

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

REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION - MINUTES

July 5, 2006

The Board of Education of the San Leandro Unified School District met in regular session on July 5, 2006, in the San Leandro City Council Chambers, 835 East 14th Street, San Leandro, California.

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by President Pauline Cutter.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Ray Davis
Mr. Louis Heystek
Ms. Linda Perry
Mr. T. W. "Rick" Richards
Mrs. Lisa Hague, Clerk (arrived at 6:18 p.m.)
Mr. Stephen Cassidy, Vice President
Mrs. Pauline Cutter, President

DISTRICT STAFF PRESENT

Christine Lim, Superintendent
Leon Glaster, Assistant Superintendent
Michael Martinez, 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 6:12 p.m., the Board went into closed session for Student Expulsions, Conference with Labor Negotiator:

Unrepresented Employees:

- Superintendent
- Assistant Superintendent for Business Services
- Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources
- Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services

Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation – Significant Exposure to Litigation; Conference with Real Property Negotiator – Property(ies); and Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation.

The closed session was adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

The Board returned to open session at 7:10 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. President Cutter said the Board had been in closed session and no action was taken.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

On a motion made by Mr. Richards and seconded by Mr. Davis, the Board approved the agenda for the regular meeting of July 5, 2006, by a 7-0 vote.

PRESENTATIONS

- * On behalf of Felix Elizalde, member, Alameda County Board of Education, President Cutter and Superintendent Chris Lim presented a Public Education Service Award to the “Yes on Measure A Campaign” committee, with a special thanks to the committee co-chairs Leroy Smith, and Deborah Cox, who accepted the award, and to the many volunteers who generously gave of their time.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

- Mike Katz addressed the Board regarding the teachers’ use of school mailboxes ruling. Realizing that such lawsuits are sensitive issues and there are limits of what can be discussed, he requested that, in the future, the District be a little more proactive in informing the community of the reasons why they chose to pursue the lawsuit, and spend the District’s valuable resources.

RECESS TO FACILITIES WORKSHOP

- Facility Options from Community Workshops and Forums

Before proceeding with the workshop, Trustee Perry explained that she had requested a legal opinion from the District’s attorney regarding a potential Board member conflict of interest, due to the fact that she lived within a block of a location being considered for purchase by the Board for a new 9th grade academy. It was the opinion of legal counsel that *“there was a basis for the member to refrain from considering or voting upon matters before the Board that bear directly on the purchase”*, for the following reasons:

“We believe that as a neighbor to the potential new school, the member could reasonably be perceived as having personal, non-economic interests that could

come into conflict with the member's Board to consider the proposed purchase objectively. Such interests could include concerns about changes (either positive or negative) that a new school would bring to the neighborhood, environmental changes (such as traffic and/or noise) and potential changes to value or attractiveness of residential property adjacent to the new school".

Staff, representatives from Harris & Associates, and WLC Architects provided additional detailed information and research regarding the project options that had come forward from the prior board workshops and community meetings, including architectural renderings illustrating options for a 9th grade academy (now being referred to as a Freshman Campus), the PG &E lot, Performing Arts Center/Music/Industrial Arts, library expansion, Auxiliary Gym, 7th & 8th grade Opportunity School, Burrell Field Renovation, and Jefferson Multipurpose Room potential options.

Part of the classroom modernization projects and alternatives presented included a list of potential reduction in modernization scope items for flooring, ceilings, heating systems, restrooms, and telephones, totaling approximately \$8.8 million.

Assistant Superintendent Cindy Cathey highlighted some of the major research that emerged in response to the question "*Why aren't we considering a K-6, 7-8, 9-12 grade span configuration like we used to have?*", focusing particularly on the "caught in the middle" group students in grades 6-9 (10-14 year olds).

She explained that middle school reform has been a high priority in California since 1987 and that it supported a 6-8 model (a common configuration), for a number of reasons including the physical needs of 10-14 year olds, (the brain develops at a rapid rate but not necessarily as the same rate as the body), curriculum, and social and emotional needs.

In addition, Ms Cathey said should the District pursue the K-6 configuration, that would counter research that says 6th graders also have unique needs and should be clustered with middle level students (grades 6-8), and would potentially create larger elementary schools than we currently have, which would also counter research that tells us about learning environments that maximize teaching and learning and keeping them as small as possible, noting that some researchers believe that all configurations have strengths and areas of need, but what matters the most is the quality of the program that is provided to students regardless of the configuration.

Assistant Superintendent Leon Glaster addressed future year enrollment projections and how they would impact the proposed options. A chart showing an analysis of classroom capacity current/future enrollment projections with the current configuration indicated that the elementary schools would have sufficient space to house through 2025. With the exclusion of portables at the secondary

schools, projections indicated that Bancroft was currently over capacity; however, enrollment would decrease to a capacity that would sufficiently house students through 2025. Muir's capacity would be sufficient to house current and projected students through 2025, and the high school overcrowding would only increase, reiterating the need to reduce the number of students on the campus.

Reconfiguration to K-6, 7-9, and 10-12 grade spans indicated that the elementary schools capacity would not be sufficient to house current and projected students through 2025; Muir's capacity would not be sufficient to house current and projected students, and Bancroft would be at capacity. However, the 10-12 configuration at the high school would solve overcrowding, but at the expense of a K-6 grade configuration.

Before continuing with the discussion regarding the freshman campus, Ms. Perry excused herself due to the conflict of interest that she referred to early.

To clarify issues regarding overcrowding at the high school, staff explained the advantages and challenges for a freshman campus on or off the current high school site, and potential purchase of the PG&E lot for parking adjacent to the high school. It was also noted that the potential purchase of a parking lot across the street from Bancroft Middle School could generate a joint-use partner with the City to address the parking needs of the city park adjacent to the lot as well as the shortage of teacher and visitor parking on the middle school site,

In addition to potential state matching funds for site acquisition for a Freshman Campus (one block from the high school), construction projects at the high school that reduce overcrowding, and seismic renovations, Mr. Glaster drew the Board's attention to a new joint-use schools facilities bill, Senate Bill 1677, introduced by Senator Torlakson which would expand the type of allowable projects available to be built pursuant to the joint-use agreements including a performing arts center as well as a career technical building or shop, science and technology laboratory, science center, historical or cultural education center, and physical education.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following people addressed the Board regarding the Bond priority options:

- Roxanne Ansolabehere, San Leandro High School librarian, spoke in support of the library expansion, stating that students deserve a fully stocked, fully staffed, wonderful library media center that is appropriate for this day and age, and urged the Board to consider the library expansion "not as a frill" but as an "incredible necessity for the majority of our students."
- Caeli Koizumi, a 5th grader at Roosevelt, Claire McKean, Megan McKinley, Karen Koizumi (on behalf of Richards Palmer), Wendy Alder, Catherine

Heck, Alan Koizumi, Joanne Schultz, Jerry Engler, Jeni Engler, Jason Proctor, Rebecca Thvedt, Angela DeClan, voiced their support of building a Performing Arts Center (PAC), stating that many outside communities have impressive joint school and community performing art centers, this would be something the community would support, and that academic achievement goes hand in hand with opportunities such as arts education. In addition speakers echoed that it would attract and encourage students to attend the local schools, and if the community wished to continue to maintain quality families in San Leandro and attract incoming homeowners, this should be a high priority. They urged the Board to consider including a PAC as a top priority when setting the Bond projects.

- Danny Hinkley asked to see the ranking results of the bond priority list from the June 19 Community Forum. He was concerned that consideration for a PAC and library expansion was contingent on the 9th grade academy, and urged the Board to consider those three critical options separately.

In addition to adding their support of the PAC, the following people also addressed other bond options:

- Raymond Holton felt that an off-campus Freshmen Campus might limit 9th graders from participating in extra curricular activities and their ability to interact with upper classmen.
- Jerry Engler would also like to see the athletic programs upgrade for much the same reasons as arts education in that it motivates students, and brings positive attention to our schools.
- Angela DeClan encouraged some investment in the condition of Burrell Field.

Before continuing, it was the consensus of the Board to have Conference Item 1.1-CF, where the Board would be considering prioritizing the facility options, follow this discussion.

The Board continued to raise questions and concerns around the PG&E lot acquisition, and the design, seating capacity, and beautification of the area in front of the proposed PAC.

Mr. Heystek was interested in the details of the modernization improvements, and what the District could expect to see with the dollar amount being considered, adding that he felt that roofing, heating, ADA fire life safety needed to be at the top of the priority list.

Ms. Perry pointed out and it was confirmed by Mr. Glaster that architectural plans for the Jefferson Elementary school already existed and included a full gym/multipurpose room and music rooms.

Mr. Cassidy was interested in additional specifications regarding possible state matching funds that may be available, particularly for upgrading of shop classes and equipment. Mr. Glaster explained that SB 1677 expands the joint-use from teaching and classroom-based educational facilities to new areas such as performing arts centers and physical education facilities, adding that the major criteria of this bond is overcrowding, industrial arts, green, modernization, and joint-use projects.

In addition Mr. Cassidy requested that staff bring back information regarding the growth capacity of the freshman campus should we need to meet accelerated enrollment projects down the road, and more specific design details on the performing arts center.

On-going costs utility costs, heating systems, and programmatic issues were areas of concerns raised by Mrs. Cutter.

CONFERENCE

These items are submitted for advance planning and to assist the Board in establishing future agenda items. The Board may, however, take action on the following:

General Services

1.1-CF Facility Options from Community Workshops and Forums

The Board discussed and considered prioritizing facility options from the community workshops and forums, sharing their priorities with regards to the modernization and special projects.

Mr. Heystek would like to scale back on the modernization budget to accommodate the overcrowding and focus only on restrooms, heating, roofing, and ADA, Fire Life Safety as the modernization package.

Responding to Ms. Perry question about bond language needed to qualify for matching state funding, Ruth Alahydoian from Kelly, Northcross & Nobriga, stated that with Proposition 39 specific projects needed to be pinpointed, and sites identified; however, you could identify as many projects as you wanted, even though you may be unable to complete them.

Mr. Cassidy would like to solve one problem fully rather than one problem halfway by dedicating more money to the high school rather

than to the modernization, making it a “desirable landmark campus for the community”.

Board members continued to feel that there needed to be a clearer understanding of the community threshold, and what that would provide for the District. They requested that staff provide additional information at the June 18 Board meeting regarding the impact on the high school, should we be unable to acquire the PG&E property; and a revised modernization list with district-wide costs provided for roofing, restrooms, heating, and ADA fire safety.

Mr. Heystek felt that having available detailed information regarding the City’s participation in possible joint-use projects such as a performing arts center, Burrell field, Jefferson Multipurpose Room, and Bancroft parking lot would be helpful when the District met with them on July 31.

Mr. Cassidy suggested that consultant Connell Lindh attend the next meeting, to offer some political reality and insight on the dollar amount to set the bond. He thanked those community members who spoke, adding that a tremendous amount of work is required, but felt that together with the community we could achieve success.

Mrs. Cutter suggested that the Facility Committee meet prior to the next Board meeting to focus on the detail of the options being proposed.

Superintendent Lim verified that the next meeting would be the regularly scheduled July 18 meeting and not a special July 13 meeting.

The Board took a break at 9:35 p.m. and returned to open session at 9:48 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON AGENDA ITEMS

- Kathy Goodall addressed the Board regarding Jefferson Elementary School’s School Accountability Report Card report that is posted on the District’s website and also requested that the school develop protocol regarding Megan’s Law. She continued to voice her concern over the lack of leadership at Jefferson on the principal’s part. Her daughter, a 4th grade Jefferson Elementary student, added her thoughts as well.

Mrs. Cutter indicated that she would forward her July 6 response to Ms. Goodall’s complaints to the Board.

- 1) Correspondence – Clerk Hague reported receipt of the following emails from Kathy Goodall regarding Megan’s law, Jessica’s law petition, meeting, and Jefferson fire drills; from Gerald Shovlin regarding ideas for presenting the Bond; Jeni Engler regarding priorities for a bond proposal; from Heidi Finberg regarding invitation to speak; from Claire McKean regarding the bond; from Catherine Heck regarding arts educational center; from Barbara Berry regarding bond measure priorities; from Joanne Schultz regarding the proposed bond projects, and a letter of support for a performing arts center from Gabrielle Koizumi.
- 2) Superintendent’s Report – Superintendent Chris Lim acknowledged the communities’ passionate comments regarding their concern for the children, education and the arts, adding that it was an exciting time, and that the District heard their voices, and would move forward to create, what she hoped to be “better schools for our community”.
- 3) Board Committee Reports
 - Communication – Mr. Cassidy reported that the committee met on June 30 and reviewed outstanding projects including creating a ListServ for the District allowing the community to opt-in to choose to receive email messages with District-wide news. It was the hope of the committee that in conjunction with the updated website, ListServ could be launched, adding that a ListServ presentation should be planned. The next issue of *Focus* will highlight the opening of the Adult School. It was decided to continue with a series of informational pieces in the *San Leandro Times* beginning in the fall rather than a community-wide newsletter. Scheduling significant events announcing positive things in the District such as the re-opening of the metal shop, and a parent leader reception for October 5 in the afternoon, inviting all Board members was also discussed.
 - Policy – Ms. Perry reported that the committee met on July 5 (before the regular Board meeting) and reviewed the Student Wellness Policy and related policies such as contracts, food service/child nutrition program, other food sales, physical education, and comprehensive health education. Intra-district transfers policy was also reviewed, noting that all of these policies and any new required forms would be coming before the Board at the July 18 Board meeting. Responding to Mr. Cassidy’s inquiry, Ms. Perry said the policies were completely new so there would not be any “redline” comparisons with the old.

Mrs. Cutter reported that inquiries were being made with regards to Megan’s Law in terms of neighborhoods, and the District’s responsibilities, and that the Policy Committee would be reviewing the information once it was compiled. Ms. Cathey said that she was

currently gathering data on what the District is required to do, comparing it with other Districts, and asking for guidance from CSBA and the state.

7) Board Representatives' Reports

- Alameda County School Boards Assn. – Ms. Perry reported that the committee met on June 29 for a planning meeting and she would be serving as president next year. Nancy Riddle from Berkeley would be secretary and Dennis King from Dublin, treasurer, noting that they were still looking for a vice president. Their first meeting will be a joint meeting with Contra Costa on Oct. 5, focusing on tools for Board members around student achievement and achievement gap issues as presented by CSBA. She said that she would forward a list of the proposed programs to the Board which includes the “Teacher of the Year” event on October 26, noting they meet on the third Thursday of each month at the Alameda County Office of Education at 7 p.m.
- Mid-Alameda County Special Education Local Plan Area – Ms. Perry also reported that MACSELPA met on June 29 and approved the budget for the upcoming year. She had a matrix for each district describing the services that are provided at each school and indicated that she would pass along San Leandro’s to the Board. Ms. Perry said this was the last meeting for the current director, and that the former assistant director from Pleasanton would be taking over the reigns at their next meeting on October 18.
- City Disaster Preparedness Council – Mrs. Cutter reported that the committee met and heard a report on painting and refinishing the emergency storage trailers (Arks) located at some of the school sites, making them more accessible and replenishing the supplies, adding that the one at Bancroft would be moved out to the parking lot during construction. With regards to earthquakes, a report was given regarding local medical point dispensing sites to be established in case of fire, terrorist, or public health emergencies, noting that San Leandro High School had been identified as one of those sites. There also was a representative from the 4-Paws Society who explained caring for animals during a disaster.

CONSENT ITEMS

General Services

- 1.1-C Approval of Board Minutes – May 16, 2006
- 1.2-C Approval of Board Minutes – June 6, 2006

Human Resources

- 2.1-C Acceptance of Personnel Report
- 2.2-C Release Time for SLTA Bargaining Chair for 2006-07 School Year
- 2.3-C Extension of the Term of the Employment Contract and Compensation Package between the District and the Superintendent
- 2.4-C Extension of the Term of the Employment Contract between the District and the Assistant Superintendent, Business Services
- 2.5-C Extension of the Term of the Employment Contract between the District and the Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources
- 2.6-C Extension of the Term of the Employment Contract between the District and the Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services

Educational Services

- 3.1-C Acceptance of Donations
- 3.2-C Recommendation from Administrative Panel for Expulsion for Student E61-05/06
- 3.3-C Recommendation from Administrative Panel for Expulsion for Student E70-05/06
- 3.4-C Recommendation from Administrative Panel for Expulsion for Student E71-05/06
- 3.5-C Recommendation from Administrative Panel for Expulsion for Student E72-05/06
- 3.6-C Recommendation from Administrative Panel for Expulsion for Student E73-05/06
- 3.7 -C Recommendation from Administrative Panel for Expulsion for Student E74-05/06
- 3.8-C Recommendation from Administrative Panel for Expulsion for Student E75-05/06
- 3.9-C Recommendation from Administrative Panel for Expulsion for Student E76-05/06

- 3.10-C John Muir's Addendum to the Single School Plan
- 3.11-C Renewal of Carl Perkins Application for San Leandro High School
- 3.12-C Renewal of Carl Perkins Application for the San Leandro Adult School
- 3.13-C Low Income Investment Fund Grant for San Leandro Adult School Even Start Literacy Program

Business, Operations and Facilities

- 4.1-C Resolution #06-31 to Declare Certain Equipment Surplus and/or obsolete due to the age and condition of the designated equipment.
- 4.2-C Liability Claim Submitted to San Leandro Unified School District

On a motion made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Cassidy, the Board approved the consent items by the 7-0 vote.

President Cutter asked Superintendent Lim to recap the following timeline for upcoming meeting dates:

- July 18 Regular Board Meeting
- July 20 Special Board Meeting, 5:30 p.m., D.O.
- July 31 Tentative Joint City/District Meeting, 6 p.m.; work session beginning at 7 p.m.
- August 1 Regular Board Meeting

The need to schedule a special board meeting on July 13 was raised. Ms. Perry was concerned about the August 1 deadline for adopting the bond resolution. She thought that the Board was still a long way from the target and had not fully addressed the issue of the community threshold. She would rather meet on July 13 for a special meeting, in lieu of a Facilities Committee meeting, to further discuss and clarify any pending concerns before the meeting on July 18.

Mr. Cassidy was concerned about decision being made with lack of community input or oversight, which he felt occurs at a special meeting as apposed to a regular meeting.

Mr. Heystek noted that he would be arriving late to the July 18 meeting, because he would be attending his brother's swearing in ceremony as a councilmember in Davis and was concerned about how that would impact the discussion on the 18th.

Staff indicated that the consultant, Connell Lindh, may not be available on the 13th, with the Superintendent adding that she was not sure if all the information requested would be ready for a meeting on the 13th, and that by waiting until the 18th, it would provide her with more time to work with various groups.

As a compromise, the Board agreed to Superintendent Lim's suggestion that a special meeting be tentatively scheduled for July 13, and because it only required a 24-hour advanced posting, the decision to meet would not be made until she returned from vacation on July 12, adding that the special meeting would be a discussion only meeting where no action would be taken. She would also adjust the July 18 agenda in order to maximize Mr. Heystek's arrival time.

Ms. Perry felt that another meeting should be added as a placeholder after the 18th and before Aug. 1st should something unforeseen arise. President Cutter suggested, and the Board agreed, adjourning the meeting, and then discussing additional meeting dates.

ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

- Mr. Cassidy reported that he joined the Superintendent and the John Muir principal and walked through the school campus, suggesting that other members of the Board visit the site, as there are a number of issues that need to be addressed.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Future Board of Education Meetings

- Regular Meeting – July 18, 2006
- Regular Meeting – August 1, 2006
- Regular Meeting – August 15, 2006
- Regular Meeting – September 6, 2006
- Regular Meeting – September 19, 2006
- Regular Meeting – October 3, 2006
- Regular Meeting – October 17, 2006
- Regular Meeting – November 7, 2006
- Regular Meeting – November 21, 2006
- Regular Meeting – December 5, 2006
- Regular Meeting – December 19, 2006
- Regular Meeting – January 17, 2007
- Regular Meeting – February 6, 2007
- Regular Meeting – February 21, 2007
- Regular Meeting – March 6, 2007
- Regular Meeting – March 20, 2007
- Regular Meeting – April 3, 2007
- Regular Meeting – April 17, 2007
- Regular Meeting – May 1, 2007
- Regular Meeting – May 15, 2007
- Regular Meeting – June 5, 2007
- Regular Meeting – June 19, 2007

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion made by Mr. Richards and seconded by Mr. Davis, the Board adjourned the meeting at 10:23 p.m. by a 7-0 vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Hague, Clerk