1. OPENING ITEMS

A. Call to Order

Board President Beverly Gerard called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. She noted in the effort to increase accessibility, simultaneous interpretation of the meeting would be provided in Spanish using Zoom technology.

B. Approval of Agenda

After a motion by Trustee Alvaro and a second by Trustee Cannon, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross) approved the April 6, 2022, 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. **March 16, 2022, Regular Board Meeting**

   After a motion by Trustee Alvaro and a second by Trustee Cannon, the Board approved, by a vote of six in favor (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, and Lempert) and one abstention (Ross), the Minutes of the March 16, 2022, Regular Board Meeting as presented.

   A. **March 18, 2022, Board Budget Study Session Special Board Meeting**

   After a motion by Trustee Alvaro and a second by Trustee Ross, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross) approved the Minutes of the March 18, 2022, Board Budget Study Session Special Meeting as presented.

4. **CONSENT AGENDA**

   B. **Adopt Joint Resolution No. 22-21 Recognizing April 2-8, 2022, as the Week of the Young Child**

   C. **Adopt Joint Resolution No. 22-22 Recognizing April 10, 2022, as Dolores Huerta Day**

   D. **Adopt Joint Resolution No. 22-23 Recognizing April 22, 2022, as Earth Day**

   E. **Adopt Joint Resolution No. 22-24 Recognizing April 27, 2022, as Administrative Professionals Day**

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

5. **EDUCATIONAL SERVICES DIVISION**

   A. **Receive Update on the SMCOE/Alder Teacher Residency Program**

   Marco Chávez, Associate Superintendent, Educational Services Division, introduced Elizabeth Veal, Director, Teacher Residency and Administrator Programs, Educational Services Division, who, along with residents Alyssa Kujiraoka and Matthew Tate, provided an update on the SMCOE/Alder Teacher Residency Program.

   Trustee Ross congratulated the residents and thanked them for attending. He described being a fan of the Alder Graduate School of Education and shared his excitement the County Office is leading the way in facilitating a residency program for districts. Trustee Ross asked about Director Veal’s role as faculty, coach, and recruiter. Director Veal replied she is Alder faculty and teaches the required seminar courses, as well as the monthly seminars for the mentor teachers. Director Veal explained mentors need to be lifelong learners and transfer that to the experience provided in the classroom. Mentors are expected to understand the needs of their residents and provide support for their academic success.
Trustee Cannon asked Director Veal why she feels the program is a preferred option for teachers in training. Director Veal described how the structure aims to build capacity around standards and Individualized Education Program (IEP) practices and provides an understanding of those who are being served. Residents are strongly encouraged to keep their focus on each individual student, which is emphasized in the mission and goals of both the County Office and Alder Graduate School of Education. Director Veal said the team is not afraid to have conversations about systems that do not serve all students equitably, how to disrupt those systems, and how to develop student agency. Director Veal summarized the program is outstanding due to the structure, the aligned priorities, and the determination to support those who might not have imagined they could become teachers.

Trustee Cannon recalled when the first cohort of administrative candidates earned their credentials, they cited the supportive atmosphere of the cohort model. He asked Director Veal about the cohort aspect of the residency program. Director Veal said the cohort structure is outstanding. Ms. Kujiraoka shared that having a cohort was incredibly important. Her cohort is comprised of seven residents who gathered for study sessions and created a 200-page Eureka slide deck for group study. The cohort was not only beneficial on the academic side, but also provided a way to connect with others experiencing the same challenges.

Trustee Bonini asked which type of credential the residents were working towards. She recalled when the program was first discussed, the scope was broader than just special education. Director Veal responded that Alder Graduate School of Education is credentialed to offer kindergarten through twelfth grade general education credentials, as well as the mild/moderate education specialist credential. The program includes a master’s degree and a credential. The SMCOE planning team analyzed high-needs areas and focused on education specialists due to the shortage of qualified teachers with that credential. There are opportunities to expand through state grants, for which the team is applying, and the third cohort in 2023-2024 could potentially expand to general education. However, the second cohort in 2022-2023 will again be comprised of education specialists.

Trustee Alvaro expressed her excitement to have met two resident teachers. She noted their energy, knowledge, and the power of the cohort behind them. Trustee Alvaro asked why only eight districts were participating and how the rest of the county could get involved. Director Veal responded that districts are currently addressing the trauma experienced throughout the pandemic and are in differing circumstances. Some are in position to take on residents in classrooms but may not have mentors to offer.

Trustee Alvaro reflected it is more about capacity than will, and Director Veal agreed. Trustee Alvaro asked if the goal was to continue to expand throughout the county if possible. Director Veal confirmed the goal is to reach a cohort of 23 residents. For next year, they will double the number of residents for the second cohort, and she is confident they will have 14-15 residents next year. In the third year, having 23 residents is achievable, especially if the program expands in the direction of transitional kindergarten (TK), kindergarten (K), and general education.

Trustee Ross asked about Ms. Kujiraoka’s experience in seminar and classes and for the titles of some of the classes. Ms. Kujiraoka responded her experience has been completely virtual this year.
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During the summer, the cohort focused on diversity, equity, and inclusion. In the fall and spring, courses were aligned with more practical applications, including case management and instruction for mild/moderate for both English and Math. Seminar has been the bridge between the two, with the cohort discussing how to use technology with students and how to manage challenging behaviors in the classroom. Some of the professors attend seminars to fill in knowledge gaps, answer questions, and provide support with assignments, especially for the completely asynchronous classes.

Trustee Cannon thanked the residents for being interested in special education. He described how the residents are teaching students, parents, and their fellow teachers, which is a huge challenge. Trustee Cannon emphasized the importance of having a strong special education staff on campus because they provide a tremendous service to the school and the students.

Board President Gerard thanked Director Veal for an excellent update. She shared her excitement to hear about the current success as well as the upcoming expansion. Board President Gerard also thanked the resident teachers for sharing their experiences, which is invaluable to the Board.

Director Veal thanked and expressed appreciation for the support of the County Office including from the Executive Directors, Superintendent Magee, the SELPA, and the programs focused on the arts and social-emotional well-being. She stated one of the great benefits of the County Office partnering with Alder Graduate School of Education is that she can provide an introduction into the value of the resources the County Office provides to the residents. She was unaware of the role of the County Office until she became an administrator at SMCOE, and if she had known about the resources provided for educators, she would have felt more supported as an instructional leader in the classroom. Director Veal expressed appreciation for the teamwork with her colleagues at the County Office.

6. OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

A. Receive Report on Recommendations for SMCOE Board Policy and Administrative Regulation Reorganization and Revisions

Superintendent Magee began by explaining that in 2019, the team focused on the Board policies under the 4000 section, Personnel. These policies need to be updated and aligned with current legislation and changing laws. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham studied other county offices and recommended breaking Board Policies into two parts – Board Policies and Superintendent Policies. The primary interest is in the 4000 series related to personnel matters. Because the County Superintendent is the employer, there is no gray area for authority, and there is a real need to update. The plan is to begin work updating the 4000 series, and if the Board selects a Board Policy Subcommittee, they could work together on additional sections.

Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham said developing and keeping Board Policies and Administrative Regulations current takes a great deal of effort, but the time has come to get this work done. Some of the Board Policies are outdated and she hopes to update them and align them
with statutory requirements in terms of the roles and responsibilities of the County Board of Education and the County Superintendent of Schools. The team looks forward to working with a subcommittee, if one is formed.

Trustee Alvaro stated this is a good idea. She believes the difference between Board Policies and Administrative Regulations seems to be that the Board sets the policies, and the Administrative Regulations determine the follow through by the Superintendent and Human Resources. It always seemed strange to her to have separate Board Policies and Administrative Regulations which related to each other. Trustee Alvaro asked why there are Board Policies not in the Board purview. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham replied that the California School Boards Association (CSBA) is the entity which developed default templates for school districts, but less so for county offices.

In digging into the Board Policies and Administrative Regulations of other county offices, she saw efforts to modify the CSBA templates for county offices of education were clunky. The phrase “School Board” cannot just be swapped with “County Board” because of the difference in statutory responsibilities. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham said there are more than 1,000 school districts and only 58 county offices of education in California, so CSBA has not devoted the same time and resources to fleshing out the Board Policy templates for county offices.

Trustee Alvaro asked if the California County Boards of Education (CCBE) could offer assistance, because other county offices are likely in the same situation. Trustee Ross added that this year, CCBE is prioritizing the development of an updated governance handbook, with the help of Kathy Meola, former County Attorney to SMCOE and the Board, and to CSBA. The handbook aims to describe county board member and county superintendent responsibilities and lay out the possible interpretations of ambiguous areas. That process may be helpful in some respects, but some of the details will need to be worked through.

Trustee Ross asked if Trustee Camacho could offer additional resources. Trustee Camacho recalled in the last review in 2016, the CSBA guidelines were used as a resource. He shared he was intrigued about how CCBE could work with CSBA staff to have actual county Board members be involved in the update, and what they develop could be used as a model for policies.

Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham noted in the Board’s prior review, the focus was on the Board bylaws, but there are many other series of policies and regulations which have not been reviewed by a Board subcommittee, or anyone else, for quite some time. She agreed with Trustee Alvaro’s distinction between Board Policies and Administrative Regulations. The Board Policies set the high level general direction and the Administrative Regulations are more detailed. One of the reasons for having two documents covering one topic is that a Board Policy must have two readings before it can be approved by the Board, but an Administrative Regulation does not require Board approval. It may be clunky to look in two places to handle a situation, but it provides the flexibility to make changes regarding details without having the item on two Board meeting agendas taking up valuable Board time. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham summarized that Board Policies are general and the details can be found in the Administrative Regulations, making it easier to make modifications in real time as needed.
Trustee Alvaro indicated perhaps it would be appropriate to ask for assistance and back-up from attorneys at CCBE because the work will ultimately benefit all county boards. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham agreed that was a good idea.

Trustee Bonini stated she felt it was appropriate to separate out the 4000 series and asked whether some which were missing would be identified and created, rather than just updating the Board Policies already in place. Superintendent Magee confirmed that would be part of the process. As the team recognizes an issue is not addressed in any Board Policy, they would determine whether it would best fit a Board Policy, a Superintendent Policy, or an Administrative Regulation. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham added there will be changes, as she has already identified policies that might need to be added, while others will be retired, as they are no longer applicable or relevant. Numbering will also be changed as part of a comprehensive review.

Trustee Bonini asked whether the coordination of a subcommittee would be a parallel process. Superintendent Magee responded the team would begin with the 4000 series and involve the subcommittee throughout the process by providing updates, answering questions, and engaging in discussion.

Trustee Bonini discussed how Board Policies are approved by the Board and asked if the Board would be approving the Superintendent Policies. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham confirmed that some Board Policies are County Board Policies and will require two readings and adoption. The team proposes making the Policies and Regulations more accessible by posting them online in a way that supports a word search functionality, similar to what can be done through Gamut.

Trustee Bonini asked whether there would be any policies not approved by the Board. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham indicated there will be some which are not Board Policies approved by the Board. There will also be Superintendent Policies which do not come to the Board for approval because they are not within the statutory roles and responsibilities of the County Board. Trustee Bonini asked if there would be any notice requirement so the Board would be shown the policies. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham assured they would be posted and publicly available. Trustee Bonini asked if there would be notice as they are adopted and implemented. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham explained there is no legal requirement that there be a public hearing, which is a differentiation between a School Board and County Superintendent. However, the subcommittee will be kept apprised of the work related to Superintendent Policies to ensure everyone is on the same page in the process.

Trustee Bonini asked if the Superintendent Policies are being couched as Administrative Regulations, so they do not need to come to the Board. She asked if this is written in Education or Government Code, and if it isn’t, whether it should be. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham stated that there is no requirement. Trustee Bonini indicated there is no reference to creating separate policies in the code. Superintendent Magee shared that the Board and Superintendent Policies would be presented together in the same location, as is done in other county offices. In the 4000s, there will be Board Policies and Superintendent Policies. All will be available and presented to the public in the same location.
Trustee Ross discussed the discretion of the Board and Superintendent in approaching this process and stated it makes sense to promulgate Superintendent Policies describing the direction of the office. He related that Education Code provides that the County Board of Education may adopt regulations governing the administration of the County Office of Education and the County Superintendent of Schools. The Board has a discretionary authority to do so, as well. Because they have that discretionary authority, it creates an obligation for County Board members to be aware of the regulations and policies because they are accountable for them. The County Superintendent needs to run their own office and should have room to operate and fulfill the mission and vision, but Education Code provides the Board with discretionary authority to also promulgate regulations affecting the County Office. This means they are also accountable for how the office is run. Trustee Ross suggested the Board and Superintendent Policies be updated, but there should be a way to present them to the Board for adoption, or they may choose to do nothing because they are Superintendent Policies. But the Board should have a chance to look them over and make suggestions as necessary. He summarized he was recommending a collaborative process and asked if that was a fair suggestion.

Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham proposed one option was to provide them in batches. These could be submitted as informational items if they are Superintendent Policies to ensure the Board receives them. The Board would have the opportunity to provide feedback, but it would not be an action item. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham indicated there are constraints, for example with the 4000 series, including collective bargaining agreements and merit system rules. Those must be considered and all components must work harmoniously together. There cannot be a Superintendent Policy which contradicts a union contract or the merit rules. She emphasized that there are a number of constraints as to the content of the policies.

Trustee Camacho asked if Superintendent Policies were part of Education Code. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham clarified that other county offices have used them to differentiate different roles and responsibilities, but they are not in Education Code. As with the CSBA templates, most of the Education Code is designed or written from a school district perspective, not the county office perspective. Trustee Camacho related he would be uncomfortable with that for two reasons. First, two of the county offices mentioned in the memo have appointed superintendencies, which is different. Second, in reference to Trustee Ross’ comments about the Board being accountable to the activity of the County Office, he would be uncomfortable with policies being adopted in the name of the County Office without the intentional conversation. He referred to the suggestion to include these items as informational items, which is different than public oversight of a policy process. Trustee Camacho requested that the subcommittee, if formed, explore this further so the public does not feel as though there are policies being adopted without public feedback. It is part of the Board’s responsibilities to be outside of that world and ask that policies be reconciled with Education Code if necessary. He looks forward to a subcommittee, if formed, being a part of that conversation.

Trustee Lempert discussed how the role of School Boards is under intense focus, especially district School Boards who hire and fire their superintendents. He stated that at the County Office, the County Superintendent is elected. He made the analogy to the County Board of Supervisors, who do
not ask for the Sheriff’s policies, but only comment as elected officials. Trustee Lempert expressed concern, mostly for Boards which hire and fire their superintendents and are responsible for the governance. Even there, public Boards have acted in micromanaging ways which have led to public mistrust. Trustee Lempert summarized that the Board provides overall guidance on the budget, but not direct operations. The County Superintendent is accountable directly to the voters and the role is based on an election. He again made the analogy to the County Board of Supervisors, which are independently-run elected offices. Trustee Lempert emphasized the Board should simply be giving advice on Superintendent Policies, but the County Superintendent’s boss is not the Board, it is the voters.

Trustee Camacho clarified his statement. He indicated he wanted to make sure to have a conversation about this process being fully open and transparent to the public. It is not about the Board’s approval, it is about when an Administrative Regulation or Superintendent Policy is adopted, he believes it should be presented to the public. There should be a clear process in which these are made public, whether they are approved by the Superintendent or the Board. The public should know to what they are holding their Superintendent accountable.

Trustee Alvaro discussed when Board Policies were altered in the past, whether something was added or changed, or the Board Policy was made obsolete and deleted, there was always a vote. She asked about the removal of the 4000 series and whether the Board would publicly vote on the removal of certain Board Policies. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham replied that the Board does not have to vote to remove a policy. The process is tied to changing, modifying, or adding a policy, but a vote is not required for removal. This is why presenting the changes as an informational item would be legally sufficient.

Trustee Bonini referred to the example provided for Santa Clara County and stated she had printed out a few of their Superintendent Policies. Those policies state the date on which they were adopted. She asked if the team had looked at whether their County Board had approved those policies. Trustee Bonini expressed concern for this issue and her belief that Education Code is the controlling law.

Trustee Ross stated as far as he could tell, the only authority in the Education Code for the Board to adopt policies is Education Code 1040, which indicates what the Board must do. He shared that the County Boards of Education shall adopt rules and regulations not inconsistent with the laws of the state for their own governance. The Board must adopt its own policies, which is meant by the phrase “rules and regulations.”

Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham added that SMCOE refers to these as the Board bylaws in the 9000 series, which are for the Board’s own governance. Trustee Ross confirmed these are the policies the Board must adopt for itself. He referred again to Education Code, sharing in regard to the other County Office policies, County Boards of Education may adopt rules and regulations governing the administration of the Office of the County Superintendent of Schools. Trustee Ross discussed how the Board has the authority to write policies which affect the way the County Superintendent of Schools operates, but they do not have the obligation. He stated the Board would be performing their responsibility by being made aware of the policies. If the County Superintendent wants to promulgate a new policy, the Board should have a chance to read and
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know it, on behalf of the public. He doesn’t believe that in the normal course the Board will want to vote on every policy. Trustee Ross related that if a future County Superintendent creates policies with which the Board disagrees, the Board could set up a committee to write their own policies because they have the discretion to do so. They also have a responsibility to know about these policies. Having them as an informational item would keep the Board apprised about what is happening and would not take away the authority provided in Education Code.

Trustee Alvaro again asked if the Board needed to vote to remove the 4000 series. Trustee Ross feels the Board must rescind the policy if they are the one who adopted the policy. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham clarified that the policy would be replaced and renamed as a Superintendent Policy, not rescinded. She informed that Education Code 1040 states that County Boards must adopt rules and regulations not inconsistent with the laws of the state, and Education Code 1042 permits County Boards of Education to adopt rules and regulations governing the administration of the office. That requires an analysis of the different Education Code provisions which set forth the roles and responsibilities of the County Board versus the County Superintendent. An argument could be made that if the County Board adopted a policy or regulation which infringed on the clear statutory authority of the County Superintendent, that would be inconsistent with the laws of California. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham indicated there are boundaries in terms of making sure, from an Education Code perspective, that the entities are staying in the correct lane.

Trustee Bonini agreed that the Board and Superintendent should stay in their own lanes. She discussed reading Education Code 1042 differently, as being discretionary. If it is the will of the Board to approve such policies, she believes they can. That may not happen, but that is how she is interpreting the language.

Trustee Lempert again expressed extreme concern about this conversation. He emphasized how the County Office has an elected Superintendent who is accountable to the voters. In a time focused on how democracy works, process is critical. Trustee Lempert shared he did not believe that is what the law intends or how this Board should function. He referenced the Orange County Office of Education and again stated that the County Office has an elected Superintendent. The voters determine whether the Superintendent’s decisions are good or bad, and the Board needs to be very careful about its role. There have been abuses of that role, which is not beneficial for students or the system.

Trustee Ross explained this is a conversation about the rule of law. The law states the Board has the authority to do something, not that they necessarily should. He agreed this may not be prudent policy and it puts the Board in an awkward position because voters will put pressure on the Board. But the Board does have authority under a plain language law that they may adopt regulations governing the administration of the office and that is not mitigated by any phrase that says it must be consistent with state law. In fact, that statement indicates the Board can regulate the office on a discretionary basis. Education Code 1040 states the policies must be consistent with law, but doing a code analysis makes this even more open-ended.
Trustee Ross referenced the roles of the District Attorney and the Board of Supervisors and shared his experiences in the District Attorney’s Office. He cautioned against making direct comparisons between the Board of Supervisors, countywide offices, and the County Office. Trustee Ross discussed the strange bureaucracy which is not always best for students and how there appears to be general agreement on what should be happening. He described how the Superintendent has been leading through difficult times very well and suggested setting up a process acknowledging that others will be in the chairs in the future. The best strategy is to create the foundation for future circumstances by analyzing the law and prudently setting up successors to work with each other.

Trustee Ross suggested letting the Superintendent produce new policies for the office and allowing the Board to see those policies. A decision does not need to be made at this time about what to do, but at some point, the Board may want to step in and articulate a new policy, which is allowed by Education Code. At minimum, the Board and the public will have notice, which is sufficient. Trustee Ross indicated if a Board voted on policies outside of the 9000 series, his preference was for the Board to be made aware of superseding policies. There was no need for a vote on every change. The Board has already adopted, approved, and published many policies for the office. When there is a new policy, that is the one in effect, as long as the Board did not take counter action.

Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham explained the other issue is that many policies should not have been Board Policies in the first place, but they were set up that way because of a lack of awareness of distinction. She stated she was unsure how policies were set up in the 1980s, but many never should have been characterized as Board Policies because at no point of time did they fall within the jurisdiction of the County Board.

Superintendent Magee added that the practice has always been having Board Policies and Administrative Regulations. The Board never sees, reviews, or approves the Administrative Regulations and this is how the office has always been run. The team is suggesting, in efforts to run a top-notch organization focused on the needs of students, to update the outdated 4000 series policies under the purview of the County Superintendent as the employer. They are restrictive, bound by law, by contract, and by the merit rules.

Trustee Alvaro said she was not questioning whether the Board should vote on every detail or on each policy. She asked if, at some point, the Board would need to vote saying “yes, please do what you said you were going to do.” Superintendent Magee confirmed that was not legally required. Trustee Alvaro clarified the Board would not have to give permission to remove some policies. Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham agreed the Board would not need to take action in that case.

Trustee Ross respectfully disagreed. He shared he feels that if the Board adopted policies, the cleanest move would be to support the Superintendent by officially sunsetting those policies. Trustee Ross indicated it is in the Board’s interest to sunset some policies, especially the Human Resources sections, and not be held legally responsible. He stated the Board should not concede that the policies are of such little matter that once approved, they can be superseded without action. Trustee Ross suggested supporting what the Superintendent is doing, finding which parts of the series should be Superintendent Policies, and by resolution, affirmatively terminating policies
which were affirmatively implemented. Trustee Alvaro suggested these policies could be
terminated as a block, and Trustee Ross agreed. Trustee Alvaro suggested the Board formally
approve the termination of certain policies, and Trustee Ross strongly agreed. He remarked it is
within the Board’s discretion to do so, even if Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham advises
it is not necessary.

Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham informed there will be an opportunity to discuss these
issues in greater detail with the subcommittee. Board President Gerard suggested it was time to
move on to the next item.

Superintendent Magee thanked the Board for the conversation. She shared the importance of
discussing these types of actions and honoring the relationship between the County Superintendent
and the Board. The item was presented with the idea of working in partnership with the Board
through the subcommittee and the offer to bring periodic updates on progress, questions, and what
is being learned, to be discussed by the Board.

B. Public Disclosure of Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the San Mateo County
Superintendent of Schools and the San Mateo County Educators Association (SMCEA) for
2021-2022 and 2022-2023

Kevin Bultema, Deputy Superintendent, Business Services Division, and Tami Moore, Associate
Superintendent, Human Resources, presented the public disclosure of the collective bargaining
agreement between the San Mateo County Superintendent of Schools and the San Mateo County
Educators Association (SMCEA) for 2021-2022 and 2022-2023.

Trustee Cannon congratulated the team on this process. He shared the toughest job, from his point
of view as an educator, was in Human Resources, and he thanked Associate Superintendent Moore
for taking on that challenge.

Board President Gerard also congratulated the team on the excellent news, commenting that
negotiations are not easy and require a lot of hard work, but the Board is appreciative, as are the
teachers.

C. Superintendent’s Comments

Superintendent Magee began by acknowledging that Youth Commissioner Liaison Willis was
traveling on the east coast, and invited him to provide updates. Youth Commissioner Liaison Willis
shared he was touring colleges to help decide where he would spend the next four years. He shared
that the Youth Commission was working on a sexual assault policy with Congresswoman Jackie
Speier’s Youth Advisory Commission. They are seeking information throughout the county on sexual
assault resolutions and what schools do when there is a case of sexual assault, with hopes of making
suggestions on policy. Youth Commissioner Willis shared his school just started two weeks of spring
break. Trustee Ross asked to which colleges Youth Commissioner Willis had been accepted. He
informed he was currently touring Yale University and would next visit Harvard University. He was
also accepted into Stanford University. The Board offered their congratulations.
Superintendent Magee discussed her attendance the previous evening at the send-off celebration for Jeneé Littrell, Deputy Superintendent, Educational Services Division, who is ending her formal services at the County Office. It was a positive event with many wonderful comments shared. She thanked and expressed appreciation to everyone who attended.

Superintendent Magee congratulated Deputy Superintendent Bultema, Associate Superintendent Moore, and SMCEA leadership for their hard work in collaboration at the bargaining table. The team was thrilled to come to agreement on a two-year deal, which allows everyone to settle, know what is coming, and move forward with positivity and trust. She thanked Deputy Superintendent Bultema and Associate Superintendent Moore for their exceptional leadership in this space.

Superintendent Magee addressed Board member requests for school visits and apologized that they were unable to participate in site visits over the past few years. Everyone is now looking forward and the team worked hard to schedule time for the Board to visit and tour both Gateway and Canyon Oaks on April 28 from 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. Superintendent Magee said these visits would be added to the Board calendars and suggested any Board members interested in attending should let Ms. Perna know.

Superintendent Magee noted that coming out of COVID-19, there are a lot more in-person events being scheduled. She suggested if Board members become aware of a community event, especially in their district or trustee area, that they want to bring to the attention of their colleagues, to let Ms. Perna know and she would gather the information and then place the event on the Board calendars.

Superintendent Magee shared about additional upcoming events, including San Mateo County’s prioritization of the goal to end homelessness in the county. The County has planned an entire year of events on this topic on April 22, May 20, June 3, and a summit in September.

Superintendent Magee spoke of another bucket of work with “Home for All,” a countywide effort to increase access to workforce housing in the county. There is a special “Educator and Workforce Housing” subcommittee reconvening on April 18 from 2:00 – 3:00 p.m. She had placed Board members who expressed interest on their mailing list, and any other interested Board members may contact Ms. Perna.

Superintendent Magee also shared that on Friday, May 13, at 5:00 p.m., the Jefferson Union High School District will hold their ribbon-cutting event for their amazing workforce housing project. The JUHSD Board has shown incredible, progressive leadership in bringing this project to fruition, and she expects it to be a wonderful celebration.

Superintendent Magee also shared information on the County Office’s ribbon-cutting event for the new outdoor learning space at the El Portal/Palos Verdes special education campus in San Bruno. This event will be held on May 18 and will include a BBQ lunch to celebrate staff. Details on the timing of the ribbon cutting are still to be determined and an invitation will be sent to the Board soon.

Lastly, Superintendent Magee gave a shout-out to Niambi Clay, Executive Director, Equity, Social Justice, and Inclusion, Office of the Superintendent, who sits on the Immigrant Forum, a countywide
body working to support the success and well-being of the county’s immigrant community. The San Mateo County Youth Commission also has an “Immigrant Youth Committee” subcommittee working on this issue, and they have established a $1000 scholarship to administer to five outstanding youth who are immigrants, to be used toward the achievement of higher education. Superintendent Magee shouted out the team broadly advertising that scholarship and called to attention this intersection of the Youth Commission and the County Office.

7. BOARD MEMBERS

A. Receive Update from Legislative Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chair Bonini shared that the subcommittee recently met with Superintendent Magee and Patricia Love, Executive Director, Strategy and Communications, Office of the Superintendent. They are still adding items to their agenda and tracking the legislative calendar. There was robust discussion around excess property taxes and both she and Trustee Camacho attended the San Mateo County School Boards Association (SMCSBA) legislative committee the following day in hopes of planning an event. They raised the issue to the districts who were excited about that idea.

Another item discussed was the new legislation around Assembly Bill (AB) 824, Student Representatives to County Boards of Education, which former Youth Commissioner Liaison Chan had worked on during her time with the County Office. There is no requirement to entertain petitions until the start of 2023, and the County Office already has a process in place, so the recommendation is to wait on this item.

Trustee Bonini spoke about the issue of early childhood legislation and Senate Bill (SB) 876, Digital Equity Education and County Offices of Education. Superintendent Magee informed that Lorrie Owens, Chief Technology Officer, Business Services Division, is carrying that forward in grand fashion for the County Office. Trustee Bonini indicated that may be brought back at some point. There were several other pieces of legislation discussed at the subcommittee meeting, but those were the highlights. The subcommittee will keep the Board apprised of continuing conversations.

B. Discuss/Act on Establishing an Ad Hoc Board Policy Subcommittee

Board President Gerard indicated that one of her goals was to continue to update Board polices and it was at her request that the Board form an Ad Hoc Board Policy Subcommittee. She related that other Board members had expressed interest in this work and she was hoping they would be willing to be part of this subcommittee. She referenced Trustee Alvaro, Trustee Camacho, and Trustee Bonini as potentially having interest in serving and turned the item over for discussion. Trustee Alvaro, Trustee Bonini, and Trustee Camacho volunteered to participate in the subcommittee, with Trustee Bonini serving as chair.
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After a motion by Trustee Ross and a second by Trustee Cannon, the Board unanimously (Alvaro, Bonini, Camacho, Cannon, Gerard, Lempert, and Ross) approved establishing an Ad Hoc Board Policy Subcommittee.

C. Suggested Topics for Future Board Agendas

There were no suggested topics for future Board agendas.

D. Board Member Comments

Trustee Ross
Trustee Ross reiterated feeling proud that the County Office is the pioneering county office running a teacher residency program in the state. He believes county offices have a big role to play in helping school districts address the teacher shortage, and he is delighted that the County Office is a model. Having come from a convening of Educators Rising in Arkansas, he shared there are three entry points for educators. One is high school students who want to be educators, so the next step is to encourage them to go into teaching. Trustee Ross suggested it would be wonderful to see Educators Rising in this county. Superintendent Magee shared the effort had been taken up several years ago, but it was difficult to get traction. Trustee Ross asked if it might be reconsidered again at some point.

Trustee Ross stated, as a point of clarity, that he did not believe the Board members were trying to pick fights with each other or the Superintendent regarding how to go about policies. He discussed efforts to perform fiduciary responsibilities as Board members and shared great optimism that the subcommittee will steer forward in partnership with the County Office and Superintendent. He thanked the Board members who volunteered to serve on that subcommittee.

Trustee Alvaro
Trustee Alvaro extended condolences to the family of Court and Community Schools teacher John Dummler who passed away recently, as well as to the teachers and staff who worked alongside him and are dealing with this loss.

Trustee Alvaro wished the best of luck to Cheryl Agrawal, Executive Director, Teacher and Administrator Development, Educational Services Division, and Alyson Suzuki, Executive Director, Early Learning Support Services, Educational Services Division, as they move on to new adventures. She shared that Executive Director Agrawal and Executive Director Suzuki have done incredible work in their respective departments, and they are amazing women. Trustee Alvaro thanked them for all they have done and let them know they will be missed.

Trustee Alvaro shared that she attended John Beiers’ retirement celebration and presented him with the resolution from the Board. She discussed how the Board passes resolutions to honor educators when they retire, but it is unusual to honor an attorney. However, Mr. Beiers did so much for all of the school districts, the County Office, and the County Board. Trustee Alvaro described how Mr. Beiers made sure the County Office always had attorneys who understood the heart of its role and Education Code, and how its work impacts students, families, schools, and districts. He was moved by the resolution, and she extended his gratitude to the Board.
Trustee Cannon

Trustee Cannon echoed Trustee Alvaro’s comments regarding Mr. Dummler, Executive Director Agrawal, and Executive Director Suzuki. He also thanked her for representing the Board so nicely at Mr. Beiers’ retirement celebration with her heartfelt speech.

Trustee Cannon shared that Board President Gerard did an excellent job representing the Board at Deputy Superintendent Littrell’s send-off event. He described how Superintendent Magee set a wonderful tone for the event, as she did the previous year for Denise Porterfield, former Deputy Superintendent, Business Services Division; Lori Musso, former Associate Superintendent, Human Resources; and Jennifer Frentress, former Associate Superintendent, Innovation and Research, Educational Services Division. He remarked he was particularly impressed by the comments, appreciation, and support shared by Executive Director Littrell’s colleagues, which were natural, honest, and heartfelt. Trustee Cannon described being moved by Executive Director’s Littrell’s comments about the Board, and asked Superintendent Magee to summarize those comments. Superintendent Magee related that Deputy Superintendent Littrell commended the Board on their whole-hearted focus on the best interests of students in all their actions and words, which is not the case in every community and on every Board. In her comments, Deputy Superintendent Littrell had indicated she was especially grateful to be able to work with such an organization.

Trustee Cannon thanked Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham for her clear explanations that evening on various items, allowing the Board to cut through the maze of the law.

Trustee Cannon shared at Deputy Superintendent Littrell’s send-off event, he had spoken to staff working in support of Unity Days, and he asked Superintendent Magee to share a little about their project. Superintendent Magee shared that Unity Days are day-long experiential activities for students to connect with each other and tap into their leadership, learn shared language, connect across identities, and build community. The team has been doing deep work in San Bruno around Unity Days, pulling in Capuchino High School, and have also been working in San Carlos schools. This is the kind of work in which students and school staff need to be involved, especially coming out of the pandemic. Trustee Cannon asked if the Board might hear a presentation on Unity Days in the future. Superintendent Magee agreed that could happen.

Trustee Lempert

Trustee Lempert thanked Trustee Alvaro on behalf of the Board for her presentation to Mr. Beiers. He shared that he enjoyed attending Mr. Beiers’ retirement celebration with Trustee Cannon and former colleague Tom Fitzpatrick. Trustee Lempert noted that Mr. Beiers highlighted Superintendent Magee and Chief Deputy County Attorney Cunningham in his speech, and informed those in attendance that they could not attend because Superintendent Magee was being honored by ACSA for her outstanding leadership. Trustee Lempert described Mr. Beiers as a class act who will continue to engage in important work moving forward.

Trustee Camacho

Trustee Camacho reminded the Board that the next SMCSBA general membership dinner meeting would be held on April 18 at 7:00 p.m. He thanked Superintendent Magee and the County Office for
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opening up 101 Twin Dolphin Drive to host the first in-person event in several years. The topic is workforce shortages and how districts are working to address that issue.

Trustee Camacho thanked Superintendent Magee and the team for submitting the CCBE Conference proposals. The CCBE Conference planning committee will meet in Sacramento on Friday to discuss the proposals, and he is excited and looking forward to discussing the proposals submitted on behalf of the County Office.

Trustee Bonini
Trustee Bonini reported on her attendance at the SELPA Community Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting the previous Monday. She described the progress over the last few years in the way they do their governance of the CAC. For the first time, there was a chair who was one of the appointed district parents and helped plan the meeting and set the agenda. The group engaged in a robust conversation around legislation and SELPA has a legislative action day for which they were preparing. They discussed SELPA’s budget process, including the hearing being held with the SELPA Governing Board on May 17. They are being proactive in ensuring they have the opportunity to give input on the budget prior to that and are having a meeting in advance.

Bonini noted she has been attending these meetings for roughly four years and still there are only three districts represented, with members appointed by their Boards. There were three other districts with parents, one being Trustee Bonini, so six districts represented in total. She hopes to get more districts involved and a recruitment packet was assembled by Anjanette Pelletier, former Associate Superintendent, SELPA, and Karen Breslow, Coordinator, SELPA. Trustee Bonini discussed measures the Board could take in their own districts, with their own trustees, and how she had discussed this with SMCSBA, letting them know how the importance of this process. This is in Education Code as an advisory, oversight, and accountability component for SELPA.

Trustee Bonini shared she is also working on projects with the Commission for Disabilities and the Youth Committee. They are conducting research with the San Mateo Union High School District, the San Mateo-Foster City School District, and the Jefferson Elementary School District, trying to identify and support potential leadership opportunities for students with disabilities. They also aim to ensure students with disabilities are represented and break down barriers where that is not happening. In another project, the Youth Committee for the Mental Health Commission is working to help students find resources because parents are often confused by the process. Trustee Bonini serves on the Parent/Guardian/Caregiver Roadmap subcommittee, putting together every piece of the mental health system, including the school and substance use and abuse components. The latter is part of the Mental Health and Substance Abuse Recovery Commission, soon to be renamed the Behavioral Health Commission, when the bylaws amendment is approved by the Board of Supervisors.

Board President Gerard
Board President Gerard shared she had attended the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Committee meeting the previous week for the first time, which was interesting. Deputy Superintendent Littrell provided a report and shared a lot of helpful information. There were a lot of questions about the closing of Gateway, and it was a productive meeting which she was glad she attended.
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Board President Gerard reported she also attended Deputy Superintendent Littrell’s lovely send-off event the previous evening. There were many wonderful comments shared and Deputy Superintendent Littrell is moving into the role of full-time grandmother, which sounds like a lot of fun.

Board President Gerard informed she would be attending the CCBE Conference planning committee meeting in Sacramento on Friday. She spent several hours the previous day reviewing proposals and there were many excellent proposals submitted which she is excited to review with the planning committee on Friday.

11. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:13 p.m. Board President Gerard announced the next Regular Meeting will take place on Wednesday, April 20, 2022, at 7:00 p.m.

Nancy Magee, Secretary

jlp