

SPECIAL TELEPHONIC MEETING OF THE
MONTEREY COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION
JULY 29, 2020
APPROVED MINUTES

1. Opening Business

1.1 Call to Order: President Ron Panziera called the Special Telephonic Meeting of the Monterey County Board of Education to order at 9:05 AM.

1.2 Roll Call

BOARD MEMBERS:

Ronald Panziera, President	Trustee Area #5
John McPherson, Vice President	Trustee Area #2
Harvey Kuffner	Trustee Area #1
Judy Pennycook	Trustee Area #3
Janet Wohlgemuth	Trustee Area #4
Lupe Sánchez	Trustee Area #7
Dr. Deneen Guss, Secretary to the Board	

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT WITH NOTIFICATION:

Mary Claypool	Trustee Area #6
---------------	-----------------

STAFF TO SUPERINTENDENT:

Chris Devers
Adam Gavalla
Jessica Hull
Sonia Jaramillo
Justin McCollum
Dr. Colleen Stanley
Carla Stewart
Dr. Ernesto Vela

1.3 Pledge of Allegiance: Sonia Jaramillo led the Pledge of Allegiance.

1.4 Adoption of Agenda

Changes, additions (based on Board Bylaw 9322 – Provision of Emergency/Urgency), and approval of the Agenda as presented. 23 vote required if any item is added to the Agenda.

1.4.1 Changes to the Agenda: None

1.4.2 Additions to the Agenda: None

1.4.3 Adoption of the Agenda:

MSC 20-21-07 (6-0) Harvey Kuffner, Judy Pennycook

AYES: Ron Panziera, John McPherson, Harvey Kuffner, Judy Pennycook, Janet Wohlgemuth, Lupe Sánchez

NOES: None

ABSENT: Mary Claypool

ABSTENTIONS: None

“That the Monterey County Board of Education adopts the agenda as presented.”

2. Communications

2.1 Correspondence: None

- 2.2 Oral Comments from the Public *(Comments from the public are limited to items both within the Board's jurisdiction, as well as not on the agenda. The Board may limit public comments to no more than three (3) minutes, at the discretion of the Board President. Public comment will also be allowed on each specific agenda item prior to Board action thereon.)*

Ron Panziera read public comment into the record from Kelly Arbor and Sean Crossno (attached).

3. Monterey County Alternative Education Program Return to School Plan for the 2020-2021 School Year

Dr. Guss explained why three plans are needed for our schools according to the Center for Disease Control guidelines (low risk distance learning, moderate risk modified in-person instruction, and high risk plans for in-person instruction with less restrictions).

Dr. Ernesto Vela and Chris Devers presented the Alternative Education Return to School Plan for 2020-2021 in detail. Mr. Devers answered questions from the Board related to Monterey County Probation Department protocols and union involvement in the plans. Dr. Guss shared that she will forward out to the Board via email the Probation COVID protocols.

Judy Pennycook expressed her concern and frustrations, given that the studies have shown that distance learning has largely been a failure and equally significant that the sequestration of children/students from their classmates has led to a plethora of mental health issues. It is of paramount importance that schools are allowed to reopen with best practices in place for families which believe that the classroom setting is in their children's best interest. Additionally, education must be seen as an essential service. Accommodations should be made for families with inherent risk factors and those teachers that have such risk factors should serve those students through distance learning. In addition, the operating success of MCOE's Head Start programs this summer, accommodating preschool children without incident, is an effective model that could possibly be emulated.

MSC 20-21-07 (5-1) John McPherson, Harvey Kuffner

AYES: Ron Panziera, John McPherson, Harvey Kuffner, Janet Wohlgemuth, Lupe Sánchez
 NOES: Judy Pennycook
 ABSENT: Mary Claypool
 ABSTENTIONS: None

"That the Monterey County Board of Education approves the Monterey County Alternative Education Program Return to School Plan for the 2020-2021 School Year."

4. Monterey County Home Charter School Return to School Plan for the 2020-2021 School Year

Justin McCollum presented the Monterey County Home Charter School Return to School Plan for the 2020-2021 School year in detail. Ron Panziera inquired regarding home visits; Mr. McCollum stated they will be made if and when necessary.

The Board was in agreement requesting a memo on what the rigorous protocols will be in establishing the safety and welfare of all children in our programs.

MSC 20-21-08 (6-0) Harvey Kuffner, Janet Wohlgemuth

AYES: Ron Panziera, John McPherson, Harvey Kuffner, Judy Pennycook, Janet Wohlgemuth, Lupe Sánchez

NOES: None

ABSENT: Mary Claypool

ABSTENTIONS: None

“That the Monterey County Board of Education approves the Monterey County Home Charter School Return to School Plan for the 2020-2021 School Year.”

- 5. Next Meeting Date:
August 12, 2020 – 9 AM Agenda Items Due July 23, 2020

- 6. The meeting was adjourned at 10:37 AM.

Approved: August 12, 2020

Ronald Panziera, President

Deneen Guss, Ed. D.,
Secretary to the Board



Public Comment <public-comment@montereycoe.org>

Testimony for the Board of Education meeting of July 29


Kelly Arbor <arbor.kelly@gmail.com>
To: public-comment@montereycoe.org

Wed, Jul 29, 2020 at 12:49 AM

Please find my attached written testimony, which I hope will be read into the record during the July 29 meeting.

Thank you very much,

Kelly Arbor

 **Kelly Arbor testimony to the Board of Education.docx**
17K

2621 Willowbrook Lane
Soquel CA. 95003
karbor@montereycoe.org
July 28, 2020

Dear President Panziera and Members of the Monterey Co. Board of Education,

I am writing to offer testimony on Item 3 on your agenda, the Monterey County Alternative Education Program Return to School Plan for the 2020-2021 School Year. I am proud to be an educator with the Monterey County Office of Education for the past six years. For the last three years, I have taught in Wellington Smith School Court School, as a Special Education and English Language Arts teacher inside the Monterey County Juvenile Hall.

As you are probably aware, the students who attend court school reside in the locked facilities run by the Monterey County Department of Probation. Beginning in late March 2020, the six classroom teachers who worked in Juvenile Hall and in the Monterey County Youth Center worked from home and zoomed live into the facility classrooms each day, for four full periods of instruction. As you might imagine, this mode of teaching has its challenges, but it also created a workable solution to the problem of distance learning. Additionally, the Special Education Resource Teacher joined the classroom zoom from time to time, giving individualized attention to the needs of those students requiring Specialized Academic Instruction.

I and other teachers have participated in Alternative Education meetings and discussions, and I have submitted written suggestions to Mr. Devers, about the protocols and instructional models we deemed necessary for the "lowest risk," "more risk" and "highest risk" scenarios. The draft document before this board today is quite substantial and is a generally well-constructed document, but I have a few nagging concerns.

Because the court school environment is quite different than the situation of community school students who receiving distance learning in a home setting, I believe the document should differentiate the two Alternative Ed schools. I am particularly hopeful the description of cohort groups will be better clarified, if not in today's document then in a future amended version.

- 1) **Cohort needs to be defined.** In the court school, the cohort groups have always been created by the Probation Department, with most students having two (Youth Center) or three (Juvenile Hall) different teachers. I believe the intention of a cohort in the "more risk" scenario, is that a cohort would be one group of students with one teacher for all classes, though this is not explicitly stated. Also, I believe the probation officers, who come into the classroom and who have close contact with students in their units, have to be considered part of the cohort group and be tested with the same regularity as school staff.

Another important consideration is that probation sometimes reassigns from one cohort group to another. For instance, if a student receives a conviction for a serious offense, they are usually switched from the general population group to a higher security group. We also have seen many students go back and forth between Juvenile Hall and the Youth Center.

California has mandated that each cohort be tested every two months, so we must contemplate how we define members of that cohort. Consider a student who is in my classroom for three weeks, and then switched to another classroom within the court school. Shouldn't that student still be considered part of my cohort in the event that someone in my classroom tests positive, shortly after he or she has left my classroom? Also, the Resource teacher may have students in all six classrooms in both settings. Will he be considered part of all six cohorts? I recommend that these issues be more closely examined before we move into the "more risk plan."

- 2) **Attendance.** Under the "more risk plan," students who are incarcerated will attend in-person classes (as they have under "lowest risk plan") because probation does not have the means to offer students an individual "at-home" distance learning option. I think that could be made clear on "student attendance and health policies" on p. 9.
- 3) **Instructional Model/Models.** The remote learning in court school is entirely synchronous, as court school students do not complete assignments apart from the in-class setting. It is unclear to me whether parents (with educational rights) or probation (with custodial rights) need to be contacted with ParentSquare. Perhaps this can be better clarified.
- 4) **Professional Development.** (p.16). Student growth measurement does not belong under this heading. Additionally, summative assessments on a weekly basis do not generally work in an Alternative Education environment.
- 5) **Social and Emotional Well-Being.** I find it is a very worthy ideal for each student to have access to 1:1 interaction with adults at minimum of once per day. However, I don't see how this will be implemented in Wellington Smith School, when the teacher is zooming into the classroom and not into the home environment.

I want to thank you all for your careful attention to my concerns. I applaud the hard work that went into this draft document, and hope that my comments and suggestions are helpful to you in your consideration of any future revisions or amendments to this draft.

Thank you for accepting my written testimony.

Respectfully,

Kelly Arbor



Alternative Education Reopening Plan Comment

sean crossno <seancrossno@gmail.com>
To: public-comment@montereycoe.org

Tue, Jul 28, 2020 at 4:35 PM

Hello distinguished school board, I am a teacher for MCOE Alternative Education, working in court schools. I have read over the draft Alternative Education reopening Template and I have two concerns. The first is that there is no differentiation made between court schools and community schools, court school students live on campus and that can present a different struggle to maintain a healthy cohort than a community school. I would also like to see a more explicit definition of cohorts, does this include probation staff that are in classrooms?, does it include instructional assistants who move between sites?, and does it include resource specialists who travel between sites to serve students?

Thank you for hearing my comments

Sean Crossno
MA Ed. Teacher, Monterey County Office of Alternative Education.