



Board of Education

Patrick Kennedy, President, Area 7
 Darrel Woo, Vice President, Area 6
 Christina Pritchett, 2nd Vice President, Area 3
 Jay Hansen, Area 1
 Jeff Cuneo, Area 2
 Gustavo Arroyo, Area 4
 Diana Rodriguez, Area 5
 Margarita Kovalchuk, Student Board Member

Sara Noguchi, Ed.D., Interim Superintendent

BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

Date: March 21, 2014

INTERIM SUPERINTENDENT – DR. SARA NOGUCHI

BC NO.	FROM	REGARDING
S-5	Dr. Sara Noguchi	Upcoming Board Presentation

CHIEF ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICER – DR. TERESA CUMMINGS

BC NO.	FROM	REGARDING
CACC-16	Teresa Cummings	Program Evaluations

CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER – DR. OLIVINE ROBERTS

BC NO.	FROM	REGARDING
CAO-7	Olivine Roberts	NCLB Requirements for Sacramento City Unified School District

CHIEF BUSINESS OFFICER – KEN FORREST

BC NO.	FROM	REGARDING
CBO-8	Ken Forrest	Requested Information Re: Lack of Payment by Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA)

CHIEF COMMUNICATIONS OFFICER – GABE ROSS

BC NO.	FROM	REGARDING
CCO-22	Gabe Ross	Sacramento Bee Story on NCLB Waiver



**SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD COMMUNICATION**

BC NO: S-5

CONFIDENTIAL ITEM - <i>(Check a Box)</i>	No:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Yes:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Date: 3/21/2014
From the Office of the Superintendent						
To the Members of the Board of Education						
Prepared by: Dr. Sara Noguchi, Interim Superintendent					Contact Email: Superintendent@scusd.edu	
Subject: Upcoming Board Presentation						
<p>The next Board Meeting will present information to staff on 504 Plans and Health Services. If you have specific questions you would like addressed, please send the questions to Teresa Cummings at cummingst@scusd.edu.</p>						
Approved by:						
Sara Noguchi, Ed.D., Interim Superintendent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				Date: 3/21/2014		



**SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD COMMUNICATION**

BC NO: CACC-16

CONFIDENTIAL ITEM - <i>(Check a Box)</i>	No:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Yes:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Date: 3/21/2014
From the Office of the Superintendent						
To the Members of the Board of Education						
Prepared by: Teresa Cummings, Chief Accountability Officer					Contact Email: cummingst@scusd.edu	
Subject: Program Evaluations						
<p>In 2013-14, the SCUSD Office of Accountability began an initiative to internally evaluate programs and resources. The purpose of these evaluations is to identify programs that support students in their learning and determine program efficacy towards meeting student achievement goals. In particular, two types of program evaluations are utilized in the evaluation process: (A) cost-benefit studies and (B) evaluation studies, focusing primarily on student outcomes. Both provide useful insights to support strategic decision making and planning. Staff will begin providing the board with one page program evaluations. Full reports are available upon request.</p> <p>The first evaluation study examined the Vision 2000 Summer Academy Program (Vision 2000). Attached you will find a one page summary of the Vision 2000 Summer Academy Program. SCUSD has been participating in the Vision 2000 program since 2001. This study evaluated the efficacy of Vision 2000 relative to its stated goals. As a result of the program evaluation, SCUSD staff will work closely with Dr. Hazel Mahone to ensure curriculum is aligned with the Common Core State Standards and District goals and objectives. In addition, SCUSD staff will support the Vision 2000 program in tracking and monitoring student progress.</p>						
<p>Approved by:</p> <p>Sara Noguchi, Ed.D., Interim Superintendent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Date: 3/21/2014</p>						



PROGRAM EVALUATION

ASSESSMENT, RESEARCH, AND EVALUATION

Vision 2000 Summer Academy Program Evaluation Summary

Vision 2000 was founded in 2001 as a college-prep program for K – 8 students who are significantly behind. The program runs for five weeks, immediately following the last day of school for the district.

Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation was to examine the efficacy of Vision 2000 relative to its stated goals.

Objectives

The objectives of this evaluation were to answer the following guiding questions:

- Do students who participate in Vision 2000 perform better than non-participants on CST tests?
- Do demographic factors influence CST outcomes more than program participation?
- Do Principals find Vision 2000 to be important in increasing student achievement?
- Do families understand the program and its impact on their child's learning?

Methodology

Evaluators from the Assessment, Research, and Evaluation (ARE) office conducted multiple interviews with program representatives, district personnel, principals, and families to get a sense of the impact of Vision 2000. Additionally, a *fixed effects logistic regression model* was employed to understand how participation in Vision 2000 influenced CST outcomes and results. This mixed approach provided a broader understanding of the Vision 2000 program, its strengths and its challenges.

Limitations/Inconsistencies

- Request for Agreement included inconsistencies between (1) program narrative and student results and (2) parent and principal perceptions. 80% of Principals did not find the program to be beneficial in increasing student achievement
- Student recruitment process was inconsistent with the program objective of serving students significantly behind. In contrast, the summer program was open to all students.
- Vision 2000 lacks proper infrastructure to manage and track students over time throughout their program.

Key Findings

- Vision 2000 lacks rigorous instructional design. Curriculum was inconsistent with the Common Core and with District Goals and Objectives.
- External evaluation provided included a focus group script that was biased toward favoring the academy.
- Statistical analysis revealed there is no evidence that Vision 2000 impacts student achievement.
- Post hoc analyses revealed the Vision 2000 Summer Academy Program had no impact on whether students advanced in proficiency levels.

Cost Analysis

The Vision 2000 project has billed SCUSD \$2.97 million dollars since 2001. In the 2012-13 FY \$94,621 was spent on the program, and there is a projected cost of \$94,000 for the 2013-14 FY.



**SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD COMMUNICATION**

BC NO: CAO-7

CONFIDENTIAL ITEM - <i>(Check a Box)</i>	No:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Yes:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Date: 3/21/2014
From the Office of the Superintendent						
To the Members of the Board of Education						
Prepared by: Olivine Roberts, Chief Academic Officer					Contact Email: olivine-roberts@scusd.edu	
Subject: NCLB Requirements for Sacramento City Unified School District						
<p>NCLB Requirements for Sacramento City Unified School District</p> <p><u>SCUSD District Program Improvement Status:</u></p> <p>2013-14: Year 3+ (Entered Year 1 in 2008-09; Year 3 in 2010-11)</p> <p>District Program Improvement Requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% of Title I funds set aside for Supplemental Educational Services (SES) and School Choice transportation: The 2013-14 ‘per pupil’ allocation from CDE for SES was \$1207.09 which would allow 2,422 students to participate in SES services and approximately \$974,899 from 20% set aside could be used for transportation. <p>(The last opportunity for LEAs in PI status to apply to become SES providers was in 2013. The RFA should be available again in 2015.)</p> <p>District Technical Assistance to PI Schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year 1 Schools: prepare PI notification letters; provide School Choice; establish peer review process of School Plans • Year 2 Schools : prepare PI notification letters; provide School Choice and SES; provide professional learning • Year 3 Schools: direct technical assistance to School Site Councils for Corrective Action Plan; Corrective Action parent notification letter; provide School Choice and SES; provide professional learning and additional interventions • Year 4 Schools: prepare alternative governance plan; prepare PI notification letters; provide School Choice and SES; provide professional learning and additional interventions • Year 5 Schools: implement Restructuring Plan; prepare PI notification letters; provide School Choice and SES; provide professional learning and additional interventions <p><u>School Program Improvement Status:</u> Due to the cancellation of the CST, in 2014-15, all CA schools will freeze in their 2013-14 PI year.</p>						

53 SCUSD Schools in PI Years 1-5

- **Year 1** - 5 schools
- **Year 2** - 8 schools
- **Year 3** - 10 schools
- **Year 4** - 7 schools
- **Year 5** - 23 schools

School Program Improvement Requirements

- 10% Site Title I funds for Professional Development
- Parent Notification (Years 1-5): 53 schools
- School Choice (Years 1-5): 53 schools
- Supplemental Educational Services (Year 2-5): 48 schools
- Corrective Action Plans (Year 3): 10 schools
- Restructuring Plans (Year 4): 7 schools
- Implementation of Restructuring (Year 5): 23 schools

Approved by:

Sara Noguchi, Ed.D., Interim Superintendent ☒

Date: 3/21/2014

SCUSD Schools in Program Improvement 2014-15

Segment	School	Possible PI 2014-15
Elementary Schools	A.M Winn	5
	Abraham Lincoln	2
	Alice Birney Waldorf	Not Title I
	Bowling Green	5+
	Bret Harte	3
	Caleb Greenwood	Not Title I
	Camellia	Not in PI
	Caroline Wenzle	4
	Cesar Chavez	2
	Crocker Riverside	Not Title I
	David Lubin	Not Title I
	Earl Warren	3
	Edward Kemble	1
	Elder Creek	3
	Ethel I. Baker	5
	Ethel Phillips	5+
	Genvieve Didion	Not Title I
	Golden Empire	2
	H.W. Harkness	2
	Hollywood Park	5
	Hubert Bancroft	Not Title I
	Isador Cohen	2
	James Marshall	2
	John Bidwell	4
	John Cabrillo	4
	John D. Sloat	4
	Leataata Floyd	5+
	Leonardo DaVinci	Not Title I
	Mark Twain	5
	Matsuyama	Not Title I
	Nicholas	4
	O.W. Erlewine	3
	Oak Ridge	Not in PI
	Pacific	5+
Parkway	3	
Peter Burnett	3	
Phoebe Hearst	Not Title I	
Pony Express	1	
Sequoia	Not in PI	
Susan B. Anthony	1	
Sutterville	Not Title I	
Tahoe	5	
William Land	3	
Woodbine	3	
K-8	Fr. Keith B. Kenny	Not in PI
	John Morse Therapeutic Center	3
	John H. Still	5+
	Martin Luther King, Jr.	3
	Rosa Parks	5+

Segment	School	Possible PI 2014-15
Middle Schools	Albert Einstein	5
	California	5+
	Fern Bacon	5+
	Kit Carson	5+
	Sam Brannan	5+
	Sutter	Not Title I
	Will C. Wood	5+
High Schools	American Legion	5+
	Arthur A. Benjamin Health Professions	2
	C.K. McClatchy	4
	Capital City	5
	George Washington Carver	Not Title I
	Hiram Johnson	5+
	John F. Kennedy	4
	Luther Burbank	5
	New Technology	1
	Rosemont	5
	School of Engineering & Sciences	2
	The Met	Not Title I
	West Campus	Not in PI



**SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD COMMUNICATION**

BC NO: CBO-8

CONFIDENTIAL ITEM - <i>(Check a Box)</i>	No:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Yes:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Date: 3/21/2014
From the Office of the Superintendent						
To the Members of the Board of Education						
Prepared by: Ken A. Forrest, Chief Business Officer, and Gerardo Castillo, Director of Finance					Contact Email: Ken-forrest@scusd.edu	
Subject: Requested Information Re: Lack of Payment by Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA)						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last payment from Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA) was received on July 17, 2012 in the amount of \$735,042.60. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Obviously this is a less than perfect situation as we have continued to incur the expenses with no funding. ▪ This has resulted in \$2,649,515.49 in additional expenses to the General Fund with no revenue offset and an outstanding accounts receivable for this amount. • Currently there are 5.5 FTE nurses and 4.0 FTE psychologists coded to MAA funding. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We now know that it is unrealistic to count on funding anytime soon. ○ We have a contract of \$130,000 per year with the vendor who submits the MAA claims. ○ The 5.5 nurse FTE's will cost us \$685,000 this year. ○ The 4.0 psychologist FTE's will cost us \$409,000. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is the lack of funding that participated the layoff notice action. <p>Should the outstanding accounts receivable be paid it WILL NOT become available for expenditures because it is still on the "books" as an asset. Therefore our "true" net worth is really \$2.7 million less than currently stated. The only way the receivable become funds available are if we "write off" the current receivable as uncollectable.</p> <p>We will be looking at our ending fund balance to determine if we have enough room to "write off" this receivable and bring our stated balance more in line with our cash position. Until we are able to "true up" the books and eliminate all outstanding questionable receivables we will be in the undesirable position of actually being more broke than our books actually say we are. Only because our auditors, the County, and we all believed that the current standoff related to MAA would be resolved were we able to leave this receivable on the books.</p>						
Approved by:						
Sara Noguchi, Ed.D., Interim Superintendent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					Date: 3/21/2014	



**SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD COMMUNICATION**

BC NO: CCO-22

CONFIDENTIAL ITEM - <i>(Check a Box)</i>	No:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Yes:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Date: 3/21/2014
From the Office of the Superintendent						
To the Members of the Board of Education						
Prepared by: Gabe Ross, Chief Communications Officer					Contact Email: gabe-ross@scusd.edu	
Subject: Sacramento Bee Story on NCLB Waiver						
<p>Please be advised that Sacramento Bee reporter Loretta Kalb is working on a story about the SCTA-organized community meeting on the district's NCLB waiver held on Wednesday.</p>						
Approved by:						
Sara Noguchi, Ed.D., Interim Superintendent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				Date: 3/21/2014		