

**Sacramento City Unified School District
BOARD OF EDUCATION
MEETING AND WORKSHOP**

Board of Education Members

Darrel Woo, President (Trustee Area 6)

Christina Pritchett, Vice President (Trustee Area 3)

Jay Hansen, Second Vice President (Trustee Area 1)

Ellen Cochrane, (Trustee Area 2)

Gustavo Arroyo, (Trustee Area 4)

Diana Rodriguez, (Trustee Area 5)

Jessie Ryan, (Trustee Area 7)

Asami Saito, Student Member

Thursday, June 18, 2015

4:30 p.m. Closed Session

6:30 p.m. Open Session

Serna Center

Community Conference Rooms

5735 47th Avenue

Sacramento, CA 95824

MINUTES

2014/15-26

1.0 OPEN SESSION / CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:36 p.m. by

section 54956.9

b) Initiation of litigation pursuant to subdivision (d)(4) of Government Code section 54956.9

3.2 Government Code 54957.6 (a) and (b) Negotiations/Collective Bargaining CSA, SCTA, SEIU, Teamsters, UPE, Unrepresented Management

3.3 Government Code 54957 – Public Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release/Reassignment

3.4 Education Code 35146 – The Board will hear staff recommendations on the following expulsions:

a) Expulsion #13, 2014/2015

b) Expulsion #14, 2014/2015

c) Expulsion #15, 2014/2015

3.5 Government Code 54957 - Public Employee Performance Evaluation:

a) Superintendent

3.6 Government Code 54957 – Public Employee Appointment

a) Chief Strategy Officer

b) Principal, Ethel I. Baker Elementary School

c) Principal, John F. Kennedy High School

4.0 CALL BACK TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called back to order at 7:32 p.m. by President Woo.

Board Member Comments:

Member Cochrane said that she recently visited the site and had a tour. She noted that the facility is a hive of activity for recycling. The neighborhood can us-3(oc)4(73(oc)4(70(B)1(oar)-1(d M)3(e)4(m)24(he)4(ne

overall plan to make the Sacramento Unified School District a destination school district. They believe it is possible, due to the May Revise, for the District to move faster in reducing class sizes to the 2008 staffing levels, and they have made a proposal to the District to do that.

Tim Tautz referred to a recent Sacramento Bee article about the re-opening of Washington Elementary School. He has two children at David Lubin Elementary School and is concerned that the plan is to open Washington Elementary School as a STEAM school. David Lubin Elementary has been working toward opening as a STEAM school as well

9.1c

Board Member Comments:

could not be spent on needed work elsewhere. She was hesitant to have the resolution go forward because we do not typically tie hands on developer fees, but it was one way to work collaboratively to be able to fund the project. She does not know where the funds will go. Member Rodriguez said that makes her uncomfortable. She would rather see us hold and wait to see what happens with the re-opening of the other school site before we go forward with any planning.

President Woo said that was discussion on Item No. 9.1m. There were no speakers on Item No. 9.1a. Member Rodriguez said that she merely wanted to pull it so that she could vote on the other Consent Agenda Items.

President Woo asked for a motion to approve Item 9.1a. Vice President Pritchett made the motion and Second Vice President Hansen seconded. The motion passed 6-1 with Member Rodriguez voting no.

President Woo then asked for a motion to approve Item 9.1m. Member Cochran made a motion to approve and Second Vice President Hansen seconded. The motion passed 6-1 with Member Rodriguez voting no.

10.0 BOARD WORKSHOP/STRATEGIC PLAN AND OTHER INITIATIVES

10.1 Approve Continuous Improvement of Special Education Services: 2015-2016 Annual Service Plan and Annual Budget Plan (Dr. Olivine Roberts and Becky Bryant) **Action**

Becky Bryant presented on this Item that was brought back due to the request of the Board. She gave a brief recap of the presentation given at the June 4th Board meeting and more specificity to the items requested. She went over the five SELPA goals. Actions to assist staff in meeting the goals were included per Board request. She noted there was an oversight during the last presentation regarding the alignment of SELPA goals to LCAP Goal 2, clean, safe, healthy, physically and emotionally safe environment. SELPA Goals 2 and 3 both align to LCAP Goal 2. She reported on service delivery models and reported that they have finalized the placements of the new Special Day Classes (SDC). She went over the 2015-2016 Annual Service and Budget Plan, noting that expected expenditures match projected revenue.

Public Comment:

Darlene Anderson said that she thought we would get some information back about the disproportionality of African American students being placed in Special Education. But mostly she is concerned about the program description of the SDC classes. She feels the SDC children should be on the same pathway as general education students. However when students are in SDC and have gotten two to three grade levels behind, they are not in the same general education text books and do not have the same goals. Their Individual Education Programs (IEPs.8kT(t)-2(et)-2(:)]TJ re f BT 12 -0 0 12 21.4 282

Bryant how many staff in the District office are deployed to be responsive to families and to oversee the management of this work. Ms. Bryant answered that there are three management staff, and there will be four. There are three Supervisors that assist Ms. Bryant. In addition, there are ten program specialists who are the direct liaison to the school sites and families. Member Ryan asked to what we attribute the increase in Special Education in the District. She wanted to know if there had been analysis done to look at the disproportionality of Special Education student referrals and if there were any thoughts as to why the numbers have grown so substantially. Ms. Bryant answered that when there is not a clear system of pre-intervention support across the organization, often schools look to Special Education. There has been a very legitimate increase in some categories of disabilities over the years such as autism. In the past five to seven years we have probably tripled our enrollment of students. Many more students are receiving diagnosis very early in life, so we have many more preschoolers than we have previously. Due to advances in medical science, many students who previously would not have survived come to us with very significant needs. We are also a very large, centralized, urban school district where multiple families live together, and there are multiple children in families that have disabilities. Member Ryan asked if anyone in the department has ever done an analysis over the referrals themselves and how they are being generated, and has there been an analysis done of the percentage of teachers compared to the percentage of referrals they are generating. In other words, she has seen in other districts where 20 percent of teachers are generating 90 percent of the referrals. Ms. Bryant said that we have not found that. We do keep yearly data on our referral rates at each school. We also keep data on the number of preschoolers coming in through those schools, as well as parent requests. We keep this data on an annual basis. We do not keep data by teacher; it is per school site. Member Ryan asked if there is reason that it is unfeasible. Ms. Bryant answered that we do many assessments during the year, and we have many transfers in and out, so although we have 6,700 students currently, we probably begin assessments on several hundred more than that. So we have not kept data in that way, but it is something we could look into. Ms. Ryan said she would be very interested to see that data. She also asked if there has been any strategy, intervention, or successful models looked at regarding closing the disproportional impact and achievement gap for African American students in Special Education. Ms. Bryant answered that when we were disproportionate previously, we did do some of that work. We exited disproportionality within a year, so perhaps our focus drifted to another place. Many of our neighboring districts are in the same situation we are in terms of disproportionality in some fashion. When we have looked at the data currently, for this disproportionality, it appears to be because we have lost a lot of general education students who are African American. Member Ryan said even though we have lost a lot of general education students who are African American, recognizing that this is still a huge challenge for the District, she would hope we would elevate it to a high priority as we are trying to evaluate how we serve this population moving forward. As we do the LCFF and LCAP work, we cannot overlook the need to focus on intervention and strategies for this group. Member Ryan also pointed out, regarding the parent education and communication piece of this and how parents feel unsettled in not knowing what school site their child will attend until often late into the summer prior to the school year, that this is something we have to be able to address. She knows it is difficult to do projections on the number of students that we are going to serve, but she would like to see a more cohesive form of communicating with our families. She suggested a better utilization of resources, such as our phone messaging services to make sure families understand the routes they have ahead of them and what their options are. She feels that this is a segment of the community that has a high need, yet does not feel that, even with the best efforts of an under-resourced staff, they understand where to go.

Member Rodriguez addressed a couple of points that Ms. Sutherland brought up. She said we have been doing inclusive practices for five years now and asked what types of data has been collected, and what is it telling us about inclusive practices? Ms. Bryant replied that most of the data we have collected is more affective data regarding how the students have done socially. Behaviors have improved, and they feel more included in their school community. Parents report that their children are happier going to school with other students that are in general education. We had some survey data last year where we surveyed the students to ask them how they felt about having two teachers. They responded that it felt normal to them. In terms of achievement data, she has analyzed some work from various settings and sites over the years and found that the improvement in writing and the level of the rigor in the co-teaching settings is sometimes higher than some of our Special Day Classes. Member Rodriguez asked Ms. Bryant if she felt inclusive practices should be expanded upon. Ms. Bryant said yes, she would like to see inclusive practices expanded. Member Rodriguez then asked if we have more lawsuits based on IEPs or 504s. Ms. Bryant said she does not directly deal with the 504s, so she is not aware of the statistics of litigation around

theoretical. There is always a lot of interest in wanting to see the numbers; what are the dollars and expenditures? So to have really robust conversations before we have any sense of a State budget in January is really challenging. However Mr. Ross concurred that we should start earlier. One thing he is sure the new Chief Strategy Officer will be looking at is how do we start in the Fall, having a bigger conversation around goals, the annual update, and pieces that we can do without the budget component. By laying that ground work in the Fall and early Winter we will be in a good position when we get information from the State around the budget and resources to align those dollars to our goals. We can then have a conversation with the community about what that looks like in the second half of the year. He does not think we can look at it quite so linearly, as the LCAP comes first and then the budget. It is a constant cycle throughout the process, making sure that the two pieces reflect each other. By law the LCAP and budget have to be adopted together. Member Arroyo asked to what degree our current budget as adopted would be any different had we not had to do an LCAP. A lot of the budgets approved are formulaic; they are based on expenditures, trends, and demands that are expected for the following year. So in many ways, staff and the Superintendent consider what is coming up and what is approved is an adoption of a previous year's budget adapted for the next year. He is not convinced, therefore, that this year's budget would have been very different had there been no demand for an LCAP. So, to what degree is the LCAP really influencing the budget? His guess is that if the input comes earlier then we know what priorities need to be kept in mind and give direction to the staff. This is part of the work that will need to be done between August/September through May of next year. So perhaps use the Spring to consolidate who the team is so that we do not have to wait until September, for school to start, and then select a team. Member Arroyo asked if we could select an LCAP committee around this time next year, in the Spring, that will start in earnest in the Fall. He would rather see a lot of input earlier in order to see it reflected in the budget that staff puts together. This would allow time for priorities to be reflected. For example, he agrees with the comments made by Ms. Vang regarding English learners, but at this point we will not re-open the budget. He said the Spring could be used to have hearings and presentations about what would be a more robust program, seeing what resources are available, and what we can change to really address some of the concerns. Mr. Ross said that these are good points. The timing and sequencing are pieces that are still being worked out. We know for certain we will be starting far earlier next time. As far as alignment with the budget, there are always going to be things that are out of our control. This year was a bit of an anomaly in that we had the May Revise come out with an extraordinary amount of new resources. Mr. Ross spoke about leading the school site councils to have conversations around single plan as a year-round conversation. The conversation should be on-going about priorities and resources. Mr. Ross feels we need to eventually get to where it is not about the beginning and end of a process, but really is an on-going process. The LCAP is a three year plan that we update every year; we do not have to start with a blank slate every year, but there is an opportunity every year to revisit and have conversations early. He understands Member Arroyo's point, agrees, and feels we will get there. Member Arroyo said that he does not bring this up as a criticism but as part of the learning process. In terms of working on the LCAP in the Fall, the group could be using the previous year's budget the same way staff uses the budget to make projections. There could be adjustments, but it would not inhibit a robust conversation amongst members of the LCAP given that there is a previous year's budget that they can work on, review priorities, and then as the Governor's proposal gets submitted adjustments could be made later on.

Member Rodriguez likes the summary that was provided. She appreciates the efforts mentioned about getting the English learner committees more aligned. She understands it is time to approve the LCAP, however she finds the comments from Ms. Vang extremely valid and feels there needs to be a commitment from the Board level about making the placement of English language learners a priority. We need to build on the asset of having a bilingual culture in the District. She asked if some of these comments and desires can be implemented when the LCAP comes back from the Sacramento County Office of Education. Mr. Ross asked if Member Rodriguez means changing the budget allocations. She noted that there will be a revision on the budget, and she would like to place a priority on English language learners. Mr. Ross noted that the LCAP is snapshot of the work that is happening in the District, it is the goals and the metrics that drive our work, but it is not inclusive of all the work that is happening with our English language students and in the English language department. He suggests that when Dr. Roberts is back, she can provide the Board and community with some information to get a more holistic sense as to what the needs are and the work that is currently going on so that we can really approach it strategically. As far as the timing, that is at the Board's discretion with budget allocations. If the Board desires to allocate more money into supporting the needs of English language students, they will certainly adjust the LCAP to accommodate.

Member Rodriguez made a motion to extend the meeting until 11:15 p.m. Vice President Pritchett seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

will not cost more than \$20,000, and by her informal calculation the school would bring in another \$2 million dollars if re-opened.

President Wo