money in. If we eliminate some of the things they are doing, we are not bringing money in. In some of the cases like juvenile court schools and Special Education, even if we furlough employees, the kids are still there and we still need someone to teach them; so instead of paying employees we are paying substitutes. She would rather pay our employees.

Mr. Cooley commented that Sly Park is a good model because districts pay to send kids to Sly Park which makes it is a generator of cash. He wondered how a sub would fit into Sly Park and some of the very detailed specific instruction there.

Superintendent Gordon added that for our other services, special education for example, the districts pay us an excess cost to buy our teachers to teach their kids. They are not paying us to send them a substitute for five days just because that suits our needs, and in the end, we do not want them to stop doing business with us.

Ms. Sanchez stated that we have to remember why this works for school districts. The reason furlough days work for school districts is that they can close down their school, send the students home and not operate for so many days and they still get their full funding because they have Revenue Limit A funding. We have Revenue Limit C funding, the law didn't pass for us, so you can't compare us to districts that way.

President Fong noted that he was the one that had asked for the options and also suggested the furlough because he thought that was a way to save some of the 47 classified positions that were going to be gone. If it doesn't work, it doesn't work. He also asked about another program, the Juveniles at Risk program. He asked where we were with that. He noted that he is nervous about working with the National Guard after reading the newspaper articles about them.

Superintendent Gordon asked to speak to that. He was recently briefed on our contacts with the Juveniles at Risk program and is personally investigating and looking into what we have done and what our contacts have been with that program. He has some

concerns but is going to take the time to work with the staff and look into what they have been finding. People from our organization have been talking to them and he wants to know a lot more about what these discussions were and what was represented. He will talk further with you after he has a chance to talk further with the staff.

Mr. Scribner questioned Ms. Sanchez and said he has heard about this program marginally. It is an existing program, somebody is deriving an income flow off of it and then we're supposed to piggy back or take it on in addition to whoever is involved. Aren't we losing though on every kid we enroll right now?

Ms. Sanchez replied yes.

Mr. Scribner continued that if we piggy back on this existing operation as well, and they are going to want an income stream from it, is that going to compound our loss?

Ms. Sanchez replied yes. She had discussions with the people at the program and that is one of the issues, the budget. Their ideas keep changing; when she talks about the challenges of one idea, then they submit something else. The way she left it when we started this conversation is that this is not ready to come to the Board yet. Superintendent Gordon wants to investigate it more and so right now it's not that we didn't do it, it's that we just weren't ready for it.

Mr. Scribner commented, to follow up on the National Guard issue, his boss is the Chair of the Veterans Committee, and we have been doing those hearings on the Guard. He has recused himself from the Bill on the Academy program and allowed another staffer to deal with it, so he doesn't have a conflict of interest. They are trying to bring hard money to the table, and those were prior administrations with the Guard, not with Baldwin.

Ms. Sanchez stated that she has never known us to just accept money without doing due diligence. She explained that we have looked at a lot of programs that we don't accept because it doesn't pencil out, or it doesn't work out, or it is not good for kids. If we look at the National Guard program and it doesn't work out, we will let you know it doesn't work out. We will do our due diligence on that, but we are just not to that point yet.

Mr. Cooley asked if Ms. Sanchez has what she needs in terms of this item for the June 21 Board meeting.

Ms. Sanchez replied that in Budget Committee today, we went over the full budget and there are no changes from the committee so she will bind that up, get it out to you on Friday, and we will go over that in a little bit of detail on June 21. Things are going to look different than usual because there are a lot of accounting changes, things that have come down from the State, things that have come down from GASB 54, and then there are the different options with the community schools; so she will go through and explain as we go along. Those are minor accounting type issues. The current community schools budget that has been submitted has zeros all the way down. When

we come up with a plan, we will amend the budget immediately, and we will be able to implement program immediately once we have all the three legs together on the stool.

President Fong stated he has just one other question and then there is a speaker that wants to speak on this. He asked if we have spent all the stimulus money that we received a year or so ago or have we parked it somewhere for reserves.

Ms. Sanchez stated we have spent most of it; some of it we can extend through September. Anything that isn't spent yet we will have spent by September of this year, which is the deadline to spend the stimulus money.

Mr. Scribner asked whether we have good news about fiscal growth in terms of technology.

Ms. Sanchez shared that today at the Budget Committee we did have a lot of good news brought up. We showed a lot of our new programs and technology is bringing in a lot of new money to the organization. All that will be shown in the budget presentation. There were some positive sides to our entrepreneurial aspects.

President Fong stated that we have one speaker, Mike O'Rourke.

Mike O'Rourke addressed the Board. He is a SCOE employee and a CSEA Chapter 480 officer. He is concerned about two related matters: first, the possible allocation of up to \$1 million for legal costs in the 2011-2012 administration budget; second, Assistant Superintendent Sanchez said at the Budget Committee Meeting on May 2 that if the money were to be expended, there could be program cuts in order to make up the shortfall and protect the reserves. The Redistricting Committee was informed on May 17 that each trustee has over 170,000 constituents in their respective areas. If up to \$1 million was needed to pay for settlements and court costs, that would equal \$200,000 per the five trustees who voted in favor of excluding the word approval from the Fortune School MOU, and to not materially modify their charter by adding that condition. That is \$1.18 or less per constituent. Four trustees' terms are set to expire in June 2012. So he asks the Board to please ask yourselves, your friends, your families, your supporters and other constituents for donations of \$50, \$100 or more for a legal defense fund. That way you can reimburse SCOE for the fiscal result of your decisions and not penalize programs that had no say in the matter.

President Fong thanked Mr. O'Rourke for his comments. He asked whether the Board needs to give direction to staff or if the presentation and discussion is enough.

Ms. Sanchez responded that it was informational.

VIII.F. Mr. Geeting moved and Mr. Cooley seconded the motion to adopt Resolution No. 11-13 nominating Senate President pro Tempore Darrell Steinberg as the 2011 CSBA Outstanding Legislator of the Year.

Mr. Geeting shared that we have nominated Darrell Steinberg the last two years, and he proposes that we nominate him for a third year. He believes our other representatives

of Sacramento County are basically too new, and don't have a record yet. Senator Steinberg is the only one with a substantial record of achievement, and it is a very substantial record.

Ms. Brown stated that she wants to be certain that we can use the language, "avoided a catastrophic fiscal meltdown that could have disastrous effects upon public schools." The resolution says that he has been instrumental in bringing about the consensus necessary for California to avoid fiscal catastrophe, but she doesn't think we are quite there yet.

Mr. Geeting replied that his tenure includes the 2009 deal, under which items were placed on a statewide ballot and it was very substantial at the time. Without those things, without the additional taxes that the legislature passed there would have been a catastrophic meltdown.

President Fong asked if we are referring to the first set of taxes.

Mr. Geeting answered that we are referring to the taxes we are now talking about extending. Those were put in place at some point that was back in 2009.

President Fong observed that Trustee Brown is referring to the current situation, and Trustee Geeting is referring to a past situation.

Mr. Geeting stated he is open to any changes.

Ms. Levy asked if Trustee Geeting would consider striking that particular whereas because she is concerned about the reference to avoiding a catastrophic meltdown.

Mr. Geeting accepted the change, as the maker of the motion if Trustee Cooley, as the second, agrees.

Mr. Cooley agreed.

President Fong clarified that the suggestion to strike that language has been accepted by the maker of the motion and the second.

Motion carried 5 ayes, 2 abstentions (Scribner, Rivas)

VIII.G. President Fong announced that this was the second reading and adoption of the proposed revisions of Board Bylaw 8000 (renumbered 9300) – Parliamentary Procedure.

Policy Committee Chair Geeting recommended the Board adopt the proposed revisions. Motion carried unanimously.

IX.A. Ms. Levy expressed that she is delighted that Superintendent Gordon is back and in good health. She has really been enjoying attending the graduations and is

looking forward to attending some more. She thanked Assistant Superintendent Sanchez and her staff for a great job with the budget.

Mr. Scribner agreed that he is also glad to have Superintendent Gordon back and thanked Deputy Superintendent Stickel for her excellent job.

Ms. Brown – No report.

Mr. Cooley echoed the same comments that Trustees Brown, Scribner and Levy had, and personally welcomed the Superintendent back from his brief hiatus.

Mr. Rivas welcomed Superintendent Gordon back. He thanked Assistant Superintendent Sanchez, who helped him discuss community school funding with the California County Boards of Education (CCBE). CCBE is looking at establishing a work group on the topic and he is hoping we can collaborate.

Mr. Geeting also echoed what everyone else has said and welcomed back Superintendent Gordon and thanked staff for a marvelous meeting. Congratulations to all our graduates. He'd like to mention the base Academic Performance Index (or API) numbers that were released by the CDE during in May. The base API is a valuable tool to use for evaluation purposes, as the CDE staff has spent most of the fall and spring months "scrubbing" the data for accuracy and comparability. It's why the base API is used for ranking purposes. In looking at our county's school districts, one sees some good news and some bad news. As we all know, our county has six major school districts – Twin Rivers, San Juan, Sacramento City, Natomas, Folsom-Cordova, and Elk Grove. Together, these districts serve about 93% of the county's K-12 students. One piece of decidedly good news is that – for the second year in a row – in five of these six districts, the subgroup of white students has exceeded the state goal of 800 on the API. In other words, on average, white students in these five districts are at or above the proficient level. Only in the Twin Rivers district are white students below 800, reaching the level of 765. The decidedly bad news is that in none of these six districts has the African American subgroup even reached the level of 700. In all six districts, African American students remain in the 600s. Here are the achievement gaps between white and African American students:

Twin Rivers – 102 points
San Juan – 129 points
Natomas – 140 points
Elk Grove – 145 points
Folsom Cordova – 149 points

And, in the Sacramento City Unified School District, the achievement gap has reached a startling 161 points – about 20% of the whole API scale – and moreover the gap widened 11 points over the previous year, and 19 points over two years ago.

These data underscore what we learned from the analysis Dr. Paul Tuss provided us in February. Sacramento County's major school districts have a serious, intractable, and worsening achievement gap problem. It really is no wonder that 123 parents of five, six,

and seven year olds from throughout our county signed the countywide charter petition, exercising the empowerment granted them by the Democratic members of the California Legislature and Governor Gray Davis in 2002 through enactment of Assembly Bill 1994. These are parents who have no more time. They need help starting this fall, not two years from now, not by the end of a district's five-year plan, not by the year 2020, but now. According to our staff's analysis, the charter they signed met the benchmarks established in AB 1994 and in the charter policy established unanimously by this Board. Some have asked him – in view of rumored litigation – how could he support such a charter? He looks at these data and circumstances, and at these worried parents eye-to-eye, and asks how could he not?

IX.B. President Fong welcomed Superintendent Gordon back and thanked Deputy Superintendent Stickel for her work.

IX.C. Budget Committee met – no comments.

Redistricting Committee met and follow up meetings are scheduled.

Executive Committee met - no comments.

X.A. There was no distribution of the June/July Events item.

X.B. There was no distribution of the June/July Site Visits item.

XI. Schedule for Future Board Meetings:

A. June 21, 2011 – End of Year Report

B. July 12, 2011 – Annual Organizational Meeting

XII. Mr. Scribner moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Cooley seconded the motion, which carried. The meeting adjourned at 10:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David W. Gordon
Secretary to the Board

Date approved: July 12, 2011