## DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
SCHOOL CONSOLIDATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SCAC)
Newark Unified School District

September 10, 2020-6:00 PM held virtually via Zoom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Call to Order</th>
<th>The meeting was called to order at 6:01 pm by Chair Martinez.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Roll Call</td>
<td>Board Member Elisa Martinez addressed that at the last meeting there was a vote for Chair and Vice Chair. At that time she explained that the outcome was against the Board's directive and she would bring it back to the attention of the Board. The committee charge, as specified by the Board in April 2020, was that a Board Member would serve as Chair and Vice Chair of the School Consolidation Advisory Committee. She brought the matter to the attention of the Board during Committee Reports. She shared the concerns of the committee to have Board members serve as Chair and Vice Chair. A majority of the Board members agreed to keep the committee charge as is. Therefore, she will serve as Chair and Member Phuong Nguyen will serve as Vice Chair. Members of the Committee Attendees Chae Marshall, Rachel Bloom, Sue Eustice, Hamilton Baylon, Veronica Medina, Selene Nevarez, Angela Ringlein, Maria Ibarra, Cathreene Ingham-Watters, Christine Dix, Michelle Padilla, Janet Crocker Mark Triplett, Ed.D., Superintendent Elisa Martinez, President NUSD School Board Phuong Nguyen, Member NUSD School Board Absent Vilma Cristina Mendoza Clarification was made of Non-Voting Committee Members Mark Triplett, Ed.D., Superintendent Elisa Martinez, President NUSD School Board Phuong Nguyen, Member NUSD School Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Welcome from Dr. Mark Triplett, Ed.D., Superintendent</td>
<td>Dr. Triplett welcomed the committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Visitor/Public Comment</td>
<td>Chair Martinez reviewed with the committee that comments are reduced to two (2) minutes, with a maximum of 20 minutes to read them aloud. All comments will be attached to the minutes of the meeting and become a part of the record. The reduction in the time limit is to respect the time of the committee members and still allow comments to be read aloud. By limiting each comment to two minutes, more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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comments can be heard.

Committee Discussion

Informal poll of committee members to confirm that they would like to keep the time to three (3) minutes per comment, total reading time 20 minutes.

Two speakers addressed the committee.
Statements included at the end of the minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Approval of Minutes</th>
<th>Motion to approve minutes with two (2) edits:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Correct meeting date from October 8, 2002 to October 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Correct November 7, 2020 Board meeting date to November 5, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion: Ingham-Watters  
Second: Marshall  
Yes: Marshall, Bloom, Eustice, Crocker, Baylon, Medina, Neverez, Ringlein, Ibarra, Ingham-Watters, Dix, Padilla  
No: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. Review of Committee Charge Documents</th>
<th>Marie dela Cruz, Chief Business Official, NUSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shared the timeline of Board meetings where the forming of the committee was discussed and approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shared the committee charge and composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The reason the recommendation needs to go before the Board by November 5, 2020 is because the financial impact changes need to be reflected on the first interim report and for 2020-21 budget development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. Proposed criteria/scoring methodology</th>
<th>Chair Martinez and Vice Chair Nguyen voted on August 27, 2020 items. These items are being brought back to the committee for a new vote, to be taken without the Chair and Vice Chair.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Motion made to remove criteria #10 from the criteria | Motion: Ibarra  
Second: Ingham-Watters  
Committee Discussion  
Votes  
Yes: Ingham-Watters, Ibarra, Eustice, Marshall, Ringlein, Nevarez, Padilla  
No; Crocker, Medina, Bloom, Dix, Baylon |

Motion to approve proposed criteria without item #10  
Motion: Dix  
Second: Padilla  
No Committee Discussion  
Votes
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| Yes: Marshall, Eustice, Crocker, Baylon, Ringlein, Ibarra, Ingham-Watters, Dix, Padilla |
| No: Bloom, Medina, Nevarez |

### H. Presentation of district demographic data

Ken Reynolds, President SchoolWorks

Presentation of school demographic projections
- 10 Year Enrollment History and 10 Year Enrollment Projection
- December 2019 enrollment data
- Birth rates 2008 - 2023
- 6 Year Projection by School
- 6 Year Projection by Grade
- New Developments
- Students Not Enrolled in Newark Schools
- School Demographics as of December 2019
- Enrollment Projections by School Site
- 1 Year Projection by Grade
- Next meeting will present capacity

Committee discussion
- SpEd preschool data needs to be included in the enrollment data
- We are looking at 2019 data, how has the new developments impacted schools? The next data collection will be in October, too late for this committee.
- Alternative school data? The numbers for this program are calculated to serve a percentage of the population, so no hard numbers for them.

### I. Site Analysis

Brianna García, Director, School Services of California

The intent is to have criteria that can be scored as objectively as possible, while still being open to information that is important, but cannot necessarily be scored.

The committee agreed that 40% - 60% is the ideal range for scoring diversity. So schools within that range are scored lower (better) than schools above or below that range.

**Scoring**
- **Yes** means the school fits within the 40%-60% range and is considered diverse = 1 point
- **No** means the school was outside the range and is considered to have less diversity = 2 points

7:55 pm

Motion to extend the meeting for 30 minutes
- Motion: Bloom
- Second: Crocker
- Votes
  - Yes: Marshall, Bloom, Eustice, Crocker, Medina, Nevez, Ringlein, Ibarra,
### J. Next Meeting

Next meetings
- September 15, 2020 (Capacity and Facilities)
- September 24, 2020
- October 8, 2020
- October 22, 2020
- October 29, 2020

The committee will be presenting their report and recommendations to the Board at the November 5, 2020 Board meeting.

### K. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn 8:12 pm
- Motion: Dix
- Second: Padilla
- Yes: Marshall, Bloom, Eustice, Crocker, Baylon, Medina, Nevez, Ringlein, Ibarra, Ingham-Watters, Dix, Padilla
- No: 0

### Other Attendees

- **District Personnel Attendees**
  - Marie dela Cruz, Chief Business Official
  - Jessica Saavedra, Executive Director of Human Resources
  - Lucia Gutierrez, Executive Assistant to Superintendent
  - Paul Rose, Network Manager
  - Jodi Croce, Business Services Administrative Assistant

- **Other Attendees**
  - Facilitator: Brianna García, Director, School Services of California
  - Demographer: Ken Reynolds, SchoolWorks
  - Gilma Guevara, Spanish Translator

### Visitor/Public Comment

Can we trust our representatives if they first say they are fine having a non-board member as chair of the SCAC provided the full board approves the change and then do not bring it back to the full board as an action item?

Can we trust our representatives if they, without proper process, unilaterally reduce the public speaking time from 3 to 2 minutes without having the full board and the SCAC involved? The standard of 3 minutes is across the board appointed committees, whether an LCAP or a CBOC committee.

Why would our representatives unilaterally limit the meeting time to two hours and call on a board bylaw, which only applies to the general board meeting, limiting any extensions without involving the full board and the SCAC?

Why are our representatives trying to rush this committee into making a recommendation within two months on such an important matter? The purpose
document lists a time frame which could be 6 to 12 months.

How can you possibly analyze the closure of one or two schools, the impact to special ed students and services and a move towards a middle school model in only 9 weeks?

While we should take a serious look at closing one or two schools, there is absolutely no reason to rush things. Given our improved financial situation we do not have to force a decision for the 2021-22 school year.

A committee this large needs time and a lot of discussion to evaluate the merits as well as the consequences for each school it considers for closure.

Don’t be used as a scapegoat, if you don’t feel confident in making a recommendation due to time-pressure or lack of proper evaluation and discussion, make no recommendation at all.

The school board cannot force you to make a recommendation!

Cary Knoop

**Visitor/Public Comment**

Good Evening Committee Members,

I would like to summarize the introduction of the Closing a School Best Practice Guide from the California Department of Education – last reviewed February 2020:

It is a legislative intent, but not a mandate, for a district to have and use a District Advisory Committee before decisions are made about school closure. But whether an intent or a mandate, the advice is good. It is best to have a membership mostly of volunteers (although a paid chairperson or facilitator is useful).

The job of the superintendent and board members is to evaluate facts, not gather them. And the process of gathering the facts must be as credible, transparent and non-political as possible. The superintendent and school board members should not be included on the District Advisory Committee.

Why isn’t Newark Unified following this recommended Best Practice?

The decision to close a school must be based upon hard, empirical evidence that leads to a broadly supported, unquestionable conclusion—the district cannot afford to keep a particular school open without cuts elsewhere. This conclusion must be program-based upon such factors as projections of declining enrollment, critical district financial circumstances, facility conditions, educational program quality, costs of keeping underutilized facilities open, feasible options to closing a school, anticipated fiscal relief from a school closure.

Two of the four board members sit on this board advisory committee. You are being
forced to accept the two board members as your chair & vice-chair, public comment has been reduced to two minutes, Birch Grove schools are over represented and you are given 9 weeks to make a critical decision that will impact this district and city for years to come. If the board wants to convey that much influence over the process, why don’t they spare all of you the work this will entail and make the decision themselves?

I have more to say but my two minutes are up.

Signed,
Cindy Parks