

1 ASSEMBLY ON MISSION

2 Twelfth Meeting

3 August 2, 2002

4

5

## MINUTES

6

7 John Scudder, Moderator, called the twelfth meeting of the District of San

8 Francisco Assembly on Mission to order at 1:15 p.m. The roll was taken by the

9 Tellers. Brother George, General Secretary, reported the following delegates

10 absent: Lou Boston, Sister Ingrid Clemmensen, Brother Thomas Jones, Brother

11 Harry Morgan, Marilyn Paquette, and Ms. Sally Stamp.

12

13 The Moderator invited Brother David Brennan to lead the opening prayer.

14

15 The minutes of the ninth meeting of the General Assembly were presented for

16 approval. The following correction was noted:

17       Line 75 should read that the motion was made by Robert Jordan, not

18       Rudy Schulze.

19

20 Upon motion made by Brother Dominic Berardelli, second by Brother Ronald

21 Roggenback, the minutes of the twelfth meeting were unanimously approved as

22 corrected.

23

24 The Moderator opened the floor for questions and clarification on Report #1 from  
25 the Service of the Poor Committee. He noted that there was a five minute limit  
26 for each report. No questions followed.

27

28 The Moderator opened the floor for discussion and endorsement of Report #2 of  
29 the Regional and Overseas Apostolates Committee. The following points were  
30 raised:

- 31 • Clarification of lines 14-16 pointed out that not everyone enters our  
32 schools/works knowing what a “Lasallian school” is. The report wants our  
33 colleges recognized as Lasallian schools and to note what is different  
34 about them.
- 35 • Opportunities would be available for formation programs through the  
36 internet.
- 37 • As the secondary schools have more and more connection to overseas  
38 works, why were they not included in this report? Secondary schools are  
39 addressed in the committee’s second report.

40

41 The Moderator called for a vote on endorsement of this report.

42

43 In favor: 113      Opposed: 2      Abstain: 0      the report was endorsed.

44

45 The Moderator opened the floor for discussion and endorsement of Report #1  
46 from the Regional and Overseas Committee. Prior to discussion it was

47 confirmed that this report had been clarified in an earlier session. No discussion  
48 followed.

49

50 A vote to endorse was taken.

51

52 In favor: 112          Opposed: 1          Abstain: 4    the report was endorsed.

53

54 The Moderator opened the floor for discussion and endorsement of Report #1  
55 from the Outreach of Saint Mary's College/District Committee. The following  
56 points were made:

57

- 58        • Saint Mary's College would like to ensure that communication and  
59                collaboration continues and that District schools are aware of the multi-  
60                layers in which the College reaches out to the schools/works.
- 61        • The committee was commended for their report acknowledging the long  
62                term commitment by the College and District.
- 63        • In reference to tuition reduction, no timeline was established, but rather  
64                this was meant as a discussion possibility.
- 65        • Reduction of tuition at the District high schools for Saint Mary's College for  
66                the children of Saint Mary's College faculty and staff was brought forward,  
67                but no information was available regarding this possibility.

68

69 A vote for endorsement was taken.

70 In favor: 113      Opposed: 2      Abstain: 2    the report was endorsed.

71

72 Proposition #3 from the Formation Committee was read for consideration. The

73 floor was opened for debate. The following issue was brought forward:

- 74 • In researching the development of a Spanish language immersion  
75 program, the Committee discussed the one possibility which would be with  
76 Obregon, Mexico.

77

78 No further debate ensued. A vote was called for on Proposition #3.

79

80 **BE IT RESOLVED** that District Leadership, in collaboration with SSAA and local

81 institutions, research the development of a Spanish language immersion

82 program for Brothers and Partners throughout the District, especially for

83 those in direct contact with Spanish-speaking students and families.

84

85 In favor: 113      Opposed: 4      Abstain: 1    Proposition #3 from the

86 Formation Committee was passed

87

88 Proposition #4 from the Governance, Leadership and the Structure of

89 Educational Works Committee was read by the Assembly Secretary. Prior to the

90 debate on this proposition, clarification was called for on lines 47 and 51.

- 91 • On line 47, the word “conduct” should read “initiate”.

- 92       • On lines 47 and 51, the word “District” should read “District Leadership  
93           Team”.

94       The Assembly Secretary read the proposition and the floor was opened for  
95       debate. The following issues were brought forward:

- 96       • There was a general feeling expressed that this research has already  
97           been done by the U.S. Catholic Conference and NCEA on the issue of  
98           vouchers. Would the study include all Lasallian schools across the  
99           country? The money for further research might be better spent lobbying in  
100          Washington, Sacramento, Oregon, and Washington or being given to the  
101          Service of the Poor Fund.
- 102       • There was a general feeling expressed that this research could be guided  
103           by a pre-judgment that assumes the voucher system is good and the right  
104           way to go. A committee member assured the Assembly that the research  
105           is an attempt to raise questions regarding the fundamental doctrine of  
106           educating children within the framework of the Lasallian commitment.
- 107       • There was concern that we would be seen as biased if we did our own  
108           research. This concern was answered by emphasizing lines 63-69 of the  
109           proposition, the assurance that special efforts would be made to consider  
110           the impact of public legislation, and the suggestion that we could work with  
111           National and State agencies on the research.
- 112       • It was noted that the cost of the study would less if it was done in  
113           conjunction with other groups (state/national). With tuition rising, we need  
114           as many sources of funding as possible. The study is meant to be

115 objective and we need to be ready when and if vouchers are available to  
116 families.

117 • It was pointed out that good leadership needs good information to make  
118 good decisions. Vouchers promise hope to students.

119 • Proposition #4 was seen as planning for a realistic future. Vouchers will  
120 benefit both public and private schools.

121 • Saint Mary's College resources can be used for any study done, along  
122 with information that has already been collected.

123

124 Mike Trefacanty moved to call the question. This was seconded by Br. Norman  
125 Cook, FSC. A voice vote was taken and the debate on Proposition #4 was  
126 discontinued.

127

128 A vote was called for on the Proposition.

129

130 **BE IT RESOLVED**, that the District conduct a comprehensive study of the  
131 impacts on Lasallian schools (K-12) that might result from the future  
132 adoption and implementation of school choice/ educational voucher  
133 programs at the federal, state, and/or local levels; and

134 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the District report the findings and  
135 recommendations of this study to the Secondary School Administrators'  
136 Association (SSAA), the Association of Board Chairs (ABC), the boards of

137 trustees of LEC and shared charism schools, and the faculty and staff of  
138 all schools and works of the District in order to help them:

- 139 ❖ acquire a more complete understanding of (1) the Church's social  
140 justice teachings about the primacy of the rights of parents in the  
141 education of their children; (2) the constitutional principles upon which  
142 the Zelman decision was based; and (3) the underlying social, political,  
143 economic, religious and educational issues that have affected the  
144 national debate on school choice as family policy, especially with  
145 respect to the needs and rights of poor and working class parents; and
- 146 ❖ understand more fully the rationale behind positions taken by various  
147 religious, social, cultural and/or political groups on their own initiative or  
148 through various networks or coalitions with other groups in support of  
149 and in opposition to possible changes in public policy at federal, state,  
150 and/or local levels that would permit poor or working class parents to  
151 enroll their children in the school(s) of their choice through the  
152 redemption of full or partial tuition vouchers; and
- 153 ❖ analyze and evaluate the mission opportunities, challenges, problem  
154 issues, and financial benefits and costs that existing Lasallian schools  
155 (and new educational works created in response to increased demand)  
156 might encounter or experience as a result of substantially increasing  
157 the number of students enrolled under school choice programs.

158

159 In favor: 92            Opposed: 18            Abstain: 10    Proposition #4 passed.

160

161 Proposition #2 from the Education of Students from Diverse Economic and Social  
162 Situations Committee was read by the Assembly Secretary. The Moderator  
163 opened the floor for debate.

164 A motion for an amendment to the proposition was made by Mr. Richard Sprague  
165 and seconded by Mr. Michael Trefacanty. Line 1 of the Proposition would be  
166 amended to include the words “this District Assembly encourage” before “the  
167 boards of trustees” and the word “to” be inserted before “create” in line 2.

168

169 A vote on the amendment was called for and passed unanimously.

170

171 Debate continued on the amended proposition with the following issue raised:

- 172 • A clarification of those schools who operate under Policy Governance model  
173 and those who do not was made. There is no common model for all the  
174 schools/works of the District, but since this is about mission, there is an  
175 obligation for a consistent message of what the needs are. This proposition  
176 should be applicable to any school in the District.

177

178 Richard Gray moved to amend Proposition #2 by eliminating lines 9 and 10. The  
179 motion was seconded by Brother Jack Henderson, FSC.

180

- 181 • A debate on whether lines 9 and 10 needed to be included or if they weaken  
182 the moral message by the accountability called for in these two lines.
- 183 • There were some who felt the lines were redundant.

184

185 Mr. Dan Cawthorn moved to call the question. This was seconded by Mr. Larry  
186 Puck. A voice vote was taken and the debate was closed on the proposed  
187 amendment.

188

189 The Moderator called for a vote on the amendment to Proposition #2.

190

191 In favor: 82            Opposed: 31            Abstain: 4    The amendment passed.

192

193 Mr. Greg Schmitz moved to call the question which was seconded by Brother  
194 Edmond Larouche, FSC.

195

196 **BE IT RESOLVED** that this Assembly encourage the boards of trustees in the  
197 educational works of the District to create policies or directives, where  
198 they do not currently exist:

- 199            • that advance efforts to increase accessibility to the poor,
- 200            • that increase awareness at all levels of the school community of the  
201            opportunities and implications of diversity, and
- 202            • that raise the awareness of the interrelatedness of diversity and  
203            decision making with respect to administrative policy, teacher  
204            formation, and the conduct of activities.

205

206 In favor: 105            Opposed: 10            Abstain: 2    The Proposition passed.

207

208 The Assembly Secretary read the joint Proposition #1 from the Education of  
209 Students from Diverse and Social Backgrounds Committee/Service of the Poor  
210 Committee/Governance, Leadership, and the Structure of Educational Works  
211 Committee. The Moderator opened the floor for debate with the following issues  
212 brought forward:

- 213 • There were concerns that the faculty and administration do not reflect the  
214 student population in the District schools/works and that it is important to  
215 recruit people who do reflect the people we serve.
- 216 • It was pointed out that in some schools, for example, Cathedral High  
217 School, the student population is approximately 80% Latino and the  
218 administration and faculty do not reflect this. However, administration and  
219 faculty are sensitive to Latinos and that hiring people because of their  
220 ethnicity does not guarantee sensitivity.
- 221 • While the schools/works of the District want to promote diversity, they also  
222 want to uphold excellence and to hire the best person for the job.

223

224 A motion to amend the proposition by inserting “as it is educationally  
225 advantageous for students to see themselves reflected in the staff,  
226 administration, faculty, board and District leadership” in line 8 after “that” was  
227 made by Ms. Catherine Karrels and seconded by Brother Richard Moratto, FSC.  
228 Debate ensued on the amendment.

229

230 A voice vote was called on the amendment and it did not pass.

231

232 Debate continued on the Proposition.

- 233 • Concern about the definition of “diversity” was voiced. It was felt that if  
234 diversity referred to gender/race than it was appropriate, but if it included  
235 religion and financial status, then it was not appropriate. For example, in a  
236 school where 40% of the student body is below the Federal Poverty Level,  
237 does the administration, faculty and board of trustees have to be in this  
238 financial category also?

239

240 A motion by Mr. Richard Sprague to amend the proposition was seconded by Mr.  
241 Brian Stanley. The amendment would insert in line 8 after the word “that” the  
242 following words, “this District Assembly encourages each educational work to  
243 establish plans . . .” and to insert in line 11 after the word serve, “without  
244 compromising the integrity and viability of the educational work”. Lines 12-14  
245 would be amended to read, “Be It Further Resolved that this District Assembly  
246 encourage boards of trustees in each education work to recruit board members  
247 who reflect the diversity of the constituencies and communities they serve and  
248 seek to serve without compromising the integrity and viability of the board; and”.  
249 Line 15 would read, “Be It Further Resolved that in like manner leadership  
250 throughout the District appropriately reflect the diversity of the District of San  
251 Francisco”.

252

253 • Prior to debate on this amendment, Brother Michael Meister, FSC, moved to  
254 suspend the Orders of the Day. This was seconded by Mr. Patrick Bonacci.

255 Debate on the amendment ensued.

256

257 Brother James Joost, FSC, moved to close the debate and this was seconded by  
258 Mr. Richard Gray. A vote by the Assembly closed the debate and a voice vote  
259 on the amendment was taken. The amendment did not pass.

260

261 Debate returned to the Proposition as originally written with the following issues  
262 brought forward:

263 • There was uncertainty that this move toward diversity would get the mission  
264 accomplished.

265 • It was agreed that while the intent of the Proposition was good, the language  
266 was not and it probably would benefit from re-writing.

267

268 Brother Michael Meister, FSC, moved to amend the Proposition with a second  
269 from Brother Martin Ybarra, FSC. Lines 14 and 15 would be amended to read,  
270 “and that the Brother Visitor be encouraged to select a leadership team that  
271 reflects the diversity of the District”.

272

273 Brother Christopher Brady, FSC, called the question and this was seconded by  
274 Brother Ronald Gallagher, FSC. A vote to close debate on the amendment was  
275 called and the debate was closed.

276 A voice vote on the amendment was called for and the amendment did not pass.

277

278 The debate returned to the original Proposition once again.

279 • Delegates were reminded that long after the Assembly is over, only the

280 language of the Proposition is left and so, it must be clear in meaning.

281 • A member of the Service of the Poor Committee noted that the language in

282 the Proposition had been changed since that committee agreed to support it.

283

284 Ms. Tina Bonacci moved to call the question and was seconded by Brother Larry

285 Haley, FSC. A voice vote to close the debate was taken and debate was closed.

286

287 **BE IT RESOLVED** that each educational work establish a plan to recruit,

288 develop and retain faculty, staff and administrators who reflect the

289 diversity of the constituencies and communities they serve and seek to

290 serve; and

291 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that boards of trustees in each educational work

292 recruit board members who reflect the diversity of the constituencies they

293 serve and seek to serve; and that district leadership reflects the diversity

294 of the District of San Francisco.

295

296 The Moderator called for the vote.

297

298 In favor: 21                      Opposed: 86                      Abstain: 8      The Proposition did not

299

300 The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.