

Meeting #5
Community-based Committee
First Phase of Implementation
Wednesday, June 23, 2010
Burnet Center, 5:30p.m.

Present

Mike Villarreal
Steve Lecholop
Andrea Pastrano
Celina Peña
Gloria Parra
Jessica Rae Sanchez
Patti Tanner
Linda Jackson
Dan Martinez
Roger Perales
Paul Talamantez, Jr
Andro Herrera-Mendoza
Bob Comeaux

Curis Bowers
Gene Garcia
Elizabeth "Liz" Riojas
Ted Guerra
Rachel Ponce
Felix Alvarez
Nellie Shannon
Josette J. Gonzalez
Sandra Ojeda-Medina
Randy Sanchez
Rolando Ruvalcaba
John Wilkins

Absent

Willie Mitchell
Paulo G. Aguilera
Linda Tippins
Armando Cadena
Cynthia Muñoz
Dr. Sylvia Reyna
Dalia Puente
Jesse Tovar
Terri Vasquez

Chairman Mike Villarreal opened the fifth meeting of the Community-based Committee at 5:39 pm on June 23, 2010. He announced the following;

- Asked committee members to raise their hand if they had read the *Express- News* article about the bond on Tuesday, June 21, 2010.
- The following is an overview of the presentation of committee work to school board and superintendent:
 - Provided update of committee work that lasted approximately 45 minutes
 - Presented memo summarizing each committee group's work
 - Updated how committee has dominate opinion supports a bond package of \$502M
 - Members mostly felt they could not take apart the original package
 - Shared concern about previous survey; needs to include Spanish speaking component; simpler in language
 - Alamo Stadium not in \$502M package
 - Trim package down to \$497M or \$499M
 - Committee discussed breaking out package into three separate propositions: Critical Needs, High Needs and Important Improvements.
 - Ultimately, committee did not get behind the concept of separate propositions
 - As Board of Trustees, they will have to determine political feasibility of offering proposal to voters
 - Property tax increase of 19% is not insurmountable and board will have to ponder
 - Ponder a second survey. Last survey indicated that majority did not support a \$502M bond package

Celina Peña, Co-Chairperson announced the following;

- The board thanked the committee for the very important work they are doing
- Board reflected what their constituents are concerned about as it relates to making sure there is representation in meetings, in the survey and the dollar amount. Does it cover all of our needs?

- Remember question while reflecting on long-term strategic plans that is lasting ten to twelve years
- Try and meet the needs of the district while being fiscally responsible
- Work after this committee will be important as well
- Interested in hearing what committee has to say as it relates to any “buzz you hear,” any comments or concerns committee has
- Important to spend the time talking to one another

Ms. Peña then asked for questions from the committee.

Steve Lecholop said he attended presentation and agreed it was an accurate representation of concerns raised by committee. However, he feels media’s understanding is that \$502M is what bond package is going to be and district is already behind in marketing the message to voters.

Ms. Peña said she believes in committee’s work and district is still building continuity and strength for bond package.

Rachel Ponce shared two thoughts committee has to ask themselves:

- Did you vote for \$502M because that is what you felt is should be or
- Is this what the public can absorb?

Andro Herrera-Mendoza commented on all the media attention given to superintendent about his job status.

Ms. Peña stated it will be addressed on Monday, June 28, 2010 and explained that the committee’s charge is the focus on figuring out if the \$502M is correct.

Nellie Shannon asked what is the committee doing as community leaders to inform parents? Media loves to report negative on the school districts. She said it is up to the parents to share the things that the district is doing well. Maybe the use of tag lines will help give the message to the community that the district is doing well. We couldn’t have had a better year academically, she said.

Bob Comeaux had two questions:

- Who is the recruitment director for SAISD to help district keep students?
- What are the essential elements needed to put together the bond package?

Ted Guerra said it’s important for the committee to be together even if we all don’t agree on a specific amount.

John Wilkins commented that a board member asked for a contingency plan.

Mr. Villarreal stated that the committee would be serving board of trustees well if they could prioritize the \$502M for board members. Committee could take the \$502M and say the committee understands that there is a question of political feasibility and what the public’s appetite is. The committee could tell the board that they would like the whole \$502M; however here is a list of priorities from top to bottom. Then he asked the question, “Is that an important question to answer and decision to make to help board?”

Dan Martinez and Josette J. Gonzalez thought prioritizing good idea, however, Mr. Martinez stated if board wants to delete anything they would not be going by recommendation of committee. It gives the board an option and puts on board’s shoulders.

Nellie Shannon questioned if the board gave any instructions on how the committee should proceed. She asked, "Where there any clear directions from them?" Mr. Villarreal said no.

To clear up some members' confusion on committee's goals, Mr. Villarreal made the following comments to the committee:

- Committee's charge was to have a series of meetings where we receive an understanding of what facilities needs are
- The financial impact of bond proposal
- To understand the state of the school district overall
- Deliberate on three questions:
 - Should we have a bond proposal go to the committee?
 - What date should that be on?
 - What should be in the first proposal?

Mr. Villarreal added that the board did not require the committee to be unified in its decisions or to be a consensus-based process.

Mr. Villarreal made a motion to call the question, which was "Do you support staff's prioritization of the 1-7 priorities at \$502M?" All those in favor raised their hand. Results are as follows:

- Majority of committee agreed and supported to adopt staff's priority list
- Two against
- One abstention

Committee identified three items they have agreed upon:

- Bond to held in November 2010
- \$502M bond package
- Support staff's priorities

Bob Comeaux made a motion: "How many people believe that the voters will support a \$502M bond issue?" Motion seconded by Steve Lecholop. Results are as follows:

- Majority in favor were fifteen
- Six No's
- Three abstentions

Ms. Peña stated the next order of business was to examine what the committee would like the board to reflect upon as it relates to the \$502M bond package. She asked the committee, "What are some things the committee would like the board to consider as it relates to the bond package?" The following is a list of those considerations:

- Savings for rebuilding new entirely rather than renovate a school piece by piece
- Go with Options of \$502M bond package
- Citizens oversight committee
- Support the committee's recommendations with unanimous vote
- \$10M of solar energy equipment
- Consider needs of surrounding community when closing of historical schools
- Consider green building ideas for our schools and partners helping us pay for them
- Extensive information distribution about bond
- Responsibility of retrieving students back to SAISD instead of losing students to charter schools
- Interact with neighborhoods and open up facilities to community use
- Proper use of designated facilities
- Look at bond as investment and reinvestment in community
- Use local contractors
- Board to make resolution for a closed school or facility not to be used as a half-way house, etc....

- Any facility for purpose of restructure is reused that enhances the surrounding community

A motion was made by Mr. Martinez to support all of the items that have been suggested to the board by committee. The motion was seconded by Jessica Rae Sanchez. There was no discussion for this motion. It was a unanimous vote.

A motion was then made to adjourn the meeting by a committee member. A second committee member seconded the motion. There was no discussion on this matter. All committee members were in favor for meeting to adjourn.