

SAN LEANDRO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
SAN LEANDRO, CALIFORNIA
www.sanleandro.k12.ca.us

REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION - MINUTES

July 7, 2004

The Board of Education of the San Leandro Unified School District met in regular session on July 7, 2004, in the San Leandro City Council Chambers, 835 East 14th Street, San Leandro, California.

The meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m. by President Linda Perry.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Louis Heystek
Mr. Ken Pon
Mr. T. W. "Rick" Richards
Mrs. Pauline Cutter, Clerk
Mr. Gary Thompson, Vice President
Ms. Linda Perry, President

BOARD MEMEBERS ABSENT

Ms. Kimberly Wilson

DISTRICT STAFF PRESENT

Christine Lim, Superintendent
Leon Glaster, Assistant Superintendent
Michael Martinez, Assistant Superintendent
Linda Pollard, Administrative Assistant

PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING CLOSED SESSION AGENDA

There were no public comments concerning items on the closed session agenda.

CLOSED SESSION

At 6:04 p.m., the Board went into closed session for Student Expulsions, Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release; Conference with Labor Negotiators: Superintendent Christine – Unrepresented Employees: Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent for Business Services, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services, and Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources; Public Employee Appointment – Title: McKinley School Principal, and Coordinator for Curriculum and Instruction pursuant to Education Code Sections 35146, 48918(c); Government Code Sections 54957 and 54957.6. The closed session was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

The Board returned to open session at 7:07 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag led by Debbie Wong, Director of Curriculum and Professional Development. President Perry said the Board had been in closed session and the following action was taken:

- On a motion made by Mr. Pon and seconded by Mrs. Cutter, the Board accepted the resignation of the Business Manager by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.
- On a motion made by Mrs. Cutter and seconded by Mr. Richards, the Board appointed Ed Winchester as the McKinley Elementary School principal by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.
- On a motion made by Mrs. Cutter and seconded by Mr. Richards, the Board appointed Ruta Krusa as Coordinator for Curriculum and Instruction by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.
- On a motion made by Mrs. Cutter and seconded by Mr. Pon, the Board approved to extend the term of the contract for the Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources by one (1) year and align it with the other Assistant Superintendents' contracts to June 30, 2007 by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Prior to the vote, Mr. Pon said he needed clarification and information was missing on Action Item 2.6-A. Mr. Martinez said that he would be introducing Action Items 2.5-A, 2.6-A, and 2.7-A for clarification and consistency.

On a motion made by Mr. Thompson and seconded by Mrs. Cutter, the Board approved the agenda as amended for the regular meeting of July 7, 2004 by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

PRESENTATIONS

- * Ms. Perry said that Linda Granger Coordinator of Data and Assessment would be presenting the 2003-2004 California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) test results for the District at the August 24 Board meeting.
- * Debbie Wong, Director of Curriculum and Professional Development, provided information on the implementation of the new K-5 Standards-Based Report Card including the history of the development of the report card, the purpose, definition, outcome, timeline, and design process.

Ms. Wong shared that two years ago, a task force of teachers and parents was formed to revise the current report card into a standards-based report card. After reviewing standards-based report cards from multiple districts and receiving feedback, the charge was to develop a draft standards-based report card for the District. However, due to other priorities, the District was forced to postpone the design process until this year. She added that the purpose of the change came with the adoption of state/district content standards and a need for a new reporting system more closely aligned with standards-based instruction and provide parents with information about student progress towards meeting grade level standards. By aligning our standards-based instruction with the reporting system for parents and students, the District will recognize who is meeting the standards and who isn't, thus providing optimal support for those who need it.

Teacher directions, parent explanation, revise conference forms, parent notification, Kindergarten supplement, and Spanish translation will be completed by July 30 and training will begin in August for principals and teachers. Preparation and development of this report card will begin in October for the first trimester in December.

This report card fits into the structure of Aeries, the District's student data system. Eventually (in two years) teachers will be able to access their reporting system and multiple measures off of Aeries. In the meantime, this will be completed by hand giving us time to make any other refinements, and revisions. This report card will make it very clear to parents if their child is having difficulties and what progress is being made, unlike the current report card that is more generic.

Highlights of the report card included key standard objects selected in ELA and Mathematics, an achievement scale (the levels) and growth scale (formally "effort"). ELD contains more specificity in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and there is a place for District assessment, and support services. A pull-down menu for teacher comment codes will be available in two years. Highlights of the back side of the report card included explanations of achievement and growth scales, a full synopsis of all Math and ELA standards in reader-friendly language, replaced letter grades with a and number system to reflect standards-based performance levels, and reference to a web site that parents can go to for more detail.

Ms. Wong said that this report card is a "work in progress". There will be ongoing feedback to refine the card, teachers will receive a resource binder with directions and probe assessments for every standard objective. To help parents understand the new report card, parent conferences will be in December to coincide with the first reporting period.

Board members commended Ms. Wong for her leadership and the staff who assisted her in this task. Concerns included educating parents on the new report card.

Mr. Thompson said that it was his experience that when going from grades to numbers, parents really appreciated the one-on-one teacher conferences that would walk parents through the report card. He was glad to hear that this was going to happen.

Ms. Cutter said that the explanations on the back gave the tools to help and guide parents in recognizing areas where students are progressing or not. Ms. Cutter added that she would like to see this introduced at Back-to-School Night. Ms. Wong said that copies of the report card would be available for the parents along with the parent handout.

In response to Mr. Pon's question about parent feedback, Ms. Wong said that this time parents were not given an opportunity to look at this report card before hand, however two years ago, there were parents on the task force. She added that there would be a concerted effort to receive feedback from the parents from this moment on.

Mr. Pon was concerned about the jargon and words that parents would not understand. i.e. under 5th grade mathematics, "factorization". Ms. Wong said that it was a challenge making explanations short (because of space available) and using parent-friendly language. She hopes the back the report card will be helpful, however if teachers indicate that parents are not understanding it, then they will have to go back and refine it. Mr. Pon added that he hopes it is helpful to parents and how they deal with their child.

Mr. Heystek wanted to know how the number scores are involved in allowing students to be promoted on to the next grade, and would there be professional development on how teachers measure or gage students' ability to read simple site words, write a narrative with beginning and supporting details, and is a parent signature still required. Ms. Wong said that by the end of the third trimester the student would need to be proficient (at level 3 and 80% mastery) to be promoted. Literacy and Math Facilitators would be helping with the professional development, and that the parent signature is required and is located on the envelope, which the parent returns.

Ms. Perry agreed with her colleagues that the big hurdle would be educating the parents. An overarching framework on why we are teaching to standards, etc. is needed. She would like to see presentations to the PTA or Dad's Club in the fall, peer counseling available for parents on how to use the report card, and focus groups with representatives from the PTA, Dad's Club, and School Site Council to help the parents. Ms. Wong indicated that the plan is to have a principal training on the report card in August, and

then have the principals take it to their teachers and parent groups. Math and literacy facilitator training during the year will focus on these standard objectives, how it needs to make sense and be integrated into the core curriculum.

Ms. Perry would like to see a glossary of terms incorporated for the parents.

Mrs. Cutter cautioned not to lower our expectations of parents. We expect our children to know this; we need to get our parents up to the level of our children and on board.

Ms. Wong said that the grade level expectations will be clearer for parents to understand but, remember that with anything new, there will be “bumps and bruises” along the way.

Superintendent Lim also thanked Ms. Wong for her leadership, particularly in light of Educational Services being insufficiently staffed this past year.

- * Jonathan Edwards from Government Financial Strategies, Inc., presented the Developer Fee Justification Study. Highlights included background information regarding developer fees and the 2004 Developer Fee Justification Study. The theoretical basis for developer fees is that new homes will lead to new students that will lead to the need for additional school facilities, which will cost the school district money. The District last increased developer fees in June 2002. The 2004 Developer Fee Justification Study was prepared to assist the District with making the legal findings required to increase developer fees to the current maximum allowable amount. Mr. Edwards added that, based on discussions with the City of San Leandro regarding the potential for new homes and how many students that would yield, the District had no capacity available to accommodate the projected students from new development, and the District must provide additional school facilities. Because of the fiscal impact on the District, the District was justified in charging the maximum fee of \$2.24 per sq. ft on all new residential development, and \$.36 per sq. ft. on all new commercial-industrial development (except “rental self-storage” at \$.08 per sq. ft.)

The Board thanked Mr. Edwards for his great analysis.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None

PUBLIC HEARING

On a motion made by Mr. Heystek and seconded by Mr. Richards, the Board opened the public hearing on Developer Fees by a 6-0 vote. Mr. Wilson was absent.

No comments were received from the audience.

On a motion made by Mr. Heystek and seconded by Mr. Thompson, the Board closed the public hearing by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

REPORTS

- 1) Correspondence – Clerk Cutter noted communications received from the parents of the San Leandro High School baseball team regarding the varsity coach; a copy of the annual report from the District nurses; a letter of complaint from James & Denise Peterson regarding their son and Madison School; an email from Barbara Tierney regarding the aide position at Lincoln; and information and sample resolution from CASBO regarding non support of SB 2.

- 2) Superintendent’s Report – Superintendent Lim reflected on her first year with the District. She is very proud of the changes in the District. We’ve improved our systems and kept an eye on improving achievement. She thanked the San Leandro staff, classified, certificated, and management, for all their hard work and dedication. Ms. Lim also thanked the Board for their support in her efforts to maintain accomplishing her goals. She acknowledged the District’s connection with the City, Chamber and community leaders. There is a tremendous energy in this city. She shared that it takes a village to raise a child, but she now realizes that it takes a district and board team to raise the achievement level of our students, and we are on a way to closing that achievement gap.

- 3) Board Representatives’ Reports
 - Alameda County School Boards Assn. - Ms. Perry reported that the committee met on June 24 and she was sworn in as secretary. She thanked those who submitted ideas for programs next year. A tentative calendar of programs includes an update on No Child Left Behind, focus on high schools, and a conference in Sacramento with both Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. They are also extending an invitation to Santa Clara County Schools to join them at some of these events. The committee is looking at having only two dinners with most the programs at the Alameda County Office of Education. Next week the officers will be meeting to assign programs. The association will meet again in September.

PRESENTATION

Senior Project Manager Jean Moore from Vanir Construction Management, Inc. shared with the Board the status of current projects throughout the District. Highlights included updates on the health and safety retrofit program, interim housing status at four sites, the growth housing status at two sites and the New Jefferson Elementary School K-5 facility. Target occupancy for the new facility is scheduled for winter break with total completion scheduled for July 2005 (includes playfield growing time). Staff tours have been taking place and Councilmember Surlene Grant has had an opportunity to tour the facility. The new official address for the facility, when it opens, will be 14300 Bancroft Avenue, 94578.

Mrs. Cutter asked about the HVAC at the high school, and an update on the ventilation on the third floor in the new wing. Ms. Moore said that the building would have heating and ventilation but would not open with air conditioning. However, there was a provision for the installation of future air conditioning when funding is available. In regards to the ventilation on the third floor of the new wing, Ms. Moore said that Kwan Henmi, the architect for the new wing, and the mechanical engineer, Winzler & Kelly, had met with the District's facilities director, Mike Murphy, and Robert Flory from Vanir to begin reviewing the solutions that need to take place in order to provide more ventilation. Mr. Glaster said that there would be a complete report at the August Facilities/Technology Committee meeting.

Mrs. Cutter also noticed conduit and steel used for portables at Bancroft and, assuming that the District paid for it, was wondering if the metal shop classes could use this material or if we could get a charge back. Mr. Glaster said that that would be addressed at the July Facilities/Technology meeting and Mr. Murphy would have a complete report at that time.

Mr. Heystek was interested in how the District would be addressing the issue of possible vandalism and defacing of buildings, which happen with the opening of the new high school wing. He wondered if the District would be working with staff about student expectations and consequences to that type of behavior, and would there be a plan to install security cameras in the other areas when funding became available.

Mr. Pon asked if the tile flooring in the main wing at the high school was new. Ms. Moore said that new flooring in the main hallway was not in the budget or the original scope of the project. Mr. Pon added that the community had been asking about a possible work party to paint classrooms after completion. Mr. Glaster said that the District was moving ahead to finalize a Beautification Day at the high school with the principal and the community. He added that they had already received approval from the unions.

FACILITIES/CONSTRUCTION ITEMS

Action Items

4.1-F/A Resolution #04-37 Developer Fee Justification Study and Increase of School Facilities

Prior to the vote, Mr. Richards indicated that on page seven of the Resolution only five of the seven Board members were listed. Trustee Pon and Trustee Perry should be added.

Mr. Pon requested including the City of Oakland to those receiving a copy of the Resolution to #9 on page seven. The Sheffield Village area is part of our District, but located in Oakland.

Mr. Pon also noticed that in the study it refers to senior housing using a commercial rate instead of the residential rate. Mr. Edwards said that it was statutorily prescribed that certain types of senior citizen housing (i.e. age restricted 55 and older) was subject to the lower commercial developer fees. Mr. Pon posed a theoretical situation that if someone developed a senior housing facility and after the project was done, went bankrupt, sold it, and the site became a residential housing project, would it be possible to go back and recharge at the residential rate. Mr. Edwards said that to his knowledge he had not seen anything in the law that would allow you to go back and recharge, but that he would check with legal counsel and would report back to the Board.

On a motion made by Mrs. Cutter and seconded by Mr. Thompson, the Board approved Resolution #04-37 to approve the Developer Fee Justification Study and recommendations to increase the school facilities to \$2.24 per sq. ft. for new residential; \$.36 per sq. ft. for commercial/industrial development; and \$.08 per sq. ft for construction of rental self-storage space within the boundaries of the District as amended by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

4.2-F/A Change Order #5 Jefferson Elementary School – Increment II

On a motion made by Mr. Richards and seconded by Mrs. Cutter, the Board approved Change Order #5 for Fedcon General Contractors, Inc. for Jefferson Elementary School Increment II; Bid Package #03-01 by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

4.3-F/A Change Order #8 Elementary Schools Modernization

On a motion made by Mr. Thompson and seconded by Mr. Pon, the Board approved Change Order #8 for Arntz Builders for the Elementary Schools Modernization Project; Bid Package #03-05 by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

4.4-F/A Change Order #9 Bancroft and Muir Middle Schools Modernization

On a motion made by Mr. Pon and seconded by Mr. Thompson, the Board approved Change Order #9 for Arntz Builders for Bancroft and Muir Schools Modernization Project; Bid Package #03-04 by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

4.5-F/A Change Order #12 San Leandro High School Modernization

On a motion made by Mr. Pon and seconded by Mrs. Cutter, the Board approved Change Order #12 for Vitton Construction for the San Leandro High School Modernization Project; Bid Package #03-03 by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

4.6-F/A Notice of Completion Growth Housing at San Leandro High School and Muir Middle School

On a motion made by Mr. Thompson and seconded by Mrs. Cutter, the Board approved the Notice of Completion for the Growth Housing Project at San Leandro High School and Muir Middle School by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

CONSENT ITEMS

Mr. Pon asked that 1.1-C be pulled from the Consent Agenda for clerical corrections. Mr. Thompson asked that his comments regarding the Voc. Ed. presentation be included in the minutes.

General Services

1.2-C Approval of Special Board Minutes – June 21, 2004

1.3-C Approval of Special Board Minutes – June 29, 2004

Human Resources

2.1-C Acceptance of Personnel Report

2.2-C Renewal of Student Teaching Agreements

2.3-C Office Clerk IV Position Increase/Employee Specialist Position Decrease

Educational Services

- 3.1-C Acceptance of Donations
- 3.2-C Non-Public School Contracts
- 3.3-C Consolidated Application – Part I

Business, Operations and Facilities

- 4.1-C Ratification of Payroll- June 2004
- 4.2-C Approval of Warrants – pulled from June 15, 2004 Board Meeting
- 4.3-C Approval of Bill Warrants
- 4.4-C Resolution #04-38 to Declare Certain Equipment Surplus and/or Obsolete

On a motion made by Mr. Richards and seconded Mrs. Cutter, the Board approved the remaining consent items by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

- 1.1-C Approval of Board Minutes – June 15, 2004

On a motion made by Mr. Heystek and seconded by Mr. Pon, the Board approved the minutes of the regular board meeting held on June 15, 2005, as amended by a 6- 0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

ACTION ITEMS

General Services

- 1.1-A Contract for Legal Services with School & College Legal Service
Mr. Thompson was unclear as to how many hours we were contracting for. Ms. Lim said that Cabinet estimated the same as before, 200 hours, and all those hours had been utilized.

On a motion made by Mr. Heystek and seconded by Mr. Pon, the Board approved the contract addendum for legal services with School & College Legal Service for the 2004/2005 school year by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

- 1.2-A Contract for Legal Services with Ruiz & Sperow, LLP

Mr. Richards asked if this was an additional firm. Ms. Lim said that as an ongoing effort to reduce legal fees, Cabinet was in the processes of analyzing the legal services this year. The District was moving towards a combination of utilizing certain expertise within each area; while there was not a deliberate plan to eliminate or replace a firm, the District was, depending on the issue, being more strategic about which firm we use in services.

On a motion made by Mr. Heystek, and seconded by Mr. Thompson, the Board approved the contract for legal services with Ruiz Sperow, LLP for the 2004/2005 school year by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

Human Resources

2.1-A Adult School Hourly Rate

Prior to the vote Superintendent Lim confirmed that the increase would be funded through the Adult School program and not the General Fund.

On a motion made by Mr. Thompson and seconded by Mr. Richards, the Board approved the proposed hourly rate of pay, the staff development rate of pay, and incentives for Adult Education teaching staff by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

2.2-A Adult School Vice Principal

For clarification, Ms. Perry said that an administrative salary survey was conducted and in comparative ranking, the San Leandro Adult School Vice-Principal position ranked lower. This increase will also be funded by Adult School program.

On a motion made by Mr. Pon and seconded by Mr. Richards, the Board approved the recommendation to increase compensation for the Adult Education Vice-Principal position so that the position is 4.34% from the mean of districts' survey in Alameda County by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

2.3-A Resolution #04-39 to Eliminate/Reduce Classified Services Due to Lack of Funds/Work

Superintendent Lim corrected the estimated savings to the general

fund to \$7,876. The fringe benefits were not included in the original figure of \$6,403.

Ms. Perry added that the intention was to bring the position back with a more appropriate funding source.

On a motion made by Mr. Heystek and seconded by Mr. Pon, the Board approved Resolution #04-39 to eliminate/reduce classified services due to lack of funds/work as amended by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

2.4-A Teaching Vice-Principal at Bancroft Middle School

On a motion made by Mr. Pon and seconded by Mr. Thompson, the Board approved a shift of .10 FTE to the administrative portion of the Teaching Vice-Principal assignment at Bancroft Middle School by 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent

Prior to the vote of Action Items 2.5-A, 2.6-A and 2.7-A, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, Mike Martinez, explained that this was part of the “me too” clause that was negotiated with the SLTA and indicated that he wanted to make the language consistent by adding “Approve the 2003-2004 1% salary increase...” to each of the recommendations.

Mr. Martinez added that the Teamsters/Trades were scheduled for negotiations on September 17 and that they would be addressing the “me too” clause as well.

2.5-A Tentative Agreement between San Leandro Unified School District and California School Employees Association (CSEA)

On a motion made by Mrs. Cutter and seconded by Mr. Pon, the Board approved the 2003-2004 1% salary increase between San Leandro Unified School District and the California School Employees Association (CSEA) as amended by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

2.6-A Tentative Agreement between San Leandro Unified School District and the San Leandro Unified School District’s Management Association (SLUSDMA)

On a motion made by Mrs. Cutter and seconded by Mr. Thompson, the Board approved the 2003-2004 1% salary agreement between San Leandro Unified School District and the San Leandro Unified School District’s Management Association (SLUSDMA) as amended by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

2.7-A Salary Increase for the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendents of Business Services, Education Services, and Human Resources

Mr. Pon clarified that Assistant Superintendent for Business Services started January 1, 2004.

On a motion made by Mrs. Cutter and seconded by Mr. Thompson, the Board approved a 2003-2004 1% salary increase for the Assistant Superintendents for Business Services retroactive to January 1, 2004, Education Services retroactive to October 3, 2003, and Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources retroactive to July 1, 2003 by a 6-0 vote as amended. Ms. Wilson absent.

Educational Services

3.1-A Recommendation from Administrative Panel for Expulsion

On a motion made by Mr. Pon and seconded by Mr. Richards, the Board approved the Administrative Panel's recommendation for expulsion for student EO51-03/04 by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

3.2-A Recommendation from Administrative Panel for Expulsion

On a motion made by Mr. Thompson and seconded by Mr. Pon, the Board approved the Administrative Panel's recommendation for expulsion for student EO53-03/04 by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

CONFERENCE ITEMS

General Services

1.1-CF Community Survey Regarding Bond/Parcel

The Board discussed and considered utilizing the results of the survey, plan and begin the information campaign in 2005, and target March 2006 as the election period for a bond and/or parcel.

As directed by the Board at the June 21 Board meeting, staff was asked to determine the amount of bond proceeds the District would receive from passing a bond at \$28 per \$100,000 per assessment value; research the cost of the projects that were favorably

supported by the voters of the City of San Leandro; and for the Superintendent to communicate with the City Manager regarding the City's intentions in proceeding with a Parcel Tax.

Mr. Glaster said that after speaking with the District's bond council and financial advisors, Kelly, Northcross & Nobriga, we would receive \$40 million for a bond at \$24 per \$100,000 of assessed value. He later explained that per Brad Senden from The Center for Community Opinion, it was better to go for a little lower than the \$28 per \$100,000 to insure victory. He added that based on the list of projects, that voters would most likely support and a 71% -55% approval rate, would total approximately \$126 million. Those projects included: improving existing school libraries including technology and other media at all sites; replacing aging roofs; HVAC systems; renovating and modernizing school bathrooms; replacing all portables with new classrooms at all levels; adding school pick up and drop up areas (depending on need and design); build a second high school of 1,000 students (not including land); a complete modernization of the District; replacing all windows; and build a new 600-student elementary school (not including land). He added that this list would still need input and be prioritized.

Mrs Cutter asked if the City was definitely going out for a bond. Superintendent Lim said that she met with John Jermanis and the City would be going out for a parcel and that San Lorenzo Superintendent Arnie Glassburg would be making a presentation to the City Council in July asking for their endorsement for their bond. She added that the District does not have the details of San Lorenzo's survey.

In answer to Mr. Thompson, Mr. Glaster said that we could get the narrative information on San Lorenzo's survey as Brad Senden had done their survey also.

Board members shared their perspectives and expressed concerns on how torn they were between delaying the bond and proceeding as soon as possible.

Mr. Pon said that he would like to see us go forward with projects the people would support such as the libraries and technology. If we looked for a lower amount of money and projects that the voters would support, this would encourage them. He added that New Haven had a technology bond that was very successful. Every student has an email address. He would like to see every family receive school communication by email. Also, if we waited, would matching funds still be available. We need to make an effort to communicate to the voters that we are here for the kids and are

trying to make it better and easier for them to learn.

Ms. Perry said that while she would like to go forward, there's a political reality filter and a timing question. It's hard to ask people to choose between public safety and their child's education. She believes that the District is on the right path, but needs to step back, look at our next opportunity for 55%, in March 2006, line up our projects, do our community outreach, have a priority list, and get a citizen group active in an education campaign.

Mr. Thompson said that he has seen the incredible progress the District has made on so many fronts, has observed the bond process in this District, but is concerned that you can't fast track public opinion. If we really had the community support than he would say go for it. He senses that there is a lot of misinformation, miscommunication and some level of mistrust. If we expect to have a successful process we need to have the support of the people. He supports putting this on the back burner and really trying to put our effort into developing a campaign where we have the people of San Leandro behind us and educating them all the steps of the way.

Mrs. Cutter tended to agree with the Ms. Perry and Mr. Thompson. Mrs. Cutter however didn't feel that we needed to wait for "big money". She suggested "chipping away" at these projects. The more you do, the more the public sees. Castro Valley went out several times for things that they needed. This probably is not the time, but she feels that it's not necessary to wait for a large bond to do everything at once. She would like to begin planning, incorporating projects like the bathrooms in the budget, and the education process.

Mr. Richards said we have good opportunity to review those survey results and see the areas where we need to improve upon within the community. We need to reconstitute the Bond Advisory Committee, change its charter, and have them look at this and how we can communicate to the community, and then look to another date and time for a bond ballot measure.

Mr. Heystek said we must look to the future. Everyone's passion is justified but beside the community support and communication that needs to take place, we need to do a better job in communicating the accomplishments we have made i.e, that Muir and Jefferson were completed ahead of schedule, and the bond projects have been accelerated well beyond the 2012 date. His frustration is always saying "it's not the right time". He values the survey, but at the same time, Mrs. Cutters' remarks about minimizing the disruption

to the community, with a smaller effort, makes a lot of sense. Mr. Heystek said that he is supporting the move to delay and using that time to foster the support. We need to have a Board that is fully committed to the bond and to the Superintendent's passion not only go for a bond but a parcel tax as well.

The Board continued with other suggestions including putting a menu of bonds on the ballot and letting the voters make a choice (Piedmont did that in 1997 and both were successful), run-off elections, talking to a campaign consultant about possibilities for November, and whether District's have done a "menu" approach in the past under a 55% threshold.

Mr. Glaster said that the deadline for putting a bond on the ballot for the County was Aug. 3, but they were asking public agencies to move that back to the end of July.

Ms. Perry requested and received Board consensus not to proceed with the bond in November but utilize the results of the survey, plan, bring it to the Facilities/Technology Committee in August, and have a Board workshop in early fall to review the Facility Master Plan and look at the District's priorities.

In response to Mr. Thompson's question about the role the Bond Advisory Committee played in the 1997 process, Ms. Perry said that the Bond Advisory Committee was only charged to look at the fiscal matters and if the District was meeting the requirements and projects. The Board conducted a series of community input workshops with a list of potential projects and then proceeded.

Mr. Pon added that he still had a list of citizens who attended those meetings in 1997 and we could re-form a citizen group to compliment what the Board is doing.

The meeting was recessed at 9:28 p.m. and reconvened at 9:35 pm.

Human Resources

2.1-CF Recommendation from Reclassification Panel's for Reclassification

The Board discussed and considered approving the Reclassification Panel's recommendation to reclassify the Special Services Secretary, Education Services position from a Range 36 to a Range 38, to include a new title and job description.

Mr. Martinez explained that pursuant to the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the District and the California School

Employees' Association (CSEA), members have an opportunity to come forward each spring and request a reclassification based on the following criteria: (1) new job duties have been added to the job description over an extended period of time; (2) the job description is out of line with similar job classifications in other districts; and (3) there is an unique need for change such as shortage of applicants, excessive turnover, or unique skills required. The panel is recommending a new classification range for the Special Services Secretary, Education Services due to added duties. Mr. Martinez added that the funding for this position would come from categorical funds and that this was an advisory recommendation. The Board has the option of approving the recommendation by the panel or delaying its decision or implementation of the new salary schedule in advance until there is more funding.

In response to questions from the Board regarding adding positions or distributing the work load to someone else, Mr. Martinez said that when directors and coordinators let Human Resources know that deadlines are not being met and the job is not getting done that would be time to hire short-term people depending on the need. Right now Ed. Services is still short clerically, but the deadlines are being met and the job is getting done.

In regards to categorical funding being limited, Mr. Pon was concerned that if money was taken from one area and put in another would other services be left out. In his discussions with Curriculum Director Debbie Wong, Mr. Martinez said that there was money to support this increase, and Ms. Wong added that there would be a minimal effect on the categorical program because the funding would be coming from several sources, not just one.

On a motion made by Mrs. Cutter and seconded by Mr. Heystek, the Board approved the Reclassification Panel's recommendation to reclassify the Special Services Secretary, Education Services position from a Range 36 to a Range 38, to include a new title and job description by 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

Educational Services

3.1-CF K-5 Standards-Based Report Card

On a motion made by Mr. Pon and seconded by Mrs. Cutter, the Board approved the K-5 Standards Based Report Card by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Wilson was absent.

Business, Operations and Facilities

4.1-CF 2004-2005 Adoption Budget

The Board continued their discussion of the 2004-2005 Adoption Budget.

Regarding questions around classified salaries being lower in the 2004-05 school year as compared to the 2003-04 projected budget, Mr. Glaster indicated that the unrestricted side of the 2004-05 budget actually increased by the amount of the salary increases and the decrease was in the restricted portion specifically due to the decrease in the funding of the 21st Century grant. There were also additional increases in AWOL and school safety programs.

Mr. Richards requested better clarification about the dramatic decrease in the amount for books and supplies between 2003/04 and into 2004/05 as well as what is causing the increase in our services in other operating expenses, the Child Development Fund, and how the system report for a checks and balances on the audit of the Adopted Budget was generated and what the exceptions really meant.

Mr. Thompson also was concerned about the books and supplies reduction and how we could make sure that when the District publishes a document there are explanations, particularly when it directly impacts the classroom.

Ms. Perry added that because a number of state funding sources sunsetted and those new bills and the state budget had not been approved yet, money we didn't have in hand had not been included in the budget, and per Mr. Glaser, the budget would change.

Mr. Pon summarized that it would be helpful to include a summary page of major changes and explanations in the front of the budget to help understand and ease any concerns.

Mr. Glaster thanked the Board for their suggestions and would provide a more detailed explanation to all their questions.

Mr. Heystek asked about what was the purpose of the self-insurance fund and "safety monies", and what could they be used for.

Mr. Glaster explained that the self-insurance fund was the District's workers' compensation fund. We are self-insured through a JPA, Alameda County School Insurance Group (ACSIG). Specific amounts of money are taken from the fringe to fund that and the balance is safety money, which helps reduce workers' compensation claims and can be used for ergonomic equipment etc.

Mr. Heystek reiterated that “safety monies” were used for the first phase of the security cameras and asked what funds would be available to fund the second phase of that project at the high school.

Ms. Lim said that the school safety money was frozen, but there was carryover. Principal Dan Spence indicated that the cost of the 2nd phase would be approximately \$15,000, so that amount had been set aside out of the carryover. In our recent closing, however, some discrepancies about the actual amount of the carryover had been raised, so she would need to research that and report back later.

Ms. Perry liked the definitions of certain descriptions. When the Adopted Budget goes out to the community, the Glossary of Terms needs to be included so they can understand.

Mr. Glaster added that the Adoption Budget timeline for next year’s adoption was included and indicates there will be interaction on an on-going basis, and that the budget would be presented in a timely manner.

Mr. Heystek asked to be excused at 10:05 p.m.

INFORMATION ITEMS

General Services

1.1-I Emergency Response and Crisis Management Grant

Assistant Superintendent, Leon Glaster reported that the District and San Lorenzo Unified School District are jointly applying for a Federal Emergency Response and Crises Management Grant. The purpose of the grant is to design, develop and deliver an Emergency Response and Crises Manage Program plan, training and exercises, complete American Red Cross Mass Care Shelter Survey, and County of Alameda Safe Schools Program data. Each district would get approximately \$125,000. As the lead District we would receive the indirect costs to cover the cost of administrating and managing the program.

Business, Operations and Facilities

4.1-I Miscellaneous Receipts

Miscellaneous receipts in the amount of \$961,325.93 have been deposited in the Treasury of Alameda County.

ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

Ms Perry updated the Board that Lisa Wong found space at the Bancroft library to begin her intervention type club to help with the English language, and it is now in full swing.

On a motion Mr. Richards and seconded and by Mrs. Cutter, the Board adjourned the meeting at 10:07 p.m. by a 5-0 vote. Ms. Wilson and Mr. Heystek absent.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Future Board of Education Meetings

- Regular Meeting – August 24, 2004
- Regular Meeting – September 8, 2004
- Regular Meeting – September 21, 2004
- Regular Meeting – October 5, 2004
- Regular Meeting – October 19, 2004
- Regular Meeting – November 16, 2004
- Regular Meeting – November 30, 2004
- Regular Meeting – December 7, 2004
- Regular Meeting – December 14, 2004
- Regular Meeting – January 11, 2005
- Regular Meeting – January 25, 2005
- Regular Meeting – February 1, 2005
- Regular Meeting – February 16, 2005
- Regular Meeting – March 1, 2005
- Regular Meeting – March 15, 2005
- Regular Meeting – April 5, 2005
- Regular Meeting – April 19, 2005
- Regular Meeting – May 3, 2005
- Regular Meeting – May 17, 2005
- Regular Meeting – June 7, 2005
- Regular Meeting – June 21, 2005

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion made by Mr. Richards and seconded by Mrs. Cutter, the Board adjourned the meeting at 10:07 p.m. by a 5-0 vote. Mr. Heystek, and Ms. Wilson were absent.

Respectfully submitted,

Pauline Cutter, Clerk