



San Francisco Board of Education  
**Parent Advisory Council**

**Minutes of the Special Meeting of the PAC  
January 27, 2010**

**I. Attendance**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ruth Barajas, Georgia Bratt Williams, Nancy Gapasin Gnass, Mandy Johnson, Stelly Kuo, Natasha LaVine, Quran Mays, Michelle Menegaz.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Tiana Blunt, Un Un Che, Rochelle Fort, Beatriz Gudino, Diane Huang.

ALSO PRESENT: Ruth Grabowski, PAC Staff; Ellie Rossiter, Parents for Public Schools.

**II. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Michelle called the meeting to order at 6:25pm.

Ruth G. distributed copies of the draft report of findings from the community conversations, and pointed out this draft is not ready for public distribution. A copy was given to Board Commissioners and district staff so they could look at it before the presentation on February 2. Will give a draft report of the recommendations to the Board and staff on Monday, February 1. The final reports will be released to the public on Tuesday, February 2.

**III. New SFUSD Data about Options for Student Assignment**

Ruth G. reviewed the Board's priorities for student assignment, and posted descriptions of the six options being considered.

It was noted that the findings from this round of community conversations were consistent with what we've heard over last four years. The PAC has heard from over 1,300 people in last 4 years (in public engagement initiatives with other groups).

The PAC reviewed a one-page summary of key data presented by Stanford researchers at the Jan. 25 Ad-Hoc Committee meeting.

The researchers defined giving Academic Diversity Preference by looking at census tracts. They looked at CST scores over the last three years to identify census tracts with students scoring in the bottom 40<sup>th</sup> percentile. Their models gave academic diversity preference to students in those tracts (who applied to higher performing schools, with APIs of 8-10).

These are the recommendations from the researcher, not district staff.

They ran simulations for all lottery options and all local school options – they couldn't do zones because we haven't had that situation before. They used data on who has applied to which schools in the past.

---

PAC members discussed this data and noted the following:

If you give spots to lower performing kids it will limit spots open in higher performing schools. How much will the odds drop for parents with options 2 and 3? It's great that we are trying to help the targeted audiences but we need to remember that we need to consider the needs of the other families and not drive them out of the district.

For Options 2 and 3 the percent of people who get one of their 7 choices is 71% but drops to 46% for first choice. Right now 60% get first choice and 80% get one of their choices.

#### **IV. Recommendations for the Student Assignment Redesign**

Ruth G. posted options for recommendations for the PAC to discuss, which were based on:

- The Board's priorities
- What we heard from community conversations
- Data from simulations and research
- The PAC's formal role to advise the Board

First we reviewed a draft statement of what the PAC is against:

- Option #1: This limits equitable access
- Option #4: This eliminates choice
- Option #5: This limits choice

Then we reviewed a draft statement of what the PAC supports for student assignment:

- Choosing a student assignment system that values parent choice and equitable access.
- Improving the quality of under-performing schools by focusing on teacher and administrator (QUALITY) assignment, support and accountability
- The researchers recommendations for option #3 were very powerful (give preference to students in census tracts with low CST scores) → provides choice + equity and diversity.

Then we reviewed a statement of "Questions and Concerns":

- Concerned that option #6 implies more choice than would actually be the reality
- People who expressed support for this option believed they would be able to send their child to any school they choose.
- We can't endorse any of these options. We have too many questions, still re: how the system would work. → Research re: #3, or Modify #6, sound good but we don't know enough to endorse

The PAC then reviewed a draft statement of what might work to achieve the Board's priorities:

- Modifying option 6 to ensure a % of seats are available for open enrollment (with Academic Diversity Preference)
- 3 + modified 6 they seem to have good potential to meet Board's priorities 1 & 2

We then reviewed recommendations addressing issues apart from which option to consider:

1. Need better systems to support diverse student communities
2. Improve enrollment systems
3. Ensure special ed placement based on IEPs

4. Strengthen teacher and admin quality/standards, support accountability (deal with placement)
5. Inform, engage & empower families & the community

PAC members commented on the proposed recommendations and made several changes. People felt reluctant to recommend any of the options because there are so many questions about how they would be implemented. At the Ad-Hoc meeting Board members were aggravated by a presentation of research done through interviews with students, families and staff at 23 schools that did not address the models for student assignment, and said they want to recommendations for models, not just comments about general issues or what is not working.

People pointed out we could say that the researchers recommendation for Option 3 was powerful, but that we can't endorse it because of the many outstanding questions and concerns.

Others also pointed out we need to step back and make sure we are accurately representing what we heard from parents. A lot of parents did not agree with any options and that should influence whether the PAC endorses an option or not.

After discussion, PAC members agreed to keep the language in the draft against options 1, 4 and 5, and to state that the PAC finds the researchers' recommendation on Option 3 powerful. PAC members also agreed to suggest modifying option 6 so that it ensures a percentage of seats are available. At the same time, the PAC agreed they are not endorsing any options because we do not have enough information.

Ruth Barajas moved that the PAC be against options 1, 4 and 5; Nancy seconded the motion. There was no discussion and no opposition to the motion. All members were in favor of the motion.

Michelle made a motion that the PAC supports a student assignment system that values parent choice and equitable access, and improving the quality of under-performing schools by focusing on teacher and administrator assignment, support, and accountability; Nancy seconded the motion. There was no discussion and no opposition; all members were in favor of the motion, and the motion passed.

Nancy motioned that the PAC not endorse any of the options as they stand, including option 6 as is currently stated. The PAC finds the researchers' recommendation for option 3 compelling, and believes a modified version of option 6 might work, because they seem to meet the Boards' first and second priorities of redesigning student assignment; however, we do not have sufficient information to be able to endorse either of these options; Stelly seconded. There was no discussion and no opposition; all members were in favor, and the motion passed.

Michelle made a motion that the PAC affirm the recommendations made earlier (including the spring of 2009), related to improving the enrollment process, strengthening teacher & administrator quality, and addressing placement needs of Special Ed students; Carolyn seconded. There was no discussion and no opposition; all members were in favor, and the motion passed.

#### **V. Preparing for Committee of the Whole on February 2<sup>nd</sup>**

- We confirmed who will attend the meeting on Feb 2<sup>nd</sup>: Stelly, Natasha, Betty, Georgia
- The following PAC members will participate in presenting the report: Mandy, Ruth B, Quran, Carolyn, Michelle

- Other people who will help present the report: Rocio (who helped facilitate conversations), Carla, Cindy, Kelly, and possibly Valerie from PPS.
- Ruth G and Ellie will start the presentation by explaining how we conducted the conversations and who we heard from, and hand off to PAC members and partners to present the rest
- Presenters will meet on Feb 2<sup>nd</sup> at 4:30 to prepare for the presentation.
- Michelle will be a back up presenter at the end to wrap up the presentation/

**VI. Community Engagement in the SFUSD Budget Process.**

- Ruth G updated PAC members about the budget discussion that took place Jan. 26<sup>th</sup> at the board meeting.
- Nancy mentioned that the PAC was asked to participate in the SSC Summit, specifically for the PAC to help parents engage in the budget process. Ruth G expressed concern about the PAC's capacity and the short notice in which the PAC is being asked to do this at the SSC Summit.
- PAC members who can attend the SSC Summit: Nancy and Michelle
- There will be a town hall meeting on the budget cuts on Thurs Feb 25<sup>th</sup> at 6:30pm at Marina MS. PAC members confirmed to attend: Michelle and Carolyn (maybe Stelly)
- Ruth G mentioned that the PAC may need to be creative in how to engage parents in the budget process. Former PAC member, Omar Khalif, is willing to organize a community event to engage parents in the budget conversation (similar to community fish fry he organized a few years ago – these bring in people we really don't reach through meetings at school sites)

**VII. PAC Business**

- The next regular PAC meeting will be February 16<sup>th</sup>. Ruth G will set the March and April meetings with PAC members through Doodle.
- Reports to the Board of Education: Feb. 9 Michelle and Feb. 23 Carolyn

**VIII. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**IX. Adjourn Meeting**

Michelle adjourned the meeting at 8:31pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Natasha LaVine