



**BOARD OF EDUCATION
REGULAR MEETING**
2309 TULARE STREET
BOARD ROOM, SECOND FLOOR
FRESNO, CA 93721-2287
www.fresnounified.org/board

**MINUTES – BOARD OF EDUCATION REGULAR MEETING
Fresno Unified School District
February 11, 2015**

**Fresno, California
February 11, 2015**

Office of the Board of Education, Fresno Unified School District, Education Center, 2309 Tulare Street, Fresno California, 93721.

At a regular meeting of the Board of Education of Fresno Unified School District, held on February 11, 2015 there were present Members Ashjian, Chavez, Davis, De La Cerda, Mills, Ryan and President Johnson. Superintendent Hanson was also present. Student Board Members Gonzales and Romero were absent.

President Johnson convened the meeting at 3:30 p.m. in the Board Room and adjourned to Closed Session. The Board reconvened in Open Session at 6:11 p.m.

Staff Present

Deputy Superintendent Quinto, Instructional Superintendents: Her, and Russell. Assistant Superintendents: Locker, Hunt, Hashimoto, Maldonado, and Severns. Interim Chief Information Officer Idsvoog, Chief Technology Officer Madden, Human Resources/Labor Relations Mecum, Chief Operations Officer Temple and Chief of Staff Chavez.

Reporting Out of Session

- By a vote of 7-0-0, the Board took action in Closed Session to hire William Belanger, Assistant Superintendent, Operational Services.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Rene Rocha, a parent that has had a positive impact at Figarden Elementary, led the flag salute.

APPROVE Minutes

Minutes for the January 21, 2015 Regular Meeting and January 26, 2015 Special Meeting were approved with minor corrections. Member Mills moved for approval, seconded by Member De La Cerda, and by a vote of 7-0-0, as follows: AYES: Members Ashjian, Chavez, Davis, De La Cerda, Mills, Ryan and President Johnson.

HEAR Reports from Student Board Representatives

Student Board Representative Rafael Flores provided comments/reports from the Student Advisory Board Representative meeting hosted by Edison High School with Board Members Mills and Davis present. Student Board Representative Rafael Flores acknowledged the student ambassadors from Edison Computech Middle School.

Member Mills – Thank you for hosting. We do appreciate the student voice.

Member Davis – Thank you Ms. Perez for hosting the meeting. Very gratifying to have Juanita Stevens there to see the great work our students are doing with the Human Element.

Member Ashjian – Great job presenting. Your parents should be very proud.

HEAR Report from Superintendent

Black History Month - Across the county the month of February is designated for celebrating and emphasizing the history and achievements of African-Americans throughout our rich history. The accomplishments made by African-Americans in our county are widespread. Fresno Unified is dedicated in making sure our students receive a fair and complete understanding of all cultures.

Kings Canyon Middle School – Our first “School to Watch” celebration. Is among 66 schools deemed “School to Watch” which puts them in the top 400 out of 25,000 in the U.S. Great work and congratulations.

Excellence in Education Awards – Tomorrow night we will be recognizing 43 district employees. To celebrate and honor individuals who have given so much of their time and energy to Fresno Unified. The winners of tomorrow night’s award ceremony will advance to the County Educator of the year award competition.

Strategic Budget Development Discussion – We will be making our first recommendation to the Board of Education. Although we will be receiving additional money from LCFF we do have obligations to our pensions. That needs to be understood when we think about our budget position and how that necessarily is going to reflect when we try to do more building and more bond. Will be providing an additional meeting for LCAP at McLane High School, February 19 at 6:00 p.m.

On a motion by Member Davis, seconded by Member Mills, the consent agenda, exclusive of agenda items: A-3, A-4, and A-6 which were pulled for further discussion, was approved on a roll call vote of 7-0-0 as follows: AYES: Members Ashjian, Chavez, Davis, De La Cerda, Mills, Ryan, President Johnson.

A. CONSENT AGENDA

A-1, APPROVE Personnel List

APPROVED, as recommended the Personnel List, Appendix A, as submitted.

A-2, ADOPT Findings of Fact and Recommendations of District Administrative Board

ADOPTED, as recommended the Findings of Fact and Recommendations of District Administrative Panels resulting from hearings on expulsion and readmittance cases conducted during the period since the January 21, 2015, Regular Board meeting.

A-3, APPROVE Funding Support For Fresno First Steps Home Organization

APPROVED, as recommended Included in the Board binders is information on the Fresno First Steps Home (FFSH) organization. This organization provides housing and supportive services for chronically homeless families. Collaboration with FFSH will provide additional support to the homeless students within our district.

Member Chavez – Can you provide an overview on the service delivery model and what the services look like for our students?

Ambra Dorsey – We are actually fortunate to have a representative from Fresno First Steps Home. This is our second year partnering. We have approximately 1,100 homeless students and their families will be benefited.

Cary Catalano – Today was a big milestone for us. We opened up our One Stop Center. Primarily, over the last five years since we have started this collaborative effort with the Continue of Care we have helped place over 600 individuals and reunited families that have lost their children based off of being homeless. It has been very successful. We work very closely with Fresno Unified School District, all the schools and all the hospitals. We are very thrilled that Fresno Unified participates in this effort.

Member Chavez – Does our district assess our students and then refer them or do they do the wrap around services?

Ambra Dorsey – Currently in our Project Access unit, which is under the Department of Prevention and Intervention, we have four social workers working specifically with foster and homeless and we also have two community school liaisons. As we identify students we reach out to our partners and they help us. It's a valuable partnership.

Member Chavez – How many students are we serving?

Ambra Dorsey – We can communicate that in a board communication.

Member Chavez – Great collaborative effort.

Member Chavez moved for approval, seconded by Member Davis, which carried a vote of 7-0-0, as follows: AYES: Ashjian, Chavez, Davis, De La Cerda, Mills, Ryan and President Johnson.

A-4, APPROVE Independent Contractor Services Agreements with Therapy Travelers and Staff Rehab

APPROVED, as recommended two Independent Contractor Services Agreements as required by Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). The term of each agreement will commence on February 17, 2015 and will end on June 30, 2015. The Superintendent recommends approval. Fiscal Impact: Sufficient funds in the amount of \$148,024 are available in the Special Education budget.

Member Ashjian – Can we get a bit of clarity on this item?

Cheryl Hunt – Our role is to ensure we have service providers for our students to meet their SLP needs, on the onset of each school year we have anywhere from 2-3 contracts that we bring forward to ensure all of our service needs are met. Unfortunately, even with our pre-planning with our contracts, some of our contract providers are unable to fulfill their contract as noted and in this case, that is what took place. We are constantly working

with different vendors to offer those services and in this case, we are reallocating the approved dollars from August to two new contracts.

Member Ashjian – I just want to thank you for doing that because that is a big deal. Last month before this board we thought we had a short fall or could have possibly been a short fall. The expediency that the board and the Superintendent moved this deficit was lighting fast. I want to thank you for all the hard work considering the students who need these services and then adding the dollars and the proper teachers to this, thank you.

Member Ashjian moved for approval, seconded by Member Mills, which carried a vote of 7-0-0, as follows: AYES: Ashjian, Chavez, Davis, De La Cerda, Mills, Ryan and President Johnson.

A-5, APPROVE Itinerary Changes for an Out-of-Country Field Trip for Fresno High School

APPROVED, as recommended a matrix and revised itinerary with specific details for an out-of-country field trip involving students from Fresno High School. This field trip was approved as Agenda Item A-6 at the November 20, 2013, Board meeting. Changes to the approved itinerary were requested by the tour company.

A-6, APPROVE Award of Bid 15-10, McLane High School Site Improvements

APPROVED, as recommended Bid 15-10 for upgrades to the Cedar/Clinton parking lot and Cedar pedestrian entry at McLane High School. The project includes improvements to the main entrance with decorative concrete, a planter box, and benches to match those on the quad, and installation of irrigation and low water-use trees throughout the main parking lot. The request for bid was lawfully advertised on December 10, 2014. Notifications were sent to seventy-two (72) vendors and four (4) construction trade publications, and the district received ten (10) responses:

Staff recommends award to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder:

Clean Cut Landscape (Clovis, California) \$270,908

Member De La Cerda – First of all I would like to say thank you to Ms. Temple and Mr. Friesen for meeting with myself, Member Chavez, and Member Ashjian. I am excited with what I see being presented with the parking lot and the front entrance at McLane. Wanted to say thank you for your time and thank you for giving us that tour and the information that you shared with us.

Karin Temple – Thank you. We are very excited to move this project forward.

Member De La Cerda moved for approval, seconded by Member Mills, which carried a vote of 7-0-0, as follows: AYES: Ashjian, Chavez, Davis, De La Cerda, Mills, Ryan and President Johnson.

- A-7, DENY Claim #14-0919-0284**
DENIED, as recommended a Claim for Damages on Minor, case #14-0919-0284. The Superintendent recommends that the Claim be denied and the matter referred to the district's Director of Benefits and Risk Management for further handling.
- A-8, DENY Claim #14-1025-0312**
DENIED, as recommended a Claim for Damages on Nora Flores, case #14-1025-0312. The Superintendent recommends that the Claim be denied and the matter referred to the district's Director of Benefits and Risk Management for further handling.
- A-9, RATIFY Purchase Orders from November 1, 2014 through November 30, 2014**
RATIFIED, as recommended a list of Purchase Orders for \$10,000 or more submitted for ratification by the Board. Purchase Orders/contracts that are required by law to be competitively bid will be submitted as separate agenda items. Beginning on page ten (10) is a list of Purchase Orders issued from November 1, 2014 through November 30, 2014. These Purchase Orders were previously authorized and awarded by the Board. The Purchase Orders are submitted for information only and are not included for ratification.

**END OF CONSENT AGENDA
 (ROLL CALL VOTE)**

UNSCHEDULED ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Tish Rice – Spoke about when the district will disclose the next 20 designated elementary schools.

B. CONFERENCE/DISCUSSION AGENDA

6:00 P.M.

B-10, PRESENT and DISCUSS the 2015/16 Strategic Budget Development

PRESENTED and DISCUSSED At the January 21, 2015 Board of Education meeting, the 2015/16 Governor's Proposed Budget and the District's preliminary strategic budget development was discussed. On February 11, 2015, staff and the Board will continue budget development discussions.

Presentation by Deputy Superintendent Ruth F. Quinto

An opportunity was provided to hear questions/concerns from members of the Board and staff was available to respond.

Member Mills – You mentioned QEIA, SIG and other grants that are ending. Are they ending as in the end of this fiscal year June 30th?

Ruth Quinto – Yes. SIG actually already ended, but they allowed carry over.

Member Davis – With QEIA, SIG and the other grants ending, does that mean we will have to layoff personnel?

Ruth Quinto – No, we will not be laying off personnel.

Member Ryan – I wanted to make mention, I have been reading that the Governor will probably have some substantial funds available for CTE. I want to make sure that in our budget we are going to have money set aside ready to apply for those matching funds.

Ruth Quinto – Yes, and the incentive grant does indicate there would be a matching situation. We absolutely will not let that slip passed us. In fact we just applied for an incentive CTE grant with some business partners that I believe was due last week or the week before. If there is an opportunity we will put up a match for CTE grant.

Member Ryan – I just want to make sure we are ready with our proposal and ready to go. I also wanted to mention Social Security and Medicare are in trouble. I want us to be aware that we could be losing some Federal funds in the future. As we budget for the next few years that we are prepared for other cuts in Federal funding.

Member Mills – Back to slide 19. I would like to get an updated slide, the one that was given in the board packet shows both categories as employer rates. If I could get just that because this is a very useful slide to have when speaking to the public. My comment on the employee rates is CalPERS. The CalPERS board does periodically increase the amount of employee contributions, and I think there is a strong possibility that at some point prior to 2020 they are going to increase the employee contribution. That obviously does not impact the employer amount. I think there is a strong potential for that to happen. On the STRS slide on 20, I just want to clarify you indicated that under the employee columns, the first column is for those employees hired prior to January 2013 and the second column is for those hired January 2013 or after.

Ruth Quinto – Yes, Ms. Canfield just told me the asterisk should be on the left on the 15 percent side. I will get you an update slide as well.

Member Mills – Can we get that slide updated to reflect that one column is employees hired prior to a date certain and the next column those hired after that date certain?

Ruth Quinto – I will replace PERPRA with the January 1, 2013 date. Thank you that is a great suggestion.

Member Mills – Thank you that certainly helps me and that will help any employee who is looking to see how their rates are going to increase. We have had the conversations in the board room before about the significant increase in contributions that this school district is going to have to make to STRS and PERS. We have had the discussions before about how unhappy we are that the State has totally altered their proportionate share among the three entities; the employee, the district and the state. Right now there is nothing we can do about it and I understand we have to plan for it and we do need to communicate this to the public so they understand the reduced amount we have to allocate to programs and the needs in the district. Having said that, if we have \$17 million with which to work in terms of additional funding and allocation, I would like to focus remarks toward that \$17 million. I know we have not finished the final LCAP meeting and I am frankly very interested in getting the report from Ms. Townsend. I have attended at least one of those meetings. I am interested in that input as well as the input from our student meetings. I hope that informs the board's discussion and allocation but I also want to reiterate a couple of points I made previously. One we are a district of 100 schools and we are in the midst of a building campaign and we need to maintain the facilities that we have, many of them aging. We frankly, in my view, do not have adequate monies in the maintenance fund and that needs to be increased. The second thing that I want to raise relates to goal two. We have had concerns raised by the Student Advisory Board about whether or not we were providing funding for clubs sponsors and so forth. I know the district was going to look into how we actually do that. I would like to make

sure we get that information before we make any budget decisions. I would like to throw into that mix, JROTC programs. Apparently they are responsible for fundraising for all of their transportation. That is a lot of fundraising when you have large JROTC's with 200 students. I would like us to look into increase funding towards goal two.

Member Ashjian – It is \$38 million today, a 78% increase for one of the funds over five years, 130% for another fund in the next five years, so it looks like it is an additional \$30 million come 2020. Is that somewhere close to what you were thinking? \$38 million today and closer to \$68 million come 2020.

Ruth Quinto – The total impact from 2013/14 to 2020/21 is \$38 million. We are two-thirds of the way there.

Member Ashjian – I was thinking it was \$38 million and then it was 130% increase, or 78% increase above and beyond the \$38 million. So the total increase up until 2020 is \$38 million? Thank you for clarifying.

Ruth Quinto – Yes.

Member Ashjian – The hit to our balance sheet is going to be \$500 million? Is that going to take our equity position down to \$300 million?

Ruth Quinto – I don't have the financial statements with me and your memory is probably better than mine. But that is only the CalSTRS portion. There is a whole other portion that is CalPERS but we don't know yet because their actuarial study is not done yet. So I don't know what the total hit is going to be. It is going to significantly deteriorated. If I am recalling correctly I thought it was going to be wiped out.

Member Ashjian – Let just say for round numbers we are somewhere around \$8 million and you are going to take \$5 million. The last I remember eight minus five equals three correct?

Ruth Quinto – Yes, but that does not include the PERS.

Member Ashjian – Then you add another component and that is bad.

Ruth Quinto – The PERS could very well wipe it out to zero.

Member Ashjian – We used to be allowed to take 3% to go to a building maintenance fund, and now it's not 3%. It gives us a little more flexibility with capital projects is that correct?

Ruth Quinto – The percentage has changed there was more flexibility when the state was in its most significance time of financial trouble but I believe it is going back to 3%. The flexibility that is being offered is instead of spending those resources only on maintenance projects you can save those resources and then spend those on a capital project or multiple capital projects rather than spend them on maintenance.

Member Ashjian – The board communication that we received got says differently.

Ruth Quinto – Perhaps I am remembering it wrong. We will go back and clarify that for you and the entire board.

Member Ryan – It is my understanding that STRS and PERS are basing all of these numbers on an average increase of 7.5% for their funds to earn that much. It is pretty much agreed by financial experts that it is unrealistic to expect STRS and PERS funds will gain 7.5% per year on average for the next few years. This whole picture could even be worse. There are many things that I would like to talk about of where I would like the funds to be spent. I think we need to find out how much we will have before we get into that discussion.

Member Chavez – We have increased costs to our retirement funds, we are getting no money from the State for facilities construction in the way of bonds, and it is pretty gloomy. We really need to be looking to see if our schools will be eligible for securing cap and trade funding. The two areas that I can think of would be transportation and facilities with some of the green house

funds that will be available. I have always said the Central Valley does not get its fair share of resources from the state I think this would be a great opportunity to improve our school bus systems and then seeing if we could secure some funding to make our older schools more energy efficient, which make the argument for reducing those green house and free up some of that money that we can later use to put into the classroom.

Member De La Cerda – How does Proposition 2 effect our bottom line? Can you bring that into focus especially with our credit rating?

Ruth Quinto – Proposition 2 was approved in the November election that would require, after a certain set of criteria have been met by the State, that the district spend down our reserve. That we only have a maximum reserve level in our reserve for economic uncertainty. That is in fact in conflict with board policy 3000, which gives us a more stable financial position and protects us against the state very volatile funding cycle. There are short term options for an exception to the need to spend that down we can make a request with the superintendent of county schools. We can also make deposits to our long term actuarial liabilities. However, what is the conflict is that not only does the Governor say on one hand we have the option for flexibility for capital projects with the option to spend it with maintenance money and he also wants to provide flexibility in reducing the threshold to pass a bond. Those options are not tenable when we don't have the financial stability or position on the market with our credit rating because we have just had to decimate our reserves. We were required to spend them down because of the agreement the Governor made with CTA to have to spend our reserves down. What is ironic, is that agreement that the Governor made with CTA was probably to spend the one-time money on CTA priorities such as salary schedule and class size reduction. I would strongly oppose a one-time spending on on-going expenditures. That in fact is what Proposition 2 would require.

Member De La Cerda – Thank you. I am hoping that those who are in the audience and those who are watching at home understand the potential impact that can occur fiscally and the challenges that we are going to be facing.

A copy of the PowerPoint is available on the district website

6:30 P.M.

B-11, PRESENT Response to Proposal for District Reorganization

PRESENTED On February 11, 2015 information in response to the proposal for District reorganization. The proposal was provided to the Board with the December 10, 2014 Board of Education materials. Fiscal Impact: The proposal for reorganization does not discuss fiscal matters. Contact person: Ruth F. Quinto, telephone 457-6226.

Education Code Requirements

1. Adequate pupils enrolled
2. Substantial community identity
3. Equitable division of property and facilities
4. Ability to continue to Educate students in an integrated environment and will not promote racial or ethnic discrimination or segregation
5. Insignificant costs to state
6. Will not significantly disrupt educational programs
7. Insignificant school facilities cost
8. Designed for purposes other than significantly increase property values
9. Sound fiscal management and not cause a substantial negative effect on fiscal status of the proposed district
10. Any other criteria board may prescribe

Presentation by Deputy Superintendent Ruth F. Quinto and Guest Speakers: Bob Blattner from Blattner & Associates and Christopher Skinnell from Nielsen Merksamer Parrinello Gross & Leoni

An opportunity was provided to hear questions/concerns from members of the Board and staff was available to respond.

Member Mills – We had a Student Advisory Board Meeting yesterday and they had some questions and concerns about this proposal. The students questioned whether or not there would still be the ability to transfer to the different schools and different programs within Fresno Unified. Splitting the district would have a significant impact on that but one of the students from Hoover asked whether or not anyone had looked at the percentages for LCFF funding. Would it remain the same after this split or whether or not that would impact the overall funding? This district does with its current percentages of English Learners, poverty and foster youth we get supplemental and concentration grant money. Has that been looked at?

Christopher Skinnell – Most evidently there will be impacts but as I have said we have not taken time to go through and have a comprehensive analysis of those sort of questions. In our view, the proposal is not complete enough to permit evaluation of some of these things and even respect to the other issues.

Bob Blattner – The report did predate the LCFF but in a cursory analysis of what would happen if the district were to split. Yes, there would be a district who would get more than the other new district. There would be significant fiscal impacts, but again they did not address number nine and had they addressed number nine, the LCFF was not in place when they were working at this.

Member Mills – If I remember correctly in the proposal they had classified Roosevelt, Fresno High and Edison together in a district that was to have a new name. We represent the areas that founded Fresno Unified which struck me a little bit odd. Thank you for explaining the process because I am getting questions on that and had you not started with that I would have asked that question. Thank you.

Member Davis – I spoke to a couple of the kids after our meeting yesterday and they were wondering about their younger brothers and sisters. What if they wanted to go to different schools? We do have magnet schools in our elementary and middle school areas. When the proposal came we didn't have pure feeder schools in this district. Now all of our schools are in line to a specific high school.

Christopher Skinnell – With respect to the magnet schools it would be an issue. The analysis is not complete and is wrong and would have an impact.

Member Davis – And regarding the taxes?

Christopher Skinnell – That has not been addressed by the proposal.

Member Davis – Would the significant building redoing at one school? We are going to spend \$35 million at one school.

Christopher Skinnell – There is no discussion in the report of how that liability would be divided among the district. There would have to be a way to make that work.

Tony Pings – Our report was actually not provided, so you have been responding to a report that has not been presented in accordance with normal CDE requirements. You have identified some things that are very important to us. You were told that the financial component was not there yet. What I have heard tonight is primarily a presentation of why you don't want to do this. What I want to say is that our goal is to bring this forward for the voters to decide. If you are against it I understand but I think the more important thing is get the issues in the public. I want to go over the overall process and remind you this is a stepping stone. We want to do the first step and then go on to the next, and that will include the financial components. Every one of those questions are important. You also brought up some data issues. The data that you are questioning came from the district. You kept referring to the 2006 report. This process that we have before us right now actually started some time ago. We worked together and looked at things and we worked with the CDE to find out what works and what does not work. I spent fourteen months working directly with Dr. Mejas and he was the number one person who advised me and helped us as we went through this process. I also wanted to show you that it is the 1998 report that deals with Fresno Unified that you should be considering not the 2006 report. What you heard today was generally correct but what you didn't realize is the interest of that was from the earlier report. We came up with a community driven process and that is in code. I'll remind you a community driven process you can literally take an item to them which says split the district and nothing is going to happen but the community does not quite the same standards. It is realized that these things will be filled in as we go forward. It is our intent to bring them all forward as we go into this. We developed collectively a pure process, this has been developed with no outside input. This was intended to be a process that is devoid of any political input.

Mark Arax – Tony asked me to speak as to why I am passionate about the citizens of Fresno having the opportunity to vote on whether we should reorganize Fresno Unified into two smaller,

leaner, more nimble school districts. One answer is Democracy. Why shouldn't people be engaged about a vote on this? We voted on the future of garbage service, certainly this would seem like a compelling issue to allow voters to engage and vote on. We have issues in this city that speak to how profoundly broken we are. If you look at various studies with exception of one town on the border of Texas and Mexico. We have the worst concentrated poverty in America. With the exception of that same town, we have the lowest education employability of our potential workforce. We have more gang members per capita than any city in America. There are a lot of reasons for that, one is the family institution, two we can look at an economic structure that reaches deeper into the rural heart of Mexico to pull out its workforce, but three we have to look at this school district. There is no reason why we should not be looking at this school district to explain some of that failure. I have to take issue with the first attorney. If you look at the achievement gap between white students and students of color in Fresno Unified it is as wide if not wider than it was ten years ago. We have not made any progress. If you look you will see we continue to receive "F's" and "D's" from outside experts studying the achievement gap. We have failed that gap. We have thousands of students dropping out of the school district into a life of drugs, crime and gangs and we have thousands of students who have moved in search of a better education to Clovis. The whole sprawl of Fresno says something about people voting with their feet to leave this school district. We have some compelling and profound things to look at. Go to the website reformfresno.com and you will see data showing that smaller school districts do a much better job in communities with high poverty. Google small school districts and you will see the case being made time and again in studies. We should be talking about this issue. There is no reason why the community should not get a chance to vote on it.

Member Ryan – There is no evidence that I have seen that shows that two districts of 37-38 thousand students do any better than a district of 75 thousand. The evidence that Mr. Arax is talking about I believe is probably districts that are two thousand to ten thousand but that is not what they are proposing. So let's study what they are proposing. Two districts of 37-38 thousand.

Bob Blattner – The LAO said there may be some evidence that smaller schools districts between two thousand and six thousand do perform better. The second thing they said about the two thousand to six thousand is that they think that much of the impact to the improvement in such a small school district actually has to do with smaller site sizes that generally come with a district of that size. The improvement is on the site size not the district size.

Member Ryan – So we are talking about 200-300 students in a school vs. 700-800 students?

Bob Blattner – It did not mention an actual number but smaller site sizes maybe the cause of the improvement.

Member Ryan – Long Beach is larger than we are, they are 80-90 thousand. There is a district that has been winning awards. They were in pretty bad shape 20 years ago and they turned themselves around. It took about ten years which is just about where we are in Fresno Unified.

Bob Blattner – In the Map Study they also do talk about the large districts such as Long Beach with whom you are working closely. The Map Study did not say that being a large district was a problem at all.

Member Ryan – Over the last ten years we have done quite a bit in fact it is often referred to, Fresno Unified, as a big ship that we found ten years ago going in the wrong direction, hung up on the rocks and we had to take that ship off the rocks, turn it around. As we were fixing the ship, turning it around, getting it off the rocks and in the right direction, we had folks on the outside taking pot shots at us from row boats some of them with cannons from the side some from the inside. Through it all we've done a good job. We've moved this district, kids are doing better.

This to me is just a distraction and it certainly is not going to be helpful as we discussed in the beginning. There is actually no evidence that two districts of 37-38 thousand would do any better. As far as I am concerned we don't need to look any further.

Member Johnson – I appreciate all this information that we received from the presenters. I come from a different stance in all of this. When you use migrant kids and workers etc. and when you use look at people of color and etc. and when you take a community not necessarily progressive you have a tendency to convey to students that they are not going to do to well. I was reading an article and one of the things we have a tendency to do, we try to promote our kids to look at athletics as a way to get out of things. When you look at the NFL as an example or the NBA you are talking about some two thousand people who participate in that. They make x number of dollars for a short period of time. When you look at children who are in the poverty area they think about kicking a ball a soccer ball, bouncing a basketball or running with a football without putting that same amount of effort in their academics. We need to look at this in an honest way and think about a progressive way. How do we address the issues that we have in Fresno Unified? I think we are headed in the right direction here in Fresno Unified. We should be meshing the academics with the athletics. We have a broader problem let's not just focus in on one small thing let's focus on all of our attitudes and how we perceive people

Member De La Cerda – I did read the report when it first came out. Some of which you presented today I found very interesting. I have not found any conclusive evidence to reduce class size. They are talking about class sizes of 13 to 17. Considering with what we have been addressed with today, with the finances considering what would happen with the division of the two districts, those sizes are not realistic. I don't see a benefit to the division of the district. I do thank you for what you offered to help us at this time.

Ruth Quinto – Just for the record I wanted clarify that Mr. Blattner is not an attorney he is a consultant.

A copy of the PowerPoint is available on the district website

C. RECEIVE INFORMATION & REPORTS

There are no items for this portion of the agenda.

BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMUNICATIONS

Member Ashjian – I would like to thank this board for two things that they have done. One, Fresno Unified bused 1,000 kids on a non-school day so that they could listen to Chris Herren tell his story about the dangers of drugs. Secondly, the board approved 55,000 dollars in the kNOW More Program, which directly deals with the Marjaree Mason Center and domestic violence and how it relates to teens in their ability to deal with relationships. I am extremely appreciative and thank you.

Member Davis – I to would like thank Superintendent for providing the buses for our students to attend the Chris Herren speaking engagement. I am still hearing about it from teachers and coaches. Also Mr. Hanson you failed to mention that the 900 well behaved students at Kings Canyon Middle School were treated to a carnival. I really proud of the teachers and their hard work.

D. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Board of Education at this time, President Johnson declared the meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, February 25, 2015 – OPEN SESSION AT 5:30 P.M.