



ICOC  
December 17, 2009  
Exhibit 4.2.1

Board of Education Workshop October 6, 2009  
Partial transcription  
Regarding the priority Zip Codes for PSA workforce referral  
[Recording time segment 1:51.25 through 2:13.58]

**Mr. Stump:** Thank you Madam President, John Stump. The ICOC has not had an opportunity to review this [the staff proposal] yet. We had a little fumble on our scheduling. [The document] I presented to the Board [is] a look at the zip codes by distribution by the household median income. You will see there are zip codes [in the staff proposal] that are included that are far and above the median income for the district. There are zip codes that are not included [in the staff proposal] that are far below and the one that jumps up to me right away is 92101 District. Just because we do not have a lot of schools there, I guess that's the reason they are out, but they have a lot of poverty. My suggestion to you is that as you consider this on a final basis because today is just a workshop that you actually look at the method of calculation and see if it really makes sense in reality. I certainly think that 92101 deserves consideration. I think you will see on the chart we have, I'm trying to indicate that what your priority zip codes should be, those persons in the district who live and come from families that make less than 80% of district's median income. Okay, that's all that I have Madam President and I can answer any questions, then at the end, Mr. Johnson has asked me to speak concerning this whole.

**President Jackson:** The sheet that you [Mr. Stump] gave us what you are saying is that I see where line 21 is and anything [i.e. any ZIP code] that's below that [line] 21 to 22-30 are really the only ones that should be included.

**Mr. Stump:** I haven't had a chance to look at the raw data and the formulas that were used and I did see some data which seemed to indicate that there were 15,000 resident students in City Heights but knowing the schools in City Heights 92105, I don't think there's 15,000 attending. I think some of the 15,000 are being bused or transferred out of that census track to different areas. But not having had a careful review of the data in the presentation, I can't really represent anything to you. This data, by the way, is from SANDAG's profiles, it is the current estimate, I did it myself, and it is available on line you can check it. Any other questions?

**Mr. DeBeck:** At the time we set up the PSA, I think we indicated that zip codes would be the criteria [for giving worker referral priority]. . .

**Mr. Harris:** Correct . . .

**Mr. DeBeck:** I don't know that we said what the subset of that was. My personal view is I like using free and reduced lunch because that indicates kids who are in poverty in that particular area. I would rather help families with children than families without children no matter the level of poverty.

**Mr. Stump:** And again. . .

**Mr. DeBeck:** We can debate all this forever. . .

**Mr. Stump:** The question is whether or not the data is skewed somehow because of busing.

**Ms. Nakamura:** But didn't he say residence . . .[interrupted]

**Mr. Stump:** I know he said residence. I haven't verified the data and I have looked at some of the raw data and I am not convinced it isn't. Between now and when the Board adopts its policy we can go over the raw data and go to one of the ICOC committees and figure it out.

**Mr. Evans:** I was trying to recall that George validated it was free and reduced lunch and the poverty level and they were residential. I thought I heard we were just trying to focus on neediest zip codes driven by the PSA.

**Mr. Stump:** What I am suggesting to the Board is send it to committee and have the data checked because I am not convinced it is correct at the moment.

**President Jackson:** Anything else?

**Mr. Harris:** This data came from our Demographics Department. I asked several times to make sure that this information they were giving me was in fact the residence of the students not where they attended school.

**President Jackson:** Okay

**Mr. Barrera:** This is my comment to Mr. Stump, I am fine with having the ICOC review the data with a couple of points of direction: One is we need to have the zip codes in place by the time the bids are going out on October 27, 2009. I want to make sure it is done by that time line. And the other thing is so you are reviewing the data with clarity that the Board agrees with the basic method of selecting the zip codes which is the combination of poverty and kids who live in the neighborhood who are on free and reduced lunch.

**Mr. Stump:** That's clear the problem is when you look at the data you don't see sums. Normally when you double check sums data you can say "here's the amount of students in that zip code and here's the ones that are in that attendance area." That column has been missing.

**President Jackson:** All right, thank you.

**Mr. Harris:** I'm sorry, just one more thing. As far as the Board's direction on this, according to the agreement it doesn't say the Board doesn't have to approve it, so I just want to know should I go ahead and proceed with the ten zip codes for now as far as working with the unions and the contractors to highlight that those are zip codes going forward.

**Ms. Nakamura:** The green ones you mean?

**Mr. Harris:** Yes

**Mr. Barrera:** I just think run it by the ICOC in a timely manner and my preference would be to proceed after having gotten that feedback.

**President Jackson:** I agree with Mr. Barrera but in a workshop as today, we don't have items for action. . .[interrupted]

**Mr. Harris:** Exactly . . .[interrupted]

**President Jackson:** If it is required to have a Board vote, then it would have to come back on the agenda and so if it goes to do that then we have different information to do certain things so it becomes agendaized you have a good idea [interrupted]

**Mr. DeBeck:** I think there is a consensus that the green is it. Not a total agreement but it's in order to operate I don't see any reason why we should vote on it. It is clearly the green is the first target.

**President Jackson:** It is going to the ICOC, then what is the purpose of going there if we are going to do consensus now?

**Mr. DeBeck:** To validate the data.

**President Jackson:** And so if it goes there and for some reason the data is not correct...[interrupted]

**Mr. Markey:** I will be happy to bring it to the ICOC and we'll just ensure that we have their concurrence. I just have to decide which subcommittee it needs to go to. It could be the Finance, Planning and Controls committee. I will talk to the ICOC President and we'll find out where it needs to go. We will double check and unless otherwise directed, then what we will do is go ahead and implement the ten in the green area as the priority for the 35%.