1. OPENING ITEMS
   A. Call to Order
   Board President Hector Camacho, Jr. called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.
   B. Approval of Agenda

   After a motion by Ms. Gerard and a second by Mr. Lempert, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Hsiao, Lempert, and Ross) approved the February 5, 2020, agenda as presented.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

   There were no persons wishing to address the Board.
3. **EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH**

   A. **February 2020 Employee of the Month**, Cindy Matsuyama, Administrative Assistant II, Outdoor Education, Instructional Services Division

   Board President Camacho recognized the February 2020 Employee of the Month, Cindy Matsuyama, Administrative Assistant II, Outdoor Education, Instructional Services Division. Board President Camacho congratulated Ms. Matsuyama on behalf of the Board and presented her with a check and commemorative clock.

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

   A. **January 15, 2020, Regular Board Meeting**

   After a motion by Mr. Lempert and a second by Ms. Gerard, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Hsiao, Lempert, and Ross) approved the Minutes of the January 15, 2020, Regular Meeting as presented.

5. **CONSENT AGENDA**

   B. **Receive Staffing Reports**
   C. **Adopt Joint Resolution No. 20-6 Recognizing March 2020 as Arts Education Month in California/Youth Art Month**
   D. **Adopt Joint Resolution No. 20-7 Recognizing March 2020 as National Women's History Month**
   E. **Adopt Joint Resolution No. 20-8 Recognizing March 2, 2020, as Read Across America Day**
   F. **Adopt Joint Resolution No. 20-9 Recognizing March 2-6, 2020, as National School Breakfast Week**
   G. **Adopt Joint Resolution No. 20-10 Recognizing March 21, 2020, as International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination**
   H. **Adopt Joint Resolution No. 20-11 Honoring Paul Scannell on his 48 Years of Service to the Personnel Commission**

   After a motion by Ms. Gerard and a second by Mr. Hsiao, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Hsiao, Lempert, and Ross) approved the Consent Agenda.
6. **RECEIVE UPDATE ON THE 2020-2021 LOCAL CONTROL ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN (LCAP) FOR COURT AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS**

   A. **Receive Update on SMCOE's 2020-2021 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) for Court and Community Schools**

   Board President Camacho introduced Deputy Superintendent Littrell who shared the 2020 SMCOE LCAP stakeholder engagement process is underway. Deputy Superintendent Littrell introduced Administrator Gnusti who reminded the Board about the new LCAP template and stated increased engagement is necessary over the next two months to discuss and shape the goals.

   Administrator Gnusti explained additional stakeholder meeting dates are being set aside for Court and Community Parent Night and Kemp Family Night in early March. Dates are also being considered for Hillcrest Family Day on Sundays. Administrator Gnusti shared the LCAP team will be mailing surveys home in multiple languages and will be offered via Google and paper for teachers, depending on their classes. Administrator Gnusti said the process will extend into April and May, involving Superintendent’s Cabinet and finishing up with the Board for review and action.

   Mr. Hsiao thanked Administrator Gnusti for the planning and asked if it was appropriate for Board members to attend parent meetings. Administrator Gnusti answered it is absolutely appropriate for Board members to attend, and said she would keep Superintendent Magee up to date with all confirmed meeting dates.

   Mr. Cannon asked about the updated LCAP template and for two to three items on which the team would need to focus. Administrator Gnusti answered the team reflected on the goals set three years ago, and the first step is deciding where the organization has moved and how the goals fit now. She said the template is supposed to be much shorter, more cohesive, and easier to read.

   Board President Camacho thanked Administrator Gnusti for the timeline and inquired if the team is finding the template is appropriate for the alternative schools model, or if it is still one size fits all. Administrator Gnusti responded the template is quite workable for all schools and all districts. She continued there are pieces tied more to the Dashboard, which are complicated for SMCOE schools, but the team is tackling that by meeting with the data teams from Student Services and Instructional Services. Administrator Gnusti explained this is not unique to SMCOE and is occurring in other county office programs.

   Board President Camacho thanked Administrator Gnusti for the multi-language translation of documents. He asked if the team, when engaging with parents, provide samples of goals and what the team is working towards, and if so, what that looks like. Administrator Gnusti replied that she is working with all stakeholders about what the process should look like, and last year in the first layer there were attempts to obtain parent engagement by asking a couple of questions, in multiple languages, at a few events. She said the team continues to think of ways to meaningfully engage parents.

   Board President Camacho summarized this as a two-step process of first, what the team is doing and second, reflecting on what is being done. Administrator Gnusti agreed, adding the LCAP is a steep
learning curve and must feel practical for families. Board President Camacho again thanked Administrator Gnusti for her thoughtful approach.

Mr. Hsiao shared he loves the line of inquiry promoted by the LCAP, and how goals are identified, along with potential solutions. He inquired about the transitory nature of Court and Community School students, who may help write the plan and determine goals, but are not around the following year to measure impact. Mr. Hsiao asked whether there are other counties which have tried to solve this problem by bringing in other community stakeholders to provide more continuous and sustained attention to the work.

Administrator Gnusti replied that earlier in the day, Principal Parcels was speaking to this issue, and there was discussion of a community Google survey with school partners to obtain feedback from organizations that work with the schools year after year. She continued that would provide valuable input on how these organizations view the engagement component with students as they work in programs, and what changes they recognize. Administrator Gnusti added the team has also identified about five experienced families who have come into the program, left, and returned, with whom the team can work specifically in a closed circle. Mr. Hsiao asked if the Board could provide names, and Administrator Gnusti answered the team was open to this suggestion.

Board President Camacho asked how the 17th District Parent Teacher Association (PTA) could be leveraged to allow the parents to see themselves as PTA members, as there is an access gap for PTA membership. He continued that the 17th District PTA has been wonderful with SMCOE students and programs, but perhaps there is a partnership which could happen there to create a welcoming space for parents to join. Administrator Gnusti agreed, adding the team is working on adding a parent liaison for the program, which will hopefully be helpful in this conversation.

7. **STUDENT SERVICES**

A. Receive Report on English Learner (EL) Master Plan for SMCOE Student Programs

Board President Camacho introduced Deputy Superintendent Littrell who thanked the Board for their support in approving the 0.5 ELD Coordinator Position dedicated to Court and Community Schools. She reminded the Board that the ELD Coordinator working with Court and Community is Erica Ng, who along with Gracie Hough, has done an amazing job continuing the work of the previous EL Coordinator Nabila Massoumi. Deputy Superintendent Littrell explained Coordinator Ng and Administrator Gnusti would provide an overview of the EL Master Plan, specifically the Reclassification Criteria. She shared in regards to stakeholder engagement, the team recently met with the main client districts and stakeholders – San Mateo Union High School District, Sequoia Union High School District, and Jefferson Union High School District – who comprise a disproportionately large number of Court and Community students.

Administrator Gnusti discussed the importance of the EL Master Plan and the Reclassification Criteria the updating of Board Policy delineating how English Learners are placed. She explained
the test for English Learners changed a few years ago from the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) test to the English Language Proficiency Assessment for California (ELPAC) test, and the team now has a few years of solid scores and recommendations. Administrator Gnusti described how the state mandated changes for the reclassification of students and an updated Board Policy would be brought to the Board at an upcoming meeting.

Administrator Gnusti outlined in the fall of 2018, committee members met to implement changes to create a high-quality English Learner program and put the reclassification structure in place so students in SMCOE programs can be formally reclassified. She added in most cases, students are classified and reclassified in their home districts, but SMCOE must be able to accurately assess the EL learning of students, determine what needs to be done as a program, decide where students are when they come to SMCOE, and if necessary, reclassify and potentially exit students, even if they are enrolled in SMCOE programs for a short period of time.

Coordinator Ng shared she has continued the work begun by Coordinator Massoumi and others. She stated per California Education Code Section 313, every Local Educational Agency (LEA) must have four criteria for reclassification:

1) English Language Proficiency Assessment
2) Norm-Referenced or Standards-Based Demonstration of Basic Skills
3) Teacher Recommendation
4) Parental Notification and Consultation

Coordinator Ng elaborated on the proposed criteria for both Court and Community and K-12 schools in each category:

1) English Language Proficiency Assessment – SMCOE to use the ELPAC test, updated per California Department of Education (CDE) request to an Overall 4
2) Norm-Referenced or Standards-Based Demonstration of Basic Skills – SMCOE students would need to demonstrate an overall performance level of “Standard Nearly Met” (no more than 25 points less than net criteria) or above on the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) exam or use of the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Reading test, taken by all Court and Community school students
3) Teacher Recommendation – necessity of a grade of “C” or higher in English class
4) Parental Notification and Consultation – parents to agree to reclassification by letter, phone, or in person

Coordinator Ng explained in addition to proposed reclassification for English Learners in general education, there are also proposed new criteria for English Learner students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). She stated sometimes English Learner students with learning differences may not meet the regular Reclassification Criteria in one or more areas due to their disabilities, not because of language, so in those cases another set of criteria must be used for reclassification. Coordinator Ng added students in moderate to severe special education programs who are non-verbal or have significant communication deficits will be reclassified by team decision based on multiple assessments.
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Administrator Gnusti explained all documents sent to families are currently in the process of being translated.

Mr. Hsiao thanked Coordinator Ng and Administrator Gnusti for the work done over the past few years. He clarified that the committee is striving to create an integrated strategy to help students acquire English language skills and get reclassified, and the current discussion involves changing some of the Reclassification Criteria. Administrator Gnusti confirmed this was correct. She stated her team recognized the components required to get a student reclassified, and the forms and worksheets are used by her team to determine student placement.

Mr. Hsiao asked about the ELPAC assessment tool, and what is meant by a student earning a score of 4. Coordinator Ng answered it is a score of 4/4, meaning language is well-developed, adding there are sub-domains of reading/writing and speaking/listening, which are scored out of 3, and the exam considers the combined score. Mr. Hsiao asked if it was a weighted score which requires proficiency in different domains. Coordinator Ng confirmed the score is weighted, but at different grade bands, and the students strive to earn mostly 3s.

Mr. Hsiao clarified the maximum score is a 4, and a student must earn a 4. Coordinator Ng confirmed a student must earn an overall 4, but a student could earn 3s in reading, writing, and listening, and a 2 in speaking, and still earn an overall 4, depending on the formula and scale scores.

Mr. Hsiao asked about the additional criteria of parental notification and consultation, which he felt is a subjective measure, based on a letter sent to parents which when signed, indicates the child is now proficient in language. He asked what basis parents have to confirm their student is able to read, speak, understand, and write in English. Administrator Gnusti replied there has always been subjectivity in that component of the reclassification structure in California, and agreed the process for parental consent varies.

She explained the hope is to start with a parent phone call to engage parents in the process and enable an informed decision, but that does not always happen. Administrator Gnusti stated the assessment helps SMCOE best serve students and there is a progression over several years as students work through levels of learning English. She explained students are often in the English Language program for many years before being exited, and there are some long-term English Learners no longer receiving services, a cause for concern.

Mr. Hsiao shared concerns for the long-term English Learners who are not mastering the language and being reclassified, and others who are not receiving necessary services. He described the parental notification component as “squishy” with the potential for abuse to get a student reclassified when additional services are needed or to promote a student when parents have no benchmarks to make a determination. Administrator Gnusti explained the guidelines are provided by the State and followed closely, and to her knowledge parents have the right to exit students at the start of the process to avoid receiving any services, or at any point in the process. Coordinator Ng confirmed parents have the civil right to refuse or exit their students from any type of EL services, but the student is still considered an English Learner. She explained the parent notification letter asks the
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parent to let the team know if they do not agree to the reclassification, and there have been situations where parents did not agree.

Coordinator Ng described the progress as rigorous with multiple measures needing to be met, so most of the time when parents are shown data, they understand their child is performing at a certain level and feel comfortable. She added sometimes parents want their child to continue to receive services so they oppose reclassification, and the team helps the parent understand the benefits, along with the pros/cons of reclassifying or not reclassifying.

Mr. Hsiao asked if there is a process with criteria #1-3 confirmed before getting to #4, and the parent letter gives objective assessment feedback to parents rather than just a narrative. Coordinator Ng confirmed criteria #1-3 must be considered before getting to #4. Mr. Hsiao shared he felt more comfortable understanding that part of the process. Coordinator Ng explained if a student earned an Overall 4, but on their Smarter Balanced English test scored a 1, they would not likely be reclassified because they did not meet the second criteria.

Ms. Alvaro thanked Coordinator Ng and Administrator Gnusti for the presentation. She stated that most SMCOE students come from other districts, and for the most part, return to those districts, and she knows, according to Education Code, the team must have this data, but asked how much this data is used to look at students and reclassify them before returning to districts. She followed up by asking what happens if the home districts do not agree with SMCOE’s determination. Administrator Gnusti replied although she does not have specific data points, she can subjectively say a small percentage of SMCOE students are identified for potential reclassification. She added the ELPAC is given to a large percentage of students each year, and scores are analyzed closely for movement and progression, so this needs to be available as an option. Administrator Gnusti stated now that all components are together, this conversation can be revisited with more data to inform the discussion.

Ms. Alvaro asked if there is a student who should be reclassified based on the criteria, whether the home district is involved because reclassification will impact the services provided by the home district when the student returns. Administrator Gnusti replied the team is working on agreements with districts and sharing information, but there needs to be more consideration of how to include the home districts in the conversation.

Administrator Gnusti continued that the reclassification needs to happen for the student’s best interest, so the student can earn elective credit upon returning to their district, rather than being placed into unnecessary language development courses. Ms. Alvaro asked if there are conversations with the home districts to avoid differences of opinion regarding reclassification. Administrator Gnusti expressed appreciation for the comment as a valid point and stated because the EL plan is adaptable, a paragraph can be added regarding the relationship with the home district and expectations. Ms. Alvaro added the home district would likely need to talk to the SMCOE team, as well, for students close to reclassification.

Superintendent Magee interjected that reclassification data is included in the LCAP as a benchmark data point, so the team can look at the LCAP to determine how many students have been reclassified each year.
Coordinator Ng reminded the Board there is an IEP process for English Learners with disabilities and she recently spoke with teachers at the K-12 school site who were excited to have this process, as they have students needing to be reclassified as well.

Board President Camacho thanked Coordinator Ng and Administrator Gnusti for the helpful presentation, and recalled how the previous plan contained language regarding linguistic and cultural assets. He described how critical that language has been to making sure SMCOE programs are inclusive and responsive, and asked if this language could be added if possible. Board President Camacho also asked if a visual would be created for this plan. Administrator Gnusti said this could be created.

Coordinator Ng commented she was glad the assets-based aspect was mentioned because she has noticed in talking to teachers about criteria for reclassification, it helps for them to take on an assets-based lens for their students. She cited the example of a student who earned an Overall 4 on the ELPAC at Gateway and teachers and staff are working to prepare him for the CAASPP so he can reclassify. Coordinator Ng summarized it is motivating for teachers to be aware of the goal and better understand the system, so they can better inform and empower students.

B. Discuss/Act on Reclassification Criteria for English Learners in SMCOE Student Programs

Board President Camacho introduced Administrator Gnusti who summarized the Reclassification Criteria is a mandated part of Board policy which needs to be in place. She advised the criteria needed to be sorted, aligned with state mandates and laws, and embedded into future Board policy reflecting the changes in the test and the criteria. Administrator Gnusti asked for Board approval of the Reclassification Criteria put forth for students in the English Language program, students who are English Language learners, and for English Language learners with disabilities.

After a motion by Mr. Hsiao and a second by Ms. Gerard, the Board unanimously approved (Alvaro, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Hsiao, Lempert, and Ross), the Reclassification Criteria for English Learners in SMCOE Student Programs.

C. Discuss/Act on Comprehensive School Safety Plan: Non-Tactical Portion for SMCOE Student Programs

Board President Camacho introduced Deputy Superintendent Littrell who began by thanking Administrator Gnusti and Coordinator Ng for their work. Deputy Superintendent Littrell stated the Comprehensive School Safety Plan must be brought forward before March 1 of each year for Board approval and introduced Coordinator Henricks to talk about the process she went through with site staff.

Coordinator Henricks described the Comprehensive School Safety Plan as Education Code 32280-32288, outlining schools operating first grade through twelfth grade must have a school safety plan. She explained every year new requirements are added, and the requirements added last year are included in this year’s plan. She shared last year the requirement was added that stakeholders must include members of law enforcement, along with other first responders, principals, teachers,
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classified staff members, and parents, which SMCOE has implemented for many years, through the Coalition for Safe Schools and Communities. Lastly, she explained the requirement was added to include a tactical portion, to be reviewed in Closed Session.

Coordinator Henricks said that this year’s plan includes a Suicide Prevention Policy, not as a requirement, but as a recommendation, along with protocols for Student Threat Assessment Procedures, Disaster Responses, and Harassment, Bullying, Antidiscrimination, and Hate Crimes.

Coordinator Henricks explained a template was produced to be utilized by SMCOE’s 23 districts to craft their own Comprehensive School Safety Plans, which has been well received and appreciated by small school districts who have limited staff, often with the same person working on the LCAP, the EL Master Plan, and the Comprehensive School Safety Plan.

Mr. Hsiao discussed his dismay at reading newspaper articles about harassment and abuse of students by teachers. He asked about procedures in the Comprehensive School Safety Plan for students harassing other students, but asked what measures and protections are in place for students being harassed by teachers or other authority figures, to make students feel safe. Deputy Superintendent Littrell replied that recently there was a full day training by attorney Dora Dome regarding Title IX, not only for SMCOE administrative staff and leadership, but also for SMCOE’s 23 districts. Deputy Superintendent Littrell commented the training helped SMCOE recognize areas in need of additional development over the summer. She shared if there is a sense of a harassing environment or disrespectful climate surrounding sexual orientation, sexual identity, gender identity, there is an obligation to intervene, but the administrative team needs to determine and develop what that will look like. Deputy Superintendent Littrell spoke of the need to be proactive and know how to best respond.

Mr. Hsiao reiterated he was speaking specifically to the situation of a teacher abusing their position. Deputy Superintendent Littrell replied that the Coalition for Safe Schools and Communities has spent a year and a half working with the District Attorney’s office, legal counsel, Rape Trauma Services, and Victim’s Services to develop a protocol for all 23 districts, 24 including SMCOE, that if there is a sexual assault or an allegation of sexual assault, whether student to student or staff to student, there is a protocol outlining steps to be taken by school personnel to complete a proper investigation, coordinated with law enforcement, which is trauma-informed and avoids harming any potential legal case. She described the training being rolled out across the county, clearly advising on school and law enforcement steps to take. Deputy Superintendent Littrell explained both school and law enforcement have the legal obligation to investigate. She said if it were to happen for SMCOE staff, Human Resources (HR) would be involved to ensure HR policies are followed for staff members, in sync with law enforcement, ensuring dual collaboration. She stated a complete reset is occurring across the county.

Mr. Hsiao asked if more work is to be done. Deputy Superintendent Littrell responded there is a lot more work to be done, and shared there is a district who will contract a full-time investigator due to the number of allegations and the lack of capacity for their administrative team to properly investigate. Mr. Hsiao stated he would love to receive an update in the future and thanked the team.
Mr. Cannon reflected back on his experience working in schools on such reports and shared he would contact the Superintendent, who then contacted local law enforcement or child protective services. He asked if the process is more complicated now. Deputy Superintendent Littrell answered it varies, depending on the district. She added the Superintendent is always alerted, but the way in which they get involved varies, for example if there is a Director of Student Services, that person may get involved. Deputy Superintendent Littrell explained a school allegation between students and adults on campus such as a teacher or coach is not a child welfare report, as their scope is parent/guardian, but rather directly a law enforcement call, who come in to complete a co-investigation. Deputy Superintendent Littrell explained there are efforts to ensure timelines aren’t missed, for example if there may be an expulsion, there is a partnership for how that information will be shared. She also cautioned against multiple people continuing to interview the victim, to be mindful of trauma impact. Mr. Cannon thanked Deputy Superintendent Littrell for the explanation.

After a motion by Mr. Cannon and a second by Ms. Gerard, the Board unanimously approved (Alvaro, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Hsiao, Lempert, and Ross), the public portion of the Comprehensive School Safety Plan Pending Approval of the Tactical Portion in Closed Session.

8. CLOSED SESSION: COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL SAFETY PLAN: TACTICAL PORTION (Education Code section 32281(f) and Government Code section 54957(a))

A. Discuss/Act on Tactical Portion of the Comprehensive School Safety Plan for SMCOE Student Programs

The Board convened to Closed Session at 8:03 p.m.

9. OPEN SESSION: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION

The Board reconvened in Open Session at 8:28 p.m. After a motion by Ms. Gerard and a second by Mr. Lempert, the Board unanimously approved (Alvaro, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Hsiao, Lempert, and Ross), the Comprehensive School Safety Plan: Tactical Portion (Education Code section 32281(f) and Government Code section 54957(a)).

10. OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

A. Receive Overview of 2019-2021 SMCOE Strategic Plan

Superintendent Magee indicated she would take the Board through an overview of the two-year strategic plan, identified as 2019-2021.

Superintendent Magee explained the timeline was begun under Superintendent Campbell in 2016. She elaborated under Superintendent Campbell, the cycle was broken into a two-year action plan starting in 2017 and going through 2019. Superintendent Magee described the idea of strategic
actions is to focus on specific deliverable goals which can be measured to see if they are being accomplished. She said Superintendent Campbell planned the timeline to intersect with the new Superintendent, who could carry the existing plan, creating continuity for the organization.

Superintendent Magee described in 2019 the team spent time reviewing accomplishments from the previous two years, analyzing where they had arrived with that work, and where they felt they needed to project forward for the next two years. She explained the current plan covers 2019 through 2021.

Superintendent Magee shared the Strategic Plan includes the SMCOE vision, “Excellence and Equity in Education, Every Student, Every Teacher, Every School,” to which everyone is deeply connected. She described how the vision resonates for the organization. Superintendent Magee spoke of the mission statement, “Inspiring Students, Investing in Teachers, Invigorating Leaders, and Involving Families and Communities.” She explained the original statement did not include the word “families” and staff pushed to add the idea of family involvement to the statement, so it will be included moving forward.

Superintendent Magee informed core values were not included in the original 2017 plan, and staff felt it was important to include these in the new plan, which evolved into Core Practices, which are actionable. She shared the statement “We put our values into action daily through these core practices.” Superintendent Magee described the first three practices, Growth Mindset, Trauma-Informed, and Cultural Humility. She shared the addition of two new elements, Sustainability and Accountability. Superintendent Magee indicated Sustainability comes from the Environmental Literacy work, a priority for the county office, and was broadened to consider the sustainability of staff and student health and wellness and the sustainability of programs so real change can occur. She elaborated that chasing after money that disappears after two years does not necessarily bring real change, work needs to be approached with a sustainable mindset, and the goal is for deep and ongoing change which can be sustained over time.

Superintendent Magee spoke to the Accountability component, describing it as personal and professional accountability, what is brought to work each day, and our accountability to each other as colleagues inside the organization. She described the $100,000,000 which flows into the county office from the taxpayers of San Mateo County each year, and the expectation that SMCOE will support school districts, teachers, and students, and uphold the values of public education in the county, of which there is no greater accountability. Superintendent Magee added accountability also involves data, outcomes, and impact, and the need to question and measure what is being done, to ensure the work is moving the organization closer to equity goals. She summarized these are the Core Practices added to the Strategic Plan draft moving forward.

In reference to goals, Superintendent Magee described four priority buckets:

- OneSMCOE Culture – related to a positive growth mindset being necessary to do the complex, hard work ahead, feel part of a team, and gain strength and learn from each other
- Educator Workforce – related to all the workforce it takes to provide a high quality, equitable education for every child, and involving early learning, supporting, celebrating,
and elevating teachers and their work, and providing pathways to earn teaching and administrative credentials

- Alignment and Improved Outcomes – related to the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS), a system addressing the needs of students in their social, emotional, behavioral, and academic needs, as the organization aspires to serve the whole child; also related to being a large system and being part of an even larger system, alignment requires communication, getting out of silos, learning from each other, and cross-training

- Advocacy and Partnerships – related to how the organization advocates for an equitable system of education and combines with others in the community to form powerful partnerships and have greater impact

Superintendent Magee described the above as an overview of the target for the next two years. She ended by describing work on organizational definitions. Superintendent Magee stated there are four county office leaders participating in the San Mateo County School Boards Association (SMCSBA) Equity Network, along with four Board members. The group has discussed the creation of a shared definition of equity and creating an equity policy.

Mr. Cannon shared in his experience in education, the issue of sustainability has always been a weak area needing additional work, and he is interested in continuing that work. He also shared he is encouraged by the work done with school safety since Newtown in 2013 to bring services together and maintain them over the years.

Mr. Ross commented on his frustration in pursuing equity and access in education, how there is very little measurable progress in desired areas year after year, and the rare examples in the country where there has been dramatic progress such as Long Beach. He feels there has been very little accomplished, against the urgency of the inequity in San Mateo County, over the last several years, although some progress has been made. Mr. Ross spoke of Superintendent Campbell’s focus on early childhood education and the Big Lift, and how powerful statewide and local ripples have occurred. He asked Superintendent Magee about her thinking and angle on which component of the Strategic Plan has a chance to create more than ripples and waves. Superintendent Magee replied the MTSS framework is a serious response to the fragmented siloed system which has been created. She added experts in the office have been leading this work statewide and although it might feel like another education initiative, it is not. She stated the Board will see a shift and restructure of the way SMCOE organizes divisions and collaborations that will have greater impact and engagement with district partners, providing more leverage. Superintendent Magee added the Big Lift and other programs must continue and something must be done about funding reform and the pay for early learning educators, which is completely broken. She stated with all the data known, the organization hopes to collectively work across the county and state, and have impact in that way.

Mr. Ross replied those are all good responses. He stated what jumped out for him is Superintendent Magee’s emphasis on the teacher residency program, something which can be taken on as a major initiative and demonstration program for the state, analogous to the Big Lift, with a lot of state funding, and an idea which has come of age. Mr. Ross said there is no magic wand in education, but having great teachers in every classroom working together and ready on day one, instead of year three, would be great. He discussed residency as job-embedded full-time exposure, how great
teachers can be born or made, and how teachers in this program can be great after year one of being a full-time teacher. Mr. Ross stated there are schools in the county without enough adults, and the model of two adults in the classroom, one a master teacher and the other a teacher resident, can move numbers if done to scale. Superintendent Magee agreed and shared excitement for this program and confidence that Alder Graduate School of Education is the right partner.

Mr. Hsiao thanked Superintendent Magee and Cabinet for their hard work. He commented that SMCOE is uniquely positioned to do cross-cutting systems level work, and he hopes through conversations at the Equity Network and at Board meetings, areas to influence and control can be considered to address fundamental inequities. Mr. Hsiao suggested being bold and hopes SMCOE will take on the role for which it is uniquely suited, for the entire county, not just the students directly served.

Board President Camacho thanked Superintendent Magee for the presentation.

B. Superintendent’s Comments

Superintendent Magee began by discussing the Governor’s budget a few weeks back, and how she was at California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCESSA) the previous week, where there was a lot of conversation about the budget and how it looks. She shared unfortunately the Governor is using a mechanism to spur innovation and work across the state by releasing big competitive grants. Superintendent Magee explained it has created grant chaos. She added every grant needs partners of different shapes and sizes, some need districts, some need county offices, and they cross different topics. Superintendent Magee updated that staff are working on 5-6 different grants, in addition to their daily work. She cited the example of the Mental Health Student Services Act grant, in which SMCOE has partnered with Behavioral Health and spent almost 3 months in conversation with them to create this grant to support all school districts. Superintendent Magee explained there would only be two grants funded across the state of California, but if the work is not done and the grant is not submitted, there is no chance of earning a grant award.

Superintendent Magee acknowledged missing bringing to the Board the resolution for Proposition 13, related to the public preschool, K-12, and college health and safety bond act, the bond measure on the March ballot. She assured the resolution would be on the February 19 agenda.

Superintendent Magee stated she is excited for the Equity Network meetings at the end of the week and shared there are a lot of great upcoming events on the Board calendar. She shared attending the Jefferson Union High School District (JUHSD) groundbreaking earlier in the day, for their new workforce housing project. Superintendent Magee described it as a beautiful project and the room was full, with Governor Newsom’s and State Superintendent of Public Instruction Thurmond’s offices represented. She said leaders from across the county attended and honored JUHSD’s Superintendent and School Board for their innovative efforts.

Lastly, per Mr. Cannon’s request, Superintendent Magee requested to adjourn the meeting in honor of Harry Redlick, a long-time educator and public servant in the community of San Bruno.
11. **BOARD MEMBERS**

A. Board Member Comments

**Ms. Gerard**  
Ms. Gerard mentioned visiting Oxford Day Academy the previous week to observe several classrooms and talk to students. She commented when asked what they would change, she found it interesting that students answered “uniforms,” with some of them liking them and some not liking them. Ms. Gerard described it as an interesting and informative visit, and she was able to observe an earthquake drill. She shared she would be attending the first meeting of the California County Boards of Education (CCBE) Conference Committee in Sacramento on February 20 and if any Board members wished to submit strands for programs, please let her know via email or phone. Ms. Gerard updated she would not be able to attend the meeting on February 19 due to having a medical procedure. Lastly, she shared appreciation for all of the evening’s reports.

**Mr. Hsiao**  
Mr. Hsiao thanked Ms. Gerard for signing up for the SMCSBA Dinner Meeting on February 24, adding he, along with Deputy Superintendent Littrell and Coordinator Yung are developing an MTSS program for the event. He said Daina Lujan and Shauna Kamashima are attending, and he encouraged all of his colleagues to join to learn different perspectives of how MTSS is getting implemented.

**Mr. Cannon**  
Mr. Cannon shared he was delighted to see Mr. Ross advocating for SMCOE and thanked him for taking on this issue. He stated he enjoyed working with Ms. Alvaro, Superintendent Magee, and Deputy Superintendent Porterfield on Outdoor Education plans, which are coming along nicely. Mr. Cannon shared his optimism for how it will all work out. He shared looking forward to attending the 17th District PTA luncheon and Mr. Scannell’s retirement celebration the following week. Lastly, he thanked Mr. Hsiao for providing information on the SMCSBA event.

**Ms. Alvaro**  
Ms. Alvaro shared thanks for the resolution on School Breakfast Week and asked for increased public relations on the important issue, as many districts, including Cabrillo Unified School District (CUSD), are considering eliminating their school breakfast programs. She explained that CUSD Superintendent McPhetridge has already heard from a number of people why the program was started and why they don’t want it to go away. Ms. Alvaro thanked Mr. Scannell for his almost 50 years of service although she is unable to attend his retirement celebration. Lastly, she shared attending a Coastside Education Committee meeting the previous day, and speaking to Leticia Bhatia, Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction, who was working with SMCOE’s Coordinator Holdt on integrating arts curriculum into CUSD’s curriculum.

**Mr. Ross**  
Mr. Ross discussed attending the impeachment town hall with the South San Francisco school districts, Congresswoman Speier, a Stanford law school professor, and students. He shared his enjoyment of the community convening at a school. Mr. Ross shared he has been doing a lot of work travel and unfortunately will miss the upcoming Equity Network events on February 7 and 8, but will make his best effort to attend the SMCSBA Dinner Meeting on February 24. He asked Ms. Perna to sign him up for the February 24 SMCSBA Dinner Meeting and 2020 Progress Seminar, and said he would follow
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up if he could attend Legislative Action Day on March 17, to potentially meet other counties and Superintendents willing to discuss the excess property tax issue and possibly get CCBE to sign a letter of support.

Lastly, he described being at a high school the previous Monday in Council Bluffs, Iowa, where three precincts convened to engage in democracy. Mr. Ross shared he was struck that another way to use a school was for three hours of community members talking to each other about candidates, learning about the campaign from each other, changing their minds, and doing all respectfully. He shared the event occurred at a beautiful high school with a wonderful facility and Iowa is clearly investing in education in a way in which California could take note. Mr. Ross stated he could not attend the 17th District PTA Luncheon, but some people in his network who saw the article on excess property tax had shared it with their local PTAs, which caused an email frenzy back and forth. He didn’t know when it could be leveraged, but he feels this is an opportunity to get additional signatures on the letter. He asked Ms. Gerard and Mr. Cannon to spread the word and determine with whom they could follow up.

Mr. Lempert
Mr. Lempert shared regrets that he cannot attend the celebration event for Mr. Scannell nor the meeting on February 19.

Board President Camacho
Board President Camacho said he would discuss the possibility of rescheduling the February 19 retreat with Superintendent Magee.

12. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:18 p.m in honor of Harry Redlick.

Nancy Magee, Secretary
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