# BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

**Date:** September 25, 2015

## SUPERINTENDENT – JOSÉ L. BANDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BC NO.</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>REGARDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-79</td>
<td>José Banda</td>
<td>Highlights of Calendar for the Week of September 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-80</td>
<td>José Banda</td>
<td>School Services of California’s Sacramento Weekly Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT – LISA ALLEN, INTERIM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BC NO.</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>REGARDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DS-66</td>
<td>Stacey Bell</td>
<td>My Brother’s Keeper Event at Sacramento State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHIEF COMMUNICATIONS OFFICER – GABE ROSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BC NO.</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>REGARDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCO-215</td>
<td>Gabe Ross</td>
<td>California Office of Traffic Safety Event at Sutter Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO-216</td>
<td>Gabe Ross</td>
<td>Benefits of Workday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHIEF STRATEGY OFFICER – AL ROGERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BC NO.</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>REGARDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSO-8</td>
<td>Al Rogers</td>
<td>Student CAASPP Test Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO-9</td>
<td>Cathy Morrison</td>
<td>Deadline: LCAP Parent Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monday, September 28
- Extended Cabinet Meeting
- Executive Cabinet Meeting
- Meeting with Nancy LaCassee (SSC)
- 1:1 Meetings with Cabinet Members

Tuesday, September 29
- Meeting with Dr. Nelsen (CSUS)
- Meeting with Member Ryan and PIQE
- Meeting with Labor Partners (SCTA)
- 1:1 Meetings with Cabinet Members

Wednesday, September 30
- Attend CORE Board Meeting

Thursday, October 1
- Board Meeting Day

Friday, October 2
- Presenting with Jay Schenirer at League of California Cities Conference
Attached is the weekly update from School Services of California for your review.
Just a little over a week after the Legislature sent a gamut of bills to the state’s chief executive officer, Governor Jerry Brown has yet to take significant action on the package of education-related bills presented to him. However, on September 22, 2015, he did sign Senate Bill (SB) 103, the Education Budget Trailer Bill, into law. As you will recall, the enacted 2015-16 State Budget appropriated $490 million to be disbursed to local educational agencies (LEA) for purposes of enhancing the effectiveness of teachers and administrators.

SB 103 significantly changes the calculation of these funds from a per certificated staff head count to one based on full-time equivalency status of certificated staff reported by LEAs in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data Systems (CALPADS).

As a reminder, pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 104 (Chapter 13, Statutes of 2015), Educator Effectiveness funds can only be used for:

- Beginning teacher and administrator support and mentoring
- Professional development, coaching and support services for teachers identified as needing improvement
- Professional development for teachers and administrators that is aligned to state-adopted content standards, and
- Promotion of educator quality and effectiveness

With the signing of SB 103, we expect the California Department of Education (CDE) to post the Educator Effectiveness certified funding apportionments for LEAs soon. We also understand that the CDE is working to publish the Expenditure Report that LEAs will be required to submit to the CDE by July 1, 2018.

Budget bills are effective immediately upon the Governor’s signature.
Three Education-Related Initiatives Aim for the 2016 Ballot

As the expiration of the Proposition 30 taxes draws closer, education stakeholders and other beneficiaries of the $7 billion to $8 billion in additional state revenue are looking to extend the tax on the state’s highest income earners. Additionally, the K-12 and community college school facility community—starved for state assistance to build and modernize campuses—has gathered sufficient signatures to be eligible for the “Kindergarten Through Community College Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2016” for the statewide ballot.

To ensure that public education and other social programs do not suffer the effects of a “fiscal cliff” when Proposition 30 taxes expire, two separate groups filed, respectively, the “School Funding and Budget Stability Act” and the “Invest in California’s Children Act” within a week of each other. The former was submitted jointly by the California Teachers’ Association (CTA) and the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), while the latter was submitted jointly by the California Hospitals Association (CHA) and a chapter of the SEIU. While both proposed initiatives allow the sales tax component of Proposition 30 to expire at the end of this year, they extend the increased personal income tax on the state’s highest income earners, with some key differences, shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Rate Applied to Income Earners</th>
<th>School Funding and Budget Stability Act</th>
<th>Invest in California’s Children Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>$250,000-$300,000</td>
<td>$290,000-$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$300,000-$500,000</td>
<td>$350,000-$580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>More than $500,000</td>
<td>$580,000-$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$1,000,000-$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>More than $5,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expiration Date: December 31, 2030

Revenue Eligible for State/Education Rainy Day Accounts:
- No*—contains explicit language to exclude revenue from rainy day funds.
- No*—specifically earmarks all revenue for deposit into special funds rather than the state general fund revenue, as follows:
  - 50% for Education
  - 40% for Medi-Cal
  - 10% for Child Development and California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKS)
  - Requires 1.5% of all revenue to be deposited annually into the Children’s Services Rainy Day Special Fund until the fund balance equals 10%.

*The initiative provisions are subject to further detailed analysis.

Of revenues that would be generated by both initiatives earmarked for education, 89% would be allocated to K-12 LEAs in proportion to each LEA’s Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) entitlement and
11% would be distributed to community colleges. Funds would be prohibited from being used to pay for administrators or administrative costs.

Similar measures on the same ballot are usually cause for concern among proponents as they tend to confuse voters who consequently would be inclined to vote “no” on both initiatives. If both measures obtain the requisite number of signatures (roughly 576,000 valid signatures from registered voters) to qualify for the statewide ballot, we imagine that many behind-the-scenes discussions may take place to consolidate the measures into one that is palatable to all parties.

Nancy LaCasse  
Robert Miyashiro
Achievement Gap Points to Ineffectiveness of Decades of Reforms

By Louis Freedberg

*EdSource*  
September 22, 2015

The vast achievement gaps in the Smarter Balanced test scores released this month point to the ineffectiveness of reforms over the past 15 years or more that were intended to close those gaps, raising the question of whether a new set of reforms being introduced in California are more likely to succeed.

Those reforms include the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards; the Local Control Funding Formula, which allocates additional funds for high-needs children and grants local districts more decision-making powers; and a more comprehensive accountability system that emphasizes deeper learning skills, and promotes support for schools and teachers in place of punishment or sanctions.

Only 28 percent of African-Americans and 32 percent of Latinos who took the test in California met or exceeded standards on the English language arts section of the Smarter Balanced tests, which students took for the first time this spring. By comparison, 61 percent of whites and 72 percent of Asian-Americans met or exceeded standards in English language arts. The differences in math are even wider. Only 16 percent of African-Americans and 21 percent of Latinos met or exceeded the standard in math, compared with 59 percent of whites and 69 percent of Asian-Americans.

**ADDRESSING RACIAL AND ETHNIC INEQUALITY**

These differences come against the backdrop of arguably the most sustained national conversation on the causes – and effects – of racial and ethnic inequality that has occurred at any time since the Civil Rights Movement.

The fact that the disparity in academic achievement is so wide in a state like California is even more troubling than in states where educational and political leaders may have been less committed to serving students from diverse backgrounds. In addition, during the past two decades, California has beaten back the anti-immigrant sentiments surging through other states, especially against Spanish-speaking immigrants. Latinos now wield considerable political clout in the state, and have helped drive education reforms here.

The last time there was a substantial narrowing of the gap in the U.S. was from the early 1970s to the late 1980s, as measured on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, or NAEP, often referred to as “the nation’s report card.” A 2010 report by the Educational Testing Service, titled “The Black-White Achievement Gap: When Progress Stopped,” observed that since the late 1980s “there has been no clear trend in the gap, or sustained period of change in the gap, one way or another.”

“The gaps were there and are still there,” said Michael Fullan, a Canadian educator who is working with several California school districts and the California Department of Education to promote what he calls “the right drivers for change.” These include promoting teamwork and collaboration, improved instruction and “systemic” rather than “piecemeal” change. The ongoing achievement gaps, he said, are an
indicator that “the in-your-face accountability (of the No Child Left Behind law and related reforms) is not working.”

The NCLB law was supposed to hold school districts “accountable” for results. Teachers, principals and superintendents were prodded to reach a goal and rebuked when they failed to do so. By 2014 every child, regardless of background, was supposed to be proficient in math and English language arts. California, like every other state, did not come close to meeting that goal.

CALIFORNIA’S ‘ACCOUNTABILITY’

It would be easy to dismiss NCLB as a top-down misguided federal strategy. But California promoted a similar ethos of “accountability” through the Public Schools Accountability Act approved in 1999 by the state Legislature.

Unlike NCLB, California’s accountability plan emphasized improvements from year to year, rather than setting fixed levels of proficiency that schools had to meet. During the reform’s early years, the state provided cash rewards to teachers, principals and schools that succeeded in improving performance. But the rewards part of the reform equation soon fell victim to the series of budget crises that California has experienced in recent decades.

Sean Reardon, a professor of poverty and inequality at the Stanford Graduate School of Education, gives those accountability reforms a failing grade. “I don’t think there is any evidence that accountability systems have been effective in reducing achievement gaps,” he said.

That sentiment was echoed by UC Berkeley School of Law professor Christopher Edley, Jr., who chaired the Equity and Excellence Commission established by Congress to advise the U.S. Department of Education on disparities that contribute to the achievement gap. Edley said the continuing achievement gap shows that the “approach to school reform starting with the 1983 A Nation at Risk report has run its course and left us with this yawning gap that is endangering America’s future.”

TESTING LOW-LEVEL SKILLS

Stanford University professor Linda Darling-Hammond, who is president of the Learning Policy Institute in Palo Alto whose goal is to “shape policies that improve learning for each and every child,” said one reason the approach used in recent years did not work is that “test-based accountability” reforms like NCLB emphasized “tests of low-level skills.” Those tests shaped what students were taught, especially in schools threatened with sanctions if they did not produce higher test scores each year.

“As a result,” she said, “the curriculum divide grew wider between those schools that were teaching for higher-order skills and those drilling kids on lower-order skills.” Compounding the problem was that NCLB reforms featured “testing without investing,” Darling-Hammond said, so the gap “in access to dollars, qualified teachers, technology resources and other materials for learning grew wider and wider between rich and poor schools.”

“We have a lot of work to do,” she added, “and these data (on the achievement gap) show just how much.”

Given short shrift in the accountability reform era was the preponderance of research showing that the greatest predictor, by far, of how well or badly a student performed in school was his or her socio-
economic background. Reformers often dismissed any reference to a child’s background as an “excuse” to let schools off the hook.

But it was precisely during the era of reforms demanding more “accountability” from schools that income inequality in California increased more than in all but a handful of states. According to one report, California ranks third among states with the highest economic inequality. The extent to which these inequalities affected the most recent test results is unknown, but if the research is any guide, they must clearly contribute to them.

WILL NEW REFORMS WORK?

The big question is whether the new set of reforms in place in California will make more of a difference than the ones they are replacing.

Experts interviewed by EdSource agreed that, in general, California is moving in the right direction.

Stanford’s Reardon pointed to new research from UC Berkeley’s Rucker Johnson showing that states that have done more to equalize funding among poor and rich districts have seen improvements in educational outcomes of children in lower-income districts.

But Reardon is withholding judgment as to whether the Common Core will translate into major improvements.

“Will the Common Core make things better or worse or make no difference in terms of equity?” he said. “I hear competing arguments. Both have merits.”

One argument, he said, is that more-affluent districts will have more resources to meet the raised expectations embodied in the Common Core standards, and will widen inequalities in education outcomes.

The other argument is that the Common Core will put pressure on schools to move away from what he terms the “drill and kill” approaches to the curriculum of the NCLB era, and that by “pushing toward standards of instruction and learning, the kids in disadvantaged schools will start getting what kids in advantaged schools are getting.”

“Both are very plausible arguments, he said. “We don’t yet know how it will play out. I wouldn’t venture to predict at this point.”

Stanford’s Darling-Hammond, who is also chair of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, said the state has invested $2 billion into technology upgrades and professional development for the new standards that she believes ”will begin to level the playing field” over the next few years. “I would expect to see a reduction in the achievement gap because of all these factors,” she added.

CUTTING POVERTY’S IMPACT

It is also clear that while California will funnel more funds to schools serving low-income students, it will not tackle directly the income disparities that students experience in their home environments – and which are so highly correlated with test scores and academic outcomes generally.
UC Berkeley’s Edley says that schools can do much to mitigate the effects of poverty, starting with expanding access to early education and preschool. Another strategy would be to expand the community schools model, in which schools become a hub for the entire community and bring together many partners and organizations that offer a range of services to children, youth and families.

But for community schools to be truly effective, the approach itself needs to be improved, said Edley. The key is to ensure that the range of health and social services community schools are supposed to offer “are baked into the structure of these programs rather than being “ad hoc and voluntary.”

Fullan believes that the impact of poverty on academic achievement can be reduced “by half” with better teaching. This involves focusing on the needs of English learners, promoting better leadership and “zeroing in on improved instruction and getting teachers to work together,” he said.

“The new strategies in education are competing with poverty and can make more of a difference than we think we can make,” Fullan said. “If you really end up saying there is nothing we can do because of poverty, then you are really dead in the water.”

But if Fullan’s assertion is correct – that the impact of poverty on the achievement gap can be reduced by half – is that good enough? Shouldn’t California be striving to reduce the achievement gap altogether?

That will take significant investment that California has been so far unwilling or unable to make. “I doubt that schools alone will ever entirely reduce the achievement gap without some equally concerted efforts to reduce racial and ethnic inequality in incomes and neighborhood conditions outside school,” Reardon said.

*EdSource will be looking closely at the achievement gaps reflected in the Smarter Balanced test scores in California that were released on Sept. 10. This article will be accompanied by a series of interviews with leading educators and scholars that we will publish over the next several weeks. The first interview, with Christopher Edley, a professor and former dean of the UC Berkeley School of Law, can be viewed here.*

---

**Note:** These skirmishes are being played out across many fronts—the courts, Legislature, and the State Board of Education.

**California Has Skirmishes All Around In School War**

By Dan Walters  
*The Sacramento Bee*  
September 22, 2015

The epic war between California’s education establishment and a loose coalition of school reform and civil rights groups rages on many fronts.

Combatants clash in the Legislature, in the state Board of Education, in local school board meetings, in school district, legislative and statewide elections, and, ultimately, in the courts.

One of their many specific issues is whether charter schools, despised by school unions and their political allies, should play a larger role in attacking the state’s persistent “achievement gap.”
This week, the Los Angeles Times revealed the existence of a 44-page draft plan circulating among wealthy philanthropists for shifting as many as half of the students in the much-troubled Los Angeles Unified School District into charters – a move that unions would consider a major escalation of the war.

While the California Teachers Association and other elements of the establishment have pretty much had their way in Sacramento, the battles in local school districts have gone both ways, depending on local circumstances.

When spurned in those arenas, however, the reformer-civil-rights coalition has turned to the courts with consistent success, including forcing union-dominated school boards to approve charters initiated by parents.

Several lawsuits target Gov. Jerry Brown and Tom Torlakson, the union-friendly state schools superintendent, alleging that they have failed to ensure that local schools are giving “high-risk” poor and English-learner students the attention they need – a need confirmed by the recent Smarter Balanced math and English tests.

When confronted in court, the two politicians have argued that they have done their duty by enacting the Local Control Funding Formula, which provides extra money for educating those kids.

They also have contended that by leaving LCFF implementation to local districts, what Brown terms “subsidiarity,” they have effectively handed off legal responsibility.

However, they haven’t succeeded in persuading judges that they can wash their hands of responsibility, most recently in a suit filed by the American Civil Liberties Union on behalf of high-risk students, alleging that they hadn’t received the attention state and federal law require.

“A state cannot abdicate its supervisory responsibilities by ignoring credible evidence of persistent or significant district noncompliance,” Los Angeles Superior Court Judge James Chalfant declared in a recent 45-page decision. “If districts fail to provide services and the state has notice of this failure, the state has a duty … to take reasonable action.”

Faced with that, state officials backed down and agreed to monitor what districts are doing for high-risk kids.

That acknowledgment could affect another front in the school war: demands by reformers and civil rights groups that the LCFF “accountability” process now being written by the state school board hold districts responsible for outcomes as they spend the extra money.
Note: The Medi-Cal Administrative Activities program has had a number of problems in recent years.

One in 6 School Districts Gives Up on Medi-Cal Outreach Reimbursements

By Jane Meredith Adams
EdSource
September 21, 2015

Nearly one in six California school districts has dropped out of a federal outreach program for low-income student health that brings millions in unfettered dollars into schools, citing bungled state management and years-long delays in receiving funds, according to a new state audit.

The exodus is part of the continuing fallout from a 2012 federal investigation that found California had “serious deficiencies” in its oversight and management of the School-Based Medi-Cal Administrative Activities program. The program reimburses schools for a portion of the cost of referring students to Medi-Cal, California’s name for the federal Medicaid low-income health insurance program.

After the 2012 investigation, federal officials temporarily froze payments to school districts effective July 1, 2012, recalculated previously paid claims submitted in 2011-12, introduced a formula for interim payments and devised a new method of calculating claims moving forward.

As a result, some districts are still waiting to be reimbursed for 2009 expenses, while others have been told to return money from previous reimbursements that are now under review. Still other districts may not receive their interim payments until 2019 because the state has used their reimbursements to offset money owed by districts that were overpaid, the state audit found. A final accounting of contested Medi-Cal administrative claims may not be resolved until 2019, according to the California Department of Health Care Services, which oversees Medi-Cal.

As of March, 145 districts have walked away from the program, according to the state audit report released in August, leaving more than 800 districts still participating.

“A lot of districts have thrown up their hands,” said Maria Thomas, senior director of business development at the California School Boards Association. Among the unified school districts exiting are Redondo Beach, Carlsbad, Galt Joint Union High School and Chino Valley.

Asked if the lengthy payment delays for California schools are unusual, John Hill, executive director of the National Alliance for Medicaid in Education, a national group that advocates for Medicaid reimbursements for schools, said, “Extremely.”

The California Department of Health Care Services agreed with many of the recommendations from the state auditor, including the recommendation that the department play a lead role in encouraging districts to participate in the reimbursement program.

At its peak in 2011-12, 966 California districts collectively claimed $200 million for administrative time spent discussing student health needs, translating information for families and arranging for Medi-Cal covered services such as speech therapy, counseling and dentistry. The reimbursements are particularly valued by districts because the federal funds may be spent as districts choose, from closing budget gaps to funding counseling groups.
But obstacles mounted following the investigation of three California school districts and county offices of education by the federal Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Investigators found that two of the educational agencies had filed unallowable claims, and ordered the state to create new compliance and oversight systems.

Yet creating these systems, and explaining them to school districts, has been a challenge, according to the state audit report. In the last three years, the state has asked districts to recalculate their claims using three entirely different methods for tracking the amount of time school staff spend referring students to Medi-Cal services. Two of those methods were quickly discontinued, but not before districts spent untold hours trying to implement them.

At Chino Valley Unified, which received $2 million a year in reimbursements for Medi-Cal administrative activities before the federal investigation, the decision to leave the program about two years ago came after several years without payment. Lack of clarity from the California Department of Health Care Services about how much money the district was likely to receive in future payments exacerbated the problem, said Cheryl Rollins-Alлен, a billing specialist for Medi-Cal administrative activities for the district.

“Everything was unknown,” she said. “There was nothing from the state and feds that said ‘This is exactly how this program is running.’”

The state offered the district a final payment of 35 cents on the dollar on its outstanding invoices, in lieu of waiting for a final reconciliation of past claims. Chino Valley Unified took the deal. It was a lot of money to walk away from, but with no money coming in and uncertainty about what future payments would look like, the decision made sense, said Rollins-Alлен.

“It was $2 million a year, but if you’re not getting it, you’re not getting it,” she said. “You’re living on promises.” The district could decide to rejoin the program after the current issues with reimbursements and accountability systems are worked out, she said.

Adding to the frustration, some districts say, is the way the California Department of Health Care Services has handled interim reimbursements, which are partial payments to districts that the state and federal agencies agreed upon in 2014 while the contested claims are being re-evaluated.

Those interim reimbursements range from 35 to 100 percent of outstanding claims, minus money that districts previously received for claims that the state now says were wrongly calculated. Those overpayments had to be returned to the state and, at least theoretically, to the federal government. But rather than trying to collect overpayments from individual districts, the state decided to consider districts collectively, and balance money that districts owed to the state against money that the state owed to other districts.

The Department of Health Care Services took the unusual step of writing a check to the intermediary agencies that stand between the district and the state, without instructions for how those funds would be distributed. These intermediary agencies are 26 regional claiming units that receive claims from districts and send them to the state, which then sends them to the federal government. Typically, the process is reversed for payments, with money going from the federal government, to the state, to the regional claiming unit to the district. But in the case of the disputed claims, the checks aren’t always making it back to the districts in the amounts they submitted, according to the audit report.
In the Los Angeles County regional claiming unit, for instance, districts were owed $2 million in interim payments, but the regional claiming unit received a lump-sum check for $55,000 “because other claiming units within the consortium had overpayments that totaled more than their interim payments,” the audit report stated.

Similarly, the report noted, San Juan Unified School District never received more than $76,000, to which it was entitled as an interim payment. Also denied its interim payment was the Folsom-Cordova Unified School District, which at one time received more than $100,000 a year in Medi-Cal administrative activities reimbursement.

“One of our sister districts owed more money than was given, so our money wasn’t given at all,” said Mary Ann Delleney, director of health programs at the Folsom-Cordova district. “I don’t think that is how the program is supposed to be run.” Folsom-Cordova Unified, which hasn’t received a Medi-Cal administrative reimbursement since 2012, is remaining in the program despite problems, she said.

At the Glenn County Office of Education, which acts as a regional claiming unit for dozens of districts, Randy Jones, assistant superintendent for business services, has a check for interim reimbursements that he doesn’t know what to do with. Missing from the check is a 14-digit district code that indicates which district should be paid. “The check is for $5,000 and change, but I don’t have a district due for that amount,” he said. “This check came as no other check has ever come in before.”

The California Department of Health Care Services defended the practice of distributing reimbursements as net payments to regional claiming units.

Otherwise, the state would have had to issue individual checks for more than 800 districts and county offices for eight quarters of deferred claims, the state wrote in a response to the audit.

Ultimately, the importance of matching students with Medi-Cal services, and the money the program can bring to districts, will outweigh difficulties, said Mary Barlow, associate superintendent for the Kern County Superintendent of Schools. The Kern County office was held up by federal investigators as a model accountability program. “This work is vital,” Barlow said.

She believes setbacks in the California program are temporary and will prompt positive changes. “There are many districts that decided they didn’t want to continue,” Barlow said. “But we believe some will re-enter the program.”
To the Members of the Board of Education

Prepared by: Stacey Bell, Director

Contact Email: Stacey-bell@scusd.edu

Subject: My Brother’s Keeper Event at Sacramento State

SCUSD students and staff – including Superintendent Banda -- participated in today’s My Brother’s Keeper (MBK) Community Convening held at Sacramento State. The convening was coordinated by SCUSD, Mayor Kevin Johnson’s office and Sierra Health Foundation.

Participants are working to develop an action plan to promote the success of young people of color, particularly boys and young men. Earlier this year, the City of Sacramento announced it would join nearly 200 cities, tribal nations and counties across the nation in answering President Obama’s call to action with the My Brother’s Keeper initiative. A press release was issued about today’s event by Sierra Health Foundation and we anticipate media coverage.
The California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) will debut a new campaign aimed at raising awareness of pedestrian and bicycle safety at an early morning event (7:45 a.m.) on Monday, October 5, at Sutter Middle School. The event, aimed at generating media interest in OTS’s new campaign, will include an assembly with the OTS mascot “Pete Walker.” OTS selected Sutter because of the busy streets around the campus.

October is Walk and Bike to School Month. Tentative plans are underway for a safety event during October at Will C. Wood Middle School, where students who walk or bike to school often have to cross the four-lane 65th Expressway. We will give you more details as the plans gel.
Per the discussion at the last Board meeting here are talking points about the benefits of Workday.

**Benefits of Workday – Talking Points**

**OVERVIEW:**

- Our community – our staff, our students, our parents, our neighbors – deserve a 21st century organization that operates as efficiently and transparently as possible.
- They deserve the highest level of customer service we can achieve.
- We have heard over and over that we need to improve our service and our responsiveness to the public.
- This level of service cannot be achieved without a major upgrade in the way we conduct our day-to-day business.
- By automating operations that are currently accomplished by hand through the processing of paperwork, Workday will help us become the organization our community wants and deserves.
- It will free up staff time to do our most important work: Provide quality customer service and accountability to our stakeholders.
- We have the opportunity to be real leaders in the K-12 community in the area of building and maintaining community trust with this groundbreaking project.

**TRANSPARENCY/ACCOUNTABILITY:**

- One of the best features of Workday is the real-time reporting and auditing dashboards.
- With Workday, information is updated 24/7 in real time.
- It’s the difference between looking at a photograph of something and watching it on a live stream.
- These are publicly available dashboards.
• Workday will improve the accuracy of our data by eliminating many of the areas where there are the possibilities for human errors.
• Workday will give us analytic capabilities that we simply don’t have now.
• Those analytics will also be online to ensure our accountability to our public.

SUPERIOR EFFICIENCY:

• We are not a well-oiled machine.
• Our inefficiencies stem from our old-fashioned way of collecting and disseminating data.
• We spend or waste staff time on hundreds of time-consuming tasks that should be automated.
• Because Workday is a state-of-the-art cloud-based model, we can reduce the cost and overhead associated with managing infrastructure internally.
• With Workday, we can eliminate many of our paper forms and the risk of human error that goes with them.
• We can free up staff to focus on customer service.
• One Workday client (Pierce County, WA) estimates that the tool saved them $150k in annual operating expenses PLUS an additional $300k - $400k in staff hours.
• Some examples:
  o Every month we mail out paycheck statements to all 4,200 employees.
  o With Workday, those statements will be available online through an employee portal.
  o We’ll save money on paper, printing and mailing.
  o Another example: consistent operational practices when we hire a new employee or an employee leaves the district.
  o This involves many different departments (email and Infinite Campus access, payroll, security credentials, etc.)
  o Currently, there are a variety of different forms and documents that go from department to department for dozens of different purposes.
  o Workday will automate a significant portion of this.

BETTER SERVICE FOR EMPLOYEES:

• Workday will take us into the 21st century with online tools for employees.
• Example: If an employee moves, they have to file paperwork with HR.
• They don’t always do this because coming down to Serna requires time and travel.
• So we don’t have accurate information about our workforce.
• With Workday, employees can update their information online, print out their W2s, request or check available vacation time, etc.
SCUSD has received all student score reports from last spring’s California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress standardized tests. Working with our print shop’s timeline and schedule, we anticipate having the letters processed (stuffed, enveloped and stamped) and ready for mailing home to parents by October 2.

Below are talking points and Frequently Asked Questions for reference:

### Understanding the New CAASPP State Testing Program

#### California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress

Last spring, students in grades 3-8 and 11 participated in the online Smarter Balanced Assessments in English-language arts and mathematics. Students in grades 5, 8 and 10 also participated in paper-and-pencil science tests. In the next few years, science tests will also be online, and tests in history/social science, art, and technology will be added.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Grades Tested</th>
<th>Test Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English-language Arts</td>
<td>Grades 3-8 and 11</td>
<td>Computer-adaptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Grades 3-8 and 11</td>
<td>Computer-adaptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Grades 5, 8 and 10</td>
<td>Paper and Pencil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some students will take the CAA online subjects tests, which replace the CAPA

The state’s testing program is designed to give information to teachers, students and families about what students know and are able to do and whether they are on track for success in college and careers when they graduate. Test results help identify and address gaps in knowledge or skills early on so students get the support they need.

#### New Standards Require New Tests

California’s new Common Core State Standards set higher expectations for our students than ever before. They represent the skills that today’s students need to succeed in college, careers and life --
critical thinking, problem-solving and strong writing. Measuring these skills requires different types of test questions.

Results Set New Baseline for Student Achievement
Results from the new tests are measured differently and cannot be compared to results from the previous Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program. The tests measure different things in different ways. Comparing results would be like comparing apples to oranges. Think of this year as hitting the reset button: Results will set a new starting point for student achievement, against which we can compare performance for years to come.

Frequently Asked Questions:

My child has always been advanced, but is now scoring below standard. What does this mean?
It is a new set of standards and we are asking students to do more complex thinking. As we are looking at the results for the first time we are also learning how we must adjust our instruction and focus our professional development for teachers.

My son’s friend said that his test had different questions. How could that be if they are taking the same test at the same grade level?
The test is computer-adaptive, meaning that students are given different questions based upon how they perform on earlier items. As a result, two students will have very different exams that test the same grade level standards.

My student didn’t get a score for one of the claims. What does this mean?
For this particular area or claim your student did not complete all of the items on the exam to test that area.

My third grader received a 2610 for his ELA exam. Does this mean that he exceeds grade level standard in fourth and fifth grade too?
Your child was only assessed on third grade standards and the results are only reflective of performance for this grade level.

On the old paper-and-pencil CST my English Learner student performed better in math than English Language Arts, but actually has a lower score in math this year. Why is that?
The assessment asks students to demonstrate their understanding in math in different ways, including explaining their solutions or rationales in writing. For students who are learning to write in English, this could result in a lower score.

My child scored below standard in some of the math areas/claims. What can I do to support them for next year?
Talk to your child’s teacher about the instruction occurring in the classroom and how you can best support learning at home.
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Approved by: José L. Banda, Superintendent

To the Members of the Board of Education

Prepared by: Cathy Morrison, LCAP Coordinator

Contact Email: Cathy-morrison@scusd.edu

Subject: Deadline: LCAP Parent Advisory Committee

To date, the district has received 12 applications for the Board-appointed LCAP Parent Advisory Committee. Some trustee areas have limited applications from which to choose participants.

Please encourage parents and community members who you know would be a great addition to this committee to apply by the close of business (5 pm) Wednesday, September 30. The applicants who served on last year’s LCAP Parent Advisory Committee who wish to serve again must submit an application.

The simplest way to apply is through the home page of the SCUSD website, where there is a direct link to the application: www.scusd.edu.
LCAP Parent Advisory Committees

Please consider ways to become involved with the 2016-17 Plan

LCAP Parent Advisory Committee (PAC)
DEADLINE to apply: Wednesday, September 30 by 5:00 p.m.

LCAP English Learner Parent Advisory Committee
DEADLINE to apply: Monday, November 16 by 5:00 p.m.

Applications online at www.scusd.edu/LCAPAdvisory2015

For more information, contact Cathy Morrison (916) 643-9222
cathy-morrison@scusd.edu