Meeting Date: June 2, 2021
Meeting Location: Held Remotely
Board Members Present: Susan Alvaro, Chelsea Bonini, Hector Camacho, Jr., Jim Cannon, Beverly Gerard, Ted Lempert, Joe Ross
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, Denise Porterfield
Youth Commissioner Liaison Present: Allyson Chan

1. OPENING ITEMS

A. Call to Order

Board President Hector Camacho, Jr. called the meeting to order at 6:01 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 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 June 2, 2021, agenda as presented.
2. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The following speaker provided live public comment:

- Janice Pellizzari, SMCOE teacher and San Mateo County Educators Association (SMCEA) President

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

   **A. May 19, 2021, Regular Board Meeting**

After a motion by Ms. Gerard and a second by Ms. Alvaro, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross), by roll call vote, approved the Minutes of the May 19, 2021, Regular Board Meeting as presented.

4. **CONSENT AGENDA**

   **B. Adopt Joint Resolution No. 21-34 Recognizing June 19, 2021, as Juneteenth**

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

5. **LOCAL CONTROL ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN**

   **A. Receive San Mateo County Office of Education's 2021-2022 Proposed Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP)**

Jeneé Littrell, Deputy Superintendent, Educational Services Division, introduced Karen Gnusti, Executive Director, College, Career, and Secondary Education, who provided the annual update for the Learning Continuity and Attendance Plan from the 2020-2021 school year and discussed a few highlights of the proposed Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) for the 2021-2024 school years.

Mr. Cannon spoke of previously discussed concerns about finding the adequate personnel to carry out programs and asked for the name of the organization with whom the team is collaborating. Executive Director Gnusti confirmed the organization is Effective School Solutions. Mr. Cannon asked if the Board might have the opportunity to hear from representatives of the organization. Executive Director Gnusti indicated she believed this was certainly possible. Mr. Cannon described Effective School Solutions as a major incoming resource and reaffirmed it would be good to develop rapport.

Ms. Bonini shared she has personal experience with the services offered by Effective School Solutions. She described the counseling services they provided and how they attended Individualized Education Plan (IEPs) meetings. She expressed her excitement to learn more about the organization and meet the individuals involved.
Deputy Superintendent Littrell described how Effective School Solutions was selected as a partner because of their integrated approach with the school culture and team. She reiterated the team looks forward to working with this organization to help round out and enhance the great skills and strengths of the staff.

Board President Camacho noted that the LCAP received in the packet went to page 27 out of 42, and asked if the missing pages were just extra materials. Executive Director Gnusti confirmed the extra pages were directions that had been omitted from the packet.

Board President Camacho referred to the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) testing and described how in this pandemic year the ability to test has been limited. Board President Camacho inquired about the challenges, outside of a pandemic year, to get to 100% MAP testing for the students in the program for the 90 days. Executive Director Gnusti confirmed that Board President Camacho was referring to having students tested and re-tested again in 90 days, and indicated the challenges are what one would imagine. They involve factors such as consistent staffing on the probation side, availability of the student on scheduled test days, and other conditions that are often beyond the control of school staff. It takes someone to oversee the schedule and have full capacity to coordinate the effort, which is an area of growth for the team.

Board President Camacho described how he has always had interest in what happens to students after leaving SMCOE programs and asked whether any of this tracking factors into the LCAP. He tends to think of students who have been in SMCOE programs as SMCOE students forever because the educators work so hard with them. Executive Director Gnusti confirmed that these indicators involve “cradle to career” data that is systemically being built at the state.

She added she was recently part of a discussion with the California Department of Education (CDE) about what it would take to track students. This data could be built into the LCAP in the future. Board President Camacho indicated he would be interested in this, particularly as more is invested in the Community Schools programs. He feels there will be significant relationships formed during students’ time with SMCOE and success stories, from the moment students join a SMCOE program, whether it be for 90 days or six months. There are missing success stories which could be discussed as students reach their senior year. Board President Camacho expressed curiosity for what these would look like and stated he is glad the team is thinking about this and how it can be incorporated. Executive Director Gnusti said she would talk with the team and consider how this data might be added to the LCAP.

Mr. Cannon concurred with Board President Camacho’s point and discussed how it would have been valuable to him as a teacher and Assistant Principal to know how students were responding to interventions.

Board President Camacho confirmed Executive Director Gnusti would be back on June 16 for LCAP approval and any edits would be redlined. He thanked Executive Director Gnusti.
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B. Public Hearing on San Mateo County Office of Education's 2021-2022 Proposed Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP)

Board President Camacho opened the public hearing on San Mateo County Office of Education's 2021-2022 Proposed Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP). Receiving no public comment, Board President Camacho declared the Public Hearing closed.

6. BUSINESS SERVICES DIVISION

A. Receive San Mateo County Office of Education's 2021-2022 Proposed Budget

Denise Porterfield, Deputy Superintendent, Business Services Division, began by stating she was presenting the draft 2021-2022 Budget. As required, the LCAP and LCAP public hearing were presented first. Education Code requires the Budget be presented afterwards, with its own public hearing, with at least one day between the public hearing and adoption, and SMCOE will meet that obligation by bringing the Budget back on June 16. Both the LCAP and Budget documents have been provided to the Board and for public viewing. The Budget is linked to the LCAP, as required, and there is sufficient budget to meet LCAP goals.

Deputy Superintendent Porterfield shared that SMCOE, under the leadership of the Superintendent of Schools, provides a variety of services for districts and students. The first Education Code mandate is that the Superintendent is required to superintend schools. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield indicated over her 11 years with SMCOE, this role and responsibility has changed as the needs of students and districts have changed. This past year, efforts focused on the pandemic, providing distance learning, and planning for the reopening of schools, which has been different, yet critically important work, from prior years. She noted this past year’s work has also included evaluation of programs, reorganization, reductions, and identification of some efficiencies, all while continuing to meet the goals of the SMCOE Strategic Plan. The true challenge moving forward is to evaluate and identify the needs of students, while maintaining fiscal responsibility.

Deputy Superintendent Porterfield stated this Budget reflects the most current information and demonstrates a reduction in deficit spending over the prior year. She defined a Budget as simply a spending plan which identifies known and estimated expected revenues and expenditures. It is a living document which changes as more information is acquired. Over the course of the fiscal year, SMCOE may be awarded a grant, receive more or less property taxes, eliminate or add a position, or experience increases in the cost for goods and services, which is currently being experienced. A Budget is also the best estimate of how the year will end, even though the Budget is developed at the beginning. SMCOE also informs the Board about the Budget with the First and Second Interim Reports, and closes the year with the Unaudited Actuals. Budgeting practice does not include revenue funding not yet awarded or received. Funding such as Title 1 is budgeted based on prior year receipts, grants for which we may already know the awards, or letters or notifications from the California Department of Education and the Federal Government to show what those types of revenues are going to be. If that number is unknown, it is not put into the Budget at this time. A Budget should have a savings plan, account for reserves, and plan for multiple years.
Deputy Superintendent Porterfield noted the Budget document is broken down into several sections, including a narrative, which contains most of the components being discussed. The Board is required to see the standardized account code structure (SACS) report, which is also presented, with the ending fund balance.

Deputy Superintendent Porterfield reminded the Board that SMCOE is a hold harmless county office, which means the office will receive the same amount of funding as received in 2012-2013. This is compared to the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) target, which is calculated based on the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) in programs and countywide. She described a countywide decline in ADA, and explained SMCOE has experienced a drop of 27 ADA in Court and Community programs since 2016-2017. This equates to roughly half a million dollars in reduced funding against the target. Countywide ADA has also declined by 4,240 since 2016-2017.

Deputy Superintendent Porterfield stated for the General Fund, SMCOE is estimating revenues to be $108.6 million. Excess Property Tax is estimated at $25.5 million for the 2021-2022 fiscal year, but is subject to change as final property tax amounts will not be known until June 2022. Although spendable amounts for the LCFF received are the same, SMCOE is receiving increased amounts from Federal, State, and Local revenues. In this Budget, SMCOE did not budget for the Federal Stimulus funding because the numbers were not yet known at the time the Budget was put together.

In expenditure assumptions, General Fund expenditures are estimated at $114.4 million. SMCOE, like all local agencies, is subject to increasing costs against that flat funding in areas such as pension, unemployment, worker’s compensation, and step and column increases for salaries.

Deputy Superintendent Porterfield compared the dollar spent in 2016-2017 to that same dollar being spent in 2021-2022. The State Teachers Retirement System (STRS) has gone from 12.5% to 16.9%, the Public Employees’ Retirement System (PERS) has gone from 13.89% to 22.91%, and due to recent situations, unemployment insurance has gone from .05% to 1.23%. Workers’ compensation has also increased and an increase in health and welfare costs has been negotiated. The only reason STRS went down is because the Governor recognized these increasing costs and had made prior contributions to the STRS pension fund. Looking at the out years for planning, STRS has an increasing rate going up to 19.1% in 2022-2023 and PERS is expected to climb to 27.1% in 2023-2024.

Deputy Superintendent Porterfield next discussed how the California Cost Price Index is the cost of goods and services within the area. The cost-of-living allocation is what the Governor puts on any funding and SMCOE will get that 5% added to the target, although no additional money will be realized. This is the Government cost-of-living over two years, and year over year, except for in 2020, there have been over 3% increases on goods purchased in the area. This is another tension on the Budget which we need to keep pace with and understand, in regards to salaries and benefits and other costs staff contend with living in the area.

SMCOE recognizes this, has been working on this for a number of years, and has put away savings. Under the leadership of Superintendent Magee, SMCOE has evaluated programs, reorganized a division, reduced staffing, and reevaluated the use of contractors. As a result, SMCOE was able to
reduce the contribution towards restricted programs by $500,000 and reduce the deficit spending overall by $2.1 million. That includes a $1 million increase in investing in facilities, otherwise that number would have been smaller.

Deputy Superintendent Porterfield shared that in the Multi-Year Projection, SMCOE is required to demonstrate the ability to meet obligations for the current budget year and subsequent two years. This is proven out with the only adjustment in capital outlay investments. She discussed how SMCOE has saved significant funds and shared the anticipated ending balances. Work continues on the business model, one way SMCOE is starting to identify organizational pricing for Tier II and III services to re-coup revenue for work over and above the core requirements.

Deputy Superintendent Porterfield also discussed Excess Property Taxes, explaining that SMCOE is now receiving twice the property tax amounts needed to fund its hold harmless. Roughly $25 million is received each year in hold harmless and there is an additional $25 million over and above that. These funds will be swept next year and sent to the State Controller’s office to offset trial court costs. She shared that statewide, there are now 11 county offices that can identify as Excess Tax Property entities, where there were only three when this began happening.

Deputy Superintendent Porterfield indicated next steps are to bring the Budget back to the Board on June 16 for consideration for Board approval and adoption.

Ms. Alvaro referred to page 5 of the Budget, indicating $322,763 in Contributions to Court Schools Hillcrest – Unrestricted, and asked if those are contributions from SMCOE’s General Fund to the Court Schools. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield confirmed that was correct. Ms. Alvaro stated that was above and beyond ADA or anything else and asked if that was projected for the coming year when there may only be 25 students. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield replied that was correct, explaining the infrastructure needed to support students in the Court Schools, aside from teachers, is the same program, so the infrastructure needs to be there. She pointed out this amount is reduced significantly from the previous year, when it was roughly $485,000. Ms. Alvaro asked if this is an economy of scale, and if there were twice as many students, there would not be twice as much expenditure. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield replied there was a great possibility of this. Ms. Alvaro stated she suspected this would be the response but she needed to ask about it because the number jumped out at her.

Ms. Alvaro referred to page 8 and Code 8710 with roughly $20 million under Tuition from Districts – Unfunded Costs, and asked if that included the teacher training and administrative credential program into which districts pay, and was not simply Special Education or Community School students. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield responded that the dollars for the teacher credentialing program are not 8710, but fall under 8699, local revenues. Ms. Alvaro asked if she followed 8710, she would eventually come up with the $20 million total. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield stated that was correct.

Mr. Ross asked for information about what is and what is not the County School Service Fund in this Budget. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield responded that the County School Service Fund is the money that is held at the Treasurer. All money is at the Treasurer unless it is held with an
outside fiscal agent. To her knowledge, the only money SMCOE has held outside is the revolving
cash fund. Mr. Ross asked about the revolving cash fund. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield
explained this is very little money. Mr. Ross referred to page 26 of the report, noting in the County
School Service Fund, the total budget is $108.6 million, at least on the revenue side. He explained
there is roughly $9 million that is not part of the County School Service Fund.

Deputy Superintendent Porterfield asked Mr. Ross to which page he was referring in his question
and he clarified on page 26 he noted the summary of the County School Service Fund specifically
being $108.6 million. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield explained that the County School Service
Fund is Fund 01 and these are the funds that pass through Fund 01. Mr. Ross asked if there are some
funds with other fiscal agents but SMCOE still budgets for them, and the County School Service
Fund plus the money held by other fiscal agents together sums to the total. Deputy Superintendent
Porterfield replied this was not correct, describing funds not in the document, for example those off
with Mental Health. She confirmed these are just the funds that go through SMCOE. Mr. Ross
stated there is a $127 million budget and $108 million in the County School Service Fund, and he
estimated there is a roughly $20 million difference, which is not in the County School Service Fund.
He asked what funds do not make it in. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield clarified page 26
displayed Fund 01, the General Fund used for operating expenditures. Some of that fund is
unrestricted for uses and some is restricted for specific uses. SMCOE is estimating revenues of $108
million including any Excess Property Taxes, which is up in the $57 million LCFF sources.

Mr. Ross asked if outside of Fund 01, there is another roughly $20 million in funds in the Budget.
Deputy Superintendent Porterfield explained there is far more in other funds. She reviewed the
document starting on page 28 and explained Fund 10 is the fund in which the Special Education
Local Plan Agency (SELPA) receives its dollars which are then portioned out to school districts.
These funds do not run through Fund 01 since SMCOE is just the fiscal agent for those dollars. Mr.
Ross asked if Fund 10 was not in the Budget summary and is just a pass-through. Deputy
Superintendent Porterfield confirmed she does not talk about those funds since SMCOE is only the
fiscal agent.

She explained Fund 12 is for childcare and those dollars are received, restricted, and recorded in
Fund 12. Fund 14 is for deferred maintenance and is no longer an active fund from CDE, but
SMCOE is still allowed to use it to put money aside for deferred maintenance. Fund 17 is attached
to Fund 01 and can be used, but as reserves, SMCOE does not access these dollars for spending.
This money is set aside for the future for anything which isn’t a capital outlay. Fund 19 is a small,
special reserve foundation fund with targeted uses. Fund 35 is a facility fund from funds received
many years ago which must be held in Fund 35 until they are spent. Fund 40 is capital outlay,
another area of saving for the future of SMCOE. Mr. Ross stated this information was helpful. He
clarified that all of these funds are part of the Budget, but the County School Service Fund is
another way to name Fund 01.

Mr. Ross referred to the 5000 category of Services and Operating Expenditures which is the one
category that is not books or head count, or capital expenses or pass-through. He asked if he was
correct that discretion may lie in the 5000 category in any given year, as SMCOE may choose to
spend money on an outside contractor or a temporary service. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield
answered that what Mr. Ross described is accounted for in the 5000 category, but it also includes electricity, water, sewer, phones, cell phones, and radios.

Mr. Lempert asked how to talk to constituents at a time when many people, including politicians, the press, opinion leaders, and many educators, are saying the issue is not money. Mr. Lempert described how some districts in California are receiving a lot more money, at least in the next year or two. He discussed how when looking at the difference between LCFF, federal revenue, and state revenue, there is a big bump this year, but SMCOE is not seeing that at all. He asked if it was correct that some districts are seeing a massive influx of dollars but SMCOE is seeing virtually nothing. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield confirmed this was accurate, but the term “massive” depends on the type of district. San Mateo County is unique because it currently only has five non-basic aid districts even though there may be districts flipping back because of the impending mega-COLA, reduction in ADA, and property tax increases.

A basic aid district is still getting the same property taxes that they were going to get, whether the COLA increases or not. The basic aid districts will get and keep all of their due property taxes, unlike SMCOE. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield explained when the calculation is redone each year against ADA, it is a dollar comparison, not an ADA comparison. SMCOE’s target is roughly $13 million if we were being funded on our LCFF target formula, but because we were receiving roughly $25 million at the time the model converted to LCFF, we are held harmless. With that decline of ADA, the target isn’t moving financially, so we are still receiving the same hold harmless.

Deputy Superintendent Porterfield further stated she is unsure what this would look and where the lines would cross because when the projections were penciled out to 2035-2045 there was no movement. She assumed SMCOE would stop declining and be able to hold. If a district is truly LCFF, they may see a big bump and receive higher funding, but it also dependent on property taxes because we are seeing some big jumps in property taxes, particularly in the supplemental area. Supplemental is anything that happens and is received after the assessment, and that pot is getting bigger. The number of those sharing those funds is getting smaller, so it can flip a district into basic aid one year and flip them right back out the next year.

Mr. Lempert responded he was just asking about SMCOE, but he was glad Deputy Superintendent Porterfield referred to the other districts because it makes the point that school district funding is complex. He is sure constituents are noting that a lot of districts are getting a lot more money so the Board needs to be able to convey the context. Mr. Lempert stated he likes to make comparisons between counties and cities, but he assumed this is not as much the case. He is guessing that most counties and cities are getting an influx of funding, but with schools it depends, so the messaging to constituents is difficult. Constituents can read about certain districts getting a huge influx, but SMCOE and other districts are not.

Mr. Lempert discussed SMCOE’s role and accountability, and given the focus on equity and accountability, county offices, including SMCOE should be getting more resources to do that important function. Instead, we are forced to rely even more on districts for funding, which are the same districts we are supposed to be holding accountable. He stated that most of what constituents are hearing is accurate, with governments getting a big influx of money, but when it comes to
SMCOE, that narrative is not accurate. This is something to be aware of and figure out how to talk about it. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield agreed.

Ms. Bonini referred to Deputy Superintendent Porterfield’s comments about the budget being prepared without knowing the federal stimulus and other funds, and asked if additional funds were anticipated, and if so, how that might impact SMCOE and districts. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield confirmed federal funds are anticipated based on Title I, and SMCOE is a recipient of Title I funds for our students. This is not going to be huge, but we anticipate receiving funds. The team has been discussing how those funds will be used once they are known. These amounts will be reported in the First or Second Interim Reports. Even if it is known or received at the end, it gets put in if it is considered 2021-2022 revenue. With some of the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) Funds, the CDE is determining whether they will be 2020-2021 or 2021-2022 revenues.

Mr. Bonini asked if this was the same for the state funds being pushed back out because of the Gann Limit and if there is any money flowing towards SMCOE. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield indicated this was true, adding that some of that is known and it is included in the Budget.

Ms. Gerard shared she has been involved in conversations with other districts asking why SMCOE does not provide a virtual teaching academy or other resources, and why SMCOE charges for certain services. She tried to explain how the county is flat-funded and this will go on for years to come, but in most cases the districts did not understand her explanations. Ms. Gerard requested speaking points to help the Board answer questions about the county office. A lot of districts do not understand that the county office does not get comparable funding. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield agreed this is a good idea because as she sat through presentations about the budget, they indicated that county offices are receiving the mega-COLA and the target. However, there are now 11 county offices who qualify as Excess Property Tax entities, which are held harmless and there are roughly 20 county offices still held harmless.

Board President Camacho suggested adding the topic of Excess Property Taxes back to the Legislative Subcommittee agenda to receive updates on the Board’s advocacy on that issue.

Board President Camacho discussed how complex school finance and budgets are and talking points are a critical component. He referred to page 8 and the Budget General Fund, and asked if he heard correctly that Deputy Superintendent Porterfield indicated for every column after the General Fund column, it all adds up to the General Fund column, or whether they are all separate. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield confirmed they add up to that column. Board President Camacho suggested that talking points are helpful in explaining this to community members especially because we are dealing with such limited dollars and continued flat-funding. He added the Board needs to be able to communicate why the County Office is investing the dollars as it is.

He continued that as an example, we can communicate why we are investing dollars in the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) and administrator credentialing programs and how these programs address the equity goals in the county office. He suggested talking about how much is being spent on clearing credentials and administrator credentialing, because when it is
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broken down in the correct accounting manner, it is difficult to tell the story of how one chunk is going to administrator credentialing, one chunk is going to the Court and Community Schools, and one chunk is going to any of the Safe and Supportive Schools programs. Board President Camacho emphasized that these are the real stories. If we could say that this much money will get two additional school nurses, that is much more digestible for the community to understand why we were fighting for additional dollars. Those narrative pieces about how money is being spent is a much more tangible component than looking across line items. He indicated he looks forward to that.

Board President Camacho assured he has never had an issue with the financial soundness and stability of the office because of the guidance of Deputy Superintendent Porterfield and the leadership team, but we are getting to a place where more and more people are going to ask for the story behind the dollars and he wants to be able to confidently communicate about those stories. Hard choices must be made and it helps communicate local priorities if people know their county office is investing here and here, but must cut here and here. He looks forward to additional narrative talking points to help communicate about the budget. Board President Camacho commented that the visuals in Deputy Superintendent Porterfield’s presentation were helpful.

B. Public Hearing on San Mateo County Office of Education's 2021-2022 Proposed Budget

Board President Camacho opened the public hearing on San Mateo County Office of Education's 2021-2022 Proposed Budget. Receiving no public comment, Board President Camacho declared the Public Hearing closed.

7. Office of the Superintendent

A. Superintendent’s Comments

Superintendent Magee began by congratulating the school teams on concluding a tough but incredibly successful school year, with Friday being the last day of the school year for school staff. Staff thoughtfully considered plans for graduations and determined it best to hold off the Anne Campbell Center (ACC) and E-22 graduations until early July. The ACC graduation will be on Wednesday, July 7 at 12:30 p.m., held in person at 65 Tower Road. The E-22 graduation will be on Thursday, July 8, held in person at El Portal and Palos Verdes. The fifth and eighth grade graduations will be at 10:00 a.m. and 11:30 a.m., and the twelfth grade and transition age graduations, which the Board typically attends, will be from noon to 1:30. All events will be livestreamed, allowing people to log in and celebrate and attend virtually, but there is the option to attend in person at outdoor COVID-safe ceremonies. More information will be provided to the Board soon. Superintendent Magee congratulated the graduates and all staff for a long, tough year in which everyone showed a lot of resilience and strength. She shared she looks forward to the new school year and beginning school fully in-person and full time.

Superintendent Magee thanked the SMCOE LCAP team for their amazing work on this year's LCAP under extreme circumstances. The task was to strategize a plan for the next three years which is challenging all on its own given the context of COVID recovery. She shared being
especially impressed with the LCAP’s practical and logical metrics created to measure student success. Standardized and required data must still be captured on the dashboard, but the team has really thought through ways to genuinely measure progress with each student. Superintendent Magee congratulated Executive Director Gnusti; Sibane Parcels, Principal, Court and Community Schools; and Shelly Johnson, Assistant Principal, Court and Community Schools; and all the staff for their hard work and input.

Superintendent Magee also thanked Deputy Superintendent Porterfield and her team for their comprehensive execution of the budget development process. The Internal Business team provided mentoring and coaching to many leaders new to the budget development process. Deputy Superintendent Porterfield, Margie Gustafson, Executive Director, Internal Business Services, provided the opportunity for a great deal of learning across the organization, and it is inspiring to see staff supporting leadership growth and capacity building.

Superintendent Magee acknowledged that through sheer will, intention, and focus, the teams reduced SMCOE’s deficit by more than $2 million, all through strategic effort, thoughtful planning and alignment. There is a long way to go, but she is impressed with the progress that everyone made in their learning and the outcomes of the budget itself.

Superintendent Magee reported the Legislature came out with their combined budget the previous day. The process through June 15 is to work with the Governor to come to a final budget. The budget the Legislature produced addresses a possible reduction in unemployment insurance from 1.23% to .5%. The Legislature’s budget also suggests a full payoff of interyear deferrals in the amount of $2.6 billion dollars more than is reflected in the Governor’s budget. The Legislature also proposes spending nearly $3 billion over four years to make supplemental pension payments outside of Proposition 98. These three components alone would strengthen the financial position of the county office budget.

Superintendent Magee shared that the previous Monday she attended the First 5 California Commission in her role as a commissioner. They had the pleasure of having Mr. Lempert attend as a representative of Children Now, who spoke about the early care and education budget. Again, the Legislature produced a version of the budget that takes the Governor’s strong start toward early learning and adds important components, including an additional $1.1 billion in ongoing funds to implement rate reform for childcare and state preschool providers. The Governor has taken a lot of heat for missing that piece in early education reform.

Superintendent Magee confirmed the topic of Excess Property Taxes is on the agenda for the June 8 legislative subcommittee meeting. Last week there was a rush by County Superintendents, supported by Capital Advisors, in a last-minute effort to get the Excess Property Taxes conversation back on the slate for consideration in the final budget. Local legislators, including Senator Josh Becker, Assemlymember Mark Berman, and Assemblymember Kevin Mullin, were fully on board to help with letters of support. Superintendent Magee shared that Senator John Laird in Santa Clara seems ready to carry the ball on this issue. Senator Laird indicated that the effort was not successful in getting this issue to the final budget discussion, but Senator Laird is engaged and wants to continue.
Superintendent Magee also shared she had the pleasure of attending the Youth Commission’s Virtual Showcase the previous Thursday. She congratulated Youth Commissioner Liaison Chan for being a rockstar leading several different youth commission committees and described how Ms. Chan’s peers look up to her as a leader. Superintendent Magee expressed being proud of Youth Commissioner Liaison Chan and was happy to have her as part of the County Board of Education. She congratulated Youth Commissioner Liaison Chan on her graduation and shared that Ms. Chan would be remaining on the Board for a few more meetings before heading off to college.

Superintendent Magee wished happy birthday to Mr. Lempert on June 14 and happy birthday month to Mr. Lempert, Mr. Cannon, and Mr. Camacho.

Superintendent Magee asked Board President Camacho to adjourn in memory of former California School Boards Association (CSBA) President Suzanne Kitchens, as requested by Ms. Alvaro.

8. CLOSED SESSION: INTERDISTRICT ATTENDANCE APPEAL IAA-21-2

A. Hear Interdistrict Attendance Appeal 21-2 (IAA-21-2) Filed on Behalf of a Student Currently Residing in the San Francisco Unified School District, but Requesting to Attend School in the Jefferson Union High School District

At 7:28 p.m., Board President Camacho announced the meeting would move into Closed Session to hear Interdistrict Attendance Appeal 21-2 (IAA-21-2), filed on behalf of a student currently residing in the San Francisco Unified School District but requesting to attend school in the Jefferson Union High School District.

9. OPEN SESSION: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION

A. Report on Action Taken in Closed Session on Interdistrict Attendance Appeal 21-2 (IAA-21-2)

The Board reconvened in Open Session at 9:49 p.m. After a motion by Ms. Alvaro and a second by Ms. Gerard, IAA-21-2 was granted by a unanimous vote (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross) by roll call vote, for one school year. The Board cited Factor 9, a severe and demonstrated hardship, in terms of time and/or costs to the person having physical custody, will result if the pupil is required to attend the district of residence.

10. BOARD MEMBERS

A. Discuss/Act on Nomination of California County Boards of Education (CCBE) 2021 Outstanding Legislator Awards Program

Mr. Ross asked for the name of the state senator championing the Excess Property Tax issue. Superintendent Magee confirmed it was Senator Laird in Santa Clara. Mr. Ross suggested putting
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Senator Laird’s name forward. Board President Camacho asked if the Board should wait for success in that endeavor first. He checked the timeline and confirmed that nominations must be received by CCBE no later than September 1. Board President Camacho thanked Mr. Ross for putting Senator Laird’s name on the table and suggested working on a write-up over the next few weeks. The Board took no action on this item.

B. Discuss/Act on California County Boards of Education (CCBE) 2021 Officer Nominations

The Board took no action on this item.

C. Discuss/Act on Board Meeting Logistics for San Mateo County Board of Education Meetings for 2021-2022

Superintendent Magee thanked the Board for completing the survey on meeting format preferences and informed the Board registered varied preferences. She discussed that no one was opposed to moving the meetings to a 7 p.m. start time when meeting in person. Chief Deputy County Counsel Cunningham updated that the Governor’s office issued a letter that day stating that the Executive Order N-29-20, suspending certain portions of the Brown Act to enable remote meetings, will continue to be in place after June 15. The concern was that the State’s reopening on June 15, which eliminates physical distancing requirements, would impact the Executive Order, which was tied to physical distancing requirements imposed or recommended by state or local public health authorities.

There was concern that the Executive Order authorizing remote meetings would go away on June 15, but there is now confirmation. There is now a sure legal basis to continue with remote meetings. When the order is rescinded, the Board will have to follow suit. There are also several bills being considered right now in the state legislature which would make some of these modifications to the Brown Act permanent if adopted and enacted. Chief Deputy County Counsel Cunningham described that there is still a lot in flux, but in the foreseeable future, the Board still has the ability to meet remotely.

Superintendent Magee stated this is good news for making a decision because the uncertainty is removed. Based on the data collected from the survey, Superintendent Magee suggested the Board set its sights on coming back in-person in September. The county office staff is working on scaffolding up to achieve complete full time in-person work by September 7. The building will remain closed to the public during business hours through the summer as staff returns and ramps back up. Superintendent Magee stated given that backdrop and the ways in which the Board answered the survey, holding the first meeting of September on September 1, seems a logical target. The Board can gauge how the situation is going over the summer and if there is a level of discomfort, this can be pushed to the second meeting in September. Superintendent Magee stated this is her recommendation, which the Board could then discuss.

Ms. Alvaro asked if staff were returning on September 7. Superintendent Magee replied that all staff are already working in person to some degree, but the goal is that by September 7, everyone will be back full time, five days per week. Ms. Alvaro asked if a certain number of staff would
have to be at the meeting. Superintendent Magee confirmed it was not a problem for Cabinet members to attend in person on September 1, because Cabinet staff is already working in person. At present, on any given day, there is roughly 50% capacity in the building. She informed that the superintendent’s staff would work with Information Technology (IT) to determine the technology set up for these meetings and plan for how the meeting would flow. Everything would be experimental unless we go with the fully back in person model, because we have that down, along with fully remote meetings. The situations in the middle need to be sorted out. As far as the schedule goes, the above is her proposal for the starting date.

Board President Camacho stated that the calendar was approved with meetings beginning at 6:00 p.m. through 2022, so if the Board decided that they wanted to start in-person meetings on September 1, they would have to take action to move the meeting start time to 7:00 p.m. Ms. Alvaro corrected that the approved calendar indicates that meetings will start at 6:00 p.m. for remote meetings and 7:00 p.m. for in-person meetings, so no changes would have to be made. Superintendent Magee agreed.

Mr. Ross stated that the Board could change their minds if health conditions change, but moving forward, schools are operating in person and the Board should meet in person in the fall, when conditions are set up, and he is in favor of that.

Board President Camacho asked if 101 Twin Dolphin functions as a school building. Superintendent Magee confirmed it does not.

Superintendent Magee reminded there is only one meeting in July and one meeting in August so there are a limited number of remote meetings remaining until September 1. She added that since the Brown Act waiver will remain in place, the Board can plan on those meetings being remote.

After a motion by Mr. Ross and a second by Ms. Gerard, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross), by roll call vote, approved continuing remote meetings starting at 6:00 p.m. through July and August and beginning in-person meetings starting at 7:00 p.m. at the first meeting in September.

D. Adopt Resolution No. 21-35 Establishing and Implementing Trustee Area Elections for Board Members Pursuant to Elections Code Section 10010

Chief Deputy County Counsel Cunningham informed that the Board has been through a lengthy journey with four public hearings and several discussions about the transition to a by-trustee area election system. This is the next step and final action to be taken by the County Board of Education in this process. There is one additional piece that happens with the Board of Supervisors, so the process is not complete, but this is the last action for the Board.

After a motion by Ms. Alvaro and a second by Ms. Gerard, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross), by roll call vote, approved Resolution No. 21-35 Establishing and Implementing Trustee Area Elections for Board Members Pursuant to Elections Code Section 10010.
E. Board Member Comments

Ms. Alvaro
Ms. Alvaro wished a happy birthday to Mr. Lempert and Anne Ton, Public Communications Specialist. She described being in a Big Lift meeting where they announced that the Cabrillo Unified School District would be back to a full-day, full in-person schedule effective August 12.

Ms. Bonini
Ms. Bonini had no comments to share.

Mr. Cannon
Mr. Cannon described two superstar performances for the evening, in addition to the Board making the IAA decision together. First was Deputy Superintendent Porterfield, who provided an excellent explanation of the budget, and second was the most beautiful Spanish he has heard in his life from interpreter Teresa Mendivil.

Mr. Lempert
Mr. Lempert congratulated Superintendent Magee on an amazing job shepherding the office and the county through a difficult school year and on her heroic work.

Mr. Ross
Mr. Ross echoed Mr. Cannon’s comments about the evening’s superstars. He informed that at the CCBE Conference there are 12 incredible panels with speakers representing Napa, Santa Clara, Placer, Sacramento, San Mateo, Ventura, Butte, Riverside, Fresno, Monterey, and Santa Cruz counties, as well as State Senator Laird. The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Kapor Center, Dr. Allison Scott, will be giving an address on Computer Science on Sunday, and Dr. Joshi and Dr. Adelsheim, psychiatrists from Stanford University, will talk about the impacts on child mental health. Mr. Ross suggested the Board all sign up for the conference because there is the option to participate either online or in person, as the conference is hybrid in 2021.

Ms. Gerard
Ms. Gerard informed the conference being held hybrid is thanks to Mr. Ross. She described the stellar report from Deputy Superintendent Porterfield and complimented Board President Camacho for getting the Board through their Executive Session, which was tough. Ms. Gerard wished happy birthday to Mr. Lempert and stated she would see everyone in a few weeks.

Board President Camacho
Board President Camacho thanked the Board for providing an amazing space in Executive Session and shared he was honored to be there with the Board. He shared the Board makes a space for saying things he finds hard to say and he feels comfortable saying these things with them because of the space they create.
11. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:14 p.m., in memory of Suzanne Kitchens, a 21-year trustee in the Pleasant Valley School District, dedicated student advocate, and former 2021 CSBA President who worked to ensure that the needs of all students would be met by securing funding and resources needed to provide a "comprehensive, high-quality education for every member of California’s diverse student population.” Ms. Kitchens leaves a tremendous legacy for her family, her community, and CSBA as a public servant, an advocate for students and, most of all, as an incredibly kind and caring person. Board President Camacho announced the next regular meeting would take place on Wednesday, June 16, 2021, at 6:00 p.m.

Nancy Magee, Secretary
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