



**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 25, 2015**

**Fresno, California
February 25, 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 25, 2015 there were present Members Ashjian, Chavez, Davis, De La Cerda, Mills, Ryan and President Johnson. Student Board Member Romero. Student Board Member Gonzales was absent. Superintendent Hanson was also present.

President Johnson convened the meeting at 4:00 p.m. in the Board Room and adjourned to Closed Session. The Board reconvened in Open Session at 5:33 p.m.

Staff Present

Deputy Superintendent Quinto, Associate Superintendents: Aguilar, and Sanchez. Instructional Superintendents: Her, Russell and Wall. Assistant Superintendents: Locker, Hashimoto, and Maldonado. Interim Chief Information Officer Idsvoog, Chief Technology Officer Madden, Human Resources/Labor Relations Mecum, and Chief Operations Officer Karin Temple.

Reporting Out of Closed Session

1. By a vote of 7-0-0, the Board took action in Closed Session to non-reelect one (1) probationary certificated teacher at the conclusion of the 2014/15 school year.
2. By a vote of 7-0-0, the Board took action in Closed Session to reassign two principals to a classroom teaching assignment for the 2015/16 school year.
3. In Closed Session the Board was informed of the transfer of Mike Jones, Principal III to Fort Miller Middle School.
4. In Closed Session the Board was informed of the transfer of Antonio Sanchez, Principal II to Gibson Elementary School.
5. In Closed Session the Board was informed of the transfer of Jacqueline Price, Principal II to Homan Elementary.
6. In Closed Session the Board was informed of the transfer of Kelli Wilkins, Principal II to Slater Elementary School.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mrs. Ramona Zavala, a parent that has had a positive impact at Greenberg Elementary, led the flag salute.

ADOPT Resolution Proclaiming the Month of February 2015 as Black History Month

ADOPTED, as recommended a resolution proclaiming the month of February, 2015 as Black History Month. All schools are encouraged to celebrate the contributions of African-Americans throughout the month of February through the use of curricular materials and other school-related activities.

APPROVE Minutes

APPROVED, as recommended with minor corrections and one addition, the draft minutes for the February 11, 2015 Regular Meeting. Member Mills moved for approval, seconded by Member Davis, 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 Angela Romero provided comments/reports from the Student Advisory Board Representative meeting hosted by Fresno High School with Board Members Mills, Davis and De La Cerda present. Student Board Representative Angela Romero acknowledged the student ambassadors from Fort Miller Middle School and Hamilton K-8 School.

HEAR Report from Superintendent

Excellence in Education Banquet – Thank you to all who attended. Our five winners were: Classified – Guillermo Berumen, Certificated Elementary School – Rob Kuzminski, Certificated Middle School – Rick Perez Jr., Certificated High School – Tori Nolen, and Administrator – Raine Bumatay. The three top finalists will move on to the Fresno County Education of the Year competition. The finalists are Berumen, Kuzminski and Bumatay.

Reminder SAT Exams - A reminder for the upcoming SAT exam dates. March 2, 2015 is the last day for late registration for March 14 and April 6th is the last day to register for May 2nd. There are ongoing efforts to partner with the College Board to provide additional opportunities to students.

District Spelling Bee – Is taking place tomorrow at Fresno High School for our elementary students. We have 40 champions and 20 alternates. The top two students will move on to the Fresno County Spell Off on March 19th.

LCFF community outreach and feedback – To date we have held 34 LCAP workshops with over 1500 stakeholders attending. We have at least three more meetings to go. The next meeting is on Wednesday March 4 at 6:00 p.m. at the Fresno Center for New Americans.

On a motion by Member Davis, seconded by Member Chavez, the consent agenda, exclusive of agenda item: A-7, which was pulled for further discussion, was approved on a roll call vote of 8-0-0 as follows: AYES: Members Ashjian, Chavez, Davis, De La Cerda, Mills, Ryan, President Johnson and Student Member Romero.

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 February 11, 2015, Regular Board meeting.
- A-3, ADOPT Waiver Request for Jannetta Datsko to Serve as a Speech Language Pathologist**
ADOPTED, as recommended a waiver request for Jannetta Datsko to serve as a Speech Language Pathologist. Education Code section 44225(m) allows the commission to grant a waiver to fill unanticipated needs in an area deemed hard-to-fill.
- A-4, APPROVE Amendment to Agreement with Claremont Partners for Expansion of Enhanced Primary Care Program**
APPROVED, as recommended The services provided by Claremont Partners consists of interacting with local primary care providers at Peachwood, Northwest, Oakhurst, and Copeland's medical groups, on behalf of approximately 5000 health plan members, to evaluate and monitor cost containment and quality improvement opportunities and metrics, as well as member health outcomes.
- A-5, APPROVE Out-of-State Field Trip to the 2015 National School Boards Association Conference**
APPROVED, as recommended a matrix with specific details of an out-of-state field trip involving past and present Student Advisory Board students to the 2015 National School Boards Association Conference. The purpose of the trip is to present the Human Element Kindness Campaign as a session at the conference.
- A-6, APPROVE Independent Contractor Services Agreement with Noll Associates**
APPROVED, as recommended an Independent Contractor Services Agreement with Noll Associates to provide consulting services to Restorative Practices staff and to district site administrators. The cost of the agreement is \$21,500. The term of the agreement will commence on February 26, 2015 and will end on June 30, 2015.
- A-7, APPROVE Appointments to Citizens Oversight Committee for Measure K and Measure Q**
APPROVED, as recommended two appointments to the Citizens Oversight Committee for Measure K and Measure Q (COC) are recommended:

Jamee Moltini – nominated by Board Member Ashjian
Jose Mejia – nominated by Board Member De La Cerda

The Citizens Oversight Committee for Measure K and Measure Q was established by the Board “to inform the public concerning the expenditure of bond proceeds approved by the voters,” and “to ensure that bond proceeds are expended only for the purposes set forth in the ballot measures” (Committee Bylaws).

Member Chavez – I know there was a previous list sent with the attendance record of the committee members. Have we asked the committee members whose appointments were expiring if they were willing to stay on? Have we had that conversation yet?

Karin Temple – When the list is sent I correspond with the board members. If there is a request for me to speak directly with a committee member I will do that or the board member could have that conversation with them directly.

Member Chavez – Could you forward me the contact information for Area 2’s appointments?

Karin Temple – Yes.

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-8, DENY Claim #15-0126-0016

DENIED, as recommended a Claim for Damages on Minor, case #15-0126-0016. 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, DENY Claim #15-0130-0020

DENIED, as recommended a Claim for Damages on Minor, case #15-0130-0020. 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-10, RATIFY Submission of Grant Application to the National Foreign Language Center, University of Maryland

RATIFIED, as recommended a grant reapplication to the *STARTALK* Summer Foreign Language program funded through the National Security Language Initiative. Fresno Unified School District has received funding from *STARTALK* for the past four years (\$73,088 in 2010; \$74,294 in 2012; \$92,422 in 2013, and \$90,000 in 2014) to successfully operate a district wide Summer Chinese Language Program at Hoover High School. The three week program would serve between 60 to 80 incoming 4th through 12th grade students and be operated as part of the district’s summer school program.

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

UNSCHEDULED ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

The following individuals spoke about student reflections and concerns at Fort Miller Middle School:

Carmen Martinez	Bill Van Duzer
Unique Martinez	Cathie Tudmen
Lacey Sherman	Kevin Dueck
Marcy Barnhardt	Dot Van Duzer
Amanda Horvath	Julia Miller
Jamie Schaffer	Mo Kashmiri

Shannon Taylor - Spoke about an unresolved claim for damages.

Sarah Van Bindsbergen & Issac Lopez (RSA Students) - Spoke about Dance Development and Expansions at Roosevelt High School.

B. CONFERENCE/DISCUSSION AGENDA

6:00 P.M.

B-11, PRESENT and DISCUSS the 2015/16 Strategic Budget Development

PRESENTED and DISCUSSED At the January 21, 2015 and February 11, 2015 Board of Education meetings, the 2015/16 Governor's Proposed Budget and the District's preliminary strategic budget development were discussed. On February 25, 2015, staff and the Board will continue budget development discussions including the following:

- Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP)

Staff will present and discuss the input received from our stakeholders in preparation for 2015/16 budget discussions.

Presentation by Deputy Superintendent Ruth F. Quinto and Executive Officer
Tammy Townsend.

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

Member Ashjian – With regards to questions 1-4 and the answers that were given. Can we get a percentage of how many were number one and how many were number two etc.?

Tammy Townsend – Yes. We can provide that in a board communication.

Member Ashjian – As we go into budget conversations and when you provide those percentages from those answers, we should then be able to prioritize?

Tammy Townsend – The process for budget development includes many different phases and this feedback is a very important component of our budgeting process. There are several other components of our budgeting process, including the financial component and other things. During

our budget workshops you will be able to have the opportunity to meld what you have learned from the LCAP with other things that you will learn about future planning and come up with a great plan for 2015/16.

Member Ashjian – Could you tell me how many people attended the Fort Miller meeting?

Tammy Townsend – I did not do the LCAP meeting at Fort Miller. It was conducted by the Fresno Teachers Association.

Member Ashjian – So this board did not go to Fort Miller to do a LCAP meeting?

Tammy Townsend – No, I did not do the LCAP presentation at Fort Miller.

Member Mills – There was one at Fresno High.

Member Ashjian – So it was per high school.

Tammy Townsend – Yes. At each of the High Schools we did a regional workshop and all schools were invited from that region.

Member Ashjian – When you bring to the board the percentages for those questions, can you also breakdown each school and what was their priority?

Tammy Townsend – The majority of the feedback that people gave us came to us whether they were a teacher, administrator, community member or parent. We did not require them to tell us which region they were from. I have the surveys from each of the regional meetings but that is a small portion of the feedback that we received.

Member Mills – In looking at slide 11, it says more classroom time for students. We did have a longer school day for 10 schools and this year there will be 20 more schools that will have that longer school day. I think the public should realize that we are moving in that direction.

Tammy Townsend – One of the things that I am trying to do in the workshops is to get the word out of the great investments that this board has made especially in the last year.

Member Mills – I think it's important that people understand the investment we made with Prop 30 money, with preschools and transitional kindergarten and so forth. On slide 11 one of the suggestions was more academic counselors. I know in the time that I have been on the board that we did increase the number of academic counselors. If we can get some information as to what our ratios are at the high schools, what type of academic counseling we have and the number of counselors at our middle schools. Slide 14 spoke about adding staff focused on engaging families. I look at the home school liaison as one of those people who help engage families. I know not all of our schools have a full-time home school liaison so perhaps we can get some information on those schools who do not have a full-time liaison. Maybe that is something the board would like to look into equalizing around the district. The other item was technology. I know there are discrepancies between our campuses in the way of what they have in technology. I would like to know what technology we have at each of the campuses. I would assume we would have a certain minimum. What are the differences and discrepancies? I am trying to understand what is prompting some of this feedback. I also noticed a recurring theme that showed up on slide 11, 12 and 13. Slide 11 talks about relevant subjects and curriculum, slide 12 specifically mentions vocational education, and slide 13 talks about vocational classes, apprentice programs and real world curriculum. It certainly seems timely with the Bee editorial in the paper today about potentially having an entire high school developed that was career technical. I know that some of us on the board went and visited Porterville and Porterville has such a high school. In the past I have been at CSBA conferences and brought back the information from two different districts in San Diego County who have done that with their high schools. The board increased CTE in the years that I have been on the board but a high school would certainly jump start that and increase that significantly. It hasn't increased to the extent I would like. I know the apprentice halls here

from the building trades offered them up in 2008 to partner with us to use them. That is another way to jump start this, and they are still willing to do that. I think that it is something the board should think about. It is a need that we have in the district, it is a need that has come up from the community in response to each of these questions. Slide 11 mentions relevant field trips. I want to relate this to my questions on goal two that I have raised in the past. Some things the district is funding, like buses when our sports teams are going to a game, but not funding it when our JROTC groups need to travel. I would like the board to look into increasing the funding for goal two. Maybe the JROTC needs to have its buses funded, maybe field trips should come from clubs or other groups on campus. Not specifically a class which could still be very relevant, maybe we need to look at doing funding in that regard to increase goal two. We are in a midst of a facilities program and we have built some great buildings. We are doing that on most of our high schools but we have 100 schools to maintain. I still think we need to increase the amount in the maintenance budget beyond the minimum.

Member Davis – Can you provide in your communication to the board what the communities did not want the money to be used for? At some of the presentations I attended it was mentioned that they did not want to use the money for the teacher’s pension although it is the law. What other things did the communities not want us to spend money on?

Tammy Townsend – We can include that in the report.

Member Davis – When did FTA have a meeting at Fort Miller? Is that usual? Did other labor groups go out to school sites? How did that work?

Tammy Townsend – FTA was unique in that they are choosing to do their own set of LCAP meetings. I believe they have had one and have a few more coming up. CSEA, SEIU and FASTA met with me and we did an LCAP meeting together.

Member De La Cerda – I wanted to clarify a question that I have received out in the community. When will this list of compiled responses become finalized? And when would we implement?

Tammy Townsend – Our engagement is ongoing. We have a meeting with our Southeast Asian community next week at the Center for New Americans in partnership with Stone Soup. We look forward to hearing from that community at that time. What I am trying to do is to make our engagement a year round process. At some point, it is necessary in this process to draw the line and start to compile a budget. We want to allow the board time and our staff time to do a thoughtful carefully planned budget and that does require time. We are presenting tonight because this is the vast majority of the responses that we have received at this point.

Member De La Cerda – Are these concerns the most consistent responses that have come up within our regions?

Tammy Townsend – Yes.

Member De La Cerda – I see that there are concerns with our second language learners and families. The responses talk about bilingual staffing, expanding English Language classes for parents, ESL classes, etc. When will we be receiving a more specific presentation on how we want to move forward?

Tammy Townsend – Generally our responses that we get from our stakeholders are general in nature. A lot of times they know the result of what they want but are not as familiar with the workings of the district to understand specifically what positions might be reaching out to parents or those kinds of things. What I try to do is group common ideas into a statement where I saw a lot of commonalities. But there is a lot of general feedback that I received.

Member De La Cerda – I would like to receive in a board communication on where we are heading and be able to respond to those individuals who ask. It is good to know that we are still reaching out to our stakeholders at the Center for New Americans and with Stone Soup.

Member Ryan – I wanted to comment on a few things that Member Mills said with regards to the CTE classes. I would like to see CTE classes built out at all of our high schools before we go to the expense and effort of building an entire high school. I think we need to have programs on our campuses that are accessible to kids now. Also, to be cautious. I appreciate the unions and I know there are things we can work together on but the union halls have made it very clear that they do not want any of our kids who are not doing well in their classes. They also do not want kids coming to them who have issues and problems. I think we would be better off to capture them in the comprehensive high schools we have now.

Member Chavez – I was looking through the summary of the goals that we have and these are the means to the end. We want to get to that student achievement. How will we know these dollars are positively impacting our students with regard to student achievement? I know we are transitioning to Common Core, state testing has been removed temporarily. What are we doing? Are we using our own data management tools? How will we be measuring student achievement?

Tammy Townsend – Our Equity and Access team has done some great work with both the LCAP process and the SPSA process of tying data indicators to some of our new and ongoing investments. We are building a system with that kind of process. We are required in the template for the LCAP to establish targets associated with our investments, we will be doing that. We have developed a great system for both the site plans, the site goals and for the district goals for evaluating and measuring and tying in our indicators to our investments.

Member Chavez – We have additional resources for a specific student population. When we look at the accountability side of that with our state dollars. How will we be able to make the argument that these dollars equal additional student achievement and performance in our schools?

Jorge Aguilar – Part of our work in terms of Equity and Access is trying to define ways in which we are going to be able to respond proactively to those very appropriate questions. For example, we are monitoring how those investments are producing positive results for Foster Youth. We are also looking at the same for EL students and low income students in an unduplicated methodology. We are spending a lot of time trying to define the best ways to create data use that will allow us to drive and be proactive and aggressive in those areas.

Member Chavez – At the end of the day our district is evaluated on the quality of students that we put out to colleges, universities, vocational programs or the workforce. What I am really looking for is indicators in our data dashboard that equal that outcome. I know you are working on that and I will be scheduling a mini overview of where we are. Going forward I think that needs to be the foundation on how we hold ourselves accountable to those dollars and more importantly, those kids and families.

Jorge Aguilar – We have also heard from the board as recently as a few months ago your call to action to begin work with institutions of higher education in the transition from Fresno Unified, to Fresno City College, CSU Fresno and other institutions of higher education. Making sure we begin to work with them on policy matters that ensure students are persisting at those institutions of higher education. We don't have as much impact once the student set foot on a college campus. We are working with our partners at Fresno City College to ensure that there is a sufficient number of seats for students that are eligible to take an English 1, or a transferable Math course as an example. We understand from a lot of research that students who are placed in a transferable level course have a greater likelihood of transferring or completing an AA program or any other

certificate program. We are actively working beyond what we are able to produce for our students to ensure that they have a greater chance of successfully enrolling, transitioning and persisting in those institutions.

Member Chavez – Do you feel we have a pretty good relationship with our State Center Community College District, with our local four year institutions that are here? Are we there? Do we need to do a little more work?

Jorge Aguilar – There is always room for improvement. We do meet with them once a month in the case of Fresno City College and they have been welcoming of our feedback to make some policy changes in areas that we have identified as potential obstacles to ensure they ultimately register and then set foot on campus. They are just as interested in addressing the “melt” rate which refers simply to the number of students that we think and have actually submitted a statement of intent to register by May 1 and then we share data in the fall.

Member Chavez – The reason I am pushing so hard is because everyone has their own wish list of what they want. The intent of those resources were to increase student achievement particularly for those unserved communities. For ourselves we have said we are going to produce college and career ready graduates. That is really the outcome and our budget needs to really reflect that priority for our district.

Member Ashjian – We are tracking the percentage of students going to college whether Junior College or Fresno State.

Jorge Aguilar – If you recall you as a board approved very recently our District Data Dashboard and it has a number of elements including for example, the number of students that complete the A-G course pattern. We are certainly doing that because it is aligned to our college and career readiness goals and in addition to that outside of the District Data Dashboard we understand the importance of working with our institutions of higher education to ensure our students just don’t graduate but they graduate and eventually have the greatest number of post-secondary choices from the widest array of options. We are concerned, as are our institutions of higher education partners, with making sure students also transition seamlessly into their institutions.

Member Ashjian – What percentage do you think we are tracking?

Jorge Aguilar – With Fresno State and the State Center Community College District our agreements with them are to share information so we can cross-reference all of the students that graduated and then monitor whether in October of the fall semester if they have actually set foot in those institutions so we are able to do that kind of work in partnership with them.

Member Ashjian – Do you have any idea what that number might be?

Jorge Aguilar – In terms of how many actually set foot there? No. I would be happy to send that information to the board.

Member Ashjian – I am interested in that number but I am more interested in the number that are not setting their foot into institutions of higher education.

Member Mills – If we could get a board communication reminding us what our current staffing ratios are for the classroom. Also if we could get more detailed information with what we are doing with staffing ratios with Special Education classes.

Member Johnson – My fellow trustee made the comment how many are going to the four year colleges and how many are going to the junior colleges, etc. I think we need to take into consideration those individual in the poverty areas. Where do they go? I know a number of young people go into the military. We need to put more emphasis on CTE and those kinds of things. When people talk about how we need to do something different in terms of engaging the parents, are they suggesting we start having people work from 1:00 pm to 8:00 pm or 1:00 pm to 9:00 pm

in the evening to engage parents? When people are committed to educating children, I think they should be able to do that. And if they are not, then it is not a real thing to talk about. This came from people who are concerned, those parents whose needs are not being met. The other part is when we talk about hands-on and having something children really enjoy doing. We need to think about the hands and the head, not just doing the academic kinds of things that get kids to go to a four year college or a two year college. But how do we relate that learning to how you make things. How do we deal with people? How do we deal with the whole community? When we are asking questions regarding one specific kind of school we need to look at all the schools.

Member Davis – When you went out to the schools I know we provided translators. Was there any effort to have whole presentations done in different languages?

Tammy Townsend – Our Power Point presentation has been translated into Spanish and Hmong. At our next meeting we are planning to have three interpreters on site. Also our on-line survey was in Spanish and Hmong. We also had last year’s LCAP translated into Spanish and Hmong.

Member Davis – I know that our community is not always aware of all the things we have going on. The career pathways, the Jr. Academy, what we do with 2nd, 4th and 5th grade with CTE. I know in your presentation you talk about everything but is there a visual or a handout that says we have these types of things at all these particular schools and as a district as a whole we are doing this in the 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th grade so our community can see.

Tammy Townsend – That is an interesting point. It would be nice to get the word out. We can look at Building Futures or other mechanisms to help us to do that.

Mo Kashmiri – We are doing our own LCAP meetings to help reach out to the community and get input. They are going to be March 10, 2015 at the Piccadilly Inn from 6:00 pm to 7:30 pm, March 17, 2015 at the EOC from 6:00 pm to 7:30 pm, and March 19, 2015 at Hope Lutheran from 6:00 pm to 7:30 pm. I do want to point out in the slides that were shown there is one thing that showed up on question one, two and three. Smaller class sizes. The community wants smaller class sizes the teachers want class sizes lower. When we surveyed our membership last year they said class size repeatedly. That is what they want money spent on. Ruthie has done a great job piloting the school district and making sure we are financially stable. She has done a great job underestimating revenues so that we come out positive. I want to point out that last board meeting there were some misleading statements around that we have \$55 million from the state but \$38 million needs to go to pensions. That is not accurate. The \$38 million going to pensions is by 2021 cumulative. By 2021 we will have \$350 million more dollars to pay for the \$38 million in pensions. I understand we need to lower expectations and we can’t afford everything. Over the next few years we will be receiving more money from the state as part of the LCAP.

A copy of the PowerPoint is available on the district website.

6:30 P.M.

B-12, PRESENT and DISCUSS Facilities Funding Update

PRESENTED and DISCUSSED Fresno Unified’s Measure Q facilities bond was approved by 76% of the voters in November 2010. Combined with state facilities funds, it has supported the construction of new school facilities and significant investment in improved facilities across the district. This presentation will recap and update the Measure Q program and provide information regarding changes in the state’s approach to funding school facilities.

Comments by Superintendent prior to presentation:

Superintendent Hanson – The reason for this being in front of the board tonight is one when we did the master plan and needs assessment we identified a billion dollars’ worth of need across the city for our existing facilities. This is not a rundown of what we have completed thus far. We still have a dramatic outstanding set of work that needs to be done. One of the things you are going to hear from Ms. Temple is that we have \$280 million dollars in Measure Q. There are a number of conditions that have changed since 2010 that we were relying on and we are going to have to adjust to them. The bottom line is it does not appear at this point that we are going to have the funding authority for all that is in measure Q. The second reason is get the board’s general temperature, guidance and direction as what you would like us to do as staff next. Do you want us to gear up for another bond as early as the fall of 2016? The third piece is to be clear and explicit about what those changing conditions are that threaten us to borrow money.

Presentation by Chief Operations Officer Karin Temple.

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

Member De La Cerda – I have a question on page 5 with AB 182. Are you saying the \$35 million that we anticipate that we may not be able to access them? We can’t access them? Or limited to that total amount?

Karin Temple – The remaining \$35 million depends on how the factors that I mentioned play out over the next several months. That last chunk we will not be able to access in a timely way. We would be able to access it but it would not be as we have been doing over the past three years, an issuance every fall as we have been moving quickly through projects. We don’t anticipate that it would be within one year or two years or even three years.

Member De La Cerda – So there may be some overlap in proposing this new bond.

Karin Temple – That is correct. It is simply because the way the bond issuances are structured based on those limits that are imposed upon us.

Member De La Cerda – Do you have an idea what that limit would be at any moment? The accessibility of that \$35 million.

Karin Temple – We are working closely with our financial advisor. When we get our new assessed evaluation numbers we update all of our forecasts. Throughout the year we also look at other factors that are going to eventually impact us and our ability to access those funds. At this point I would say more than three years but again it is something that will update annually.

Member De La Cerda – If you are looking for a green light for another bond measure I would support that. We need to continue to address those issues especially for those schools that have not had as much work as needed in order to benefit our students and our communities.

Member Davis – I think the success of the district has shown the community by opening up four elementary schools, we took off all those year-round schools and some 17 different calendars. I assume we have exhausted all of Measure K money.

Karin Temple – Yes in fact as I reported before you in December with the annual report all local Measure K funds have been spent.

Member Davis – We are looking at completing all of our Measure Q and although we have identified a billion dollars’ worth of need in our community, I would be positive to the need for another bond. There is more work to be done for our children.

Member Ryan – I would also concur that we move forward for a 2016 bond. How many portables did we say we were going to remove and how many do we still have left?

Karin Temple – The facilities Master Plan document referenced removing approximately half of the portables over a long period of time. In 2008 we had over 1300 portables about a 1/3 of our districts classrooms. We have been able to remove about 220 of those, more will be coming but we have a long way to go. There is still a great need.

Member Ryan – Since that is the way we sold the bond to the public that we were going to be removing portables, I don't know if they got the impression that we were going to remove them all but we couldn't do that all in one fell swoop. I agree we need to move forward on that. As we are building the Hoover pool there was a snack bar going in, offices and restrooms particularly for special needs. We had to go back to the state architect to change the project and reduce the project because not only are we running into these money problems, but things are costing more now. The money is not going as far as we thought it was going to go. Is that going to be the case with some of the other projects that are coming up? That schools are going to have to accept a little less.

Karin Temple – We certainly have seen an increase over the past three years. However I will say that when I first started in this position in 2009 we are actually benefitting in the other direction. There was a time when construction cost were decreasing and we got more for our money so over a long period of time there was some equalizing. We feel we still get some very competitive costs. The major project that we have underway right now in terms of dollars is at Bullard High School and is at today's cost and is contracted. We will, as we continue with the smaller projects, continue working hard at getting competitive costs.

Member Ryan – So the answer is at Hoover we did have to settle for doing a little less than had been promised because of costs going up.

Karin Temple – When a project comes in over the budget we do go back and work with the general contractor and check to see how we can cut costs.

Member Ryan – So the answer is “Yes”.

Member Mills – The board made a huge commitment when it passed the Master Plan. There is a lot that the board said it was going to do in that Master Plan. Only a fraction of that was covered by Measure Q. One of the things the Master Plan put forth was that we would do all of this with three bonds. I think at the time we anticipated that three bonds of roughly equal amounts would probably complete all these projects. That is not going to happen. As you say costs are going up. I think we are finding that we are going to need more money than was initially anticipated. I thoroughly support going out for a 2016 bond. I think we need to do that. I think the amount that you show as a suggested amount is too low. The community will turn out to vote for a bond when we give them a good reason and tell them what we are going to do with it. I think they will vote overwhelmingly for a second bond even if there is a slight increase in the assessed rate. I think it is more likely to get the support to complete what we need to do for all of our facilities and schools including building new schools if we increase the amount of the bond, then if we have to go back for four or five bonds. Because there is a cost to doing a bond. I rather see us do this one time for a slightly greater amount.

Karin Temple – If we get down this path we will certainly look at all options.

Member Mills – I am looking at a larger amount and a 2016 bond.

Member Ashjian – Is there a way we could get a matchup of “here is what we said we were going to do” and “here is what we did” and “here is what it costs?”

Karin Temple – Certainly, at every meeting of the bond oversight we provide that list that is specific to school, project, cost and any dollars that we have received from the state to offset Measure Q.

Member Ashjian – So we will be able to go back through Measure Q Master Facilities Plan and say here is what we sold to the voters and here is actually what happened.

Karin Temple – I just want to be clear if you are referring to the Facilities Master Plan as Member Mills pointed out it was not anticipated to be fully funded by Measure Q which is the first portion. It was to get at some of the major priorities of the Facilities Master Plan. The major priority was to align our feeder progression in a systematic way into the high school regions and to do that we had to do certain facilities improvements. So that was the overriding objective of the Master Plan which we were able to achieve with the opening of Gaston last August. Then we were better able to utilize each of our campuses.

Member Ashjian – I read the Master Plan and I read the propaganda that went out to the voters and I am trying to match the two up. I am confused that we paid Gaston out of Measure K.

Karin Temple – I can give you details if you want to sit down and talk about it. Where that came from is that Measure K actually had envisioned additional elementary schools, ten originally in Measure K. Because of a combination of factors, one we didn't need all ten elementary schools after we had built five. The board made a decision to shift the funding to a middle school which was also on the Measure K ballot which was called the priority two ballot. Instead of building more elementary schools it was decided to shift to a middle school because it became a priority during that period of time.

Member Ashjian – I went back and read and that is what happened. The minute the priority changed the board was able to make that change and move direction. Is that what you are saying?

Superintendent Hanson – Measure K had a bad launch. It said ten elementary schools. We realized we would never get to a feeder pattern without a middle school in South West Fresno. We also realized we had a serious set of years of declining enrollment. So we didn't need all ten elementary schools. We realized that by removing kids off of year-round calendars. We also did dramatic boundary change processes around the district where we shifted boundaries to better utilize our facilities. We were then able to build five elementary schools strategically placed, house all our elementary kids by shifting boundaries and then being able to free money to build the middle school in South West Fresno. Part of what happened through the stimulus is we got zero interest bonds from the feds. A big chunk of that was used for Gaston and then we backed it up with Measure K that had been reallocated.

Member Ashjian – I understand that and agree with that. Being that this is my first go around in public office the number one thing that gets people out to the voting blocs is being a property owner. I just want to make sure when we go back to the property owners, if in fact we decide to go back, that we can go back with the history of K and a history of Q of promises and answers that directly correlate. And if there is a reason why they don't correlate then the direction of the board went in a different direction, and I am ok with that. We are seeing property values around the state and around the nation climbing at an increasing rate. Those should be good things that are going to happen for Measure Q in the ability for possibly pulling some more funds out of Q. Property values have been declining since 2008 and we pulled this bond in 2010 and prices going into the bond were really high. I have to believe we budgeted Q with high numbers. I can't believe we budgeted Q with low numbers. Would that be a safe guess?

Karin Temple – I believe that the Facilities Master Plan does note that is was in 2008 dollars. There is a variety of factors that influence construction as you well know but in particularly K-12

construction. Everything we are building now, per square foot, is going to cost more than it did 5-10 years ago because of new requirements imposed upon us. We just need to be cognizant of the variety of factors that come into play.

Member Ashjian – What I am saying is that I still don't think we are at 2008 values. So I would like to go back to Q and say here is what we promised, here is what we delivered and this is how we were able to pull this off.

Karin Temple – What I want to say on that note is, and I think the board will agree, that in terms of Measure Q and the promises, the major high school projects which were the center piece of Measure Q are all underway or completed. I can firmly say we kept those promises.

Member Ashjian – In no way am I saying that we didn't. I just want the accounting so I can see where it lines up. We just went back for \$90 million in February, excuse me in December?

Karin Temple – It was September and it was approximately \$60 million. We had \$55 million approximately a year before that and two years prior to that \$80 million. Our first issuance was \$80 million.

Member Ashjian – If we knew we were going to go back for \$60 million in October, and we knew the value we were not going to get, the \$280 million in October. Did we know in October that we were not going to get the full \$280? When did we find out? It seems like I am just hearing this for the first time.

Karin Temple – The amount when we issued the \$60 million in October or September it was around that timeframe. We went for the maximum that we could at that time. I know that is not the question you were asking. We very carefully pace our projects so that we can match dollars available with the projects that are in the pipeline and under construction. \$60 million is what we were able to do last fall and we are pacing our projects to maximize the use of that funding.

Member Ashjian – When did we find out they were not going to give us the other \$85 million? When did that conversation occur?

Karin Temple – Over time with our financial advisors these are conversations that we have as we seek updates and continue to analyze. Over the last several months we have gotten deeper and deeper into that analysis. Part of it is we run multiple scenarios. We had a variety of scenarios and now we have had to adjust. I can't tell you the exact date it became clear, but it is over a period of time because we are consistently analyzing.

Member Ashjian – I think we have done a fantastic job. I am trying to get the whole picture coming from the private side. Let's just say we go out for another bond. What stops them from not limiting the bond if we say we want \$200 million and we end up with \$80 million or \$60 million? How does the next bond not get in the same situation as this bond?

Karin Temple – The amount, whatever that amount is, would be based on analysis of how we could structure issuances over a period of time to be compliant with AB 182. We do need to estimate our value over a period of time. Our financial advisor looks over 50 years of data and what that might mean for us going forward. It also depends on bond interest rates. I will tell you I think we are conservative in our preliminary estimates. But that is our responsibility and obligation.

Ruthie Quinto – There are a variety of levers that go into the analysis. What you are asking about is basically determined by three major things. One, of those is assessed evaluation and as you have stated the assessed evaluation was declining at an alarming rate for several years. Had that decline continued we wouldn't have even brought you the issuance that we did in the fall because we would have been at our maximum debt capacity which is one of the factors that we need to remain within as a district. Another factor is a certain amount of taxes per \$100 thousand in assessed

evaluation per bond measure. No matter what our overall tax rate is of \$188.00 per \$100 thousand assessed evaluation. We also have a \$60.00 amount that we have to maintain per bond measure. The \$188.00 we self-imposed that when we made a promise to the voters. The reason I am giving you these different factors to let you know that there are a variety of different factors. There is the debt capacity, there is the limitation per bond measure, there is the self-imposed tax rate for the district, and there are the differences in projecting what our overall assessed value evaluations are going to do. Are they going to grow? Are they going to decline? Then we had the situation from Poway that changed the rules for how we structure, how are we going to pay back our debts. That is the CABS that Ms. Temple was describing to you. When that changed, that changed the trajectory of our analysis. Those are the factors that I think would be more appropriately brought to you and described perhaps in a workshop setting rather than for us to stand here and answer your questions on the fly.

Member Ashjian – When we get the matching up of Measure Q can we also get, for the lease lease-back of the \$200 million, what percentage went to which contractors?

Ruthie Quinto – We can provide that to you.

Member Chavez – I was counting back how many ribbon cutting ceremonies we have had for Fresno Unified and I have been to every single region. Next week we will be going to the Bullard area, they are kicking off their project. Every time I go to a new city I usually drive by their schools because I think it says a lot about a community if a community is willing to send their kids to crumbling schools or dilapidated facilities. I think we have a great model at Fresno Unified. Last year I had an opportunity to go up and down the Central Valley and I always talked about the model that we have at Gaston. Where we have a state of the art school with a built in health clinic, a wellness center and a lot of great services in that area. I think that if we are going to go forward with another bond we should really look replicating that model of making our schools the hub of a community where families and children can go. I think it starts with an investment. We look at how we got here with Measure Q and K and now we are getting ready to go forward with another. I too agree with Member Mills we need to look at going bigger. Especially when we consider that other educational entities that are considering going out for a bond as well in upwards numbers of \$400 million plus. These are investments in our community. We talk about poverty, we talk about challenging neighborhoods. There is nothing else that can lift people out of poverty then investing in education. Along with the LCFF money that we will be receiving I think state of the art facilities really need to be a component of that. It bothers me when I drive by a school in the summertime and I see a closed school and our kids can't use it as green space. Especially when we have a deficit of green space in certain parts of the city and I understand the liability. As a board we need to work towards a collaborative approach of working with responsible entities that can help communities and use those facilities as green space. If we are going to go off on another bond I feel that should be a component. It will be a great selling point for our community. I would support us going out for another bond.

Member Johnson – When we look at schools they help do something for our communities especially in those neighborhoods of lower incomes. It gives the residents something to care about. If we go forward and we do get the money then we need to remember Columbia Elementary and those bungalows. I have been talking about that for three years. I know the dollars will be well spent and I will support a bond issue. I would like to see more than \$200 million.

Member De La Cerda – Under Measure Q I know that there are projects that did not get realized but I am excited to say that what may have not happened then, can occur in the upcoming bond. I

agree with Member Chavez that schools can have a positive effect on the students, families and communities. It has a ripple effect. I support a third bond.

A copy of the PowerPoint is available on the district website.

C. RECEIVE INFORMATION & REPORTS

C-13, RECEIVE Fresno Unified School District's Second Quarterly Investment Report for Fiscal Year 2014/15

RECEIVED the second quarter investment report for the period ending December 31, 2014. Board Policy 3430(a) requires the Superintendent, or designee, to supply the Board of Education with quarterly and annual reports on district investments. As of December 31, 2014, Fresno Unified School District is in compliance with Board Policy 3430(a) for investments. Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact to the district. Contact person: Ruth F. Quinto, telephone 457-6226.

C-14, RECEIVE Constituent Services Quarterly Reporting

RECEIVED the Constituent Services Quarterly Reporting for Constituent Services activities for the time period of November 1, 2014 through January 31, 2015. Also included is the Quarterly Reporting for the Valenzuela/Williams Uniform Complaint Procedures from November 1, 2014 through January 31, 2015 in accordance with Education Code § 35186. Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact to the District. Contact person: Teresa Plascencia, telephone 457-3736.

BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMUNICATIONS

Member De La Cerda – Spoke about Fort Miller. Failing one child is one child too many. We need to support all of our kids. Our conversations should be about supporting our students instead of debasing them. No child asks to be born into poverty, no child asks to be born in an unstable home life, unemployment, neglect, abuse or violence. Many of our children wake up to that situation every day. We ask those same children to raise above those situations to make something of their selves even if it is just for the day that they are at school. I am not excusing the behavior but I am not supporting the dismissiveness of any child as if they have little or no worth. Every adult in this process including teachers, district leaders, labor groups, board members, site leaders and parents need to move together with clarity and focus in the same direction for the sake of the children.

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, March 11, 2015 – OPEN SESSION AT 5:30 P.M.