

1 [Board of Supervisors response to the 2007-2008 Civil Grand Jury Report entitled "San
2 Francisco Kindergarten Admissions: Back to the Drawing Board"]

3 **Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings**
4 **and recommendations contained in the 2007-2008 Civil Grand Jury Report entitled "San**
5 **Francisco Kindergarten Admissions: Back to the Drawing Board."**

6
7 WHEREAS, Under California Penal Code Section 933 et seq., the Board of
8 Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior
9 Court on the findings and recommendations contained in Civil Grand Jury Reports; and

10 WHEREAS, In accordance with Penal Code Section 933.05(c), if a finding or
11 recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a
12 county agency or a department headed by an elected officer, the agency or department head
13 and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the Civil Grand Jury, but the
14 response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only budgetary or personnel matters over
15 which it has some decision making authority; and WHEREAS, The 2007-2008 Civil Grand Jury
16 Report entitled "San Francisco Kindergarten Admissions: Back to the Drawing Board" is on file
17 with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 080926, which is hereby declared to be
18 a part of this resolution as if set forth fully herein; and

19 WHEREAS, The Civil Grand Jury has requested that the Board of Supervisors respond
20 to both Findings and Recommendations Nos. 9 and 10 contained in the subject Civil Grand
21 Jury report; and

22 WHEREAS, Finding No. 9 states: "Some members of the Board of Education appear to
23 have student diversity as their first priority for the District;" and

24 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. 9 states: "During the Grand Jury's inquiry the
25 recurring theme from parents, teachers, principals, leaders of support groups and school

1 officials alike was the need to create good schools system wide. This would provide the
2 equity that all students deserve and these leaders seek. The Jury heard that student diversity
3 is desirable, but not as important as quality schools for all, whatever the setting. With a new
4 Superintendent and two new Board of Education members to be elected in the fall joining
5 three recently elected members, now is the time to refocus on creating quality schools
6 throughout the District;” and

7 WHEREAS, Finding No. 10 states: “The District needs to make crucial decisions about
8 surplus school property, updating 30 year old and now obsolete school attendance zones, and
9 establishing policy to guide decisions to shut failed schools. Voters faced with future requests
10 for funding from the District will react favorably to the District’s efforts to streamline their
11 property management activities and to convert these non-performing assets into resources
12 that support District educational activities;” and

13 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. 10 states: “Practice better resource management as
14 an example of prudent stewardship, particularly now in the facing of funding cuts. By year-
15 end 2008 the City should devise a plan for reducing the number of under utilized properties
16 and failing schools;” and

17 WHEREAS, in accordance with Penal Code Section 933.05(c), the Board of
18 Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior
19 Court on both Findings and Recommendations Nos. 9 and 10 contained in the subject Civil
20 Grand Jury report; now, therefore, be it

21 RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the
22 Superior Court that it disagrees wholly or partially with both Finding and Recommendation No.
23 9. That is, except for the assertion of one elementary school principal, the subject Civil Grand
24 Jury report provides no factual support for Finding and Recommendation No. 9. Indeed, on
25 May 27, 2008, the San Francisco Board of Education adopted a new Strategic Plan entitled

1 "Beyond the Talk: Taking Action to Educate Every Child Now" that outlines the District's
2 priorities. This plan is organized into three initiatives: (1) Performance Management Initiative
3 (to increase the personal and professional capacity of all District employees); (2) Equity
4 Centered-Professional Learning Initiative (to create and sustain professional learning
5 communities); and (3) 21st Century Curriculum Initiative (to provide classroom instruction that
6 is personalized, relevant, meaningful and engaging for each student). The Strategic Plan
7 does not identify diversity as the first priority of the District; and, be it

8 FURTHER RESOLVED, the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the
9 Superior Court that regarding both Finding and Recommendation No. 10, the San Francisco
10 Unified School District ("SFUSD") is a state agency that is governed by the San Francisco
11 Board of Education. The City and County of San Francisco does not have jurisdiction over
12 SFUSD facilities or programs. In addition, it is important to note that the Board of Education
13 has already taken steps to determine the best uses of surplus property and to guide school
14 closures. On May 22, 2005, the Board adopted Resolution 53-22SM1 "School Consolidation
15 Policy;" on August 23, 2005, it adopted Resolution 56-14A9 "Feasibility of Selling, Leasing or
16 Subleasing Surplus Real Property;" and, on May 13, 2007, it adopted Resolution 71-23Sp2
17 "Establishing a District Policy for General Public Notification Regarding Changes in Uses of
18 District-Owned Properties;" and, be it

19 FURTHER RESOLVED, Pursuant to Penal Code Section 933.05(c), the Board of
20 Supervisors responds to the findings and recommendations to which it agrees by hereby
21 urging the SFUSD to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations.

22
23
24
25