

**Sacramento City Unified School District  
Board of Education Meeting**

**June 26, 2025**

**Written Public Comments**

Name:	Rose Ramos
School:	N/A
Agenda Item #	12.3
Comment:	<p>My questions and comments are in reference to the board agenda packet 6/26/25 item #12.3 Adopted Fiscal Year 2025-2026 Proposed Budget All Funds.</p> <p>This is a continuation of my previous public comment submitted 6/3/25 for the 6/5/25 board packet item #11.30.</p> <p>I did receive a response to my previous questions/comments but I am still unclear as to how the district is claiming to be fiscal solvent and meet all fiscal obligations when the projections indicate otherwise. I read the response regarding the understated ending fund balance and that it will most likely result in an increase by as much as 40% which will improve the budget projections and satisfy the reserves for all years. This has prompted a few more questions/comments:</p> <p>1. why doesn't the district explain this in the summary narrative versus stating that the district will satisfy all reserves when the projections state otherwise? This is confusing and misleading.</p> <p>2. is SCOE no longer providing the same level of fiscal oversight? I recall that SCOE required the district to produce a budget that satisfied all required fiscal obligation and NOT include understated ending fund balances to satisfy budget requirements. In fact, SCOE disapproved prior budgets that projected not satisfying required reserves in spite of knowing that the actual ending fund balance would result in satisfying reserves.</p> <p>I'm interested in learning of SCOE's current fiscal oversight. It seems that in past years SCOE was applying far more stringent fiscal requirements than what the district is currently subjected to. I would like to know why SCOE's fiscal oversight has become far more lenient? I am not necessarily opposed to SCOE's change as the past oversight was unrelenting &amp; demoralizing.</p> <p>3. with the respect the to the potential \$20M borrowing, I understand that there is not a legal requirement to fund OPEB. Again, my question/comment, what is SCOE's position on the potential \$20M borrowing? In past years, SCOE insisted the district pre-fund OPEB and required the on-going contributions. It is interesting that SCOE has scaled back their position. Can you please confirm SCOE's role and opinion on pre-funding OPEB?</p>

4. Is the district still holding weekly meetings with SCOE to obtain approval for expenditures & monitor other fiscal decisions? Please explain.

5. Per the SACS form page 7 of 142, Title 1 is projecting a carryover balance of approximately \$19M and other Title programs are also projecting high carryover balances. Why is the district underspending Title 1 funds? This underspending is persistent pattern year after year. However, the needs of students for which these funds are earmarked for go unmet. Test scores, graduation rates, attendance, dropout rates, etc. for Title 1 student groups remain poor. Please explain why Title 1 funds are not being spent on the needs of the intended student groups. What is the plan to spend down these funds? Is the district implementing a plan to prevent the ongoing pattern of underspent Title 1 funds?

Thank you

Rose Ramos  
Concerned Grandparent/Community Member