APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE SAN MATEO COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Meeting Date: March 17, 2021
Meeting Location: Held Remotely
Board Members Present: Susan Alvaro, Chelsea Bonini, Hector Camacho, Jr., Jim Cannon, Beverly Gerard, Ted Lempert, Joe Ross (arrived at 6:13 p.m.)
Staff Officials Present: Nancy Magee, Secretary
Jennifer Perna, Executive Assistant
Other Staff Present: Niambi Clay, Claire Cunningham, Jennifer Frentress, Jeneé Littrell, Patricia Love, Lori Musso, Anjanette Pelletier, Denise Porterfield
Youth Commissioner Liaison Present: Allyson Chan (exited meeting at 8:00 p.m.)

1. OPENING ITEMS
   
   A. Call to Order

   Board President Hector Camacho, Jr. called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. He announced the County Board was conducting the meeting as a webinar in light of the current health emergency and the Governor’s March 17, 2020, Executive Order N-29-20 suspending certain provisions of the Brown Act to allow governing boards to conduct meetings through remote access. Board President Camacho also noted in the effort to increase accessibility and opportunity for community engagement, simultaneous interpretation of the meeting was being provided in Spanish using Zoom technology through the end of Public Comment, and would continue further into the meeting if people were utilizing the channel.

   B. Approval of Agenda

   After a motion by Ms. Gerard and a second by Ms. Alvaro, the Board approved, by a vote of six in favor (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, and Lempert), and one absent (Ross), by roll call vote, the March 17, 2021, agenda as presented.
2. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Superintendent Magee noted the following public comments were received by email:

- Katie Gardner, parent in the Menlo Park City School District, requested that physical distancing requirements for COVID-19 safety be changed from 6 feet to 3-4 feet
- Chelsea Friedenbach, public school educator and parent in San Carlos, commented on physical distancing in schools and the recent ruling in San Diego questioning the role of the state in reopening schools in terms of public health

The following speakers provided live public comment:

- Janice Pellizzari, SMCOE teacher and San Mateo County Educators Association (SMCEA) President, updated that teachers are working hard to serve and educate students and asked that the community have empathy for their efforts
- Rena Korb, parent in the San Mateo-Foster City School District, spoke of schools being in crisis and asked the Board to help bring parties together and problem solve the issue of getting students back to school
- Kalagee Shah, parent in the San Mateo-Foster City School District, urged the Board to help get students back in school. She offered to help participate in that process
- Katie Gardner, parent in the Menlo Park City School District, discussed parent and district confusion over who has the authority to make decisions, guidelines, and recommendations, and asked that roles be clarified and communicated to the community

Superintendent Magee stated the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) has issued industry guidance for schools and the local county health department has local authority. SMCOE works closely with both entities to synthesize, distribute, teach, and support the safety guidelines for schools. She noted the guidance will continue to be updated and aligned as the public health authorities continue to study the data and reflect new learning.

Board President Camacho thanked Superintendent Magee and clarified that the County Board has distinct roles and responsibilities, which are outlined on the website. Board President Camacho thanked the members of the public for being present.

3. **EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH**

   A. **March 2021 Employee of the Month, Eugenie Obina, Student Services Specialist, Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA)**

Board President Camacho recognized the March 2021 Employee of the Month, Eugenie Obina, Student Services Specialist, Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA). Board President Camacho congratulated Ms. Obina on behalf of the Board and explained she would receive the award check and commemorative token soon.
4. **INTRODUCTION OF NEW STAFF**

A. **Susan Jeong, Coordinator, Early Learning Quality and Inclusion, Early Learning Support Services, Educational Services Division**

Alyson Suzuki, Executive Director, Early Learning Support Services, introduced Susan Jeong, Coordinator, Early Learning Quality and Inclusion, Early Learning Support Services, Educational Services Division. Executive Director Suzuki described how Coordinator Jeong has more than 20 years of experience supporting children and families and will lead SMCOE’s inclusion initiative, partnering with school districts and community-based organizations to provide quality supports to children with special needs and disabilities.

Coordinator Jeong shared she believes SMCOE has the “magic sauce” with a Superintendent who cares deeply about early education and a department and staff focused on relevant programming led by an experienced, proven leader, backdropped by a countywide commitment to early education. She highlighted Mr. Lempert’s role in supporting early childhood education. Coordinator Jeong discussed her previous work with the Contra Costa County Office of Education, where she held a dual role in supporting the local planning council and leading the Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS) initiative, workforce development, and inclusion efforts. Coordinator Jeong stated she is excited about her new role and looks forward to doing great work.

5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. **March 3, 2021, Regular Board Meeting**

After a motion by Mr. Cannon and a second by Ms. Gerard, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross), by roll call vote, approved the Minutes of the March 3, 2021, Regular Board Meeting as presented.

6. **CONSENT AGENDA**

B. **Receive Staffing Reports**

C. **Adopt Joint Resolution No. 21-12 Recognizing April 2021 as Public Schools Month**

D. **Adopt Joint Resolution No. 21-13 Recognizing April 2021 as Autism Acceptance Month**

E. **Adopt Joint Resolution No. 21-14 Condemning Hate and Violent Acts Against the Asian American Community**

After a motion by Ms. Gerard and a second by Mr. Lempert, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross), by roll call vote, approved the Consent Agenda.
7. BUSINESS SERVICES DIVISION


Denise Porterfield, Deputy Superintendent, Business Services Division, began by informing that Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) are required to provide three reports for approval prior to the close of a fiscal year – the budget adoption, the First Interim Report, and the Second Interim Report. The First Interim Report and the Second Interim Report are snapshots in time, intended to inform the Board and stakeholders of the fiscal health of the County Office of Education. The certification of the report further informs whether the agency needs intervention from the California Department of Education or the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team.

Deputy Superintendent Porterfield explained that at each reporting period, Internal Business Services reviews funding and adjusts the budget to reflect the most current information. Budgets are built on assumptions, average daily attendance (ADA) estimations, prior year funding, and known carryover of unspent funds. These assumptions are adjusted when apportionments are received, property tax reports are filed, and grant award letters are received.

Since the First Interim Report, revenues have increased by $7.8 million, with $3.5 million of revenue from property tax increases in the unrestricted general fund. These funds also turn to expenditures when they are paid back out as excess property taxes. The remaining $4.2 million are Restricted Resources, with $1.5 million from an increase in Special Education low incidence funding and $2.3 million a result of receiving the Strong Work Grant after the First Interim Report.

Deputy Superintendent Porterfield discussed in more detail how expenditures increased in relation to the revenue increases. The Special Education funding, Strong Work Grant, and excess property taxes are all pass-through funds and are classified as expenses. Contributions are transfers of funds from the unrestricted funds to support restricted funding programs or are transferred from one unrestricted funding source to another. Contributions are intentional and ensure the resources, both restricted and unrestricted, are used to meet the needs of students and districts as part of SMCOE’s Strategic Plan.

Deputy Superintendent Porterfield explained SMCOE continues to reserve 7% as Designated for Economic Uncertainties that must be reserved for their specific purposes. The Multi-Year Projection (MYP) is required to inform the Board and stakeholders of SMCOE’s ability to meet its obligation for the current and two subsequent fiscal years. She stated SMCOE is in good financial standing and has planned for this time when it would need its reserves to support students and districts. Staff is actively reviewing SMCOE’s 2021 budget, Strategic Plan, and the needs of today’s students to ensure it remains solvent now and in the future.

Deputy Superintendent Porterfield noted when she came to SMCOE in 2010, the budget was relatively simple. The majority of the funding was Revenue Limit, SMCOE received a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA), and increased annually. Rarely did the First and Second Interim Reports have adjustments. Since the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) has been in place, SMCOE has been flat-funded. Now with the pandemic, educational instruction and work delivery is changing, and the supports needed must also change.
With all of this information serving as background context, Deputy Superintendent Porterfield said she is pleased to report that all SMCOE funds are positive, and she respectfully requests that the Board approve the Second Interim Report with Positive Certification.

Ms. Alvaro referred to SMCOE’s allocation of money to the YMCA based on the 25-year agreement for deferred maintenance and asked where she would find that in the budget. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield replied those funds would be in Fund 40, Capital Improvements. Ms. Alvaro asked about what else would be in Fund 40 and whether it would include work being done at the early childhood sites. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield responded this was correct. This is where savings are placed for those improvements, and they will be transferred out of Fund 40 and into Fund 01 when they are expended.

Ms. Alvaro also referred to the $1,142,000 contribution to the court programs, specifically Hillcrest, and indicated there are fewer than 20 students. She recalled decisions being made when there were many more students in the court programs not covered by state funding and asked about the current status of the funding. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield discussed the declining enrollment and explained that when enrollment drops, ADA is reduced. She emphasized that although the program enrollment has declined significantly year after year, SMCOE is still required to provide the education.

Mr. Cannon indicated that Ms. Alvaro’s question related to one of the topics at the budget subcommittee meeting. He noted that Superintendent Magee and Deputy Superintendent Porterfield are focused on cutting costs for next year and on what SMCOE can afford to do with the program despite declining enrollment.

Superintendent Magee reminded the Board that staff has not yet received notification about the Community School Grant and that in the event SMCOE does not end up receiving those funds, site leaders are planning for a workforce reduction in those programs.

Ms. Bonini asked if the funds for “Admin and Beginning Teacher Services” refer to the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) training and credential clearing program. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield responded this was correct. These funds refer to the administrative credentialing programs and meet the strategic goal of providing training to ensure the county has the highest trained teachers and administrators. Ms. Bonini asked if any part of this is a requirement/mandate by the state or if it is being done by SMCOE choice. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield responded this is not a mandate but is part of SMCOE’s strategic priorities.

Ms. Bonini remarked that the funds for “Safe and Supportive Schools” reference Measure A, and asked if Measure A was from the county or was affiliated with SMCOE. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield confirmed that was the county’s Measure A. Ms. Bonini asked if Safe and Supportive Schools and Measure A pair together. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield confirmed this as correct.

After a motion by Ms. Alvaro and a second by Mr. Cannon, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross), by roll call vote, approved with Positive Certification the 2020-2021 Second Interim Financial Report.
8. EDUCATIONAL SERVICES DIVISION

A. Receive Update on Assembly Bill (AB) 86: COVID-19 Relief and School Reopening and Accountability Actions for 2021

Jeneé Littrell, Deputy Superintendent, Educational Services Division, introduced Joy Dardenelle, Executive Director, District Improvement and Support, Jared Prolo, Executive Director, Curriculum and Instruction Services, and Wendy Richard, Executive Director, District Business Services, to present an update on Assembly Bill (AB) 86: COVID-19 Relief and School Reopening and Accountability Actions for 2021.

Executive Director Dardenelle began by providing an overview of AB 86. She covered highlights of the legislation and discussed instructional support grants, the definitions of in-person instruction, and prioritized pupil groups. Executive Director Richard outlined the financial and budgeting aspects of AB 86 and highlighted reporting requirements, the purpose of in-person instruction funds, and the expanded learning opportunities grant. Executive Director Prolo ended by describing SMCOE’s role in assisting districts in the implementation of AB 86. He discussed SMCOE’s goals of fulfilling its statutory responsibility, and ensuring partner districts meet deadlines and requirements.

Ms. Alvaro asked Executive Director Dardenelle how the determination of “students below grade level” in the target population was made. Executive Director Dardenelle responded there are laws that help guide these determinations. For example, district teams are referred back to their Learning Continuity and Attendance Plan when addressing disengaged students. When talking about students at risk for neglect or abuse, teams are instructed to determine whether the student has a written referral. However, there are other situations where the law is not spelled out. She explained “below grade level” in this particular case is not spelled out, partly because there have been so many changes to assessments and as a result, determinations are made at the local level. Ms. Alvaro described how students have been out of school for a long time and although they have been doing their work online, she wondered how teachers can determine if a particular student is functioning below grade level at this time.

Executive Director Prolo interjected he has been working with assessment and curriculum leaders around these issues and the reality is that it is difficult to know right now. However, there is a push to 1) look at priority standards and identify the key pieces of knowledge students need, especially in connections across grade levels to bridge and catch students above and below, and 2) build instructional tasks and opportunities for learning around key bridge priority standards. This requires formative assessments to be done in classrooms, and is one of the reasons the extended learning grant has set aside funds for teacher training and professional development. Executive Director Prolo indicated the goal is not to pick out and identify a student below grade level, but rather to develop the structures to support all students, especially those not yet at grade level and to accelerate learning.

Ms. Alvaro remarked this is tough to wrap her head around. She knows what teachers do in the classroom in terms of formative assessments, but since they are not in the classroom she cannot understand how they are expected to determine who is functioning below grade level and who is doing fine. Ms. Alvaro stated she is glad the team is working on this.
Ms. Alvaro asked if the “students below grade level” priority is across all grade levels because the return to in-person learning is about bringing students back first at the elementary level, then middle school, then high school. Ms. Alvaro asked where high schools students who may be functioning well below grade level fit into this picture. Executive Director Dardenelle responded that the in-person learning grant prioritizes all students in all grade levels who are designated, plus priority pupils, which does not include students below grade level. On the other hand, the expanded learning grant targets students who are determined to be below grade level as well as students who have not entered kindergarten, and students at risk for not graduating.

Ms. Alvaro referred to discussions of extended school years and/or summer school to help bring students back to grade level. She asked if this factors into the grants, or if it is an entirely different discussion. Executive Director Dardenelle confirmed it is factored into both grants. The SMCOE team is aware that districts are working on various approaches to provide support for students during the summer.

Mr. Ross expressed frustration, not at the team itself, but about the confusion over the current situation. Mr. Ross went on to say that the in-person definition provided for eligibility for funds as requiring in-person learning between middle school and high school level with only one grade level needing to be in person. He noted how this is limiting. He asked if that definition refers to right now or for the fall. Executive Director Dardenelle confirmed that definition for the in-person learning grant is for the 2020-2021 school year.

Mr. Ross referred to the learning recovery plan, which he believes has to do with the fall and beyond, and asked if that will be part of the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) process. He also asked if SMCOE will review those plans in the same way they review LCAPs or whether they are separate plans. Executive Director Dardenelle stated the learning recovery plan is separate from LCAP and is due on June 1.

Executive Director Prolo noted SMCOE’s only requirement with the learning recovery plans is to collect them. Mr. Ross summarized that SMCOE collects them but unlike the LCAP, they are not reviewed by staff. Executive Director Dardenelle affirmed this is true.

Mr. Ross stated he is proud to be part of an organization providing this support to districts. Although the Board role is limited by statute around certain specific functions, they do ratify and approve a budget which supports work directly related to district success. He expressed appreciation for what the team is doing.

Mr. Ross asked to what degree does SMCOE also have the capacity to support parents from districts in increasing their understanding about what is going on and to better support districts in communicating to families. Mr. Ross asked if there is anything SMCOE can do to make the situation clearer and lessen the confusion. Executive Director Prolo replied his team started with the district leaders less than a week after the law was signed and can further work with the Superintendent and Communications team to determine where to boost the signal about what is occurring.
Mr. Ross offered that the Board can take action because of their advocacy role and assist with communication. For example, there is an expectation that school may be back to “normal” operations in the fall, but nobody is saying this because the state and county health officials are not saying so yet. Mr. Ross described how anxiety is taking up a lot of energy, and the Board may want to consider doing something.

Ms. Bonini referred to the support being offered to districts to ensure they receive their funds. She discussed how the districts can opt in or not opt in for support, and asked if there are communications to all or just some districts. Executive Director Prolo replied that the team follows up individually with the districts who are unable to attend meetings, especially with something as critical as this. His team requests that the districts check in, and although there are limits to how far they can push, the SMCOE team does keep track and follow up.

Ms. Bonini referred to the reference to “fewer than five days per week only if the LEA offers in-person instruction to the greatest extent possible,” as troubling language which can be interpreted widely. She asked if there was any legislative intent or discussion around expecting five days and about how this is being interpreted. Executive Director Dardenelle indicated the reference to the “greatest extent possible” refers to the amount of time and does not mean “who.” It will include all grade levels, prioritized student groups, and students with exceptional needs and is not covered with the “greatest extent possible.”

Ms. Bonini also spoke of references to “students with exceptional needs” and “students with disabilities” and asked 1) whether these are the same students even though they are stated in different ways, and 2) are students with disabilities being referred to widely, as covered under Section 504, or being defined as students with individualized education plans (IEPs) currently in place. Executive Director Prolo clarified that from the law, “students with exceptional needs” are defined as students with IEPs specifically. The place where the language “students with disabilities” makes an appearance is in the suggested priority in the extended learning grant. “Students with exceptional needs” are strictly defined as students with IEPs and that is one of the student groups defined under the in-person learning grant.

Ms. Bonini referred to counting school days and the ticking away of the 1% of funds. She shared concerns about districts delaying their openings. She indicated the San Mateo-Foster City School District has two weeks of extended spring break, which places them back in school on April 12, but they don’t intend to begin school until one week after that due to travel and health concerns. Ms. Bonini shared fears that this reasonable precaution of a five day delay, which has been expected after other breaks, will cause the district to lose 5% of its funding, because spring break days don’t count. She asked if it was accurate that spring break days don’t count but those additional five days do count, and if so, how that message might be communicated. Executive Director Richard replied that the school districts have Board-approved calendars in place and as long as the spring break was included in the approved calendar, schools will not be subject to the 1% reduction for those days. There is no penalty for spring break days already on calendars as of March 1 of this year. Ms. Bonini reiterated concerns about the one week delay resuming school after spring break until April 19 and asked again if these schools would lose 5% of the funding. Executive Director Richard
clarified if these are not dedicated days on the calendar, Ms. Bonini was correct that they would lose 5% of their funding.

Executive Director Richard noted it is the intent of the legislature that the LEAs offer in-person instruction to the greatest extent possible during the 2020-2021 school year, starting in the 2020-2021 school year, and continuing into the 2022-2023 school year. She summarized that starting in 2020-2021 and continuing forward, schools are expanding their in-person instructional time.

Mr. Lempert asked to look at the bigger picture given the pressure and comments being received from constituents. He described how San Mateo County will be in the headlines with more individuals returning to the office, restaurants, and bowling alleys, and everyone will feel increased pressure. Mr. Lempert asked for confirmation that this legislation is an incentive to get schools open. He commented that SMCOE, along with some districts in the county, around the state, and around the country, have been serving students in person without this legislation, and he wanted confirmation that this is not a directive of how to reopen schools, but rather an incentive based on the pressure to open schools. One of the issues has been money, so more money is being provided under conditions. Executive Director Prolo responded that some districts have been able to open without this legislation. Mr. Lempert asked if this included SMCOE, which has been serving students. Executive Director Prolo confirmed this was accurate. Mr. Lempert asked everyone to consider that this legislation came from intense pressure about why some districts are opening, so why not all districts.

Mr. Lempert discussed how SMCOE has been serving students with special needs through in-person learning. He described hearing from districts that reopening must be done safely but they don’t have funding. He is interested in hearing how districts are responding to this legislation. He asked if they now feel like they have the money or if they are asking for more money. Mr. Lempert indicated he is trying to understand how to respond to constituents. Some schools and districts are open, but it is a documented fact that California is behind other states.

Executive Director Prolo responded that these are early days, as this legislation was introduced to districts for the first time in a detailed sense only one week ago. There is not yet a perfect landscape of what districts are saying but he is hearing that this legislation does remove some barriers. One of the things the districts have done well is to open with their plans, down to complex details such as changing middle school master schedules. If a district added an extra $200 to teacher salary, which previously other districts could not replicate, now they can. He shared although there is some incumbrance involved to ensure districts are meeting requirements along the way, he is hearing that the legislation is helping collaborative work happen between districts.

Executive Director Dardenelle added the American Rescue Plan federal money has not yet even been discussed. She added that schools are not being opened as they were two years ago, they are opening with some students still at home by choice and some students in the classroom, with the same amount of personnel. Districts are sharing that these logistics are challenging and hiring additional staff is difficult when all districts are hiring for the exact same positions. Executive Director Dardenelle expressed gratitude for the money becoming available, and explained how districts are tackling the challenges of hybrid and distance learning and hiring staff.
EDUCATIONAL SERVICES DIVISION (continued)

Mr. Lempert asked for a few examples of how hybrid learning is working. Executive Director Dardenelle provided three examples, the first being an AB schedule with high school or middle school students coming in and going to all classes in person while the other 2-3 days of the week are asynchronous, or synchronous through Zoom. Another model at the elementary level may have students coming in on a morning schedule with a new shift coming in later for the afternoon schedule, with the student group at home doing asynchronous work. A third model combines the above models, with all students in school, but spread out and Zooming from the school site with their teacher in the room, to ensure they are inclusive of the students choosing not to come to school.

Executive Director Prolo discussed an increase in flexible time, office hours, and tutorial support during the day, all tools being used to make master schedules work. Executive Director Dardenelle explained districts are navigating forward based on feedback from stakeholders and realize what other districts are doing may not work with their own stakeholder groups. This is part of the networking being done with district leaders to share ideas.

Ms. Gerard shared she is hearing from parents that they don’t know what their districts are doing, and while there may be networking and communication between districts, she asked about communication between districts and parents, which appears to be a huge concern. Executive Director Dardenelle noted that many SMCOE staff members are parents and family members of students in the county, so she hears a lot of perspectives. She said districts are communicating with families in very localized ways including by texting or email systems.

Districts are still solving for how to reach out to families without access to internet or who cannot come into meetings. Executive Director Dardenelle emphasized that communication is an area in which all organizations can improve and districts leaders are working on this challenge. This level of support and funding to districts is happening so fast that districts leaders just learned from SMCOE the previous Friday about the legislation that was approved into law a week and a half ago.

Ms. Gerard referred to the prioritized pupil groups and asked how districts are identifying those students and moving forward serving them. Executive Director Dardenelle explained that the identification of prioritized pupil groups is stated in law and some have already been identified within student information systems, such as students experiencing homelessness, foster youth, English Language Learners. The category of “students without access to a computing device, software, and high-speed internet” is not clearly defined in the law as to how to identify these students, but many would fall into the category of “disengaged students” because they don’t have access to learning.

Districts must write engagement logs to track whether students are attending, so these are new ways of assessing student engagement that didn’t exist a year ago. When students don’t come to school, are not engaged, do not attend their classes, do not appear on screen, or do not complete their work on asynchronous days, teachers must track this data and these students are flagged. Executive Director Dardenelle indicated in terms of serving these students, for the in-person instruction grant, they will be included in whatever the in-person instruction implementation rollout looks like. She added there will be a lot of innovation, given how much funding is available to provide support for those targeted student groups.
EDUCATIONAL SERVICES DIVISION (continued)

Ms. Gerard asked if the deadline for plans currently being worked on was April 1 or further down the road. Executive Director Dardenelle responded the expanded learning and interventions plan is due June 1 and will be approved by district Boards. The template draft will be released on Friday. Districts will explain how they will be serving students with these funds. Executive Director Prolo added the in-person certification is due June 1, but it is not a plan, it is just a certification that what the LEA is doing is what they said they would do, in regards to the in-person grant.

Mr. Ross asked in the team’s normal work advising on LCAP plans and district reopening plans, whether there is a place in those documents for districts to plan for the scenario where all students are given the opportunity to be back in school in the fall of 2021, and to address the resourcing and considerations. Also, is there going to be or could there be language addressing that in the LCAPs? Executive Director Dardenelle responded that the approval process for the LCAP requires that districts have sufficient funds and use the template, and the team is checking for this. Districts must also meet their increased and improved services.

The team reported that districts are frantically trying to open schools and would likely be happy to put off writing their LCAPs until the schools are completely open. She stated this is what the California Department of Education (CDE) was trying to do when creating the Learning Continuity and Attendance Plan last year, which took focus away from the LCAP and onto plans to get students back to school. Executive Director Dardenelle shared that right now districts want to bring students back to campus and have additional funding, and so they are working through the logistics. As they are developing LCAP plans, they are also using available funds for next year.

Mr. Ross discussed how although Board members do not make decisions, they can state their position on the issues. Because they are not involved in this day-to-day, it is easier to state their position in their advocacy role. Mr. Ross emphasized that in his opinion, this moment is the biggest crisis of the Board’s tenure to date. Mr. Ross indicated the Board could decide to say that they have the expectation that all will be fully back to school in the fall of 2021, and schools will maximize efforts to open right now using funding to serve students who wish to be in person right now. He expressed that if the Board, as countywide elected school officials, said this, it might help provide leadership, action, and comfort, and be used as a reference to those trying to ground themselves in the confusion. Mr. Ross thanked the team for providing context around what they are doing, which crystallized the need for the Board to decide whether they will speak out about what they believe should happen.

Ms. Bonini referred to the slide indicating that less than 50% of the schools will be open, and wondered if that translated to districts or total number of schools. She expressed concern that there will be some districts that don’t have the opportunity to have these funds, which likely will be the districts that already didn’t have resources, community will, or the comfort of lower infection rates. Ms. Bonini discussed these equity concerns and stated there are schools and districts not planning on opening until the yellow tier. She said unless these schools get everything in place quickly, these schools may not open by April 1. Ms. Bonini expressed appreciation to the state for their incentive plans for opening, but again expressed concern about gaps for schools who may not get the money, which causes additional problems. She asked if her concern was fair. Executive Director Dardenelle assured that everyone is invested in getting schools open and this money will
help make that happen. One component of the money, the $2 billion, has a lot of strings attached, so schools who can’t open to meet the definition of “open” may receive no funds. However, for the other component, the $4.6 billion, as long as schools create their plans by June 1 and meet other goals, they will have access to the money. She described this as a “writing a plan” hoop which does not require that schools open by May 15.

Ms. Bonini noted when conversations are held with districts who may be unable to jump through the bureaucratic hoops with the possibility that funds won’t be received, it would be good information for their Board members to have because they are the ones giving the direction.

Mr. Cannon thanked the team for their work. He stated he shares the concerns of his colleagues and agreed with Mr. Ross that this is the Board’s biggest challenge to date. Mr. Cannon discussed the tragic loss of learning and how to make it up. He thanked Executive Director Dardenelle and her team for hanging in there. Mr. Cannon expressed identifying as a teacher, former administrator, and parent, and stated he can’t imagine what individuals are going through. He shared the optimism at receiving the federal money, which he described as a “nice problem.” Mr. Cannon added that as a school administrator, he always made a point to spend all funds available and to spend them wisely.

Board President Camacho asked if the reporting standards for these plans include an analysis of who is coming back. Executive Director Dardenelle responded the team has not yet attended meetings with the CDE and the template is not out, but they are focused on getting information out to the districts as quickly as possible.

Executive Director Prolo noted that CDE is requiring that districts and schools directly report their in-person attendance data by the second and fourth Monday of each month for districts and school sites. Superintendent Magee added that this information is being displayed on the Safe Schools For All Hub as a dashboard. Board President Camacho doesn’t want to lose sight of the goal not just to open physical campuses, but to close gaps. If the focus is just to get students on campus, he wants to know who is on campus. He feels it will reveal the gap as to which students are receiving instruction in-person. He hopes the SMCOE team will have the opportunity to provide feedback to CDE and add this aspect as an important reporting requirement. If it doesn’t end up on the template, he hopes that it can be done on the local level for our districts, in order to speak openly about what is happening over the next three months. Board President Camacho emphasized that for these critical dollars, we should be able to speak intelligently about where they went and how they impacted the gap.

Executive Director Prolo said the list of specific reporting requirements has expanded and includes the number of pupils in specific learning contexts at each site. Board President Camacho indicated this is helpful information. He thanked the team for answering the Board’s many questions, for approaching the issues with professionalism and deep knowledge, and for their continued advocacy.
9. **OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT**


Superintendent Magee introduced Dr. Mallory Dwinal, Co-Founder and Former CEO, ODA, Dr. Irene St. Roseman, Co-Founder/Head of School, ODA, and Latrice Bennett, Director of Academics, Equity, and Compliance, ODA, to provide ODA’s annual report. They highlighted the past, present, and future of ODA, discussing the following topics in detail:

- Artifacts and slides to reflect on past ODA presentations
- Accomplishments in the areas of international student travel, A-G course approval, enrollment in A-G courses, and Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation
- English Language Development (ELD) – English Learning Intensive Program, Academic Literacy, and Immersion
- English Language Development (ELD) – challenge, strategy, pilot, outcome
- Data on student demographics – on track to graduate, post-secondary options, first generation college bound, newcomers
- Succession plan – reflecting on lessons learned, developing staff, succession with intent, leadership team, developing the new Head of School
- From striving to thriving – where ODA is heading
- Three main focus areas for 2021-2022:
  - Full implementation of instructional model for 9th through 12th grade
  - Talent management/recruitment
  - Codifying commit to equity: standards-based grading
- Learnings and Recommendations – politics, biases, inclusion, collaborative learning, authentic discussion

Ms. Alvaro thanked the ODA team for an exciting and uplifting presentation, commenting that their past and future successes make the Board feel good. She described how the Board went out on a limb to approve ODA, but at the time it felt like the right thing to do, and feels even more so now. Ms. Alvaro shared she will miss working directly with Dr. Dwinal and Dr. St. Roseman, but she is excited to work with Ms. Bennett. She noted that Ms. Bennett is a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) graduate, which makes her proud, and informed Ms. Bennett she could always reach out to the Board for questions or advice.

Mr. Lempert thanked the ODA team for their excellent report and hard work. He discussed how one of the positives of charter schools is to support all schools and referred to a previous report by Summit on what they were doing from which all schools could learn. Mr. Lempert spoke of the flexibility of charter schools and using that flexibility to pave the way for all schools. Rather than asking ODA to answer broadly, which he indicated he would love to hear in their next report, he asked the ODA team how schools in San Mateo County can improve based on what ODA is doing. Mr. Lemperlt asked them to focus on the pandemic and report how they are doing so well during the pandemic, which is not happening in all traditional schools.

Dr. St. Roseman credited Superintendent Magee for providing workshops and support during the pandemic, which ODA teachers have been attending. The teachers report they are ahead of what others are doing because their model was already set up to help students work independently, and they are a small school. Also, they are reflective practitioners striving to strengthen how they work
with their students. They constantly receive feedback from parents and students, and make adjustments, and never compromise on rigor. Additionally, with the pandemic, the only difference with the curricular program was students were not at school; students continued to meet for 90-minute classes with their teachers, just online. ODA continued to provide support services such as social-emotional learning and adolescent counseling services and to meet with parents on a monthly basis. They maintained routines with the exception of physical education (PE). Dr. St. Roseman indicated if ODA could start partnering with schools, both sides could share learnings.

Ms. Bennett added that ODA works hard to maintain a strong school culture. Parents reached out to share what was working and what wasn’t, and student cohorts met weekly to report back to administration, who were responsive. She emphasized flexibility, being receptive, and moving forward until things worked, which happened rather quickly and felt seamless.

Dr. Dwinal indicated from the beginning, there was talk of scaling the model by having classes on Google Hangouts or Zoom and remote learning with teachers across the country. Some critiqued this idea and felt that learning doesn’t happen well online. ODA’s thesis was that lectures may not transfer well, but tutorials do and Google Hangouts and Zoom were made for discussion. There is no reason that an instructional model built around small group inquiry and discussion can’t be done online. She explained ODA was not planning for a pandemic, but rather was considering teacher shortages. But they are seeing that using the tutorial method and discussion-based learning has helped partner schools close the gap around learning loss because there is a transferability of learning into the Zoom platform with tutorials.

Mr. Ross thanked Dr. St. Roseman for her inspiring presentation. He commented on Ms. Bennett’s confidence, leadership presence, and detail orientation around teaching, learning, and planning, and shared his excitement for her involvement in the next chapter. Mr. Ross agreed with Dr. Dwinal’s insights into the tutorial method and inquiry-based approach, which really does work well online. He asked what it actually looks like to hold a class with less direct teaching and more student-led discussion and learning. He described how student-centered learning is not new to educators, but the way it is done by ODA in the context of the Harkness table tutorial is special. He has seen it done in person and online and suggested it would be helpful to demonstrate the method to other schools in the county.

Summit had offered to do some professional development about their practices, and Mr. Ross suggested ODA might consider doing the same. He is intrigued by the online success ODA has experienced and asked on what scale they may be continuing the practice. Mr. Ross discussed how districts are experiencing challenges in planning for both online and in-person studies, and there is an open question about how this will work. If ODA has an online program for students in the county it may be helpful for districts trying to address different student needs. There are interesting K-8 models already happening in other districts, but at the high school level, this is a potential opportunity for ODA to play a countywide role in the back-to-school model.

Dr. Dwinal indicated Ms. Bennett would be the one to offer this assistance. She explained that ODA is the only county charter, and discussed options in the case that some students do not want to go back to school. Dr. Dwinal described how ODA is already offering that programming and could be an
option available for districts who cannot field full-time online programming in addition to their other content.

Dr. St. Roseman shared that “resistant learner” students who struggled in school have found tremendous success online. A recent parent and student survey indicated that students who had struggled academically feel positive about the online model.

Ms. Bennett stated if there are enough students who would like to participate in ODA’s online platform, it may be possible to expand their bandwidth. They would need to discuss numbers because an increased budget would be required to hire additional teachers for in-person and online learning, but it could definitely be handled.

Mr. Cannon agreed with the comments of Ms. Alvaro, Mr. Lempert, and Mr. Ross. He shared great respect for the work and amazing leadership of Dr. Dwinal and Dr. St. Roseman to overcome so many obstacles. Mr. Cannon noted Dr. Dwinal was the person out in front and bore a great deal of responsibility. Mr. Cannon stated he felt encouraged meeting Ms. Bennett and hearing the confidence others have in her.

Board President Camacho remarked on the thought partnership between the Board and ODA, which he appreciates. He discussed reading about the Mastery Transcript Consortium and asked if ODA has had conversations with them about how they are adopting standards-based transcripts with no letters or numbers, but just narratives. This consortium has made tremendous progress with colleges on how the colleges will receive transcripts. This is an equity-based issue that expands, as opposed to limits, access.

Board President Camacho noted he has dabbled as a practitioner in teaching a blended-learning class with a tutorial as part of the curriculum. The way the students took to this light version was phenomenal. He feels the tools are there, but the need is for teachers who are excited about trying a new model. Board President Camacho indicated that finding funding for a class that only runs 12 students is also an issue.

Board President Camacho referred to previous discussions about who is showing up to online programs and in-person instruction and indicated he never had that problem with ODA. They worked so hard on the critical component of creating community and when there is trust within the community, students show up. Traditional public schools can struggle with building community, which is built through important relationships and embedded social-emotional learning skills. The concerns he has in the big systems disappear in the smaller systems. All systems have their challenges, but the community component is so critical. ODA is aware of this and handles it well.

Board President Camacho had the opportunity to share space with Leymah Gbowee, a Nobel Peace Laureate from Liberia, and one of the projects she is working on is expanding teacher training. He shared that he is now aware of this great program that is also looking to expand their international presence around remote training of teachers. He asked if someone from ODA could contact him to make that connection. Board President Camacho thanked the ODA team for their tremendous work and stated their success, including a commitment to new arrival English Learners, is phenomenal. Although there is more work to be done, they can pivot and keep a student-centered focus.
Dr. St. Roseman mentioned that ODA’s graduation date is June 4, and Board President Camacho asked that a reminder be sent to the Board. Dr. St. Roseman indicated she would be in touch with Superintendent Magee on the proper protocol for attending. She expressed appreciation for the Board’s support over the years and discussed learning and growing through pain, and her continued focus to always do better and experience greater success.

B. Superintendent’s Comments

Superintendent Magee began by congratulating the ODA team and noted how each leader is on a unique and exciting new journey of leadership. Dr. Dwinal will be leading the Oxford Teachers Academy, Dr. St. Roseman will be heading to the University of Oxford to lead global efforts, and Ms. Bennett will move into her leadership role at ODA.

Superintendent Magee related that ODA has begun the process to join the San Mateo County Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA). The ODA team has been working with Associate Superintendent Pelletier on the two-year process. SMCOE is happy to that ODA will be able to take advantage of the support and resources from our local SELPA. Superintendent Magee thanked the SMCOE support team for all their work with the ODA team. Since the renewal, stronger data sets and structure have been developed in partnership with Sequoia Union High School District, and the teams are able to consider more targeted and meaningful sets of data on an ongoing basis. She thanked Jennifer Frentress, Associate Superintendent, Innovation and Research, Jeff Schmidt, Coordinator, District Improvement and Support, and the Systems for District Improvement team, and Executive Director Prolo and the Learning Analytics team, who have been dedicated to supporting ODA on their success.

Superintendent Magee thanked the cross-divisional team for their presentation on Assembly Bill (AB) 86: COVID-19 Relief and School Reopening and Accountability Actions for 2021 presentation on state mandates, compliance, and funding. On March 5, the team had little information and have been studying the legislation to better understand the opportunities. The team worked intently for the past two weeks to bring an informative presentation to the Board and to ensure the information is available to our districts.

Superintendent Magee reported 13 districts to date had launched an in-person learning plan. SMCOE continues to review reopening plans in coordination with San Mateo County Health. All districts are starting out with specific grade levels to establish habits, routines, and protocols, and then incrementally open more broadly to additional groups. Two districts, Bayshore Elementary School District and Belmont-Redwood Shores School District, will begin reopening next week. Four districts have targeted April dates to begin bringing students back on campus. Superintendent Magee recounted that some parents want reopening to happen a lot more quickly, but all 13 districts, and especially the eight districts already open for in-person learning since October found success implementing their plans. It was not an easy task for a single district. Despite the challenges and many varied opinions, school leaders kept moving forward, establishing norms and routines and now are able to focus on programming for next year. Districts who are currently trying to open are solely focused on getting students and staff safely back to campus.
Superintendent Magee shared SMCOE is also doing its best to communicate out to the community; for example, the team is coordinating the “Better Together” webinar series. The previous night, featured Assemblymember Phil Ting, who was joined by a first-grade teacher from the Las Lomitas Elementary School District, a nurse from the Redwood City School District, Superintendent Pittman from the Bayshore Elementary School District, Deputy Health Officer Dr. Chan, and community pediatrician Dr. Patel. The discussion focused on best practices in bringing students back and celebrating the optimism ahead based on the number of districts returning to in-person learning in the near future. Superintendent Magee shared that the superintendent’s office has been fielding many concerns and questions from community members and is aware that Board members have also been experiencing more community engagement. She noted that it’s important to highlight that the County Board’s role is not to direct district decisions and that she would provide the Board with more communication resources in the days ahead to help communities better understand this.

Superintendent Magee reported that SMCOE is working closely with the San Mateo County Health team to align and update guidance. Over the past weeks, she and her staff have been deeply involved in getting vaccines to every education worker in the county. She noted the next large task is to align the guidance and along with county health officials, get the guidance released with continuing support through training and technical assistance.

Lastly, Superintendent Magee addressed Resolution No. 21-14 Condemning Hate and Violent Acts Against the Asian American Community approved on the Consent Agenda. She expressed it is truly heartbreaking that this issue must be continuously brought to the forefront, but there is no other choice. We must speak out and condemn this difficult, challenging, and often hateful environment we currently find ourselves in. Many SMCOE employees have been personally impacted and are concerned for the safety and wellness of their children, elderly parents, and other family members. Superintendent Magee thanked the Board for passing the resolution and shared she would soon be sharing a draft of a joint statement with Board President Camacho to strongly weigh in about what we stand for and care about.

10. BOARD MEMBERS

A. Adopt Resolution No. 21-15 A Resolution of the San Mateo County Board of Education to Initiate a Transition to By-Trustee Area Elections Commencing with the 2022 Board of Trustees Election

Claire Cunningham, Chief Deputy County Counsel, explained this resolution memorializes the Board’s intention to transition from an “at-large” election system to a “by-trustee area” election system. It is before the Board tonight pursuant to the Board’s request at a prior Board meeting. The transition process has several steps outlined in the resolution which will be implemented over the next few months, including four public hearings and then final action by the Board.

Mr. Ross asked if California statute provides for the reimbursement of legal expenses of the attorney who sent the letter to the Board, and what is the maximum amount which would need to be paid. Chief
Deputy County Counsel Cunningham stated, in her opinion, the County Board of Education should not be required to pay reimbursement. The County Board received a demand letter relating to the transition of election systems from a firm in Visalia; however, the demand letter came after the Board had already commenced the process to switch from an “at-large” election system to a “by-trustee area” election system. Chief Deputy County Counsel Cunningham stated the reimbursement set forth in Election Code section 10010 is $30,000 as adjusted, but it is her opinion the firm sending the letter to the County Board is not entitled to that reimbursement because the letter was not the catalyst for the transition. The Board had already commenced the work prior to receiving the demand letter, but there will be more information as the process moves forward.

After a motion by Mr. Cannon and a second by Ms. Gerard, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross), by roll call vote, approved Resolution No. 21-15, A Resolution of the San Mateo County Board of Education to Initiate a Transition to By-Trustee Area Elections Commencing with the 2022 Board of Trustees Election.

B. Receive Update from Budget Advisory Subcommittee

Mr. Cannon began by expressing appreciation for the courtesy and thoroughness of staff in these meetings. He shared this year’s meeting was especially effective and worthwhile for him because it was a mini staff/Board development meeting. Mr. Cannon recalled during previous tough budget times the Board considered not approving the Superintendent’s budget, which is one of the Board’s major duties. Back at that time, Superintendent Holbrook worked with the Board to establish this budget subcommittee to establish trust and help the Board understand the depth of consideration Cabinet goes through in the budgeting process. He noted this has been a healthy and helpful process over the years. Mr. Cannon reported there are huge monetary challenges ahead for SMCOE, and funding crises have been present during the fifty years he has been involved in education. The burden of flat-funding as far out as the year 2040 combined with a collapse of enrollment in special programs present unique challenges for SMCOE in the 2021 budget year. However, he found Cabinet’s student-focused approach to the allocation of funding reassuring. He noted Cabinet’s budgeting philosophy is to allocate funds that meet the needs of today’s students while at the same time reserving funds for the future.

Ms. Gerard remarked that there was a different format to the meeting than in the past. She said it was more of a review of the process for Ms. Bonini, who is new to the subcommittee. Ms. Gerard requested more detailed information in the future at the subcommittee meetings.

Ms. Bonini added that part of the meeting was higher level to provide background, which she appreciated, and she also would prefer more detail in the future. She noted the real concerns about the budget in light of the flat funding for years ahead. Ms. Bonini said she looks forward to learning more about the creative solutions which will also benefit districts through continued supports and not negatively impact the budget.

Superintendent Magee then shared the PowerPoint presentation from the budget subcommittee meeting, which highlighted the following aspects of the budget in detail:
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- Historical context
  - Board role as budget approvers
  - 2013 LCFF – flat funded county office of education
- SMCOE budgeting process
  - Aligning priorities with the Strategic Plan
  - Review of Strategic Plan
  - Departments review budget documents
  - Business Department and other Departments collaborate
  - Review in Cabinet w/LCAP
  - Make budget decisions
  - Meet with Board Subcommittee on May 5th
  - Budget Hearing: June 2nd
  - Budget Action: June 16th
- SMCOE 2021 Challenges
  - Student enrollment in SMCOE programs
  - Impact of COVID-19 pandemic
  - Reduce spending to curb 2021 deficit

Board President Camacho shared that the calendar is helpful to better understand when details will come in because things happen fast between the May 5th subcommittee meeting and when the budget comes to the Board for approval. Board President Camacho commented given the tough choices to be made, the more open the process can be along the way, the more helpful it will be. He appreciates having the dates built in to have the conversations which will impact real lives.

C. Board Member Comments

Board President Camacho noted Youth Commissioner Liaison Chan had left the meeting early but her earlier presence was appreciated.

Mr. Cannon
Mr. Cannon passed on Board Member Comments.

Ms. Bonini
Ms. Bonini stated she was unsure about next conversations about SMCOE’s role and the issues raised by Mr. Ross during the AB 86 presentation and how to make a statement to bring clarity to districts, but she would be in favor of that.

Ms. Bonini noted she had the opportunity to attend the League of Women Voters meeting the previous day and it was great to have Mary McGrath, Executive Director, Safe and Supportive Schools, presenting at the event. There was discussion about mental health, district supports, and the intersection with police, and she learned a lot. Ms. Bonini suggested it might be useful for the entire Board to have that information.
BOARD MEMBERS (continued)

Mr. Lempert
Mr. Lempert reiterated congratulations to Coordinator Jeong, who comes from the Contra Costa County Office of Education, a strong early childhood county, but who can now join the strong team in San Mateo County. He said he looks forward to continued great leadership and asked that congratulations be passed along to Coordinator Jeong for her great introduction.

Mr. Lempert thanked Superintendent Magee and her incredible team for their phenomenal work amid all the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Mr. Ross
Mr. Ross added thanks to Superintendent Magee on the progress with teacher vaccinations, which has set up the county well. He shared the evening’s presentations were incredibly detailed, helpful, professional, and stimulating.

Mr. Ross referred to the Board’s role of surfacing what is being heard from constituents, as the Superintendent does the work of engaging with the County Health Officer and districts. He shared feedback received from an indirect co-worker who is a resident of the county and who reached out for the first time to share his involvement with a parent organization that has met with their district superintendent about returning to school in the fall of 2021. The district superintendent thought the idea was communicated that they had to plan not to be fully back in school in 2021 because the County Health Officer was providing a guideline which would not permit this in regard to the amount of space between individuals in classrooms.

Mr. Ross said he was struck that these parents believed that this was a County Health Officer decision about the fall and not a district level Superintendent decision. The parents asked whether the elected official behind the County Health Officer is the Board of Supervisors, the Superintendent, or the County Board of Education. Parents are looking for who is accountable and making decisions. Mr. Ross suggested the Board can help communities understand how and when decisions will be made. He emphasized it is bizarre that nobody is saying students should expect to be fully back in school in the fall. If the President of the United States thinks every American can celebrate the Fourth of July weekend together, it is not a stretch of the imagination to say that we expect schools to be back in the fall. There could be an earthquake, another pandemic, or failing vaccines, and something could happen to change the plan, but as it stands, Mr. Ross stated it would be an act of leadership to declare we expect to be back in school in the fall.

Mr. Ross related he would work over the next few days with Board President Camacho to see if a resolution could be prepared indicating the Board is optimistic that students who want to be back in school in the fall can be. He added there is a need for learning loss recovery, to gather data on who is back in school, and to ensure equity. However, he feels the expectation is that we should work to be fully back in school in the fall. Mr. Ross stated he hopes to work on this resolution for the next meeting.
Ms. Alvaro

Ms. Alvaro shared appreciation for the evening’s reports. She expressed feeling proud of ODA and what they have accomplished with their “through the roof” graduation rates, comparative in the state of California, and college acceptance rates. She is glad ODA is part of the SMCOE team.

Ms. Alvaro shared that librarians have been wanting to get back and open libraries but are concerned because their immunization priority fell into the IC and ID categories, depending on where they work. After state-level conversations, librarians are now considered IB, and librarians who work with the public are getting vaccinated. They will now be able to begin reopening libraries, which is a big deal for everyone, including students going back to school part-time.

Ms. Alvaro thanked the evening’s public speakers and empathized with being a parent. She stated she could not imagine putting up with her son as a student during the pandemic and distance learning.

Ms. Alvaro discussed clarifying the roles of the County Board of Education versus the County Office of Education and how the County Superintendent works with the Public Health Officer. She asked if there could be clarification on the website to better inform the public about misconceptions. Ms. Alvaro related that people are asking who to talk to, and feel like they are getting passed along. She described being horrified that the Board might be a perceived as a government bureaucracy. Ms. Alvaro asked that clarification be provided about who to talk to for certain information, whether it is through newspapers or the website, to ensure people are aware of the chain of decision making.

Ms. Alvaro referred to Mr. Ross’ resolution proposal and urged caution because if the Board starts directing what districts should do, it appears that they have the authority to tell them what to do. She shared she has no problem with the expectation that everyone hopes to go back to school in September, teachers will be inoculated, and that the Board urges everyone to go in that direction. However, she feels the Board should be cautious saying anything stronger about what districts should do.

Ms. Gerard

Ms. Gerard agreed with Ms. Alvaro on this point. It makes her uncomfortable to give that kind of direction, which can be misconstrued. In her personal communications with parents in her represented districts, they think the County Board can tell their districts to open their schools, but the truth is the county Board cannot do this. She feels the Board should be careful about what to put out there. Ms. Gerard also agreed she would love to have a list of things she can do to help and a list of who people can talk to. This would give people somewhere to go, other than being frustrated.

Ms. Gerard shared she attended the California School Board Association (CSBA) redistricting webinar the previous week and learned a lot. She wished she had attended the webinar before the discussion about the Board redistricting themselves and moving to a different way of voting for County Board members. Ms. Gerard reported she would be discussing the topic in the future.

Ms. Gerard indicated she also attended two different CSBA training sessions, and she encouraged everyone to attend these training sessions, even if they have been on the Board for many years. She used to personally teach both of the sessions, but still learned new things. One session was about the professional training of being a Board member and the second was about the appellant roles for
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interdistrict transfers and expulsion hearings. Ms. Gerard expressed she felt good about attending the trainings and the information can be put into practice moving forward.

Ms. Gerard suggested that to help parents and others, the Board could encourage fellow School Board members, if they can, to participate in the monthly San Mateo County School Boards Association (SMCSBA). Superintendent Magee and others provide a lot of great information. It would be to their benefit to hear the information.

Ms. Gerard congratulated ODA on their phenomenal progress and accomplishments, and congratulated their leaders in moving forward and branching out to new areas.

Lastly, Ms. Gerard thanked the team for their presentation on AB 86, which was great information.

Board President Camacho
Board President Camacho echoed the comments of his colleagues.

Board President Camacho reported it has come to his attention that there is a bill to provide basic income for those aging out of the foster care system, and he would love to add this as an agenda item under legislative action at some point. He would like the Board to consider if this is something they would like to discuss, since the office does so much work with foster youth. Board President Camacho could not recall the bill number, but he hoped to agendize the item for discussion.

Board President Camacho discussed receiving community feedback at an event the previous night. He suggested that moving forward as elected officials, the Board needs to have clear conversations about things which they can advocate about with other elected officials, but to recognize that some decisions are made by professionals and cannot be advocated out of. It must be recognized that superintendents and principals have been working since March 11, 2020, to get students back on campus. They have worked extremely hard for this outcome and want it to happen.

On the other end, there are health officers, who are not elected officials, and are trying to keep everyone alive and safe. At some point, elected officials must say there are things for which they can’t argue their way out of, like talking to the boss to change their mind. The bosses are already working hard to bring students back.

He discussed passing the one-year anniversary and how he looked at the agenda from the last in-person meeting, which was over a year ago, when Jae Takahashi, Coordinator, Information Systems, was introduced. Board President Camacho joked it would be interesting if Coordinator Takahashi knew at that time what he was signing up for. He indicated we have entered the reflection phase at the one-year mark and noted the county has created a virtual memorial of the first year. He expressed how it is important to reflect on what we have gone through and how we will remember it all. We want to be sure and take away our important learnings from this experience, for better or for worse.
11. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m. Board President Camacho announced the next regular meeting would take place on Wednesday, April 7, 2021, at 6:00 p.m.

Nancy Magee, Secretary
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