


Sacramento City Unified School District  
**Board of Education Meeting**

**June 25, 2020 Public Comments**

Name: Sarah WilliamsKingsley

Comment: This is a response to the Sacramento City Teachers Association proposal titled, "Article on Whole Child Education" dated June 9, 2020.



conflict with the District's improvement plan for GATE access mandated by the United States Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights.

The plan calls for Arts and Music instruction but does not detail how much this will cost.


Part C calls for interventions to be decided on a site basis by a new committee. This means the quality of the education each child receives will be determined site-by-site -- making equity in education impossible. If sites can opt-in they can opt-out and that should not be allowed. The remedies are also not in line with student-centered interventions -- they are adult centered. If students at a school site needs more resource teacher support, there is a mechanism to get that already through the one stop staffing process. "Targeted extended day" means teachers are paid overtime to tutor existing students. Students need to be provided services within the school day and not expected to attend school before or after hours to accommodate the needs of the adults.

Part C also calls for funding for the new site-level special education committees. This work should be done as part of the due course of employment and not subject to bargaining. The cost of the committees is listed at \$74,114.05 per site with fewer than 400 students and \$148,228.10 for those larger than 400 students. Why would the District fund committees instead of services for students directly?

The plan shows a deep misunderstanding on the part of the SCTA about what Multi-Tiered Systems of Support actually means. They specifically ask that each school site have an MTSS committee that would take disagreements to the other committee they want to create, the Special Education Committee. MTSS is not a Special Education function.

Part D-- Parent Teacher Home Visit project -- Opt-in AGAIN.

Part E -- Restorative Practices Proposal is also misguided -- it once again calls for the creation of yet another committee with the power to opt-out at the site level. Disciplinary practices should not be bottom up instead of top-down. The District's opt-in culture has already led to site-level disparities in discipline and resulted in the District leading the



Part F, section 1 calls for teachers to be paid to serve on the Community Advisory

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

parent-led. Teachers are invited to participate and join as regular members. Teachers can not be allowed to overtake or co-opt this avenue for parent input and oversight.

Question of District/SCTA committee (number 2 in this proposal) to guide special