At a Regular meeting of the Board of Education of Fresno Unified School District, held on December 9, 2015 there were present Members Ashjian, Chavez, Davis, De La Cerda, Mills, Ryan and President Johnson. Student Board Members Quintana and Correa Present. Superintendent Hanson was also present.

Trustee Davis convened the meeting at 2:18 p.m. and ADJOURNED to Closed Session to address items 1 through 7. The Board reconvened in Open Session at 5:32 p.m.

President Johnson arriving at 2:22 p.m. and Trustee De La Cerda arriving at 2:30 p.m.

Staff Present

Deputy Superintendent/CFO Quinto, Associate Superintendent Aguilar and Sanchez. Instructional Superintendents: Dutra, Gomes, Her, Russell and Wall. Assistant Superintendents: Beck, Belanger, Holland and Maldonado. Executive Director Constituent Services Plascencia. Executive Director of Student Services Dorsey. Chief Academic Officer Mecum, Chief Operations Officer Temple, Chief Human Resources/Labor Relations Officer Idsvoog, Chief Information Officer Arias, Chief of Technology Madden and Chief of Staff Nelson.

Unscheduled Oral Communications – Prior to Closed Session

Tish Rice – Voiced her concern regarding the Superintendent’s evaluation and urged the board to take a hard look at the past year. Requested a roll call vote to be taken in closed session.

Reporting Out of Closed Session

- By a vote of 7-0-0, the Board took action in Closed Session to settle Worker’s Compensation claim on Juana Delgado, case #2014-0829.
- By a vote of 7-0-0, the Board took action in Closed Session to settle Worker’s Compensation claim on Santiago Garcia, case #2015-0761.
- By a vote of 7-0-0, the Board took action in Closed Session to settle Worker’s Compensation claim on Marie Makardian, case #2011-0193, 2012-0840.

*All times are approximate and subject to change*
The Board took action in Closed Session to give Superintendent Hanson a positive evaluation and to extend his contract to June 30, 2020 on a roll call vote of 5-2-0 as follows: AYES: Members Chavez, Davis, De La Cerda, Ryan, and President Johnson. NOES: Members Ashjian and Mills.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Blanca Barrera, a parent that has had a positive impact at Balderas Elementary, led the flag salute.

APPROVE Minutes
APPROVED, as recommended, the draft minutes for the November 18, 2015 Regular Meeting.

RESOLUTION ADOPT Resolution Proclaiming the Week of December 7-13, 2015 as Computer Science Education Week
ADOPTED, as recommended - Technology is changing our world daily, and computer science and the art of coding provides an opportunity for students to nurture their creativity, collaboration and problem solving skills in preparation for future careers. The number of computer science jobs are growing faster than the number of students entering the computer science field, and therefore it is imperative we expose students to computer science. No matter what path students choose, technology is going to be an active part of their future. Having fundamental coding skills strengthens math and logic skills, and further develops a student’s ability to think critically and solve problems.

Member Mills moved for approval, seconded by Member Davis, which carried a roll call vote of 9-0-0, as follows: AYES: Student Board Members: Quintana and Correa, Board Members: Ashjian, Chavez, Davis, De La Cerda, Mills, Ryan and President Johnson.

HEAR Reports from Student Board Representatives
Student Board Representative Georgiana Rodriguez provided comments/reports from the Student Advisory Board Representative meeting hosted by Roosevelt High School. Members Davis, De La Cerda and Ryan attended their meeting. Student Board Representative Georgiana Rodriguez acknowledged the student ambassadors from Sequoia Middle School who shared highlights of various Sequoia school activities and experiences.

HEAR Report from Superintendent
- Superintendent Hanson provided a brief report to the Board of Education which included announcing the approval of a new grant that strengthens the District’s partnership with the City of Fresno Police Department, adding Student Neighborhood Resource Officers (SNRO) to 15 middle schools and the surrounding neighborhoods. This adds to the 11 Student Resources Officers (SRO) located at high schools and two middle schools. With a continued focus on student and staff safety, Superintendent noted additional safety initiatives that the Board invested in earlier this year -- high-definition cameras at middle and high schools, and LED exterior lighting upgrades made in high school parking lots.
- Superintendent Hanson also shared that at the California School Board Association’s Annual meeting, district partners from CORE introduced the School Quality Improvement
Index (SQII) Report Card. This is the first school accountability data system in the nation that includes social-emotional and culture-climate indicators, and serves as a flashlight to illuminate the instructional focus for school leaders. Superintendent Hanson spoke of pending legislation around the Every Student Succeeding Act (ESSA), putting decision-making around school accountability in the hands of the state. Indicators show that this new model resembles much of what Fresno Unified and the CORE Districts have already been doing, since receiving the NCLB waiver.

ORGANIZATION of the Board of Education

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING HELD - Superintendent Hanson presided at the organizational meeting and accepted nominations for the position of President of the Board of Education. After the President was elected, newly elected President Chavez presided and accepted nominations for the Clerk of the Board of Education. After Member De La Cerda was elected as Clerk of the Board of Education, newly elected President Chavez presided over the remainder of the Board Meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Nominations for Board President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member Ashjian</td>
<td>Nominated Member Chavez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Chavez</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Davis</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member De La Cerda</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Johnson</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Mills</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Ryan</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hearing no other nominations, Member Davis moved to close the nominations, seconded by Member De La Cerda, which carried a 7-0-0 vote as follows: AYES: Board Members Ashjian, Chavez, Davis, De La Cerda, Johnson, Mills, and Ryan.

Superintendent Hanson called for a roll call vote for the nomination of Member Chavez for Board President, which carried a 7-0-0 vote as follows: AYES: Members Ashjian, Chavez, Davis, De La Cerda, Johnson, Mills, and Ryan.

Newly-elected President Chavez accepted nominations for the position of Clerk to the Board of Education, and called for nominations in roll call order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Nominations for Board Clerk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member Ashjian</td>
<td>Nominated Member De La Cerda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Chavez</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Davis</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member De La Cerda</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Johnson</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Mills</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Ryan</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hearing no other nominations, President Chavez moved to close the nominations, which carried a 7-0-0 vote as follows: AYES: Board Members Ashjian, Davis, De La Cerda, Johnson, Mills, Ryan and President Chavez.

President Chavez called for a roll call vote for the nomination of Member De La Cerda for Board Clerk, which carried a 7-0-0 vote as follows: AYES: Members Ashjian, Davis, De La Cerda, Johnson, Mills, Ryan and President Chavez.

On a motion by Member Davis, seconded by Member De La Cerda, the consent agenda, exclusive of agenda items: A-7 and A-8 which were pulled for further discussion, was approved on a roll call vote of 9-0-0 as follows: Student Board Members: Quintana and Correa, Board Members: Ashjian, Davis, De La Cerda, Johnson, Mills, Ryan and President Chavez.

**A. CONSENT AGENDA**

A-1, **APPROVE Personnel List**

APPROVED, as recommended the Personnel List, Appendix A, as submitted.

A-2, **ADOPT Findings of Fact and Recommendations of District Administrative Board**

ADOPTED, as recommended the Findings of Fact and Recommendations of District Administrative Panels resulting from hearings on expulsion and readmittance cases conducted during the period since the November 18, 2015, Regular Board meeting.

A-3, **APPROVE Agreement with Barney & Barney for Affordable Care Act (Employer Mandate) Services**

APPROVED, as recommended an agreement with Barney & Barney to provide Affordable Care Act (Employer Mandate) consulting services to Fresno Unified School District. This agreement is for a one-year period and will not exceed $6,000 annually.

A-4, **APPROVE Agreement with Delta Health Services for Implementation of Tele-Health Services**

APPROVED, as recommended an agreement with Delta Health Systems for implementation of a tele-health services program. The Joint Health Management Board recommends approval. The tele-health services program provides district health plan members with access to same day consultations with licensed physicians 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. This access is facilitated via use of telephonic or video conferencing where available. The agreement is effective January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016 with a projected annual cost of $176,000.

A-5, **APPROVE Agreement with Envision Insurance Company for Retiree Prescription Services (Envision Rx Plus)**

APPROVED, as recommended a renewal agreement with Envision Insurance Company to provide Medicare eligible retiree prescription benefit services. This renewal is for a one-year period commencing January 1, 2016 and will allow uninterrupted coverage for Medicare eligible retirees. The contract amount is based upon a per member, per month,
fee of $212.18 for base prescription coverage and $3.50 per member per month, for administrative fees. The renewal represents an increase of 12.52% above 2015 rates, but is less than projected, given our plan experience and new federal mandates for 2016.

A-6, **APPROVE Article 20 Waivers for Various Schools for the 2015/16 School Year**

**APPROVED, as recommended** letters from the Fresno Teachers Association approving the requests from various schools to waive Article 20.

A-7, **APPROVE Independent Contractor Services Agreements with Save Mart Center and SMG for the 2015/16 Fresno Unified Graduation Ceremonies**

**APPROVED, as recommended** Independent Contracts detailing agreements made to provide the venue, and all expenses incurred, in the production and the conducting of the 2016 high school graduation ceremonies as follows:

**Save Mart Center**

- Ceremonies for Bullard, Edison, Fresno, Hoover, Roosevelt and Sunnyside in the amount of $73,000 for services provided on June 6, 7 and 8, 2016.

**Saroyan Theatre (SMG, commonly known as the Fresno Convention & Entertainment Center)**

- Ceremonies for Duncan and Fresno Specialty Schools in the amount of $17,590 for services provided on June 2 and 8, 2016.

An augmentation of $24,000 will be included in the January 2016 budget revision to support increased contract costs for Save Mart Center and the additional day at Saroyan Theater.

**Andy Fabela** – Spoke about his concern in regards to the $24,000 augmentation in support of the increased costs for graduation. There is no reason for the district to have any unexpected costs, thus no reason for the augmentation.

**Member Mills** – Provided clarification on Mr. Fabela’s comments, stating we are not asking for an increase in our budget to support the graduation ceremonies because the contract with SMG is going to change. We are adding additional days at Saroyan, and the amount we budgeted for both of these venues for these days needs to be increased, and will be reflected in our January budget revision. Is that correct?

**Leslie Loewen** – Yes.

**Member Mills** – It seems in the past few years, there seems to be somebody who is a family member of a graduate from McLane or a family member from a graduate of Duncan, and they have said we don’t have unlimited access or unlimited tickets to venue sites that those schools use unlike Save Mart. I am hoping we are doing what we can to make sure that no family member is excluded from the graduation ceremony. Are we making adjustments to ensure that everyone who wants to attend a Duncan or McLane graduation can attend?

**Leslie Loewen** – Yes we are. We went through a review process following graduations. We presented the new schedule based on stakeholder input. If we were to move Duncan and McLane, we would want to go through a process that would involve all the
stakeholders, community members, members of the board and student groups to ensure we have that tradition and feel at both sites and also accommodate. This year our principals have assured me that every effort is going to be made to get every family or friend to the graduation. They have worked on a ticket return process, where if a student is not using all of their allotted tickets, they can return them so that another student may use them.

**Member Mills** – I would like to monitor the situation at those schools if families are still being kept out of graduations. I would like that to be included in a report for the board. We need to address the situation if it is still happening.

**Member De La Cerda** – I have been talking to the administrators from both schools, as well as parents and families. I know there has been a concern in the past about the venues. There are many benefits to moving the graduations to Save Mart such as the wind and heat, but there is also a strong tradition at McLane. I understand the concerns of parents and families, but when speaking to students, and asking if they would like to move the venue they say no. It is not my decision to make that call to move the location of graduation. I appreciate that you will be reaching out to all the stakeholders to find the right choice. I look forward to seeing the report to see if the ticket return process will turn things around.

Member Mills moved for approval, seconded by Member Davis, which carried a 7-0-0 vote, as follows: AYES: Members Ashjian, Davis, De La Cerda, Johnson, Mills, Ryan and President Chavez.

**A-8, APPROVE Agreement with Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3) to Conduct a Community Survey Related to District Facility Needs**

**APPROVED, as recommended** an agreement between Fresno Unified and Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3) to conduct a community survey to gauge Fresno Unified voters’ perceptions about the district’s capital facility needs and potential opportunities for funding to meet those needs. The agreement is for the period December 10, 2015 through April 30, 2016 in the not-to-exceed amount of $40,500. On February 25, 2015, the Board directed staff to initiate exploration of a potential 2016 bond measure to support facilities improvement. The community survey is an essential step in this process as the data obtained will provide an important tool to inform possible future decision making about a bond measure. FM3 is a recognized industry leader in providing accurate, reliable and strategic opinion research to help school districts ascertain the feasibility of a bond measure and the best opportunity for a successful bond election.

**Andy Fabela** – Stated, before we start looking at another bond measure we need to see if we have fulfilled the needs of Measure Q. Have we done what was promised? If we haven’t you are going to have a hard time getting another bond passed.

**Member Ashjian** – We are hiring Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3) to do polling is that correct?

**Karin Temple** – Yes, to do a community survey.

**Member Ashjian** – Can you provide an overview of what they will be doing?

**Karin Temple** – The goal of a community survey is to provide information/data for the board to make an informed decision whether or not they want to start down the path of a 2016 school bond. The survey will provide information critical to making that decision. They will select 600 likely voters, in a variety of demographics, spread among each trustee
area, and they will either phone call or e-mail. They will ask a set of questions which will take about 20 minutes. The questions will be developed by FM3 in coordination with our staff. They will ask general questions such as if they have children in school, and if so, how many. They will ask specific questions about the district. How is the district doing its job or how well they are they managing their finances? FM3 will compile the data to see what our citizens think with regards to whether there is a need for dollars for facility improvements in the future.

Member Ashjian – Do you anticipate doing another Master Plan?
Karin Temple – We don’t currently have plans to do another Master Plan. The plan that was approved in 2009 was intended to be long range, a 15-20 year vision. The Facilities Master Plan identified close to one billion dollars of need throughout the district, for facility improvements. Measure Q was a $280 million bond, and as I will present to you later this evening, we have been able to do more than $280 million because of state funding. There is still a tremendous need, particularly in our elementary schools, to replace portables with permanent classrooms.

Member Ashjian – How would you answer Mr. Fabela’s question in regards to what we told the community and what it looks like today?
Karin Temple – I don’t have the advantage of having that in front of me. I know we told the community that we were going to invest in our facilities, build new high school facilities, new classroom buildings. We have done that on every high school campus. We have new athletic facilities. We have put millions of dollars into upgrading our building systems (heating and air conditioning). There is a multitude of investments that you see everywhere as you drive all over town. For any individual school, I can’t answer what has been done. I would have to see it.

Member Ashjian – I don’t think anyone would dispute that the buildings don’t look fantastic. The question is, how does it play out with what we said we were going to do, and ultimately what we did do?
Member Mills – You mentioned earlier the type of questions that would be used during the polling process. They seem to be focused on if we felt there was a need for more money to improve our school facilities. A lot of people can agree with that statement. We have a lot that needs to be improved. The critical question is the bottom line. Will they vote for a bond? And will they vote for a bond that increases a tax rate? If we are not asking those questions then this is not going to help us.

Karin Temple – One of the advantages of doing a bond in 2016, is we could do a bond for approximately $200 million – $225 million without increasing the tax rate. Plus, we would have dollars to match from potential state funding. There is a 2016 Statewide Bond Measure that is eligible for the November 2016 ballot. Should that be approved, having local money puts us in a very good position to then increase our own local dollars. The questions, I believe, will test those kinds of questions as well.

Member Mills – I think we need to talk about the elephant in the room, and this needs to be in the polling. We have been under a great deal of scrutiny and criticism for how some of the Measure Q money was spent, and I think we need to ask those questions in polling.

Karin Temple – I think I would say it differently. I won’t say we have been under scrutiny on how it was spent. I would say we are under scrutiny because of one of our delivery methods that is used throughout the state. I do believe in working with FM3 that there will
be some questions that will help us understand that. The purpose of the survey is to understand voter perceptions.

**Member Mills** – I just feel a need to actually put the negative information out in these questions, because if anyone were to oppose it, what is going to be used to oppose it is the negative information that may be out there. We need to assess the response to it and the reaction to it.

**Karin Temple** – I agree we need to know what messages would influence them to vote “no”.

**Member Mills** – What is the projected timeline around this?

**Karin Temple** – This moves very quickly. We would work the next 2-3 weeks working on the questions. Then they would like to have it in the field, questioning in mid-January.

**Member Ashjian** – With the proposed bond in 2016, is any of the delivery method going to be lease lease-back?

**Karin Temple** – The purpose of tonight’s approval is to do the community survey /public research. Based on that research we would make a recommendation for a potential 2016 bond. That is when we would begin to have those discussions on what would be in the ballot measure. I think that it is premature for me to even comment on that. The board will be very involved in that process.

**Member Ashjian** – It is my understanding that on Measure Q we didn’t let the public know that we were going to be using lease lease-back.

Member Davis moved for approval, seconded by Member Johnson, which carried a 6-1-0 vote, as follows: AYES: Member Davis, De La Cerda, Johnson, Mills, Ryan and President Chavez. NOES: Member Ashjian.

**A-9, APPROVE Appointments to Citizens’ Oversight Committee for Measure K and Measure Q**

APPROVED, as recommended the nomination of Dominic Papagni and Barbara Steck to the Citizens’ Oversight Committee for Measure K and Measure Q to replace members whose terms have expired. The Citizens’ Oversight Committee was established by the Board “to inform the public concerning the expenditure of bond proceeds approved by the voters,” and “to ensure that bond proceeds are expended only for the purposes set forth in the ballot measures” (Committee Bylaws).

**A-10, APPROVE Bid 16-08, Sunnyside High School Cooling Tower Replacement**

APPROVED, as recommended Bid 16-08 for a new cooling tower to provide cooled water for the air conditioning system at Sunnyside High School. The existing cooling tower requires replacement due to corrosion, leaking, and lack of reliability. The new equipment will improve energy efficiency and conserve water.

Staff recommends award to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder:

Lawson Mechanical Contractors (Fresno, California) $406,993

Staff also recommends allowing ACCO Engineered Systems to be relieved of their bid due to a clerical error.
A-11, DENY Claim #15-0504-0129
DENIED, as recommended a Claim for Damages on Mark Anthony DeSantiago, case #15-0504-0129. The Superintendent recommends the Claim be denied and the matter referred to the district’s Director of Benefits and Risk Management for further handling.

A-12, RATIFY Submission of Grant Application to the National Foreign Language Center for Summer Chinese Foreign Language Program
RATIFIED, as recommended a grant application to the National Foreign Language Center at the University of Maryland which administers the STARTALK Summer Foreign Language program funded through the National Security Language Initiative. STARTALK’s mission is to increase the number of Americans learning, speaking and teaching critical foreign languages by offering students creative and engaging summer experiences. Hoover High School offers Mandarin Chinese Foreign Language courses and hosts the district summer Chinese Language and Culture class. The 2016 application is the 6th application for the summer program requesting $89,553.

A-13, RATIFY the Filing of a Notice of Completion for Bid 15-05, Fairview Avenue Reconstruction at Edison High School
RATIFIED, as recommended a Notice of Completion for the following project, which has been completed according to plans and specifications:

Bid 15-05  Fairview Avenue Reconstruction at Edison High School

A-14, RATIFY Change Orders for Bid 15-34, Infrastructure for Portable Buildings Relocation at Various Schools
RATIFIED, as recommended information on Change Order 1 and Change Order 2 for the following project:

Bid 15-34, Infrastructure for Portable Buildings Relocation at Various Schools

Change Order 1: $98,650
This change order includes, but may not be limited to: moving portable classrooms from source campuses to receiving campuses, and setting portables per construction documents; and moving the portable classroom at Computech to avoid an unforeseen existing utility line.

Change Order 2: $2,629
This change order includes, but may not be limited to: patching foam roofing at building joint; and demolition work to allow for electrical installation.

Original contract amount: $1,295,000
Change Order 1 98,650
Change Order 2 2,629
New contract amount: $1,396,279
A-15, RATIFY Purchase Orders from August 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015
RATIFIED, as recommended information on purchase orders issued from August 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015. Purchase orders for $10,000 or more are presented first, followed by purchase orders for less than $10,000. A list of purchase orders issued for Associated Student Body (ASB) accounts is also provided.

END OF CONSENT AGENDA
(ROLL CALL VOTE)

UNSCCHEDULED ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
Andy Fabela – Voiced his concern about an article that he read which stated Superintendent Hanson was going to oversee the collection of evidence as stated in the subpoena. He felt that this was unacceptable as he, Ms. Quinto, Ms. Temple, and now the board are under investigation. Fabela stated, “He has no legal background and the district has hired individuals to complete those tasks.”

Superintendent Hanson – “Things that Mr. Fabela have said are factually incorrect. I did send an e-mail to the board as my elected and collective boss, that we are in the next phase of data gathering. Carl Faller, our attorney, has been the one in charge of that, and our board is fully aware of what my involvement has been and not been. In fact, 95 percent has been handled somewhere else in the district. It will be between Carl Faller, our attorney, and Discovia.”

B. CONFERENCE/DISCUSSION AGENDA

6:00 P.M.
B-16, DISCUSS and APPROVE the 2014/15 Audited Financial Statements Prepared by Crowe Horwath, LLP
DISCUSSED and APPROVED Included in the Board binders is the Annual Financial Audit Report as prepared by our external auditors, Crowe Horwath, LLP. The audit report has been completed for submission to the State Department of Education. Each year the district is required to have its financial statements audited by an independent accounting firm. We are pleased to report that Fresno Unified School District has received an “Unmodified Opinion” for the 2014/15 Audit, which is the best opinion that can be issued.

Presentation by Deputy Superintendent/CFO Ruth Quinto and Jeff Jensen

An opportunity was provided to hear questions/concerns from members of the board and staff was available to respond

Member Mills – Cal-PERS using the wrong discount rate does cause me a bit of concern. Is this a one-time mistake? Have they corrected that internally in Cal-PERS?

Jeff Jensen – It is part of their reporting, so next year will be another opportunity for them to report that liability, and we assume they would use the right factors, realizing the mistake they had made this year. Part of our calculations determine whether that created a material
impact to Fresno Unified, and so that is what that uncorrected statement is. We have evaluated that number, and said even with that error, your number is not materially misstated. Next year, that will be updated again, and we would hope they would correct that.

**Member Davis** – Thank you for meeting with the Audit Committee. I believe our community members were astonished to see that with a billion dollar budget that we had no modifications. Thank you for keeping our statements on-time and on-target.

**Member Ashjian** – With the GASB 68, does that have any effect upon our ability to go out and get bonds because of the way it flips our balance sheet? Can you explain to me what the bonding company is going to be looking at, as they see a negative balance sheet?

**Jeff Jensen** – Everyone is going to be in the same boat, at least within the State of California, from an educational entity perspective. Everybody participates in Cal-PERS and Cal-STRS at least, if not in any other additional pension system. They are all proportionally going to see that same impact to their financial statements as a result of implementing this. Both Standards and Poor’s and Fitch have issued white papers that have said that they realized this was coming, and that it is part of governmental organizations in California, and they are saying it is not going to create a down grade in the credit ratings of California school districts. Obviously, time will tell if they stick to that theory or not. Certainly everyone is going to be in the same financial position.

**Member Ashjian** – In the report there was a recommendation in regards to ASB dollars and the 25 schools, but I didn’t see what the district was going to do to address that recommendation.

**Jeff Jensen** – The district has a comprehensive training program that annually teaches individuals at the school sites how to do the proper internal controls and ensure the students money is safely kept.

**Member Ashjian** – Out of the 25 schools how many did you find had this issue?

**Jeff Jensen** – I don’t have that in front of me right now, but I would say not the majority of them. I would say a few.

**Ruth Quinto** – We will provide a board communication on that, but I did get that information from Ms. Canfield and out of the 25 schools, it was 2-3 sites. There is a specific plan that was included in the report. We have a very active audit committee who was particularly interested in our over-the-shoulder, on-site training program that is provided by the analyst in Ms. Canfield’s department who does the on-site training, and has a very specific incentive program for all of the folks who deal with the associate student body and school connected organizations out at the school sites.

Member Davis moved for approval, seconded by Member De La Cerda, which carried a 7-0-0 vote, as follows: AYES: Member Ashjian, Davis, De La Cerda, Johnson, Mills, Ryan and President Chavez.

A copy of the PowerPoint is available on the district website
6:20 P.M.
B-17, DISCUSS and APPROVE the 2015/16 First Interim Financial Report with a Positive Certification

DISCUSSED and APPROVED California school districts are required to approve interim financial reports twice each fiscal year. Fresno Unified School District’s 2015/16 First Interim Financial Report will be presented for approval and will reflect a positive certification of the district’s financial condition. The report is based on the October 31, 2015 year-to-date revenue and expenditures as required by state law.

Presentation by Deputy Superintendent/CFO Ruth Quinto

An opportunity was provided to hear questions/concerns from members of the board and staff was available to respond

Member Mills – On the hydration stations, it shows $120,000, are we budgeting to put hydration stations at all of our secondary schools?
Ruth Quinto – That is an estimate to currently have them at our high schools, and we are evaluating to have them at our middle schools.
Member Mills – How many are we budgeting for each high school?
Ruth Quinto – We are budgeting for two at each high school.
Member Mills – Does that include our specialty schools?
Ruth Quinto – Yes, all of our high schools. The estimation includes installation as well.
Member Mills – STRS liability is set by the legislature, but PERS liability is determined by the PERS board. In the most recent news article I have seen on this, the PERS board is reevaluating its revenue projections. That always seems to be a precursor to reevaluating everybody’s contributions. I am raising that as a cautionary note, I am sure you are aware of it. I would assume in our projections for this year, and the two subsequent years, we have included in the projections, and being able to meet the cash flow the continuing increases in our PERS contributions. Is that correct?
Ruth Quinto – Yes.
Member Mills – At the most recent CSBA conference I attended, many of the legal and budget sessions made the point that that because of the significant increases coming in PERS and STRS in subsequent years, when we do our budget projections for our own purposes, we not just project out for the current and two years, but we project out two to three years beyond. To make sure that we have adequately budgeted for all of the contributions that we have to be making to PERS and STRS, and that we have that figure in mind as we develop budgets for subsequent years. I certainly think that might be a good idea for this board. It is a bigger amount than sometimes we might be contemplating or thinking about. I think we should have that in mind when we start our budget cycle.
Member Chavez – I just want to publicly thank Chief Jerry Dyer for the work that you have done. I have worked a number of years with Councilman Quintero. I really like the approach that you are taking. I remember about eight years ago when you started along with other law enforcement officers with the gang prevention task force. You said it is not just about suppression it is about intervention and then prevention. I think this model really addresses that. I think for our parents this will provide peace of mind knowing that there is a police officer at their child’s school.
Member Johnson moved for approval, seconded by Member Davis, which carried a 7-0-0 vote, as follows: AYES: Member Ashjian, Davis, De La Cerda, Johnson, Mills, Ryan and President Chavez.

A copy of the PowerPoint is available on the district website

6:40 P.M.

B-18. DISCUSS and APPROVE 2014/15 Measure K and Measure Q Annual Report

DISCUSSED and APPROVED Included in the Board binders is the 2014/15 Measure K and Measure Q Annual Report, which is required by the bylaws of the Citizens’ Oversight Committee for Measure K and Measure Q. It includes a statement of compliance with State Proposition 39, bond project activity, and bond financial update. This is the last Annual Report that will include Measure K, as all Measure K funds have been expended. The Citizens’ Oversight Committee for Measure K and Measure Q was established by the Board “to inform the public concerning the expenditure of bond proceeds approved by the voters,” and “to ensure that bond proceeds are expended only for the purposes set forth in the ballot measures.” (Committee Bylaws)

Presentation by Chief Operations Officer Karin Temple

An opportunity was provided to hear questions/concerns from members of the board and staff was available to respond

Member De La Cerda – I just wanted some clarification on the state funding. For Measure K what was the state funding?

Karin Temple – For Measure K we leveraged $160 million in state funding. The Measure K bond was $199 million. The $199 million plus the state funding. The state’s program changed during the Measure K program. In the early years of Measure K, the state programs were more generous. As Measure K progressed through its life, the amounts that the local districts had to use increased. We were very fortunate on the early end, to have some very high level of dollars to leverage under the state program.

Member De La Cerda – And compared to Measure Q?

Karin Temple – For Measure Q, we have leveraged $40 million from the state in hand. We have an additional $36 million that has been approved, and they will write us a check once they have the money. When those dollars come in, it means we have $36 million that we can use on Measure Q projects. It is not clear what the state facilities program will look like in the future. Be assured that for every project we set forth on, we are making sure that we take extra steps and our projects are in compliance with the current state program should they look the same in the future. We are making sure we are in-line and ready to apply for those funds when they become available.

Member De La Cerda – Thank you for that clarification because that is a point that I wanted to bring up with the state’s funding requirements. They are not always consistent. What do you hope will take place for our future bond when it comes to those state funds?

Karin Temple – I hope that circumstances are such that the board decides to put a bond measure on the ballot, I hope our voters approve it, and it would mean that we would have more funding from the state. Measure Q has touched every high school campus, but there
are many campuses that have not had the benefit of new classrooms. It would be up to the board, but I would hope that be the continued focus.

**Member De La Cerda** – For clarification can you provide a quick overview of what the Oversight Committee does?

**Karin Temple** – The duties of the Oversight Committee are laid out in education code, and very specifically, their duty is expenditure oversight. Their number one duty is to affirm that the district is in compliance with the state’s constitution in terms of how we are spending our bond dollars. They are an expenditure oversight group.

**Member Mills** – I am looking at slide 7, and it says as of September 30, 2015 we have about $30 million of Measure Q bond authorization remaining. Is that going to be enough to complete the Measure Q projects?

**Karin Temple** – When we brought Measure Q to the voters, we listed on that ballot every project that we would ever want to do at every school in the district, knowing that we would only have $280 million plus whatever state dollars we could leverage. So at this point Measure Q would be a $320 million dollar bond program. We are marching forward, keeping to our commitments of new classrooms and core facilities. Will we be able to build new classrooms at every school under Measure Q? No.

**Member Mills** – I understand on Measure Q we talked in broad categories about what we wanted to do with the money, but there was a separate vote by the board that made specific allocations of $280 million of Measure Q money. My question is directed at that specific allocation. Do we have enough to meet all of those categories that were specifically allocated by the board? For example when we had $280 million, we allocated $10 million to Fresno High, $10 million to Roosevelt, $10 million to McLane, $35 million to Bullard and varying other amounts to schools and their projects and those were identified in that separate board action. Are we meeting those amounts and do we have enough to meet them?

**Karin Temple** – That was the June 16, 2010 action that the board took. Where we provided very preliminary estimates of how $280 million could or should be spread throughout our projects. That has been the blueprint within which we have worked. There obviously have been some adjustments. For example, Fresno High received more in state dollars than we had anticipated. We were able to do a bigger project than what we originally anticipated. We have used that framework as a guide as we have moved forward with Measure Q.

**Member Mills** – I appreciate and understand that Fresno High and other schools were expected to get state matching monies, but I am not sure I got a definitive answer to my question. Do we have enough to do all of the projects that were listed in that separate board action?

**Karin Temple** – I will have to come back to you on that, since I don’t have that in front of me.

**Member Davis** – I would like to know in regards to the Oversight Committee, are they the same people, do they overlap? If we have a new bond would they be the same individuals or would we reassign? What is the protocol for that?

**Karin Temple** – Should there be a new bond, I would recommend to the board the same group of people for the sake of continuity, because the programs layer on each other. I would also recommend that we start calling it the bond Oversight Committee and not attach a specific letter to it.
Member Davis moved for approval, seconded by Member De La Cerda, which carried a 7-0-0 vote, as follows: AYES: Member Ashjian, Davis, De La Cerda, Johnson, Mills, Ryan and President Chavez.

A copy of the PowerPoint is available on the district website

6:50 P.M.
B-19, HOLD a Public Hearing in the Matter of the Aspen Public School Charter Petition
HELD a Public Hearing Lead Developer, Shelly Lether, has delivered a petition to the district seeking authorization to open a new charter, Aspen Public School, which is a replication of the existing Valley Preparatory Academy, currently authorized by Fresno Unified School District. The charter seeks to serve 331 students in grades K-8. The charter petition was received by the Board on November 18, 2015, and will return for a decision at the January 6, 2016 Board meeting. Fiscal impact: The estimated fiscal impact to Fresno Unified School District for 2016/17 is $914,608. Contact person: Rosario Sanchez, telephone 457-6223.

Presentation by Debra Odom and Shelly Lether

An opportunity was provided to hear questions/concerns from members of the board and staff was available to respond

President Chavez opened the public hearing.

The following individuals spoke in support of the Aspen Public School Charter Petition:
Ashley Gonzalez
Corrie Sands
Jeff Sands
Nicole Rivera
Erin Emerson
Priscilla Robbins
John Grice

Douglas DuRivage, the property and construction manager for the Roman Catholic Diocese of Fresno, spoke on behalf of the parish Saint John’s Cathedral and their willingness in making Singleton Hall available to Aspen Public School Charter.

Member Mills – I received something that indicated that Valley Prep was not continuing to operate, it was going to close. Is that correct?
John Grice – That is incorrect.
Member Ashjian – It is my understanding that you just found out that you were approved to receive the Walton Grant for $250,000 is that correct?
Shelly Lether – Yes that is correct. It was right before Thanksgiving.
Member Ashjian – You mentioned that there is money to apply for an opening grant from the Charter Association through the state which is about $500,000 is that correct?
Shelly Lether – That is from the federal government, and we weren’t sure about that, because soon California will no longer receive that money. We have received it for twenty years for charter schools, however there is a nice pot of money left over, and we feel confident that we will be included in that and have the start up. Yes, we did apply for that grant.

Member Ashjian – How much did you apply for?
Shelly Lether – It was between $450,000 and $500,000 that we will receive.

Member Ashjian – I also read in the material about a possible loan of $500,000 from Central Valley Community Bank. Is that correct?
Shelly Lether – We put that in there when we weren’t sure about the Start-up grant. But with the Walton grant and the Start-up grant we will be good with-out it. We also have a 16 percent reserve with the other school, but we don’t think that will be needed either.

Member Ashjian – Valley Prep has been around how long?

Member Ashjian – You have a 16 percent reserve?
Shelly Lether – Yes, we have a 16 percent reserve this year.

Member Ashjian – You currently have 100 people on your waiting list? What are the age groups?
Shelly Lether – Yes, most of them are the younger grades K-4.

Member Ashjian – By opening up this school, would you be able to accommodate all 100 people on the waiting list?
Shelly Lether – We will still have a waiting list from 3rd grade on up.

Member Ashjian – The fifteen students from Rescue the Children, they can stay there up to 18 months?
Shelly Lether – They can stay at the Mission for 18 months. When they have been released we have been able to retain them.

Member Ashjian – What is the percent of retention?
Shelly Lether – I believe we have only lost about 2-3 students out of the 25 we have had.

Member Ashjian – How long have you had this association with Rescue the Children?
Shelly Lether – This is our second year.

Member Johnson – Where is this school downtown located?
Douglas DuRivage – Singleton Hall is on the Northside of Mariposa and on the East corner of our street. Directly across the street from Saint John’s Cathedral.

Member Johnson – I really appreciate the comments that Mr. Sands made in regards to not being smart enough, and then you were too smart. I think it is critical that we have teachers who understand the students they are working with. Some people don’t believe all kids can learn. You have to have high expectations for those children. Thank you, and I think I can support you.

Member De La Cerda – You are currently located on the corner of Hughes and Ashlan on a four and a half acre facility. You mentioned that you rather keep the classrooms small rather than expanding.

Shelly Lether – Yes, we could expand with portables, but we love our green space and don’t want to use that. Our mission and purpose is to keep the classrooms small. It works well with the students we serve.

Member De La Cerda – In regards to Singleton Hall there is not much green space.

Douglas DuRivage – Singleton Hall is challenged in that area. There is a small area on the Northside of the building that has some open space, but not anything significant compared to a normal school site. We own the property alongside Mariposa, S street to R Street. A few years
ago we acquired the buildings on the corner of S and Mariposa and took those buildings down. There is now a large open lot and the diocese is open to offering that space to the charter.

Member De La Cerda – In regards to that space, is the diocese matching funds to develop that area?

Douglas DuRivage – We haven’t entered into any type of negotiations at this time. What I can tell you we don’t typically act like a normal landlord. We provide a basic effective ground lease and minimal facility available with the user available to make any improvements need and want.

Member De La Cerda – Is Singleton Hall Historically registered?

Douglas DuRivage – Singleton Hall is not a historical building, but is located in a historical area. Being on the register would limit us in making changes/updates to the buildings. Because we are in a historically area, we still do need to adhere to architectural standards.

Member De La Cerda – What is the total number of students that Singleton Hall can carry in regards to classroom sizes?

Douglas DuRivage – I don’t know that, but I can tell you there are somewhere between nine and twelve rooms available. Each one of those rooms are able to hold 50 students a piece.

Member De La Cerda – When will you know if you are approved for the Start-up grant?

Shelly Lether – December 18, 2015 is when we will be notified.

Member De La Cerda – I see here that you will be contracting with El Dorado for SPED services. How come you are not contracting with Fresno Unified which is much closer?

Shelly Lether – For ten years we did contract with the district. We had special Ed services through Fresno Unified. We applied two years ago to the El Dorado SELPA. They have a lot of charter schools. By going with El Dorado we were able to provide in-house services for our six percent. For us it was a better fit.

Member De La Cerda – Are your in-house services daily?

Shelly Lether – It is on an as need basis. Sara will explain how we contract our services.

Sarah Crantz – We contract our speech pathologist through Talk Team, she is with us no less than 7.5 hours a week, and no more than 15 hours a week. Our school psychologist works for us on an hourly basis, currently she is will us two mornings a week. Our credentialed school nurse checks in with our LVN, she does the IEP’s, health plans and our hearing and vision screenings. She is with us twice a month or more if needed.

Member De La Cerda – As you move forward what is your plan with your English Language Leaners?

Corrie Sands – We start very early with our four domains trying to help the students develop English. We contract back with Fresno Unified for English Learning Testing. We do have someone who comes in and does our CELDT testing. Our initial students go through English Language Services Department at Fresno Unified.

Member De La Cerda – I noticed you have a large number of students who come from Wilson. How do you transport your students since they come from all over?

Shelly Lether – Transportation is up to the parents.

Member De La Cerda – If the $500,000 for some reason does not come through do you have an alternate plan for the funding?

Shelly Lether – I know we have a 16 percent reserve with the other school but I feel very confident that we will not have to tap into those funds. If it did come to that we would take out a loan.

Member Davis – Tonight a decision will not be made it will be brought back the next board meeting for a decision.

Shelly Lether – Yes, Debra explained that to us.
Member Davis – Rescue the Children, it that the facility on 99, formally the Tradewinds?
Shelly Lether – Yes it is.
Member Davis – You mentioned the Rotary will assist with your transportation.
Shelly Lether – They provide transportation for the Rescue the Children.
Priscilla Robbins – As of right now, we have three vans and we provide transportation to the children that live with us.
Member Chavez – I want to thank everyone who has attended tonight. I think it says a lot when you show up and it’s 9:10 p.m. and you are still here. That say a lot about your commitment and your support.

President Chavez closed the public hearing.
No action is required on this item.

7:20 P.M.
B-20, DISCUSS and NOMINATE one Delegate for the California School Boards Association Delegate Assembly for Subregion 10-B
An opportunity is provided for the Board of Education to nominate one elected member to California School Boards Association (CSBA) Delegate Assembly for Subregion 10-B. Delegates serve two-year terms beginning April 1, 2015 through March 31, 2018. There are two required Delegate Assembly meetings each year. In 2016, the first meeting will be May 14-15 in Sacramento and the second one will be November 30-December 1 in San Francisco preceding the CSBA Annual Education Conference and Trade Show. The CSBA Delegate Assembly is a vital link in the association’s governance structure. Working with local districts, county offices, the Board of Directors and Executive Committee, Delegates ensure that the association reflects the interest of school districts and county offices of education throughout the state. The Board President recommends nominations. Contact person: Board President, telephone 457-3727.

C. RECEIVE INFORMATION & REPORTS

C-21, RECEIVE 2014/15 School Facility (Developer) Fee Public Information Report
RECEIVED, the 2014/15 School Facility (Developer) Fee Public Information Report. School districts are authorized to levy fees on residential and commercial/industrial development for the purpose of mitigating impacts on school facilities as a result of the development. Government Code requires that certain public information regarding the fees collected be presented annually. The 2014/15 School Facility Fee Public Information Report provides the required information. Fiscal impact: There is no fiscal impact to the district. Contact person: Karin Temple, telephone 457-3134.
BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMUNICATIONS
Member Mills – Voiced a concern that when we are selecting our board meetings, we need to be strategic when planning so we don’t impact our students. Also mentioned that the board should have a conversation about foster youth and take a look at the model in San Diego and the residential school they are offering to their students.

Member Ashjian – Stated that he would still like information on the TK math adoption and the plan for Design Science.

D. ADJOURNMENT
With no further business to come before the Board of Education at this time, Board President Chavez declared the meeting adjourned at 9:13 p.m.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, January 6, 2016 – OPEN SESSION AT 5:30 P.M.