



APPROVED

SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION

Agenda Item 9.1o

Meeting Date: July 16, 2015

Subject: Approve Minutes of the May 27, 2015, Board of Education Special Board Meeting

- ☐ Information Item Only
- ☒ Approval on Consent Agenda
- ☐ Conference (for discussion only)
- ☐ Conference/First Reading (Action Anticipated: _____)
- ☐ Conference/Action
- ☐ Action
- ☐ Public Hearing

Division: Superintendent's Office

Recommendation: Approve Minutes of the May 27, 2015, Board of Education Special Board Meeting.

Background/Rationale: None

Financial Considerations: None

LCAP Goal(s): Family and Community Engagement

Documents Attached:

1. Minutes of the May 27, 2015, Board of Education Special Board Meeting

Estimated Time of Presentation: N/A

Submitted by: José L. Banda, Superintendent

Approved by: N/A



Putting
Children
First

Sacramento City Unified School District BOARD OF EDUCATION SPECIAL MEETING

Board of Education Members

Darrel Woo, President (Trustee Area 6)
Christina Pritchett, Vice President (Trustee Area 3)
Jay Hansen, Second Vice President (Trustee Area 1)
Ellen Cochrane (Trustee Area 2)
Gustavo Arroyo (Trustee Area 4)
Diana Rodriguez (Trustee Area 5)
Jessie Ryan (Trustee Area 7)
Asami Saito, Student Member

Wednesday, May 27, 2015
5:00 p.m.

Serna Center
Community Rooms
5735 47th Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95824

MINUTES 2014/15-24

1.0 OPEN SESSION / CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

2.0 ANNOUNCEMENT AND PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED IN CLOSED SESSION

None

The meeting was called to order at 5:12 p.m.

Members Present: President Woo, Vice President Pritchett, Member Arroyo, Member Cochrane, Member Ryan, and Student Member Saito

Members Absent:

Second Vice President Hansen

Member Rodriguez (arrived at 5:34 p.m.)

A quorum was reached.

3.0 CLOSED SESSION

While the Brown Act creates broad public access rights to the meetings of the Board of Education, it also recognizes the legitimate need to conduct some of its meetings outside of the public eye. Closed session meetings are specifically defined and limited in scope. They primarily involve personnel issues, pending litigation, labor negotiations, and real property matters.

3.1 Government Code 54957 – Public Employee Appointment

a) Principal, California Middle School

b) Principal, Rosemont High School

4.0 CALL BACK TO ORDER

The meeting was called back to order at 5:45 p.m. by President Woo.

Members Present: President Woo, Vice President Pritchett, Member Arroyo, Member Cochrane, Member Rodriguez, Member Ryan, and Student Member Saito

*Members Absent:
Second Vice President Hansen*

5.0 ANNOUNCEMENT OF ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION

Superintendent Banda announced two Interim Principal positions that have been made permanent: Andrea Egan at California Middle School and Elizabeth Vigil at Rosemont High School.

6.0 2015-16 BUDGET DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AND ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES (Gerardo Castillo, CPA)

Information

President Woo noted that this is an Information Item, and as such, the meeting moved from Board Meeting to Workshop.

Member Rodriguez invited audience members to write questions or anything they hope to gain from the presentation on index cards found in the back of the room. Board members were given the questions to address. Member Woo clarified that this portion of the workshop is conducted by Member Rodriguez as Chair of the Budget Committee.

Superintendent Banda reminded that the Workshop will go through the actual budget development process and allocation of resources and then there will be another presentation immediately following on the LEA plan. He spoke about the process for building the budget over the course of the year which involves calendar requirements. Mr. Castillo and his team will focus on revenue and expenditure projections, how we prepare our budget for adoption, and what has been done in terms of stakeholder engagement. Engagement has been extensive especially since the District has moved to the new funding formula of Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). This has resulted in the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) process. We will be talking about how that fits into this process as well. We will also talk about the Governor's May Revise and the improved economy. Mr. Banda then introduced Chief Business Officer Gerardo Castillo and Budget Director Mike Smith.

Mr. Castillo explained that since the Governor's May Revise we have additional resources. The goal of this meeting is to hear the Board's input based on Superintendent's recommendations which are based on a lot of stakeholders' engagement from the LCAP Committee, our bargaining partners, District staff, Principals, and members of the community. Due to the LCAP, stakeholder engagement is more extensive than ever before. In his presentation Mr. Castillo covered budget calendar requirements, revenue and expenditure projections, budget adoption preparation, stakeholder engagement, and the May Revise. Also, Chief Communications Officer Gabe Ross discussed the LCAP engagement.

During the time that Mr. Castillo reported on items covered by a net remaining unallocated revenue of 1.8 million dollars, Superintendent Banda commented that the items were based on input from school sites and departments across the District. Some of the positions included are those that were eliminated and have made things

challenging and difficult. However, some other items, such as high school athletic stipends, are things that have not been increased over a period of time and required updating. Otherwise it is challenging to keep people in these positions. Another example given was that of two bus service attendants. Currently mechanics are doing some of things that the bus attendants should be doing such as fueling vehicles. This takes them away from being able to do some major service of vehicles.

Member Rodriguez explained that the Board would ask questions based on the index cards submitted before taking public comment. She divided the cards between all Board members. Some of the cards had inquiries more toward LEA than the budget, so Member Rodriguez gave those cards to Dr. Olivine Roberts for review.

President Woo began with the following question: Do you use actual adopted State budget figures in the 2015-16 adopted budget and the LCAP, or do you regularly wait to revise everything? Mr. Castillo said that we use actuals if it is a budget for the next year, but for positions we use actuals for whoever is in that position at their particular step and column and estimated average salary and benefits for vacancies. The budget is a document that changes based on the best information that we have, but we do our budget based on actual expenditures. Mr. Smith added that new positions are also estimated based on averages. Member Rodriguez said that she understands the question to be whether estimates are used to build the budget and then actuals to finalize the budget. Mr. Castillo said that we need to use estimates for revenue and once the final budget is done in June, then we have 45 days to revise the revenues. Even at that point in time, we are estimating based on attendance so it will change a little bit. It is more finalized once the governor signs the budget. Member Rodriguez summarized by saying we use estimates up until we get the legislatively approved budget from the State. At that time we come back and revise with the actual and confirm that budget at the Board level sometime in June or early July.

Member Ryan read two questions related to equity. Why didn't SCUSD staff include professional development funding for Restorative Justice practice; and why aren't one time funding targeted towards closing the achievement gap with a focus on African American students? Mr. Castillo pointed out that one of the recommendations in the presentation, on slide 41, is to allocate \$650,000 to school climate, Social Emotional Learning, and discipline, and so the Superintendent is taking that into consideration. This is something new for next year. This is an on-going recommendation and not identified for one time funds. Member Ryan asked what was the individual allocation for Restorative Justice practices absent the Social Emotional Learning school climate last year? Mr. Castillo replied it was \$200,000. Superintendent Banda noted that the position of Equity Officer was created to be in charge of this. We have not been putting money into this, including SEL which is grant funded, so this year we made a commitment to budget for this as well as to pay for some of the SEL work. When you see "discipline" that is actually the Restorative practices. We know that staff and administrators need to be trained in terms of Restorative practices. Last year \$200,000 was set aside that was not used, so instead of rolling that amount over, it was increased. Also, in the Fall they will be working on the strategic plan which will include many of these components. This will help drive these initiatives and priorities going forward. Member Ryan asked why the \$200,000 allocated last year was not used. Superintendent Banda replied that it was due to staff turnover. The Chief of Staff was leading that work, but left mid-year. This created a gap without anyone to drive that work going forward, but now with a new Assistant Superintendent in charge of equity the focus will

be there. Mr. Castillo addressed the question regarding African American students by saying that funds are based on target population. The budget is not divided based on race; funds are allocated to the schools based on English language learners and free and reduced counts. A lot of LCFF funds are based on free and reduced, so if they are in the group, they will get more funding for that.

Member Cochrane read questions from Bob Hammes. Two were informational so she started with them: What are the total revenues being projected? Is the 27 million dollars on top of the 434 million dollars projected in March for a total projected revenue for 2015-16 of around 462 million dollars? Mr. Castillo said that the total will be over 450 million dollars for the general fund. Member Cochrane read the other informational question: In the Superintendent's recommendations for the May Revise unallocated revenue there is 1.6 million dollars for class size reduction (16 FTE). Is this an additional 16 FTE over the 35-40 already proposed by budget staff? Mr. Castillo answered that yes, it is in addition. The goal is to have all class sizes at the same level; right now it is only for the schools that are above 75% free and reduced. Member Cochrane read the next question about justification for allocations: There is 3.58 million dollars going to fund balance to prepare for 2016-17 and beyond as well another 2 million dollars going to increasing the fund balance. What are the justifications for these allocations, especially with over 3 million dollars of other needs identified over the 45 million dollars of the 2015-16 new revenue? Mr. Castillo said that from his perspective we need to focus on our present needs but not forget about the future. Our funding is very volatile, and we depend a lot on the State. And a lot of that depends on the top earners in California. When the stock market goes down, the economy goes down, and we suffer for that. It is prudent to invest in our students, but we cannot forget about the future. Those districts that had a fund balance when the economy went down experienced less significant and painful cuts. Member Cochrane read the last question: What is being done to identify facilities issues that may or will arise around class size reduction? Does money need to be allocated to address this? Superintendent Banda responded that Facilities plays a big role in this, and he knows that staff in Facilities has been taking an assessment of all the school sites to make sure that we are going to be able to accommodate. We have found out that approximately 80 to 85% have the capacity, but there are 10-15% of schools that will be at capacity and solutions will need to be found for them. Even though some school sites states they will be maxed out as they are utilizing all of their classrooms, we may have to decide down the line if class size reduction is a priority. This is because some of the classrooms are being used for other things such as reading, music, or art rooms. Chief Operations Officer Cathy Allen commented that any additional facility needs or furniture and equipment would not come out of the money that is being talked about tonight; it would be funded out of bond or developer fees. Member Cochrane asked what is seen as the ideal reserve for the District. Mr. Castillo said that the ideal would be to be prepared for when Proposition 30 funds are gone. Member Cochrane asked if that is what other Districts are planning for as well. Mr. Castillo said that at this point in time we are one of the districts with the lowest reserves.

Student Member Saito read: How many students per classroom will the class size reduction cover? Mr. Castillo said it will be 29 to 1 in Kindergarten and in First through Third grades it will be 28 to 1. Student Member Saito asked about middle school and high school. Mr. Castillo said that it is being taken into consideration. Member Saito asked why Ethnic Studies and vocations were not included in the

allocation of these new funds considering the recent Board directive to staff.

Mr. Castillo said that he thinks it is part of the longer plan. Superintendent Banda said it is not scheduled to be going on line for 2015-16, but it is part of the bigger plan. When we look at Ethnic Studies, we also look at other potential graduation requirements. There is a committee that is focused on that. In conjunction with Ethnic Studies, we could be looking at creating some new math graduation requirements, new language arts graduation requirements, and maybe science. The thought is to work all those together and come up with a plan and associated cost. In order to implement even just Ethnic Studies, there will be a cost in getting additional teachers certified to teach the subject as well as curriculum and textbook costs. So it is not built into the 2015-16 budget, but would be in future years if this is the direction in which we are going. Member Saito then read the next question: Which school climate, SEL, and discipline programs will be covered by the \$650,000 allocation? Mr. Castillo said he does not have the details, but that Mr. Huscher has a plan for the funding based on the needs of the schools. Member Saito then asked how much money was allocated this year compared to past years for Common Core. Mr. Castillo said that Common Core was part of restricted funds that we received initially in 2013-14 for two years. It was about 8 million dollars for a two year period.

Member Arroyo read the first of four questions from Darlene Anderson: How has the District been responsible for program performance for students in SDC classes? Mr. Castillo said that Director Becky Bryant has told him people with special needs students want to come to our District because of our services. We are spending more each year than the year before. Member Arroyo read the second question: How has the District been responsible to measure performance for summer school? Member Rodriguez modified the question to: Is there funds allocated for summer school? Mr. Castillo stated that there is. The funding is included in the first recommendations from back in January for over \$230,000 from LCFF funds, plus restricted funds from Title I. We cover a lot of our summer programs with Title I funds for some schools. Superintendent Banda said that the summer programs now do not look like summer school of the past. A lot depends on funding, grants, and the school sites. Many are run through Youth Development. They do a really good job of monitoring, assessing, and making sure that the programs are meeting certain criteria. Some of that is if they are aligned to the work going on with Common Core, are they solid interventions, and are the kids actually learning from those programs. We also contract with outside agencies. When hired, we monitor these groups and ask them to meet a certain level of requirement. They are placed in neighborhoods and areas with the highest need. As a District, we do a good job of identifying different ways of funding the programs and also in making sure that the quality of these programs is to our standard and meets student needs. Member Arroyo noted that what Ms. Anderson wanted to know was how we are tracking the performance. Also, her follow up question is "or for Special Education extended year of service?" So if he is understanding her correctly, this is about yes, we are dedicating resources and yes, the programs are there, but how are we measuring that the programs are delivering any standard of performance, academic or otherwise. Superintendent Banda said that Youth Development does require metrics and do require that students are assessed and that we are able to show progress. Member Arroyo asked where that information might be available. Superintendent Banda said we will ask Youth Development to put together a report. Member Rodriguez said that she would like to see the tie-in to what are we getting for our dollar. She would like to see that learning loss is being prevented during the summer. Speaking of summer school, she also noted

that high school students are not earning credits during summer school and asked if we will be bringing courses for credit back. Vice President Pritchett added that we have a wonderful program called Aventa that allows students to work at home on-line. She asked if this is something on which we can expand. Member Arroyo asked how the summer school programs are strategically being used given what we are trying to achieve in the District. He then read the next question: For Title I students, where is the student performance data? Superintendent Banda said that is a question for the academic side of the house; we do measure growth for students. Dr. Iris Taylor said that, in terms of the State assessments, all of our students take an annual assessment. We receive data on student performance aggregated by a variety of breakdowns such as race/ethnicity, free and reduced lunch, gender and so on. That data is forthcoming in August. Member Arroyo said that he feels what the question is asking is, is there a way to aggregate populations and then figure out who is a Title I fund-receiving student? He thinks there are students that qualify for Title I but are not Title I because their school does not receive Title I dollars. Mr. Smith said that is correct, only schools that are at 50% and above. Member Arroyo said that the question is, if there are students that receive Title I, how are they performing? And is there a way to aggregate that data and say these are the students that are receiving Title I? Dr. Taylor said that it is possible to tag the students demographically and see how they are performing. Member Arroyo asked if it is possible to see previous years. Dr. Taylor said yes. Member Arroyo read the last question: Where is the data for direct services for Title I students? Member Arroyo said what the question is asking is this: What are the services being paid for with Title I dollars? Dr. Taylor said this is tied to the previous question and is a matter of aggregating the data by student and then seeing where those students are and what programs and services they've received to determine if those programs and services have had an impact.

Vice President Pritchett asked if the workshop will be available for viewing later. Mr. Ross said that the video will be available on our website. The cable broadcast, however, is scheduled month to month in advance and so special meetings are not able to be broadcast on cable.

Vice President Pritchett also had a card from Ms. Anderson. She read the first question: Where is the attendance data for students who are attending regular ed and logging the info for alternative computer based programs? Vice President Pritchett said this refers to the Aventa program. Mr. Castillo said that we do not have attendance data to provide for this program, but that attendance is provided monthly to the Board. For reporting purposes for Average Daily Attendance (ADA) we need to report based on the student's home school. Vice President Pritchett said she knows of several students that have a regular day school program along with Aventa. She asked, as a budget concern, do we have enough licenses in our schools to supplement all of our students that are in need of this for credit recovery to be able to graduate on time? Lisa Allen answered we do. Member Pritchett then read the next question: How many students are using Aventa. The final question read was: Where is the site based data for Title I students and where is it being held? This is the same question answered previously. Vice President Pritchett asked about funds allocated to Infinite Campus. Mr. Castillo said that there are teachers on special assignment to help other teachers with the program. This was supported with bond funds. It was decided that this is a need we have in the District, and so it is continuing.

Member Rodriguez said that she finds the questions of attendance very relevant. It is

important to determine what counts toward ADA, especially in looking toward the future when Proposition 30 funds sunset.

Public Comment:

Karen Swett gave the Board some printed material. She said we have had two years of projections for 2015-16, and now we are going to get another one. You can see how we are waiting to hear exactly what the projection is. It will be on the adopted budget which will be presented on either the 4th or the 18th of June. They are very excited because they at Making Cents Work take the projected revenues and start talking about expenditures. She said thank you for the PowerPoint and the LCAP, but they think there needs to be more discussion about spending and scrutiny of the expenditure reports. Looking at only the school site budgets at the end of last year, 23.9 million dollars was not spent. We increased our ending fund balance last year by about 20 million, so we are not having a problem with our ending fund balance. In fact, in another graph which she did not bring tonight, Mr. Castillo started fixing it at the first interim. You can see how, over a number of years, that there is a plan.

Bob Hammas, with Making Cents Work, said he feels that the fund balance is very healthy and Gerardo Castillo is doing a great job. He would like to see more discussion about how we can meet the needs of students today. They feel there is plenty of money being held back in order to meet any future liabilities. They would like to see more discussion on class size reduction and how it will be done as well as discussion on tying professional development specifically into Social Emotional Learning (SEL) moving forward. He feels extra money could be put into SEL professional development without reducing the ending fund balance by very much. A few million dollars could make a huge difference right now, and he feels it should be discussed in more detail. They would also like to see class size reduction implemented more quickly. He also does not feel students should have to give up classrooms currently used for extra activities such as computer, art, and language arts intervention in order to have class size reduction.

Darlene Anderson feels there is a problem when looking at how students achieve, how it is measured, and how it is shared back to the public. She feels there should be a comparison study done.

Carl Pinkston, with the Black Parallel School Board, spoke on concerns that they have with the recent budget process. The first is that it is difficult to be able to have the information today to evaluate today. Second, he feels that the District needs to determine the criteria as to one time funding and ongoing funding. Third, he thanked Superintendent Banda for increasing the funding for Social Emotional Learning, Restorative Justice, and that whole rubric from \$200,000 to \$650,000. However, the question that someone brought up before was this: What is the allocation for Social Emotional Learning, Restorative Justice practice, and other pieces? They believe that 2 million dollars should be set aside for professional development because that professional development has to take place in a mandatory (every staff person in the District) manner to be trained in Restorative Justice practices. There are other ongoing parts of this process that takes place, but he feels the District needs to have a good sense to implement the policy adopted in June. He also feels there should be a serious discussion as to what the District would like the ending fund balance to be.

Board Member Comments:

Vice President Pritchett said that she has sent out e-mails to people in her community and administrators. One of their top priorities is School Resource Officers. Mr. Castillo said that the budget includes funding for one position. Vice President Pritchett asked how the Board will know, in looking at the list of positions included in the budget, which schools will get these positions. Mr. Castillo said that there is committee made up of SCTA and Human Resources in which they look at all of the schools. Based on the staffing formula we know what schools need more staff. They know there are five schools that will be allocated, but they do not know which schools those will be at this time. Vice President Pritchett asked if there is a timeline of when the information will be made known to the Board. Mr. Castillo said that the plan is to include this in the budget for June. Vice President Pritchett then asked if there are plans to expand the Parent Teacher Home Visit Project. Mr. Castillo said it is not in the plan. If we allocate

unrestricted funds for a project like this, we have to include all the schools otherwise we will be supplanting. Right now the project is covered with Title I funds so we cannot give general funds to the schools that are not using Title I. For the funds that had been allocated last year, some schools had used it all and others did not spend it, so there is a little money left over from last year, and there is not a plan to allocate District-wide. Vice President Pritchett said that, in working with the Parent Teacher Home Visit Project, there are other schools that are asking for it that are Title I schools, but there is just not enough money to put into it. She is hoping that this is something that we can look into. Mr. Castillo said he would. Vice President Pritchett also asked about an Assembly Bill she saw on the news recently that will require AED machines to be placed back at the schools. She asked, where are our AED machines? Also, if the bill is passed, will we be able to allocate funds? Director of Student Support and Health Services Barbara Kronick answered that a number of years ago we did have AEDs in all the schools. Grant funding allowed us to do that and keep it going. When the money went away, we took them out because of the high cost to maintain them. However, we do have them in storage. Member Pritchett asked if there is money in the budget we could allocate for this. President Woo said, theoretically, if the legislature passes a bill mandating schools or any local government to have something, they must fund it. So, presupposing that the bill passes, it has to come with money. Vice President Pritchett asked if there is a way that we can fund this prior, even if it ever becomes law, to be able to get them back in our schools. Superintendent Banda said that we have not done an assessment and do not know what this would cost. We do not know the condition of the machines we have. We could assess what we have and see what it would cost. Ms. Kronick said that she will do that. They have to be recalibrated, so there will be an annual ongoing cost as well. Vice President Pritchett asked for a timeline and Ms. Kronick said it will take her a couple of weeks to get the information. Member Rodriguez asked if training is required to use the AEDs. Ms. Kronick said yes, there is always training with that. Member Rodriguez said that some time ago she had facilitated an introduction between the District and a representative from the American Red Cross, and she asked if there any grants associated with Red Cross for training. Ms. Kronick said that there are not any grants she knows of, but a lot of agencies like the Red Cross and others do this as their job, so if they have the resources we can leverage those resources through a memorandum of understanding (MOU). So if there goal is to train, then we can be the recipients of that training once we establish that relationship through an MOU.

Member Arroyo asked if Ms. Kronick could let the Board know what the use of the AEDs, or need for, has been over the last couple of years. He is wondering if putting resources toward a nurse can be more impactful for a student population and community.

Member Cochrane asked how many social workers are accounted for in the budget. Mr. Castillo said that we are not adding any additional social workers. Two years ago we lost 2 million dollars of Medical Activity funding. The Board decided that social workers and nurses will continue the same as what we had. So even though the funding went away, we still maintained the same number of these positions. Therefore we are not adding social workers in this budget, although we are adding nurses. Member Cochrane said that there is nothing more critical that she can see adding for goal 2 than social workers in today's schools. It is an extreme priority, particularly in Seventh and Eighth grade classes. She very much would like to see a social worker added. Social workers are highly trained, degreed individuals, and she would like to see some creativity around a social worker technician that would be able to access information and provide it for either the social worker or the people who need it quickly. Member Cochrane also asked what the scheduled dates are for bargaining meetings with our labor partners. Superintendent Banda said that we are in constant meetings with SCTA and some of the other labor partners regarding different issues that come up. We are not scheduled to be in formal negotiations with SCTA and other groups until next year, meaning December, January, and February. This is because we signed off on a two year contract which is basically a closed contract. So at this point the formal negotiations are not going on, but there are informal conversations with the unions around different

issues as we go forward. Chief Human Resources Officer Cancy McArn added that of our five bargaining partners we have two contracts in which there were two-year agreements and three that were three year agreements. There are still regular committee meetings that discuss a wide variety of issues as well as just regular check-in meetings. They can provide a list of both of those types of meetings. Member Cochrane said this is a push on her part because it is part of the fixed costs in the budget. She has deep concerns about the specific allocations that have been made, and she wants the Board to be fully involved in the process going forward with negotiations both formal and informal.

Member Ryan thanked Member Cochrane for bringing up the point about social workers. In visiting her schools sites, this has been one of the most important points of dialogue regarding an area where her schools in Area 7 feel underserved. Therefore it concerns her to not see a line item budgeting for social workers. She appreciates the survey results articulating that as a priority. She also appreciates that the supplemental letter provided to the Board by the LCAP Parent Advisory Committee, under priority three, specifically calls out counselors and social workers, specifically social workers assisting with mental health needs. She noted that there is a line item for five additional full-time counselors in the budget and is happy to see that, but feels that mental health social work is something that cannot be excluded and is critical to school climate. Member Ryan then asked what school sites would be served with the \$300,000 allocation for Linked Learning. Dr. Taylor answered that the Linked Learning allocation is to continue the program and support to school sites. Most of the allocation is for staffing. Member Ryan noted that the current grant funding is going away and there was not additional opportunity for philanthropic support. She asked again at which school sites the program will continue. Dr. Taylor said that all of the comprehensive high schools have at least one pathway. The smaller high schools are single pathway. Therefore all of the high schools in the District are impacted. Member Ryan said that, for this year then, the expectation is that there is a \$300,000 allocation but likely we will need to continue to carry on that support if it remains a priority of the District. Dr. Taylor concurred. Member Ryan then said she cannot underscore enough the importance to her of figuring out a way to support the expansion of the Parent Teacher Home Visit Program. She wonders if there is a possibility of looking at other school districts that have prioritized an expansion of this work to see how they were able to work around the supplanting of funds and if they were able to offer coordination support for district level staff for the program. She also asked about the \$650,000 allocation for school climate for Social Emotional Learning and discipline. It concerns her when she hears that \$200,000 was left on the table for a program that was made a priority. There is a strong momentum behind making sure that school discipline policies are addressed and that the District is leading the way. So the \$200,000 unspent was a missed opportunity. She would like to charge the staff to look at how we can ensure that if \$200,000 is the portion of the \$650,000 allocated to Restorative Justice that it is not left unspent. She appreciates the fact that we are trying to find an interconnection between school climate, Social Emotional Learning, and discipline, but she does not want it to be at the expense of recognizing that Restorative Justice needs to be invested in as well. She does have specific comments about line items that seem to be excessive and earmarked, but she will take that off-line for a future conversation.

Michael Smith noted that for Linked Learning the total budget is \$680,000. Part of the funding comes from grant funding.

Member Rodriguez clarified on the question of expanding the Parent Teacher Home Visit Project. She noted that it is a touchy area as the District is not allowed to supplant, and if that happens, the program can end up having to foot the entire costs. She also cautioned that schools identified as Title I may be serving Title I students, yet may not have reached the threshold percentile. She asked that these two points be kept in mind as the Parent Teacher Home Visit Project is discussed. She also noted that we are one of three partners in that project. We are not responsible for the project; they are in and of themselves on their own. If they want to expand their program, they will have to figure that out on their own; they

have a national board now and a tie-in to other means for fundraising. Mr. Castillo commented that, regarding expansion, there is nothing that prohibits spending funds from one school to another school. But when you spend, you have to create a base District-wide. Resources could be taken out of Title I, but something else has to be given up. Member Rodriguez noted how particular the rules are, and said she remembered another state experimented with expansion using different funds or way of funneling funds into the program, but it did not work in the way they hoped.

Vice President Pritchett thanked Member Rodriguez for the explanation and asked how many Title I schools we currently have that are full Title I. Mr. Castillo said that we have over 58 schools. Vice President Pritchett said she was speaking with Lisa Levasseur earlier in the day about our program. She found that last year \$252,000 was split between 38 home visit schools and 11 APTT schools. She also has asked for an example of a similar district and learned that Washoe School District in the Reno area has allocated \$300,000 for just 20 schools. She understands that funding is a touchy subject, but we have to remember that this is a program built in Sacramento. We built it here, and we should be setting the example. When she goes to the national meetings, she sees other districts that are expanding and blossoming way above where we are at now. There are ties to keeping kids in school and English learner parents that are being able to communicate with their kids and teach them the Common Core. This is why she brings up that we should look into being able to expand the program even more than where we are currently.

Member Arroyo observed that the unspent balances at school sites is approximately \$23 million dollars. He assumes that this is not \$23 million dollars in a lump sum, but scattered through different sites and funds. Mr. Castillo said that under Title I there are restrictions that we cannot carry over more than 15%, so we have to spend the funds by September 30. Member Arroyo said that the specific amount matters less, but more the fact that there is always money staying unspent. Mr. Castillo said that once the funds are allocated to the school sites, it is the school sites money. We really want them to use it for their students within the year, and we encourage that. We meet with the site administrators in the middle of the year to go over their balances at that time and reiterate to them how they can use the funding. Member Arroyo said that he understands, but there seems to be two main issues. One is that better preparation probably needs to be done at the site in terms of planning how to use their money. The other observation is that we are not a business where the more money we save, the better. This is money that is going to specific children's needs. So while there may be millions of dollars left on the table, it is not a lump sum and it is not like we knew in advance that it would be left there. However, the burden lies with the site leader, the principal, to actually go through the plan throughout the year to make sure that the monies are being spent appropriately. Member Arroyo then spoke about Restorative Justice. He does not think there is necessarily an issue of always seeing Restorative Justice allocated a specific amount of money in the budget every year. He feels that that might be in the first few years. He thinks that the point when Member Cuneo brought this issue to the Board was that this is something that needs to be embedded. The idea is to bring practices into professional development. He feels Carl Pinkston was talking to this when he was speaking in that it needs to be part of how we behave in the District. So what we are trying to get at is the investment that will get us there. In the end it's about how the entire budget is utilized throughout the year to really address these needs. So while there is a request to up the ante on the money we are spending on Restorative Justice, he does not want to quantify it as only that, and only if we spend \$2 million dollars, then we will be fine. He feels that this is about spending the \$650,000, or \$2 million dollars (at whatever point), and then implement the type of policies, changes, and professional development that reflects a type of culture that is reflected through the entire dollar amount for that year. Otherwise we will be falling short of creating the type of impacts we want to create within our schools.

Mr. Castillo said that, regarding the school's carryover, some of this is planned by the principals. For example, with the QEIA funds, the funding was for a seven year period only, so with some of them it is a

planned reserve. Superintendent Banda added that sometimes money is saved to build it up in order to purchase a big ticket item like a computer lab. Member Arroyo said that he knows things like that happen, but over the six years he has been on the Board, some schools are very good at spending down to the low thousands, but others can have over \$100,000. He feels it is getting better, but is something to deal with in terms of how money is being spent at each site.

President Woo thanked Member Arroyo for bringing that point up. He would be concerned with unspent money if it was not already allocated and if it continued to grow and became a surplus at the school. He understands that sometimes there is a big ticket item for which they are saving, but on a year-to-year basis if they treat it, for example, as a reserve when it is undesignated money that continues to grow, then we need to be careful. If, however, it is spent back down over a couple of years because the administrator had plans for it, it might be a prudent management of the resources allocated for the school site.

Member Arroyo said that this is the concern that he has heard the least of from parents and English learner councils. When they ask for money for something for the school, they are always told that there is no money. The frustration that parents have is that they know there is money and that the principal could make that decision, but are always told that there is no money. So either the principal does not know how much money they have in their account or they are guarding it so much that it is not really benefiting who is really supposed to get the benefit.

Student Member Saito asked how many surveys were collected for the LCAP. Mr. Ross answered it is currently about 1,600 surveys. Member Saito said she is very glad to hear about class size reduction because she does not remember a time when there were less than 30 students in any class she had. She has been speaking to a lot of teachers lately, and they state the ideal class would be 12 students, and 20 is manageable. She asked what year Common Core started. Mr. Castillo said that it was adopted in 2013-14 and started this year, 2014-15. Student Member Saito also asked when Social Emotional Learning (SEL) started. Mr. Castillo said that this is our third year. Member Saito said that many students have been saying that the District is pushing for SEL and Common Core but they have not given us any materials for it yet. She would like to know where the funds are going right now and why they have not seen much of it in the classrooms. Mr. Castillo replied that a lot of Common Core has been staff development and materials for preparation.

Member Rodriguez thanked everyone for their participation. She addressed a couple of issues that came up. She said that this is not the presentation to the Board for this budget. It was just included because this was supposed to be a Budget Oversight Committee meeting. This will be coming to a later Board meeting for further vetting. She also noted that Second Vice President Hansen was not able to attend the Special Meeting today, but has e-mailed with his budget priorities. He wants to ensure that one time funds are clearly allocated as one time funds and not toward anything that is long term that could not be sustained. He is looking at transitional/early Kindergarten programs for his area. Member Rodriguez said she is willing to speak with him about how these programs came about years ago. Some of the prior Board had made a determination to make sure that those early programs came to schools that had the greatest need. This is probably why he is not seeing them in a particular school. He brought up a contract he is recommending the Board take a look at, and perhaps eliminate that particular contract. This will be discussed at the next Board Oversight Committee meeting. Lastly, he is requesting that we put into the budget a position that supports the Board beyond the secretary. This would be someone that can do analysis for the Board on State laws and other types of activities throughout the District. Member Rodriguez said that she supports Second Vice President Hansen on this. Superintendent Banda noted that \$80,000 has been set aside for a new position. Member Rodriguez said that she has had particular needs for constituencies that came with costs, and she would like to better plan for that in the future. She suggested having a discretionary fund for each Board member area. This way Board members can then

have discretion on what they can do for students to help engage and empower them in government processes. Superintendent Banda said that they have had this discussion. Mr. Castillo said that the Board does have a budget, but what we do not have is a location for each Board member, but that could be a discussion on how to do that based on what the Board decides. Member Rodriguez said that in order to eliminate the impression that some member could get more active than others; she would like see a more equitable divide. This way each Board member would have a set amount to budget and plan for in the future. She also noted that many Board members have noted there is not a compliment to the Men's Leadership Academy for young women. She will be asking for something to be allocated in the future to build and establish some type of women's leadership program. Member Rodriguez then summarized with three categories based on the LCAP: College and Career Ready Students; Safe, Clean and Healthy Schools; and Family and Community Engagement. Under College and Career, what she heard from around the table say is that they are very much interested in summer school programs, especially credit programs, counselors, Ethnic Studies, professional development, early Kinder and TK programs, after school programs, and class size reduction for K-3 right now. For Safe, Clean and Healthy Schools we spoke of AEDs, Campus Monitors, Social Workers, and other types of mental health services personnel related to that, Social Emotional Learning, and Restorative Justice. Under Family and Community Engagement is Parent Teacher Home Visit Project, outreach for parents, training on the budget for school site councils, translation services, negotiations, one-time funds, preparing for sunset of Proposition 30, and unspent funds at school sites. Member Rodriguez said that we need to give students every bit of resource that we have in each year we have them. She understands about encumbering money for a subsequent year's big purchase, but Title I, Title II, and Title III funds are all restricted and allocated for very specific purposes. She knows that this has been an ongoing conversation and that Mr. Castillo has been doing good due diligence on the matter, but it will be kept on the radar as we build our financial plan for the next three to five years.

Superintendent Banda thanked Mr. Castillo, Mr. Smith and their team for their commitment and expertise. Everyone has done a great job of deciphering the information and putting it together. Mr. Castillo thanked Gabe Ross and his team also for their input. He also thanked the public and the Board for their input in helping to keep the students the first priority.

President Woo echoed the sentiments of the Superintendent and thanked Member Rodriguez for bringing this altogether. It is an important dialogue that should be had every year. A five minute recess was called by President Woo.

7.0 APPROVE LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY (LEA) REVISED PLAN, 2015 Conference/Action (Dr. Iris Taylor and Lisa Hayes)

President Woo noted that this is a conference to action item.

Dr. Taylor, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction, was joined by Lisa Hayes, Director of State and Federal Programs, and Chief Business Officer, Gerardo Castillo. A cross District team was also present to answer specific questions about the plan. The presentation consisted of an overview of the LEA plan, LEA plan performance goals, the LEA plan alignment to LCAP, stakeholder engagements, and steps moving forward.

Public Comment:

Darlene Anderson: Regarding monitoring program effectiveness, Ms. Anderson asked how is it that one of our schools trained about ten GATE teachers at one time. She stated that some schools have wonderful support while others have no support. She feels that this is why some dollars are not spent at schools that have little or no parent involvement. She also feels, however, that we have a responsibility to educate all

children regardless of the parent involvement level. This is why she asked how is it we have no data. There had to be data so that choices could be made on how to develop the budget. She feels the data around Title I must therefore exist, but is not shared with the public. She is concerned about this. She also asked about books for children in Special Education. She stated that she filed a complaint when Superintendent Mejia was here for not purchasing books for children in Special Education classes. The staff provided her with a Board policy stating that the classroom teacher would determine the curriculum. She said IEPs go from Kindergarten to Eighth grade, and she wonders what happened to age appropriate curriculum, as she does not see it. So she is asking, for the SELPA, who monitors the program efficiency?

Board Comments:

Member Rodriguez noted that Second Vice President Hansen asked for this Item to be brought forward and discussed more. It is a big report with a lot of work, and she stated that each member of the team deserved recognition. She also said she is pleased to see that the report contains an outline for a need to increase partnerships with community mental health providers. There is a need in the District for collaboration, and it would help reduce our costs. Another need she recognizes is a need for health care. Referencing page 84, Member Rodriguez noted the bullet points with Safe Schools, Youth and Gang Violence Prevention. She said that often we put a youth who may be involved in gang violence or trending that way into a category that says they are only interested in doing bad stuff and so we need to divert them away from that. We do not look at them in terms of needing some leadership opportunities. Therefore Member Rodriguez suggested we include some leadership and mentoring programs next time. She also noted that page 89 lists Men's and Women's Leadership Academy. She does not know if Title I, Title II, or Title III is covering that, but said maybe we need to allocate some more or have more focus around this. She is willing to sit and talk with staff to learn more about this. She has resources coming to her currently in terms of mentor programs.

Member Arroyo referred to page 15 and asked about students at risk of dropping out under performance goal five. He asked if we know the capacity of the District in terms of dealing with the students. Ms. Hayes said that staff would have to research that. Member Arroyo asked because in closed session they do get cases of students that are borderline for being expelled or suspended, so it would be helpful to understand the capacity. Perhaps they can then do more in terms of dealing with certain students in a particular way given the resources that we have. Member Arroyo also said that he has spoken to the Principal at West Campus, Mr. Thomas, and found that over the past three years he has made it a point to boost the number of students taking Advanced Placement classes and the Advanced Placement tests. He has done magic with the resources that he has. He tries to prepare students to take the AP test, and there is a huge multiplier effect in helping students do well on the AP test. Member Arroyo noticed that a few cents of investment can translate into many dollars in return. When a student does well in the AP class and passes the test, the student does not have to take that class in college. If they take enough AP classes and do well on the tests, that can translate into full ride scholarships to universities. These are students coming from fairly disadvantaged areas for the most part. They are beating the odds academically and financially. As we think about how we help students move forward, Member Arroyo suggests coaching for these standardized tests at any of our high schools. A few cents in terms of preparing students for the tests could translate into a significant amount of savings for their families, the community, and the District.

Student Member Saito referred to a diagram on page 18. I like how they align the LEA goals to the LCAP goals. Goal #2 of LCAP and Goal #4 for LEA which is Clean, Safe, Healthy and Emotionally Safe Environment, reminded her of many stories she has heard from teachers and students across the District. There are many students and families that do not have support at home and do not value education at home. Some students unfortunately then get into negative activities involving drugs, guns, violence, and gangs. These students can influence others around them and make school a scary place that feels unsafe. So she asked if there are any ideas, such as leadership opportunities brought up by Member Rodriguez earlier, or services that could be provided to these students to get them away from negative behavior and influences. Barbara Kronick addressed the question. She said that there are quite a few leadership opportunities,

especially this summer such as Summer Matters and a City Hall program. There are also opportunities through the after school programs. She noted some of the leadership programs that Mr. Pinkston was talking about through Restorative Justice. There are conflict resolution programs in the schools during the school day also. She noted Men's Leadership Academy among others. There is also a lot of support through the Connect Center for kids that are getting involved in the wrong things due to mental health issues. In addition, 21 of our schools have student support centers where they can be referred for mental health support and counseling. Member Saito also asked if there are any programs that involve reaching out to home life. Ms. Kronick said that yes, a lot of the students that receive mental health services receive this type of help as part of the support that they receive.


President Woo entertained a motion to move from Conference to Action on this Item No. 7.0. A motion was made by Vice President Pritchett and seconded by Member Rodriguez. The motion passed unanimously.

President Woo then asked for a motion to approve the Item. A motion was made by Vice President Pritchett and seconded by Member Ryan. The motion passed unanimously.

Superintendent Banda thanked and acknowledged staff for their hard work and thanked everyone for attending. President Woo thanked the Superintendent for bringing these Items back for more discussion.

8.0 ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Student Member Saito to adjourn the meeting. It was seconded by Member Arroyo and passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 8:56 p.m.



José L. Banda, Superintendent and Secretary to the Board

NOTE: The Sacramento City Unified School District encourages those with disabilities to participate fully in the public meeting process. If you need a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the public meeting, please contact the Board of Education Office at (916) 643-9314 at least 24 hours before the scheduled Board of Education meeting so that we may make every reasonable effort to accommodate you. [Government Code § 54953.2; Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, § 202 (42 U.S.C. §12132)] Any public records distributed to the Board of Education less than 24 hours in advance of the meeting and relating to an open session item are available for public inspection at 5735 47th Avenue at the Front Desk Counter and on the District's website at www.scusd.edu