

SAN LEANDRO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
SAN LEANDRO, CALIFORNIA  
[www.sanleandro.k12.ca.us](http://www.sanleandro.k12.ca.us)

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION - MINUTES**

January 24, 2008

The Board of Education of the San Leandro Unified School District met in regular session on January 24, 2008, in the San Leandro City Council Chambers, 835 East 14th Street, San Leandro, California.

The meeting was called to order at 6 p.m. by President Ray Davis.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Mr. Stephen Cassidy  
Mr. Mike Katz-Lacabe  
Ms. Linda Perry  
Mr. T. W. "Rick" Richards  
Mrs. Pauline Cutter, Clerk  
Mrs. Lisa Hague, Vice President  
Mr. Ray Davis, President

**DISTRICT STAFF PRESENT**

Christine Lim, Superintendent  
Byron Isaac, Assistant Superintendent  
Cindy Cathey, 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 6:05 p.m., the Board went into closed session for Student Expulsions, Public Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release, Conference with Labor Negotiator, Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation – significant exposure to litigation, Conference with Real Property Negotiator – Property(ies), and Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation pursuant to Education Code Section 35146 and 48918(c), Government Code Sections 54957, 54957.6, 54956.(b), 54956.8, and 54956.9. The closed session was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

The Board returned to open session at 6:32 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. President Davis said the Board had been in closed session and that no action was taken.

President Davis presented Mr. Richards with a “Star” in recognition for his service as Board President from 2007-2008.

President Davis reminded the audience that residency verification and intradistrict transfers would be discussed at the February 5, 2008, Board meeting. He also noted that with the upcoming student Board member joining the Board, it was important that Robert’s Rules of Order were abided by. He distributed a memo outlining the proper procedures that should be followed while the Board is conducting their business.

## **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Cassidy noted that because a discussion regarding the San Leandro High School swimming pool, and the parcel tax timeline were not on this agenda (as he had previously requested), he would be not be approving the agenda.

It was explained that later this evening under Conference Item 1.1-CF, Agenda for the January 28, 2008, City/District Joint meeting, the swimming pool would be discussed. With regards to the parcel tax timeline, information was provided in the last *Confidentially Speaking*. Mr. Richards called for the “question”, and the Board voted to end the discussion by consensus.

On a motion made by Mr. Richards and seconded by Mr. Katz, the Board approved the agenda for the regular meeting of January 24, 2008, by a 6-1 vote. Mr. Cassidy voting no.

**REPORTS**                      Student Representatives’ Reports – There was no report.

## **PRESENTATIONS**

- Steve Wescoatt from Perry-Smith, LLP, presented the Independent Audit Report of the financial records for the 2006/2007 fiscal year, reporting that all programs had positive ending balances with no errors found on the federal level. Two small compliance issues were related to independent study, and attendance records, where the ADA reporting was overstated. In addition, Associated Student Body (ASB) accounting at one District site was identified in the Finding and Recommendations. It was the auditor’s recommendation that the District review current student body accounting policies and procedures and enforce existing controls to address internal control deficiencies.

Mr. Wescoatt also briefly noted that the American Institute of Certified Public Accounts has issued new audit standards that will significantly change the way independent auditors perform their audits. These new requirements will take effect for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2008.

Finance Committee chair, Trustee Richards, added that the committee reviewed the report on Monday, January 14, 2008.

In light of those findings, the Board also agreed (by consensus) to have the Policy Committee review the current policies regarding the ASB process and consider updating how cash transactions are conducted.

## Business Operations

### 4.1-A 2006/2007 Fiscal Year Independent Audit Report

On a motion made by Mr. Richards and seconded by Mrs. Hague, the Board approved the 2006/2007 Fiscal Year Independent Audit Report as presented by a 7-0 vote.

- \* Deborah Cox, Chair of The Community Oversight Committee (COC) presented their Annual Report to the Community. The report included Bond Projects and Progress and the first annual Performance Audit.

Key points included:

- District representatives have been cooperative and responsive to the committees' questions, comments and concerns regarding the progress of Measure B projects and expenditure of Measure B funds.
- In its management of the Bond fund expenditures, the District is exploring various opportunities to attain matching funds from other sources.
- As of the fall 2007, the District has pursued almost \$19 million in matching funding from state agencies.
- The District has adopted a balanced strategy for the planning and implementation of Measure B that includes hiring consultants who bring specialized knowledge and hiring a limited number of limited-term District personnel.
- The Performance Audit performed by Perry-Smith LLP reported that each of the 100 expenditures tested represented valid Bond expenditures and were not spent for any other purpose, such as teacher and administrator salaries or other school operating expenses.

Ms. Cox stated that the committee would continue to monitor, review, and update the community on a regular basis, adding that the public is invited and encouraged to visit the Measure B web page on the District website for more information, as well as attend Committee meetings and Board meetings.

- \* WLC Architects presented the Steering Committee's recommendation for the Arts Education Center (AEC) schematic front elevation and associated lobby

elements.

San Leandro High School Principal Amy Furtado reported that the Steering Committee was recommending the Scheme I theatre design because it not only reflected something different for the high school, it also would tie in nicely with the Career Technical Education (CTE) building and the science wing. She also noted that the committee would be meeting to provide some minor “tweaking” to the design with regards to window space, and whether or not there should be windows on the lower elevations.

Concerns from the Board centered around the heat gain that might occur because of the number of windows and orientation of the building because it will face the exposure of the sun, if the shade structure would be low enough to provide enough shelter from inclement weather; and the possibility of graffiti on the glass at the lower levels. It was explained that because of the computer lab and the theatre, the building would be air conditioned, window overhangs would provide additional shade, and that the committee would be discussing different solutions and amount of glass on the lower level to address graffiti.

### Facilities and Construction

#### 5.1-A Arts Education Center Schematic Front Elevation and Related Lobby Aspects

On a motion made by Mrs. Hague and seconded by Mrs. Cutter, the Board approved the Arts Education Center schematic front elevations and related lobby aspects as presented to the Board on December 13, 2007, with final selection recommendation from the January 16, 2008, Steering Committee meeting by a 7-0 vote.

\* Assistant Superintendent Business Services Song Chin Bendib presented the Governor’s 2008-09 State Budget. Key points included:

- A \$400 million reduction for public education in 2007-2008
- A \$4.8 billion reduction from the state’s 2008-09 education budget in the form of across-the-board reduction cuts to Special Education, and before-and after-school programs
- Suspension of Proposition 98 minimum guarantee
- Under the Governor’s budget proposals, the San Leandro Unified School District would lose \$243,000 from the 2007-2008 budget and up to \$4.5 billion in 2008-09 due to the suspension of Proposition 98 and further budget cuts
- California schools cannot afford any budget cuts
- Our public schools are already funded well below the national average, any reduction will leave our students even further behind
- Making cuts to an already underfunded system is not going to help

Regarding the timeline for making decisions on the proposed reductions, staff explained that the District has been advised by the County Office of Education and Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) that these proposed reductions need to be included in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Interim budget report. Decisions regarding cuts would need to be made before the March 13 Board meeting, at which time, staff would be presenting the report for Board action.

Additional comments and information included

- Mr. Cassidy suggested that the District consider looking at a parcel tax proposal, and requested that it be agendaized for the next board meeting for discussion.
  - Ms. Perry noted that she had information from the California School Boards Association budget presentation that she attended on January 17
  - Mr. Katz felt that at this point there was still time to provide input to our legislators to minimize these cuts.
- \* Assistant Superintendent Cindy Cathey presented the results of the Block Schedule evaluation based upon the following criteria .

In accordance with The 2004-2007 Collective Bargaining Agreement between the San Leandro Unified School District and the San Leandro Teachers' Association Appendix U states that:

*“Criteria will be mutually agreed upon and adopted to measure the effectiveness of the Block Schedule, with the full evaluation to be conducted on the third additional year of the program (2007-2008). Prior to this evaluation, the Block Schedule as provided herein shall continue unless both the Association and School Board agree to end Block Scheduling thus returning to the six period day. Based on the above three-year evaluation either party may elect to return to the six-period day. If neither party gives timely notice to such a change, the block schedule of the Collective Bargaining Agreement shall continue on the same basis as other parts of the Agreement”.*

In accordance with the above agreement, Ms. Cathey explained that Assistant Superintendents Byron Isaac and Cindy M. Cathey, San Leandro High School Associate Principal Linda Granger, Assistant Director of Research and Program Evaluation Daniel Chaja and Director of Student Support Services David Lorden met with SLTA representatives Charles Kuruc, Charles Peterson, and Laurie Appling and agreed to the following criteria:

- 1) History and evolution (where we started, what we changed, and why we changed it) of the block schedule to develop the current “modified” block including the impact on English learners, Special Education students, CAHSEE intervention students, Advanced placement students, and year long courses

- 2) Fiscal analysis
- 3) Impact of the block schedule on student academic performance
- 4) Potential compliance items
- 5) Convene focus groups of staff, students, and parents focusing on three questions, *“What do you like about the block schedule?”*; *“What does not work with the block schedule?”*; and *“How would you fix things that are not working?”*

Highlights of the results of the evaluation concluded that:

- Regardless of what criteria one examines, there are teachers, parents, and students who passionately support the Block Schedule, as well as those who passionately oppose the Block Schedule.
- In 2004, the District and San Leandro Teachers’ Association agreed to increase class size, thus allowing all students to be enrolled in 8 classes each year and thus it was believed that the cost neutrality of the Block Schedule was maintained.
- Based on the current fiscal analysis, it has been determined, however, that to run the Block Schedule as currently configured, requires an additional 4.17 (FTE), which equates to an additional charge to the General Fund of approximately \$322,775.

In light of new financial information, the Governor’s proposed cuts, and in order for the Board to take timely action regarding the Block Schedule, Ms. Cathey stated that District staff was recommending that the Board of Education exercise its right to eliminate the Block Schedule and return to the six-period day beginning with the 2008-2009 school year, noting that another Board meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, February 5, 2008, at City Hall at which time the Board would be discussing the Block Schedule and taking action.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The following thirty-five speakers, including District teachers, parents, and students, addressed the Board regarding the Block Schedule: Jonathan Sherr, Roxanne Ansolabehere, Andy Shyers, Diane Dove, Olivia Pagano, Carol Ho, Dan Martin, Roberta Weisbard, Francine Leatherwood, Roger deRuig, Dan Weber, Diobhan Dohee, Domonique Tate, Barbara Kreiss, Rich Fishbaugh, Laurie Appling, Sam Lucero, William Sayo, Phil Hargrave, Sean Tobin, Abier Salamy, Michelle Cantillo, Audrey Brown, Jack Nelson, Vicki Woolworth, Georgia Scharff, Geneva Scharff, Richard Styner, Jerry Engler, Jenifer Engler, Valarie Sowers, Lini Xra, Cheryl Farley, Danny Hinckley, and Mari Gordon.

Comments in support of the Block Schedule included:

- 90 minute classes allow for in depth instruction
- More time for teacher/student interaction

- Longer prep time allows for easier parent contact
- Longer time to do lab work, and project-based courses
- It allows students to take more courses throughout their high school career
- Advanced Placement courses allow for an extended class period all year long to prepare for Spring AP tests
- Moving from a 4 x 4 block will directly affect SLAM; for example, in order to allow students to still be prepared for college, the multimedia skills classes would have to cut down to one course per year and the curriculum would need to be cut substantially
- English learners benefit from the block schedule
- Students are better prepared for the college environment
- Helps the quality of education, communication and professional development
- Academies act as “schools within a school” and will have to scale back their offerings to students under the period scheduling

Comments from those who oppose the Block Schedule included:

- Classes are too long
- The Block Schedule is not conducive with the schedule of the standardized state tests
- Lack of homework students receive
- Some students are able to finish homework in their classes
- Absences effect student performance
- Because students are limited to four classes in one semester, students cannot take classes other than the a-g subjects due to the limited class schedule
- New PE requirements and mandated Physical Fitness Exam testing of all 9<sup>th</sup> graders has put the District out of compliance because students enrolled in PE during the fall term were administered the test in the fall which is out of the designated testing window of approximately February – May
- Students must pass PE fitness test – or they must continue to take PE
- Students do not take PE all year
- The Block Schedule is not achieving the goals set forth

The Board took a break at 9:28 p.m. and returned to open session at 9:35 p.m.

Recognizing that the Board would be continuing their discussion of the Block Schedule at the February 5 Board meeting, the Board asked for additional information and posed follow-up questions, as requested by President Davis:

1. What is the impact to the District regarding PE because we are currently out of compliance?
2. What would be the fiscal impact to books and materials if we return to the traditional 6-period day?
3. Provide an analysis of math scores trends and proficiency for 2005/2006; 2006/2007.
4. Will there be a 50% reduction in time for students enrolled in the academies, Voc Ed., and

- Career Technology Education (CTE) if we return to the traditional schedule?
5. What is the negative impact to ELD students under a six-period day?
  6. Can any accommodations or other actions be taken to reduce such impacts under a 6-period day?
  7. Regarding the report that 2004 data of the school district was erroneous with respect to current fiscal impact of the Block Schedule, it was requested that the District meet with SLTA representatives to review the methodology that was used
  8. Time dedicated for passing period between classes with a 6-period day
  9. Would there be any changes in the current class sizes with a 6-period day?
  10. What are the Superintendent's and the high school principal's opinion regarding the impact on student achievement between both schedules?
  11. Is staff's recommendation based solely on the fiscal analysis: If not, would the recommendation still be to return to a traditional 6-period day?
  12. Did the District staff members who met with SLTA representatives to agree upon the criteria of the Block Schedule evaluation agree with the conclusions?
  13. What do studies say about the block schedule vs. a traditional six-period schedule with respect to its impact on students and their academic achievement?
  14. Can we survey other districts?
  15. Why were there very few parent voices in the feedback?
  16. A modified block schedule has been suggested as an alternative. What is a modified block schedule?
  17. What would a 6-period day look like for science and for project-based classes, etc.?
  18. Has there been an increase of AP scores with the block?
  19. Has student environment been addressed?
  20. Will there be a need for additional classrooms with a 6-period schedule and what will be the impact on specialized rooms such as SLAM?
  21. What would a "school within a school" be like in a 6-period day?
  22. Did the teachers keep logs to record time spent contacting parents and prep time?
  23. How will the change affect the average students?
  24. How are the PE facilities?
  25. What would 3 blocks of PE look like?
  26. Will it be necessary to reconfigure how foreign language is taught?
  27. What other alternatives can be considered?
  28. Are there advantages of a 6-period day versus a block schedule to narrowing the achievement gap?
  29. How many students in each grade are not taking eight classes per year? Could these students attend eight classes a year if they wanted to?
  30. The 2008 Block Schedule Evaluation Report is much less comprehensive and detailed than the 2004 evaluation. Why is that?

Board members were encouraged to email their questions to the Superintendent, so that staff to come prepared with information and clarification on February 5.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

- Donna Vinita, Labor Relations Representative for the Classified Employees Association #94 of the District, addressed the Board regarding a recent communication to staff from the Superintendent regarding the budget. She expressed her concerns that there were two District labor units missing from the seven-member District team that attended a School Services Budget Workshop on January 15: CSEA and Teamsters/Trades.



- Dave Ellington addressed the Board regarding the Burrell Field facility, and looked forward to continued conversations this year regarding this issue. .
- Jerry Engler, San Leandro Swim Team Board member, addressed the Board regarding the condition of the San Leandro High School swimming pool and the urgency to begin the repairs, stating that the San Leandro Swim Team is willing to work together with the Board and explore creative solutions to get this done.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

A public hearing was conducted regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 9<sup>th</sup> grade campus.

Prior to opening the public hearing, Trustee Perry stated that because she lives within 500 feet of the proposed 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Campus site, she would need to recuse herself from participating in the public hearing and the following conference items.

On a motion made by Mr. Richards and seconded by Mrs. Cutter, the Board open the public hearing regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 9<sup>th</sup> grade campus by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Perry recused herself from the vote.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- San Leandro City Councilmember Surlene Grant noted that she would be addressing the Board as a resident of 138<sup>th</sup> Ave. in San Leandro. Ms. Grant drew the Board's attention to the following points that she felt had not been addressed:
  1. Projects should reference 138<sup>th</sup> Avenue as well as Bancroft Ave.
  2. Involve the neighbors in a type of charrette design discussion regarding landscaping, particularly the lighting
  3. Air-quality and the impact of the dust created
  4. Characteristics of the soil
  5. Impact of reverberation of the homes along the edge of the property during construction
  6. Summary of traffic mitigation regarding neighboring streets
  7. Construction be limited to the following time schedule: 8:15 a.m., Monday-Friday, from September through June

On a motion made by Mrs. Cutter and seconded by Mrs. Hague, the Board closed the public hearing regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 9<sup>th</sup> grade campus by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Perry recused herself from the vote.

## **CONFERENCE**

## Facilities and Construction

### 5.1-CF Resolution #08-01, Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Campus

Mr. Cassidy asked if it would be possible to table this until the Feb. 5 Board meeting, so that staff could provide clarification on the points raised by Ms. Grant. It was noted that this was a time sensitive issue, with Assistant Superintendent Song Chin-Bendib explaining that there was a 30-day public review period from December 3, 2007, through January 4, 2008, and that all public comments would be taken into account.

On a motion made by Mr. Katz and seconded by Mrs. Cutter, the Board adopted Resolution #08-01, the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Campus with the additional statement, *“adopts the 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Campus Mitigation Monitoring Program Checklist and approves the Project”* by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Perry recusing herself.

### 5.2-CF Resolution #08-02, Accept the Written Determinations and Findings for the 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Campus

On a motion made by Mr. Richards and seconded by Mrs. Cutter, the Board adopted Resolution #08-02, to Accept the Written Determinations and Findings for the 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Campus by a 6-0 vote. Ms. Perry recused herself from the vote.

## **REPORTS**

- 1) Correspondence – Clerk Cutter reported receipt of the following emails from December 19, 2007 – January 24, 2008: from Susan Criswell, Richard Fishbaugh, Kathy Gin-Yee, Jeni Engler, Patricia Baker, Sandy Lu, Andy and Pauline Lau, Phil Hargrave, Maytak Chin, Hanna Schultheis-Gerry, Mel Recabar, Melody Tannam, and Linda Thurston regarding Block Schedule; from Jerry Engler, Paul Pierce, Carol Alvarez and Richard Fishbaugh regarding the high school pool; from Alice Vesterfelt, Gerald Shovlin, Frank Lynn, Virginia Lorencz, Judy Heroek, Madeline Agius, Susan Patrick, and Roxana O’Leary regarding the District residency policy; from Lynn Drogo regarding Board meeting schedules.
- 2) Superintendent’s Report – Superintendent Lim requested that the Board discuss Board meeting dates and decide on February dates. In light of the budget, she also requested that the Advocacy Committee convene and begin developing an action plan to address the Governor’s proposed budget.

### 3) Board Committee Reports

- Facilities/Technology - Mrs. Cutter reported that the committee met on January 10 and discussed the portable placements at Washington and McKinley Elementary Schools and the District's request to the City for Redevelopment Funds for the 9<sup>th</sup> grade campus, both of which are on the agenda tonight. In addition, Burrell Field including the snack bar; numerical address for the 9<sup>th</sup> grade campus; furniture and equipment for the San Leandro High School library expansion; and the use of Bancroft field by outside groups, (noting that "hardball" would not be allowed) were discussed.

President Davis also provided the following report from the December 6, 2007, facilities meeting with regards to the 9<sup>th</sup> grade campus: "There was a consensus of the Facility & Technology Committee not to pursue the solar energy contract at this time. The District is not able to do this at our own expense and it was also noted that consideration needs to be made for the additional maintenance demand. We can possibly re-visit solar at a later time if the District has the financial means. In looking at the design phase, staff has made sure that we have the potential to allow for loading of solar panels on the roof in the future."

Mr. Cassidy asked if the Facilities Committee was looking at developing a plan to renovate the snack bar and restrooms at Burrell Field. Mrs. Cutter said that currently there has not been any discussion yet; however the District has been discussing Burrell Field with the City.

- Finance – Mr. Richards reported that the committee met on January 14 and reviewed the Independent Audit Report and the Measure B Audit Report.
- Policy – Ms. Perry reported that the committee met on January 23 and reviewed the Board Policies and Administrative Regulations regarding the District residency and open enrollment process. The revised policies will be brought forward to the February 5 Board meeting for consideration.

### 7) Board Representatives' Reports

- Mid-Alameda County Special Education Local Plan Area – Ms. Perry reported that the committee met on January 23 and discussed the annual budget plan and service plan for 2007/08 which are due to the state on February 1. Their next meeting will be April 16.

### **CONSENT ITEMS**

Mr. Davis pulled consent item 2.1-C, Acceptance of Personnel Report, and Mrs. Hague pulled 4.4-C, Resolution #08-04 to Declare Certain Equipment Surplus and/or Obsolete from the Consent calendar.

General Services

- 1.1-C        Approval of Board Minutes – December 4, 2007
- 1.2-C        Approval of Board Minutes – December 18, 2007
- 1.3-C        Adopt Resolution #08-03 Authorizing Certain Persons to Draw Funds

Human Resources

- 2.2-C        Renewal of Student Teaching Agreements

Educational Services

- 3.2-C        Acceptance of Donations
- 3.3-C        Non-Public School Contracts
- 3.4-C        Proposed Stipulated Expulsion Order for Student E6-07/08
  
- 3.5-C        Recommendation for Readmission from Expulsion for the Following Students

E62-05/06	E12-06/07	E27-06/07
E11-06/07	E21-06/07	E29-06/07

- 3.6-C        Recommendation to Terminate Expulsion for Student E71-05/06
  
- 3.7-C        Recommendation to Continue the Expulsion Order for the Following Students

E24-05/06	E41-05/06	E78-05/06	E24-06/07
E27-05/06	E59-05/06	E79-05/06	E26-06/07
E35-05/06	E70-05/06	E06-06/07	
E37-05/06	E73-05/06	E20-06/07	

3.8-C 2007-2008 Consolidated Application (Con App) for Categorical Aid Programs Part II

3.9-C Resolution for Proposed Art/Music Block Grant Expenditures

#### Business Operations

4.1-C Ratification of Payroll for November and December 2007

4.2-C Approval of Bill Warrants

4.3-C Intra-Budget Transfers for September, October, November and December 2007

On a motion made by Mrs. Cutter seconded by Mr. Richards, the Board approved the remaining consent items by a 7-0 vote.

#### Human Resources

2.1-C Acceptance of Personnel Report

It was noted that service for Employee #648 was changed to a resignation.

On a motion made by Mr. Katz and seconded by Mrs. Hague, the Board accepted the Personnel Report, as amended, by a 7-0 vote. e

#### Business Operations

4.4-C Resolution #08-04 to Declare Certain Equipment Surplus and/or Obsolete

Mrs. Hague asked for clarification on the reason why John Muir Middle School was requesting that the woodshop equipment be discarded.

At Mrs. Hague's request, Resolution #08-04 to Declare Certain Equipment Surplus and/or Obsolete was tabled to the February 5 Board so that staff could research and provide clarification.

### **ACTION**

#### Human Resources

2.1-A Resolution #08-05, Reduction of Classified Staff Due to Lack of Funds/Work

Assistant Superintendent Isaac clarified that the California School Employee Association (CSEA) had been part of the discussion around this issue.

On a motions by Mr. Richards and seconded by Mr. Katz the Board adopted Resolution #08-05, Reduction of Classified Staff Due to Lack of Funds/Work by a 7-0 vote.

On a motion made by Mr. Katz and seconded by Mrs. Cutter, the Board extended the Board meeting until 11 p.m. by a 7-0 vote.

**CONFERENCE**

Facilities and Construction

5.3-CF Redevelopment Agency (RDA) for 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Campus Development

Exhibits illustrating the District's original proposal for RDA funds, the City of San Leandro's counter proposal, and the District's discussion of joint use calculations, estimated that the City's share of the value of design and potential joint use considerations including the City's use of the gym, and District's use of the new Senior Citizen Center parking lot to be located across the street from the 9<sup>th</sup> grade campus would range between \$2.2 & \$2.5 million.

It was the consensus of the Board to continue discussions with the City of San Leandro for RDA funds.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Jana Cloud-Barnes, Co-PTO President of McKinley, addressed the Board advocating for the installation of at least four portable classrooms at McKinley which will address the facility needs critical to their educational program.

5.4-CF Portable Placements at McKinley and Washington Elementary Schools

The Board discussed and considered authorizing the lease of growth portables at McKinley and Washington Elementary Schools.

Mrs. Cutter was concerned about the cost, and suggested that the District lease 3 portables for McKinley and 2 for Washington, then in

two years, since the portables at the high school have to be moved anyway, pay the moving costs to transport them from the high school to the sites, thus saving the District the ongoing cost of leasing the additional portables at this time.

Considering the condition of the portables at the high school and the cost to move them, Ms. Perry felt it made more sense to install the maximum portables all at once because these schools are terribly impacted now and the quality of education cannot wait two more years.

Two new portable budget estimate summary scenarios were presented indicated that it would cost less to install the 3 portables at Washington and 4 at McKinley now (Scenario 1) than to wait two years and install (1) existing high school portable at each site (Scenario 2).

On a motion made by Ms. Perry and seconded by Mr. Richards, the Board approved Scenario #1, to install the maximum 4 leased portable classrooms at McKinley Elementary School and the maximum 3 leased portable classrooms at Washington Elementary School by a 6-1 vote. Mrs. Cutter voting no.

## General Services

### 1.1-CF Agenda Items for the January 28, 2008, City/District Joint Meeting

The Board discussed and considered approving the agenda items for the January 28, 2008, City/District Joint Meeting.

Staff proposed the following tentative agenda for the January 28, 2008, City/District Joint Meeting:

1. Presentation of Plans for 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Campus (Lim)
2. City Financial Participation for Joint Use of Gymnasium (Jermanis)
3. Renovation and Joint Use of San Leandro High School Swimming Pool (Jermanis)

A concern was raised regarding the expectations and context of the City's presentation. In response, Superintendent Lim explained that she has discussed the parameters and using the San Lorenzo gym as an example with regards to joint use of the gymnasium with the

City Manager. With regards to the swimming pool it appears that the cost of the pool varies and that because Ms. Lim felt that the District would not have the capacity to solely renovate, she had proposed the City consider the pool as a joint use project.

Because the meeting reached the extended hour of 11 p.m. the meeting was adjourned and there was no further discussion regarding the agenda items for the January 28, 2008, City/District Joint Meeting. President Davis stated that Miscellaneous Receipts and the Update to the Measure B Program Master Schedule would be carried over to the next Board meeting.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### Business, Operations and Facilities

- 4.1-I            Miscellaneous Receipts  
Miscellaneous receipts in the amount of \$8,168,859.98 for November 2007 and receipts in the amount of \$16,342,083.03 for December 2007 have been deposited in the Treasury of Alameda County.

### Facilities and Construction

- 5.1-I            Staff Recommendation:  
Update to the Measure B Program Master Schedule      The Board will receive for information and review the Measure B Program Master Schedule updated to December 7, 2007.

## **ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS**

## **ANNOUNCEMENT**

### **Future Board of Education Meetings**

- Special Meeting – March 6, 2008
- Regular Meeting – March 13, 2008
- Regular Meeting – April 1, 2008
- Regular Meeting – April 15, 2008
- Regular Meeting – May 6, 2008
- Regular Meeting – May 20, 2008
- Regular Meeting – June 3, 2008
- Regular Meeting – Jun3 17, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Pauline Cutter, Clerk