1. OPENING ITEMS

A. Call to Order

Board President Beverly Gerard called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. She noted in the effort to increase accessibility, simultaneous interpretation of the meeting would be provided in Spanish using Zoom technology.

B. Discuss/Act on Resolution No. 22-1 Resolution Finding That, as a Result of the Continuing COVID-19 Pandemic State of Emergency, Meeting in Person for Meetings of the San Mateo County Office of Education Would Present Imminent Risks to the Health or Safety of Attendees

After a motion by Trustee Cannon and a second by Trustee Alvaro, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross), by roll call vote, approved Resolution No. 22-1 Resolution Finding That, as a Result of the Continuing COVID-19 Pandemic State of Emergency, Meeting in Person for Meetings of the San Mateo County Office of Education Would Present Imminent Risks to the Health or Safety of Attendees.

C. Approval of Agenda
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After a motion by Trustee Cannon and a second by Trustee Alvaro, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross), by roll call vote, approved the January 19, 2022, agenda as presented.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

The following speakers provided live public comment:

- Nancy Lacsamana, resident of Brisbane
- Janice Pellizzari, SMCOE teacher and San Mateo County Educators Association (SMCEA) President

3. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH

   A. January 2022 Employee of the Month Michael Rachal, Custodial Maintenance Worker, Business Services Division

Board President Gerard recognized the January 2022 Employee of the Month Michael Rachal, Custodial Maintenance Worker, Business Services Division. Board President Gerard congratulated Mr. Rachal on behalf of the Board and noted he would also receive an award check and commemorative token.

4. INTRODUCTION OF NEW/RECENTLY PROMOTED STAFF

   A. Randy Perez, Executive Director, Personnel Commission Services

Superintendent Magee introduced Randy Perez, Executive Director, Personnel Commission Services. Executive Director Perez described his educational background and employment history, including his experience working with the merit system. He shared about his family and expressed his excitement to begin his work at the County Office.

   B. Dr. Mary Yung, Interim Executive Director, Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA)

Superintendent Magee introduced Dr. Mary Yung, Interim Executive Director, Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA). Interim Executive Director Yung described how her childhood experiences shaped her as an educator and leader. She highlighted her previous work with the County Office and emphasized her commitment to serving districts and charter schools through the San Mateo County SELPA’s partnership with the County Office.
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5. **PRESENTATION FOR SCHOOL BOARD RECOGNITION MONTH**

   A. Presentation for School Board Recognition Month

Superintendent Magee recognized School Board Recognition Month by thanking and expressing appreciation to the San Mateo County Board of Education. She highlighted the Board’s leadership and advocacy in the service of children, families, and the community, as well as their commitment to doing what is best for kids. Representative of the Board’s service includes work with the Big Lift Collaborative, the Juvenile Justice System, the California County Board of Education Association (CCBE), local library foundations and boards, the San Mateo County Commission on Disabilities, the San Mateo County Mental Health and Substance Abuse Recovery Commission, the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Commission, and Children Now.

6. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

   A. December 8, 2021, Regular Board Meeting

After a motion by Trustee Lempert and a second by Trustee Cannon, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross), by roll call vote, approved the Minutes of the December 8, 2021, Regular Board Meeting as presented.

   B. December 16, 2021, Regular Board Meeting

After a motion by Trustee Lempert and a second by Trustee Cannon, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross), by roll call vote, approved the Minutes of the December 16, 2021, Regular Board Meeting as presented.

7. **CONSENT AGENDA**

   B. Receive Staffing Reports

   C. Adopt Joint Resolution No. 22-2 Recognizing January 27, 2022, as International Holocaust Remembrance Day

   D. Adopt Joint Resolution No. 22-3 Recognizing January 30, 2022, as Fred Korematsu Day of Civil Liberties and the Constitution

   E. Adopt Joint Resolution No. 22-4 Recognizing February 2022 as National African American History Month

   F. Receive Quarterly Report on Complaints, as Required by the Williams Settlement

   G. Establish Process for Small School District Purchase of Supplies and Equipment

   H. Receive 2020-2021 San Mateo County Office of Education School Accountability Report Cards (SARCs) for the Court and Community Schools and Special Education Programs (Published in 2021-2022)

   I. Adopt Joint Resolution No. 22-5 Honoring Charlene Reimche on Her Retirement

   J. Adopt Joint Resolution No. 22-6 Honoring John Nance on His Retirement

   K. Adopt Joint Resolution No. 22-7 Honoring John McEachron on His Retirement
CONSENT AGENDA (continued)

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

8. EDUCATIONAL SERVICES DIVISION

A. Receive Update on SMCOE School Programs

The following speakers provided live public comment:

- Misty Seago, teacher at Gateway Community School
- Janice Pellizzari, SMCOE teacher and San Mateo County Educators Association (SMCEA) President
- Julianna Rees, SMCOE teacher
- Eric Rado, SMCOE teacher
- Mary McArdle, SMCOE teacher and SMCEA Board member

Jeneé Littrell, Deputy Superintendent, Educational Services Division, and Sarah Notch, Executive Director, Special Education and Instruction, provided an update on SMCOE School Programs, including information on enrollment history, program cost, student numbers, and staff impacts.

Trustee Bonini asked if there is data from the school districts about the number of students being served in other non-public school (NPS) placements, and if so, whether that data was taken into account. Deputy Superintendent Littrell replied the SELPA keeps that information, but she did not have it. Executive Director Notch noted that based on conversations with district directors, more often than not, districts are considering non-public school options or consortia within neighboring districts, as opposed to SMCOE school programs due to costs.

Trustee Bonini stated in the San Mateo-Foster City School District, in the last three to four years she has observed a hundredfold increase in non-public school placements. Having had a child in a non-public school placement for two and a half years, she knows the cost of that placement, and it is relative to the cost stated. She understands how the cost is increasing based on numbers, but she is trying to understand how decisions are being made. Trustee Bonini emphasized she is a strong proponent of inclusive classrooms and students being pulled back to their districts is likely better for the students; however, during this time of teacher overwhelm, teachers are resistant to inclusive opportunities, and parents must be strong advocates to achieve this goal.

Executive Director Notch explained SMCOE K-22 programs offer a less restrictive step on the continuum, particularly when students are placed on integrated, comprehensive site campuses. The base rate tuition refers simply to annual day costs; however, when students have one-to-one Special Circumstances Instructional Assistance (SCIA) or additional Related Services, costs increase.

Trustee Camacho asked how educators and impacted families were engaged in these conversations, and asked that the same be addressed in the presentation for Gateway Community School.
Executive Director Notch explained the team has engaged in ongoing conversations in this process, particularly with SMCEA and California School Employees Association (CSEA) leadership. The team held informational sessions for staff and is working with Mary McGrath, Executive Director, Safe and Supportive Schools, and her team to follow up with social-emotional wellness support. Executive Director Notch explained the decisions in right-sizing do not impact families because the configuration being considered still serves every single student currently with the program. If numbers change, there may need to be conversations with families about not being able to support as many classes, but the intention is to continue to serve every student. She stated the goal is supporting students and ensuring high-quality, robust educational experiences.

Trustee Camacho asked for how long the employee conversations have been going on. Executive Director Notch replied she and Associate Superintendent Tami Moore engage in regular meetings with SMCEA leadership. The team is committed to honesty and transparency in communications including sharing with staff that they were looking at numbers and costs. The team recently came up with the projections in tonight’s presentation and spoke more specifically to union leadership and staff over the previous two weeks. Leaders shared data-driven and specific information as soon as it was identified. Executive Director Notch expressed appreciation to union leadership for being valued thought partners in this process.

Deputy Superintendent Littrell added the team also speaks regularly with the district directors of Special Education. Several districts expressed intentions to take some students back and wanted to make sure they were able to do so. The team kept circling back and having as many conversations as possible. Deputy Superintendent Littrell noted the presentation information is the most accurate information at this point in time.

Trustee Alvaro shared on her years on the Board, she has seen huge fluctuations in student numbers and there are many factors making that happen. She stated the program is at a low enrollment point and the numbers are right on the edge of maximum, and asked what will happen when the numbers increase. Executive Director Notch ensured a commitment to be nimble. If there is a role to serve students, the team wants to fill that role.

She discussed making this decision in light of COVID-19 and its impact, which is why they looked at six years of trend data. The team spoke to district directors and asked if they were opening classrooms, planning transitions, or expecting to place additional students in SMCOE programs in the coming year. The team feels confident they are dialed in to current needs, but they are committed to being responsive partners. If numbers go up, the team will pivot and modify the K-22 program. However, at this time, they are confident the numbers will be consistent or dip lower due to student attrition. Executive Director Notch reiterated the team is focused on serving student needs, but they are as confident as they can be about the needs being reflected by district partners for the 2022-2023 school year.

Trustee Alvaro shared concerns about teacher shortages in districts around California and beyond, especially high school math and special education teachers. She asked how the team has planned for the need to seek professionals if there are layoffs and then numbers increase. Executive Director Notch assured her the team is prepared. She discussed how the talent pool in the K-22 programs
will be highly competitive candidates for other positions. For the 2022-2023 school year, the team plans to make a decision prior to the March 15 deadline about how many classrooms to run. She emphasized that having staff in the classroom is critical and discussed the priorities of stabilizing costs in the current year while continuing to serve all students.

Trustee Cannon asked about planning in light of the deadlines and what happens if the team does not plan adequately. He indicated the team cannot wait until July when there are better numbers. Deputy Superintendent Littrell discussed the reality of working in schools and having to make decisions in January, backing into the March 15 deadline. Historically, that has applied only to certificated staff, but with new legislation, this now applies to classified staff. If dynamics change and additional staff are needed after staff layoff notices, the team can rescind notices to retain as many staff as possible. However, looking at the fiscal situation and in working with the Business and Human Resources Departments, it is critical to make the best predictions at this time.

Trustee Bonini referred to total costs of the program and total cost per student and asked what these numbers would be under the current proposal and staff reductions. Deputy Superintendent Littrell said the Business and Schools Teams are working on this information.

B. Discuss/Act on Closure of Gateway Community School

Superintendent Magee noted a public comment was received by email from Roger Wroblewski, Teacher and California Teachers Association (CTA) Statewide Representative, which she shared.

Jeneé Littrell, Deputy Superintendent, Educational Services Division, and Karen Gnusti, Executive Director, College, Career, and Secondary Education, provided a report on the proposed closure of Gateway Community School, discussing enrollment history, program cost, recommendations moving forward, and staff impacts.

Trustee Alvaro expressed concern about fluctuating program needs and the cost of keeping the program open and asked about administrative costs and reductions. She wondered whether that had been taken into consideration as staff layoffs were discussed. Trustee Alvaro explained the County Office has been a safety net, and she has jumped in several times making sure that safety net was not pulled out. Deputy Superintendent Littrell explained that a Principal position was cut last year, so the team has already started to reduce administrative costs. They are still considering the needs of the E-22 program, and they want to ensure they have the appropriate level of administrator support. She said the team is focusing on cuts happening fairly and consistently across all categories. In terms of Gateway certificated staff, cuts would also include the half-time administrator, leaving one full-time administrator to provide leadership at Hillcrest, Kemp, and Canyon Oaks for the following year.

Trustee Cannon referred to the layoff notification deadline of March 15 for certificated and classified employees and asked about the deadline for administrators. Deputy Superintendent Littrell explained the County Office honors the March 15 deadline for administrators and Claire Cunningham, Chief Deputy County Counsel, confirmed that was accurate. Trustee Cannon asked for clarification on whether administrators, in order to leave an administrative position, need to be notified by March 15, or if that referred to leaving a certificated position. Chief Deputy County Counsel Cunningham
explained they must be notified if they will be reassigned from their administrative role into a teaching position.

Trustee Bonini stated when she first heard of the revisioning of the community school, it seemed needed because there are students who should not be in a non-public school placement but struggle in their districts. She recalled how the program applied for but did not receive the community school grant. She feels the new Effective School Solutions (ESS) program is different but getting traction and has not been given enough of an opportunity. Trustee Bonini asked whether districts are sending middle or high school students? She shared there are ways the Board may be able to help support the program, perhaps through discussions with their districts. Trustee Bonini asserted she was not happy with the recommendation and she feels more should be done.

Trustee Ross thanked the team for the thoughtful, detailed reports, and the public for their comments. He asked what would be left after these cuts, in terms of estimated students directly served by the County Office in the various programs. Deputy Superintendent Littrell confirmed the County Office would serve all students in the E-22 program, which is approximately 112 students, along with students at Hillcrest, Kemp, and Canyon Oaks, with fluctuating populations but approximately 25 students within these three programs. She also stated that Related Services has talented staff supporting the needs of students in districts, so many more students are touched. Superintendent Magee added that in the Early Start program, SMCOE serves approximately 50-60 families of infants and toddlers referred to that program.

Trustee Ross asked if the net budget benefit of this recommendation outweighs the Average Daily Attendance calculations which go into the budget formula, and if Gateway was outside of that calculation. Deputy Superintendent Littrell and Superintendent Magee confirmed that was accurate.

Trustee Camacho referred to the planned expansion to middle schools and asked what happened to those students. Deputy Superintendent Littrell explained the team has been serving students referred who fit within the program’s educational ability to serve. While there have been referrals for a few middle school students, they have not reached the threshold they were expecting. Executive Director Gnusti added they started the year with one student and put two classes in place, a lower high school and an upper high school. In trying to meet the needs of the roughly 19 students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), they do not have a middle school program per se.

Trustee Camacho asked if community school funding referred to a different set of community schools. Deputy Superintendent Littrell and Superintendent Magee confirmed that was accurate.

Trustee Camacho asked his colleagues on the Board if this was the first time they have discussed closing the community school, and if it was not the first time, if they could share about that experience and those conversations. Trustee Alvaro confirmed this is not the first time they have discussed closing the community school. At one time, there were three decentralized community schools in East Palo Alto, Redwood City, and at the old Serramonte High School campus, along with Gateway, which was inside a classroom attached to Juvenile Hall. In total, there were four community schools. The administration wanted to close these schools because costs were going up and enrollment was declining. They ended up consolidating programs and partnering with the Boys and
Girls Clubs in East Palo Alto, Redwood City, and South San Francisco. This eliminated a great deal of rent and overhead, provided students with a built-in afterschool program, and gave the Boys and Girls Club an opportunity to use their facilities in the middle of the day when they were not being used, creating a win-win situation. The Board had to think outside the box and analyze current practices. Eventually there was consolidation to a single site at Gateway. Trustee Camacho thanked Trustee Alvaro for the historical context.

Trustee Camacho referred to the complicated facilities arrangements at the sites and asked about the implications of these decisions on facilities use. Superintendent Magee explained the County Office would pursue continued use of the Gateway campus for student engagement and leadership programs. The team has not had the bandwidth to dig into these options yet because they are fully engaged in running Gateway.

After a motion by Trustee Cannon and a second by Trustee Ross to close Gateway Community School, the Board, by a vote of three in favor (Cannon, Lempert, and Ross) and four opposed (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, and Gerard), by roll call vote, the motion to approve the closure of Gateway Community School failed.

Trustee Camacho asked for additional specificity about the actual staffing changes, particularly in relation to classified staff, certificated staff, and administrators. He stated it was important to see that information on paper. Trustee Camacho also asked for additional data about ESS and how it worked or did not work. He related he wanted to make sure he was making a well-informed decision and all information was made public. Trustee Camacho added he hoped for more information on the facilities component and whether those conversations have happened. Superintendent Magee asked if Trustee Camacho wanted those questions addressed at that time. Trustee Camacho suggested moving on and providing that information in a Board packet.

Trustee Lempert asked if there was a time urgency to this decision and if there was time for a motion to table the decision. He stated he would like a reconsideration. Trustee Lempert emphasized that historically, the Board follows staff recommendations. He referred to Trustee Alvaro’s comments above regarding past discussions about closing the community schools and explained the Board did not want to make reductions. Trustee Lempert suggested tabling the vote would lead to a unanimous vote if that worked with the timeline. Trustee Camacho agreed with Trustee Lempert and asked for further clarification on the timeline. Trustee Lempert indicated the Board did not vote against closing Gateway and then some Board members changed their view. This would not be an accurate representation.

Chief Deputy County Counsel Cunningham clarified there is a strict March 15 deadline to notify staff. This year, this applies to certificated and administrative staff, but also classified staff. There is a tremendous amount of paperwork which must occur well before the March 15 deadline in order to effectuate layoff notices. Unfortunately, the layoff deadlines mandated by Education Code do not align with school budget realities or the Governor’s budget. If the layoff notices are not issued in compliance with the March 15 deadline, those employees will have guaranteed employment for another year, which will significantly impact the budget. This means an unanticipated budget increase for an entire year before there would be another opportunity to address the overstaffing.
Superintendent Magee reminded the Board that the impact on this current year’s budget was mitigated by the application of Assembly Bill (AB) 86 funds to the total cost, which will not be carried forward to next year.

Trustee Alvaro shared that the Board has not always gone with staff recommendations. At least once, they suggested pausing to create a subcommittee and bring in additional points of view and discussion from the County Manager, representatives from the Board of Supervisors, staff from the police department, school district employees, and parents. They asked for assistance and came up with a new model, which took a year but the program became successful. Trustee Alvaro expressed concern for these students if they are not served by the County Office. She discussed the timeline, the need to make a decision for this year, and spending $350,000 on a curriculum which has not been implemented. Trustee Alvaro suggested another year to try and shake out the program with a deadline of 13 months from now.

Trustee Bonini thanked Trustee Alvaro for the helpful background information. She expressed concern about the student population and stated she does not feel confident that they will have an appropriate placement. Trustee Bonini emphasized that there is hope for the program. She described spending enough time at SELPA meetings, Community Advisor Committee (CAC) meetings, Curriculum Development Advisory Committee (CDAC) meetings, and other Board meetings to know that parents have no idea that this program exists. There are many places where this program could be highlighted, and she is not willing to give up on the program.

Trustee Bonini suggested perhaps there are additional one-time funds to explore to figure out a solution for these students who need so much support. She said she did not agree that it wasn’t foreseeable that these students would have IEPs. Students who have mental health issues should have IEPs, and if they don’t have IEPs, they should have 504 plans. There are many students who have issues anticipated through ESS who have co-occurring disabilities. She indicated she did not understand how the team did not anticipate this when she would have anticipated this because she has seen these populations of students. Trustee Bonini suggested there are solutions for better ways to serve students with these needs, and she would appreciate having these conversations.

Trustee Lempert stated he wished the Board had some of this conversation before their vote. He shared his colleagues’ concerns about the students, which he did not speak of earlier. Trustee Lempert referred to the history being at issue and clarified for Trustee Camacho that he was on the Board of Supervisors, and he believes it was a unanimous vote of the Board of Education under the recommendation of Superintendent Gonella. The Board of Supervisors voted unanimously with the full support of John Maltbie so the budget worked for the County Office and the County of San Mateo. These were unanimous votes with the support of staff. He clarified that there has not been, in his recollection, a time when with the budget condition of the County Office, staff made a recommendation and the Board said no. Trustee Lempert discussed concerns about the budget and shifting students to districts and related that no former Superintendent had said they wanted to do something, but the Board said “no.” These were unanimous votes, including for the Board of Supervisors, with fiscal stability a key part of all considerations.
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Trustee Alvaro indicated she and Trustee Lempert were referring to two separate situations. She clearly remembers the situation with Superintendent Gonella and the Board of Supervisors vote. However, there was a subsequent time when Superintendent Mehl wanted to close the community schools. A subcommittee was formed, and they worked out an alternative solution. Trustee Alvaro related that what Trustee Lempert shared was 100% true, but he was recalling when the Board thought they were going to lose their probation staff and would need to close their schools. The Board of Supervisors jumped in and assured that would not happen. Subsequently, there was a recommendation after Superintendent Gonella retired that they close the community schools based on declining enrollment and other situations. That is when the Board suggested not closing the school but approaching the problem together.

Deputy Superintendent Littrell commented the team also has strong concerns about student needs being served in districts, and they are committed on a daily basis to meeting these needs. Looking at the student body at Gateway, almost all students are on IEPs. The team has considered the possibility of creating a therapeutic day school program to meet the needs of students on IEPs, specifically students with emotional disturbance (ED) as their disability. However, that would be a different model than the Gateway Community School program. It would be like taking that program and attaching it to the Special Education program, and not running a traditional community school model, as Gateway has been doing.

Trustee Ross referred to time constraints and the amount of work to be done, and asked if it would be possible for there to be another consideration of this issue and still meet the deadline, with the current Board schedule. He also asked if it was accurate that the current cost of serving students seems to exceed $100,000. Deputy Superintendent Littrell confirmed that was inaccurate, clarifying that was the cost in the K-22 program. She indicated if the team revamps the Gateway program into a therapeutic day school model, they would anticipate the cost would be close to the K-22 cost per student because staffing would increase significantly.

She reminded that this year there were Continuous Support and Improvement (CSI) funds which covered the entire ESS contract. Without those funds next year, those costs will be absorbed into the cost per student and passed along to districts. She suggested that other options could be explored, but there will likely still be staff impacts, and it hasn’t been fully determined if opening a therapeutic day school is the right direction or even feasible.

Trustee Ross asked again about timing for those who wish to explore this issue more closely. Superintendent Magee informed if the Board tables the discussion to the next Board meeting on February 2, there would be roughly four weeks to complete all the necessary paperwork, and she was unsure if that was possible. Chief Deputy County Counsel Cunningham indicated it would be possible but would require reprioritization of other duties in the Human Resources Department, which is currently understaffed and noted other duties may not be attended to in a timely manner. However, it would be possible to accomplish the necessary paperwork if a decision was reached at the February 2 Board meeting.

Trustee Ross shared his assumption that everyone is keeping the interests of students in mind, which he believes is the case, even though there is disagreement. He stated when it comes to decisions on
how to serve students, the County Office has professionals who have spent a lot of time thinking about this issue. Trustee Ross indicated he realizes it is difficult to share all the thinking in a public forum. His instinct is that this is a well thought-out decision and the Board would do well by students and their mission by trusting staff. He also understands that there is good reason to have additional conversations. Trustee Ross would still vote to support this motion, and he would be comfortable reconsidering the vote. He is also open to exploring this issue further with staff and proposed creating a subcommittee of three, perhaps chaired by Trustee Camacho with two additional members appointed by Board President Gerard, and asking them to spend a great deal of time between now and February 2, in order to reach consensus in that group by February 2.

Trustee Lempert stated he was on the Board with Trustee Alvaro during the Superintendent Mehl situation she referenced. He indicated that was not a proposal, but rather indicated what needed to be done in terms of the March 15 deadline. There were other issues and many discussions about alternatives. Trustee Lempert emphasized there was not a vote by the Board that turned down the Superintendent’s recommendation. He informed the current vote would be the first time in his memory that the Board said “no” to a superintendent’s recommendation.

Trustee Lempert discussed how it would be helpful to try every opportunity to avoid this decision and asked staff what they would envision for that process over the next few weeks. Superintendent Magee expressed appreciation for Trustee Ross’ subcommittee suggestion but said that a great deal of time, including all of last year, has been spent giving Gateway one more chance, but it is clear to staff that this is not the right model to serve the students being received. That is why the recommendation to close Gateway has been brought to the Board. Her team does not bring the recommendation lightly.

Superintendent Magee expressed concern about spending time with a subcommittee over the next few weeks when there is much work to do in so many areas. She welcomes the ability to provide additional information but is concerned about taking staff time for a subcommittee to share the details, which would be a difficult task. Superintendent Magee circled back to the recommendation as presented with the understanding that the County Office has the best leaders doing this work and the recommendation has not been presented in a casual way. She affirmed the team could take another two weeks to bring additional information about ESS, staff impacts, and facilities.

Trustee Camacho asked for clarification on whether Superintendent Magee said that students were not being served or would not be served if the program continues. Superintendent Magee confirmed that students are being well served to the best of the team’s ability. However, the structure of the program is not the best suited for the needs of students being received. She referred to Deputy Superintendent Littrell’s suggestion to explore setting up a therapeutic day school, a special education model to best support the needs of the students in a continuing program.

The team has added additional resources to the current program to ensure students are well served right now. However, this is not a sustainable model in years ahead. Trustee Camacho explained he was struggling because of the investment made over the past year and because if this program goes away and these students are sent back to their districts and not served, the opportunity may not come up again. He shared he did not want the students being served, and potentially being served in the future, to get lost because a program is ended and will never come back because of shifting priorities.
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Trustee Camacho referenced Education Code which states there is a mechanism for community schools for a very specific purpose, and he doesn’t want these students to be lost. He expressed opposition to the subcommittee approach and stated he is comfortable staying with his vote. Superintendent Magee reiterated she did not say that students were not being served, and in reality, the team is going above and beyond to serve students. Trustee Camacho thanked Superintendent Magee for the clarification.

Trustee Alvaro indicated she also did not think a subcommittee would be the best approach because leaning on staff time right now would be punitive. She asked what it would cost, in actual dollars, to give the program another year. Trustee Alvaro discussed the projections based on nine students, the chaos coming out of the pandemic, and the $350,000 spent on curriculum and training for this program. After the program is given a year, a subcommittee could be convened to begin to explore other ideas. Superintendent Magee clarified that the current funding model is based on enrollment of 25 students and the program is at 20 students halfway through the year. The program has not met the enrollment model based on funding. Trustee Alvaro indicated that she had misunderstood the information presented on enrollment, but again asked the question about the cost to give the program another year.

Superintendent Magee asked if Kevin Bultema, Deputy Superintendent, Business Services Division, could provide that projection. Deputy Superintendent Bultema referred to the budget of $1,500,000 and informed if no additional one-time dollars are applied, as they were in the current budget, including through AB 86 and taking into account increased Public Employment Retirement System (PERS) and State Teachers’ Retirement System (STRS) costs, and no reductions, the estimate would be $1,500,000 with a likely 5% additional increase, for a total of roughly $1,600,000. Trustee Alvaro asked if that was for 20 students or the entire budget in that division. Deputy Superintendent Bultema clarified that would be specific for Gateway. Trustee Alvaro asked if it was correct that it would cost $1,500,000 to give Gateway another year for 20-25 students. Deputy Superintendent Bultema reiterated that the estimate would be between $1,500,000 and $1,600,000, with full staffing.

Deputy Superintendent Littrell asked if the model continues, and the program continues to contract with ESS, whether that was built into that budget because CSI funds were currently being used for ESS. She asked if the program cost would be closer to $2,000,000 if it had to incur those additional costs, assuming ESS was kept as a therapeutic model. Deputy Superintendent Bultema indicated he did not have those numbers in front of him. Superintendent Magee asked if ESS cost $350,000. Deputy Superintendent Littrell replied that it was roughly $330,000.

Trustee Camacho indicated the Board could take another vote on this agenda item. Chief Deputy County Counsel Cunningham informed the Board could make a motion to reconsider, which would have to be made by someone who voted in the majority, against the motion. Trustee Ross explained someone who voted “no” would have to make a motion to vote to reconsider, and with a majority vote, the Board could vote again. Trustee Camacho stated that a lot of the concerns had been hashed out, and he was not interested in putting the office in a $2,000,000 conundrum, especially with important conversations about funding coming up. He requested there be room for discussion for additional concerns after he makes his motion.
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After a motion by Trustee Camacho and a second by Trustee Alvaro, the Board, by a vote of six in favor (Alvaro, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross) and one opposed (Bonini), by roll call vote, approved reconsidering the closure of Gateway Community School.

After a motion by Trustee Cannon and a second by Trustee Ross, the Board, by a vote of six in favor (Alvaro, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross) and one opposed (Bonini), by roll call vote, approved the closure of Gateway Community School.

9. BUSINESS SERVICES DIVISION

A. Receive Report on 2022-2023 Governor's Budget Proposal

Deputy Superintendent Bultema provided information on the 2022-2023 Governor's Budget Proposal, highlighting themes, financial projections, and SMCOE budget impact on Special Education, Transitional Kindergarten, Early Childhood Education, Early Literacy, the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELOP), College and Career Pathways, School Nutrition, and the Educator Workforce.

There were no questions from the Board.

10. OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

A. Superintendent’s Comments

Superintendent Magee began by sharing in terms of COVID-19, it had been a tough start to the school year with the Omicron surge. There are hopes the surge will peak within the next few weeks.

Superintendent Magee explained that the Board’s resolution for meeting remotely covers 30 days, and recommended the Board plan for a remote meeting on February 2. After that, conditions can be reviewed.

Superintendent Magee informed that the Board Budget Study Session has been rescheduled in order to meet for that activity in person. She will follow up with all Board members regarding a confirmed date.

Superintendent Magee highlighted a bright spot in the county is school-based vaccinations. There are 17 school nurses contracted to work after hours delivering vaccinations to 5-11 year-olds. Two clinics were held before the break at Bayshore Elementary School in Daly City, with three clinics at College Park Elementary School in San Mateo, three clinics at Martin Elementary School in South San Francisco, and three coming up at Hoover Elementary School in Redwood City. These events have been specifically for 5-11 year-olds, but last week they expanded the clinic for anyone wishing to receive a vaccination, whether it be a first shot, second shot, or booster shot. Through these school-based clinics, all family members of students can receive vaccinations. Superintendent Magee
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT (continued)

reported there have been more than 2,000 vaccinations through these school-based events, and she congratulated Jill Vandroff, Coordinator, Health and Wellness, for organizing.

Superintendent Magee referred to the Employee of the Month honors for Michael Rachal, who assisted with the distribution of 90,000 at-home test kits. She said the County Office has secured additional test kits from San Mateo County Health specifically for the Early Learning community, which has been the back-seat partner through this process. The County Office is trying to meet their needs and hopes to get at-home test kits out to the Head Starts and State Preschool Programs by Friday. Next week the County Office will be working with the Community Coordinated Child Care (the Four Cs) to serve the family home care providers and fill in the gaps.

Superintendent Magee reflected on the accumulation of Board member requests for agenda items. She informed future agendas would take on Trustee Ross’ requests for an update on Strategic CSforALL Resource and Implementation Planning Tool (SCRIPT) CCBE-funded training. Sarah Watanabe, Coordinator, K-12 Strong Workforce Program-STEM, attended the training and thought it was fantastic. The plan is to move forward and recruit administrators to attend a summer of Computer Science (CS) workshops to provide them background in CS. They can then recruit stakeholders in their districts and communities to do the strategic planning. The SMCOE team will bring forward a presentation once the work is further along.

Superintendent Magee informed Trustee Alvaro she had photos from the YMCA construction which had been uploaded to a digital file. In her follow-up email, she would send a link to the Board to view these photos. She gave a shout-out to the Outdoor Education staff who, under the leadership of Executive Director Gnusti, has developed strong COVID-19 protocols and continues to provide in-person Outdoor Education despite the Omicron surge.

Superintendent Magee informed a follow-up email would also include Trustee Bonini’s request for a link to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Commission (JJDPC) facility inspection reports for all court and community settings.

Superintendent Magee shared the Board meeting would be convened in memory of Lillian Lee Port, per the request of Trustee Alvaro.

Finally, Superintendent Magee acknowledged the loss of former staff member David Brashear, who suddenly passed away the previous week. She expressed it has been a sad time and that many staff had been engaging with Mr. Brashear quite recently.

11. BOARD MEMBERS

A. Discuss/Act on 2022 Board Committee Assignments

The chart below indicates the chosen assignments of Board members:
## COMMITTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSIGNMENT</th>
<th>BOARD MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Superintendent’s Salary Subcommittee</td>
<td>Trustee Gerard (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustee Camacho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustee Lempert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) (Ad Hoc) Inter-district Attendance Appeal</td>
<td>Trustee Camacho (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustee Gerard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustee Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (Ad Hoc) YMCA Partnership Subcommittee</td>
<td>Trustee Alvaro (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustee Camacho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustee Cannon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Legislative Subcommittee</td>
<td>Trustee Bonini (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustee Camacho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustee Ross</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## REPRESENTATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSIGNMENT</th>
<th>BOARD MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) SMCOE LCAP Representative</td>
<td>Trustee Gerard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) San Mateo County School Boards Association (SMCSBA) Area Representative</td>
<td>Trustee Bonini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) County Committee on School District Organization (CCSDO) Liaison</td>
<td>Trustee Lempert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Budget Advisory Committee for 2022 and the (Ad Hoc) Real Property Committee were dissolved, with the option to reinstate these committees later if necessary. The Oxford Day Academy Oversight Team Representative position was also eliminated. The representative to the Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) position was added per the request of Trustee Bonini.

After a motion by Trustee Alvaro and a second by Trustee Cannon, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross), by roll call vote, approved the 2022 Board Committees.

B. Adopt Joint Resolution No. 22-8 Implementing Board Policy BP 9250 to Compensate Susan Alvaro for Her Absence from the December 16, 2021, Board Meeting Due to Illness

After a motion by Trustee Cannon and a second by Trustee Bonini, the Board approved by a vote of six in favor (Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross), none opposed, and one recusal (Alvaro), Joint Resolution No. 22-8 Implementing Board Policy BP 9250 to Compensate Susan Alvaro for Her Absence from the December 16, 2021, Board Meeting Due to Illness.

C. Receive Update from the County Committee on School District Organization (CCSDO) Regarding Trustee Map Process

Hilary Paulson, Chairperson, County Committee on School District Organization (CCSDO) provided an update on the trustee map process, discussing in detail the timeline, map considerations, additional data reviewed, current trustee areas, the San Mateo County Census, current and adjusted maps, an adjustment overview, the legal standard, current and adjusted map population data, and next steps.

Trustee Ross stated he did not realize the degree to which the legal standard was so focused on population size and contiguous communities, and not some of the national Voting Rights Act considerations. For the part of the county with which he is familiar, seeking a contiguous community achieved better flow between some communities, which is something they did not have previously, specifically in the Ravenswood Area from North Fair Oaks. He shared he was delighted they would be in the same Area moving forward. He expressed appreciation to Chairperson Paulson and the committee for the work being done.

Trustee Bonini said she had spoken at the CCSDO’s public hearing the previous week and lodged a concern about portions of the map recommendations. She understands the need for additional balancing for Area 4. Her understanding of prior discussions from 2011, from speaking with Trustee Gerard, is there was much conversation about keeping districts together, but she acknowledged that
might not be entirely possible. Trustee Bonini expressed hope that the Board might be willing to provide direction and suggest alternative map lines. She explained the San Mateo-Foster City School District is large and is a community of interest. As a former trustee of the district, she knows there is longstanding division between the cities based on when Foster City came into the district, along with other factors. Trustee Bonini discussed the efforts to consider the district as a whole and not divide the two cities, and said this can cause impacts on issues such as bonds throughout the last 10 years. She emphasized it is important to keep the cities together in one district.

Trustee Bonini explained the way the lines are drawn right now, Foster City, in addition to the island section, has been pulled out from Area 4 and grouped with Area 1. In a worst-case scenario, for the representation of the residents, a Board member could be elected from San Mateo for Area 1 and another Board member from Foster City for Area 4, leaving no representative living on the coastside. Now that Board members are not elected countywide, it is a much easier task to be elected by a smaller body of one-seventh of the electorate. Trustee Bonini shared she was unsure what an alternative map would look like, but she didn’t feel the proposed maps were best and she was greatly opposed to separating Area 4’s current district.

Trustee Alvaro thanked Chairperson Paulson and the CCSDO for understanding the coast is a contiguous area and La Honda-Pescadero Unified School District and Cabrillo Unified School District are sister districts that work and plan together, share services, and should never be separated. She agreed with Trustee Bonini on the issue of Foster City and that breaking up a school district is concerning. Trustee Alvaro shared the coastside is often represented by those who do not live in the community and who do not truly understand its issues. She explained for the supervisorial districts, someone who lives in unincorporated Redwood City or unincorporated Menlo Park often gets elected by voters to represent the coast. Trustee Alvaro described how Foster City would bring in more than the total population of the rest of Area 1 and the likelihood of anyone from La Honda, Pescadero, Montara, Half Moon Bay, or El Granada ever being elected to represent Area 1 would be slim. She said when thinking of communities of interest, La Honda-Pescadero Unified School District and Cabrillo Unified School District work together. The area connecting these districts with the Belmont-Redwood Shores School District is likely comprised of 20 families, or perhaps 20 houses which may or may not have children. Trustee Alvaro reiterated her concerns about Foster City because the new lines would break up that community, which has been divisive in the past, and bring in more people from one small area geographically than the coast has in its entire area. She fears the coast will lose future representation.

Trustee Gerard agreed with Trustee Bonini’s and Trustee Alvaro’s concerns. She described how important it is for the coastside to have representation, which may not happen with the proposed maps. Trustee Gerard explained there was previous discussion about placing Pacifica in Area 1, as opposed to Area 2, which would make more sense than adding Foster City because Pacifica is on the coast. In the proposed maps, Pacifica goes over the hill to Area 5 and San Bruno, which she doesn’t feel makes a lot of sense. Trustee Gerard reiterated concerns about representation for the coastside.

Trustee Ross commented he didn’t feel that trustee areas have any particular substantive need to line up with school districts. The Board’s roles and responsibilities historically attend to the entire county, which he hopes will continue. This doesn’t mesh with an arbitrary decision that the Board should be
like Legos clicking together the school districts at the local level. Even though this is not an endemic problem in the county, the drawing of school districts historically was not something done with a focus on fairness or equity, but with the opposite in mind in many cases. That can be transcended a bit at the county level, where the Board can focus on all students. Trustee Ross suggested that freeing oneself from thinking about districts and instead thinking of communities and ignoring the districts could lead to the types of maps to which Trustee Bonini, Trustee Alvaro, and Trustee Gerard are referring. He reiterated that amazing work has been done and commented it is hard to do this in a way which satisfies all constituencies.

Chairperson Paulson referred to the slide with the current population data and deviations, informing it contains the most helpful information for creating maps to submit to Niambi Clay, Executive Director, Equity, Social Justice, and Inclusion. She suggested checking with Executive Director Clay to see if the geographic information system (GIS) maps will be available sooner.

Trustee Bonini asked how the Board could redraw the maps or give direction to staff to do so. Trustee Alvaro reminded the Board are members of the public in this process, and Executive Director Clay is staff. Superintendent Magee asked if Trustee Bonini wanted to share her preferences with staff, who would then draw the maps. Trustee Bonini stated she was unsure if that was possible. Superintendent Magee asked Chairperson Paulson whether the map with the lines or just the graph with the population numbers was required when someone draws a map, or if they go together. Chairperson Paulson indicated they go together. They don’t need to be exact, street by street or census area by census area, but should include a city, neighborhood, or school district boundary to help draw firm lines around one of the census tracks.

Trustee Bonini explained when the committee for the supervisorial lines was meeting and maps were submitted, there was a tool they used and a consultant checked the maps to ensure they were balanced. Trustee Bonini requested an official way of determining if the districts are balanced. She stated her belief was that the districts are now balanced because they are within the 10%, if analyzed in the same way as the county supervisor’s committee. Trustee Bonini asserted she did not agree with the current process. Chairperson Paulson replied she can only share what has been advised by the counsel representing the CCSDO. Their duty is to make the areas as equal as possible and practical. They have been advised to use city guidelines and other guidelines such as school district areas, but that is not a requirement; only the numbers are required.

Trustee Cannon related he could not recall a time it mattered to the Board in a vote which district they represented and asked his colleagues as a practical matter, if it makes a difference which districts they represent. He stated he understands and respects the emotional components, wanting the coast to be represented, and the Foster City concerns, but he has never seen a disagreement on vote based on which districts Board members represent. Trustee Alvaro discussed the idea of representation by those who live in and understand a community versus those who live elsewhere. Trustee Alvaro framed her answer to Trustee Cannon’s question in terms of the seven individuals who may be sitting on the Board in the future. She stated when one says they are elected by the people in a given community, district, or set of districts, their perspective changes. They may tell people “You’re not in my district; I don’t represent you.”
Trustee Cannon expressed respect for that point of view and agreed that could happen in the future, but he could not recall an issue in the past where that came into consideration. Trustee Alvaro related it could happen during interdistrict attendance appeals (IAAs). Trustee Cannon stated even during contentious IAAs, he could not remember the decision coming down to a Board member advocating for their district. Trustee Alvaro recalled times she knew something was going on in the La Honda-Pescadero Unified School District for which the Board should be aware when taking their vote. She lives there, knows the district, and was able to bring information to the Board, and other Board members have done the same for their districts. It is not that Board members feel they need to vote in favor of their district, but they do understand their districts and communities and can bring information to the table.

Trustee Ross shared the Board has benefitted by being elected county-wide. He has engaged in discussions for IAAs and other issues grateful for the fact he was elected to the Board in 2012 through a process which required him to get to know the entire county. He physically spent time visiting each city in the county and discovered how diverse the county is in every way. That will change going forward and the Board will get elected from more narrowly drawn areas. Some will have broad knowledge of the county because of their backgrounds, but some will not. Trustee Ross hopes this will not mean anything bad for the Board, just something different. He feels the Board is not worried about themselves at this time, but rather what happens with the Board in the future.

Trustee Bonini expressed appreciation for the questions about why the Board member areas must be lockstep with district borders. She described being a County Board member as an obscure and confusing elected role not understood by many members of the public. Trustee Bonini discussed how there are communities of interest, whether a city or school district, who need to understand who they are voting for and why. There is no need to make this process more confusing, which will happen if the trustee areas do not follow some of the existing lines. She explained how there will be entire conversations about who represents which district, rather than about issues.

Chairperson Paulson gave a shout-out to Executive Director Clay for all the work she has done in this process.

D. Discuss/Act on Lease Agreement for 1800 Rollins Road, Burlingame, CA, 94010

Deputy Superintendent Bultema provided information on the lease agreement for 1800 Rollins Road, Burlingame, CA, 94010, including the term, amount of rent, and details on earthquake insurance.

After a motion by Trustee Alvaro and a second by Trustee Lempert, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross), by roll call vote, approved the lease agreement for 1800 Rollins Road, Burlingame, CA, 94010.

E. Suggest Topics for Future Board Agendas

There were no suggestions for future Board agendas.
F. Board Member Comments

Trustee Ross
Trustee Ross stated it was good to see everyone, and he hoped to meet in person again soon.

Trustee Camacho
Trustee Camacho wished everyone a good evening.

Trustee Cannon
Trustee Cannon thanked Board President Gerard for doing a good job during a tough first meeting.

Trustee Cannon shared that Mr. Rachal is a great guy, and both he and Mrs. Cannon were happy to see him awarded for being Employee of the Month.

Trustee Cannon noted that former staff member Margie Gustafson had been a meeting attendee. He acknowledged her for the amazing work she did in her tenure with SMCOE and wished her well.

Trustee Lempert
Trustee Lempert had no report.

Trustee Alvaro
Trustee Alvaro agreed that Mr. Rachal does a wonderful job.

Trustee Alvaro noted from the staffing report that Tom Sheldon had been promoted and described him as another outstanding member of the maintenance staff. She congratulated him on his promotion.

Trustee Alvaro expressed great sadness over the loss of Mr. Brashear, as a human being and an employee.

Trustee Alvaro recalled memories of Lillian Lee Port, who had served as County Counsel and would slam her hand on the table, say “Excuse Me,” and explain why something would not happen and why someone was wrong. She did this politely but there was no further discussion. Trustee Alvaro described how Ms. Port had one of the biggest hearts she has ever encountered and gave her helpful and heartfelt advice when it was needed. She thanked Superintendent Magee for adjourning the meeting in Ms. Port’s memory.

Trustee Bonini
Trustee Bonini had no report.

Board President Gerard
Board President Gerard agreed with Trustee Alvaro’s fond recollections of Ms. Port, describing her as an amazing person in many ways. The Board was sorry to see her retire because she contributed so much.
12. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:26 p.m., in honor of Lillian Lee Port, an expert in education law who represented school districts as a member of the San Mateo County Counsel’s Office. Ms. Port also taught School Law for Administrators at San Francisco State University for many years and wrote the text book used by most educator administrative credential programs in California.

Board President Gerard announced the next regular meeting would be held on Wednesday, February 2, 2022, at 7:00 p.m., in a virtual format under the 30-day authority of Resolution No. 22-1, approved by the Board earlier that evening.

Nancy Magee, Secretary
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