



Michael Clara &lt;donmiguelslc@gmail.com&gt;

---

**Re: Smart School Technology Program**

1 message

**Michael Clára** <donmiguelslc@gmail.com>

Thu, Aug 29, 2013 at 12:01 PM

To: Janet Roberts &lt;Janet.Roberts@slcschools.org&gt;

Cc: Kristi Swett &lt;Kristi.Swett@slcschools.org&gt;, Heather Bennett &lt;heatherbennett@xmission.com&gt;, Doug Nelson &lt;doug@mdxperts.com&gt;, Rosemary Emery &lt;rosemary.emery2@gmail.com&gt;, Laurel Young &lt;Laurel.Young@slcschools.org&gt;, Tiffany Sandberg &lt;Tiffany.Sandberg@slcschools.org&gt;, McKell Withers &lt;McKell.Withers@slcschools.org&gt;, Julie Atwood &lt;Julie.Atwood@slcschools.org&gt;, Patrick Garcia &lt;Patrick.Garcia@slcschools.org&gt;, Allison Sisam &lt;Allison.Sisam@slcschools.org&gt;

Bcc: Michael Clara &lt;donmiguelslc@gmail.com&gt;

Janet,

Thank for this information. Since serving on the school board, I have not seen “a routine phone call or email request” in actual practice. I have several phone calls and emails into personnel at the district that have gone unanswered, which is why I resort to the GRAMA Request route which has proven successful.

If there is some renewed commitment on the district’s part to return my phone calls and respond to my emails, I can certainly give that route another try, when making future request.

As to the issue at hand; I have several questions that I will ask via this email. Let me clear, these are by no means rhetorical questions and I do expect a response.

As you quoted the law, it states that a school may “submit an application” with the “approval of the local school board”.

Why did the district bypass the “local school board” in the approval process? The law clearly states that approval should be obtained BEFORE an application is even submitted.

In order to comport ourselves to the requirements of the law, based on the timeline you have provided, the school board should have convened a meeting between July 15, 2013 and July 26, 2013.

I don’t recall a meeting being held within that time frame. I recognize a meeting was not previously scheduled. However, The Utah Public & Opens Meeting Act does make provisions for public bodies to call meetings on short notice. This

school board has done that in the past.

Again I ask: Why did the district bypass the “local school board” in the approval process?

Was there a reason that the school board was not informed about this grant application at its August 6, 2013, School Board meeting?

What changed between the first round and second round that caused the Salt Lake City School District to submit an application for the grant?

What is the full amount that the district has obligated itself to, by participating in this grant?

Out of all of the schools in the district, why was Newman chosen?

What fund expenditure within the Capital Fund is this being paid from?

What is the total amount that is currently in that expenditure category?

You also state that “A district can withdraw from the program at any time prior to signing the final agreement with iSchool Campus, the technology provider for the program”.

I happen to know that iSchool Campus personnel are already at Newman. Are you telling me that they have begun work on this project without a signed ‘final agreement’?

As one who has a fiduciary responsibility over school district finances, I want you to know that I find your explanation highly suspect: “It was anticipated that approval by our school board would happen when the approval for the funds were included in the Purchasing Report”.

I do not believe that the intent of the law was to have a local school board approve a grant application via a purchase order buried in a consent agenda. Aside from the specifics of this particular law, I find this practice troubling on several levels.

Un abrazo,

**Michael Clára**

801-205-0389

Board Member, District 2

On Thu, Aug 29, 2013 at 9:36 AM, Janet Roberts <[Janet.Roberts@slcschools.org](mailto:Janet.Roberts@slcschools.org)> wrote: