ACUSD BOARD – Workshop Open Session – 4:30 P.M. – Conference Room C

ACUSD BOARD – Closed Session – 5:30 P.M.

ACUSD BOARD – Open Session – 6:30 P.M.

ACOE BOARD – Open Session – Immediately Following the ACUSD Open Session

Location: Amador County Administration Center
810 Court Street, Jackson, California

February 26, 2020
AGENDA
AMADOR COUNTY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Wednesday, February 26, 2020
CLOSED SESSION 5:30 PM  OPEN SESSION 6:30 PM

Meeting Location: Amador County Administration Building, 810 Court St, Jackson, CA

NOTE: If you need a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services to participate in
the public meeting, please contact the Superintendent’s Office at 209-257-5353 at least 24 hours before the scheduled Board
meeting. (Government Code §54954.2) [Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, §202.]

NOTE: A copy of the Board agenda and backup materials is available for inspection and review at Amador County Office of
Education, 217 Rex Ave., Jackson, CA during regular business hours. In addition, this agenda has been posted on the Amador
County Unified School District Website at www.amadorcoe.org. An audio recording of the Board Meeting is made.

Board of Trustees meetings are meetings of the Board in public, as per the Brown Act open meeting law. All five
Board Members may not have discussion outside an open meeting. This meeting is their opportunity to have
discussion in order to conduct their business. Board Meetings are not meetings for the public to interact informally
with the Board. Members of the public may speak formally to the Board by completing a speaker card and giving
it to the Board Clerk or Communication Specialist.

If a person or group of persons disrupt the orderly conduct of a meeting, the legislative body has a right to order
those persons removed from the meeting. If order still cannot be restored after removal of the individuals disrupting
the meeting, members of the legislative body can order the room cleared and continue with the meeting.
(Government Code §54957.9; Penal Code §8403; Elections Code §18340; Acosta v. City of Costa Mesa (9th Cir. 2013) 718 F.3d 800; White v. City of Norwalk (9th Cir. 1990) 900F.2d 1421, 1425.)

OUR UNITY OF PURPOSE: We work as a cohesive Governance Team through discussions, actions and
decisions that are thoughtful, respectful, and sensitive. We support one another in and away from the Board Room
through active listening, vulnerability and honesty. **We make policy decisions that ensure equitable support to increase student achievement and foster social, emotional, and physical well-being for all students.**

OUR MISSION: Enriched by the diversity and deep traditions of our unique community, Amador County Public
Schools will prepare, support, and inspire each student to achieve career and college success in a rapidly evolving
world through highly engaging teaching, rigorous learning and innovative pathways supported by strong
partnerships in a safe, caring and collaborative environment.

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

2.0 BOARD MEMBERS
   [ ] Susan Ross – Board President
   [ ] Kandi Thompson – Board Clerk
   [ ] Deborah Pulskamp
   [ ] James Marzano
   [ ] Janet White
   [ ] Hailey Dacier – Student Board Member
   [ ] Sophia Davis – Student Board Member
   [ ] Kailey Pace – Student Board Member
   [ ] Rebecca Morla – Student Board Member
ROLL TAKEN BY THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON CLOSED SESSION

CLOSED SESSION

Minutes – 2-12-2020
Release of Temporary Certificated Employees ACUSD 19/20-023 (Government Code §54957 and California Education Code Section 44954(b)) (Mr. Vicari)
Negotiations – with ACTA and CSEA (Government Code §54950 and §54957) (Mr. Vicari)
Teleconference with Legal Counsel – Potential Litigation. Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to paragraph (2) or (3) of subdivision (d) of Government Code section 54956.9. Significant Exposure to Litigation: one potential lawsuit. (Mr. Critchfield)

RECONVENE TO OPEN SESSION/REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PRESENTATION AND RECOGNITION

Classified and Certificated Employee Recognition: Charles Fovil & Bonnie Miller (Mr. Vicari)

Spotlight on Schools – Pioneer VAPA Elementary School (Mr. Vicari)
This Spotlight on Schools presentation features Pioneer VAPA Elementary School with Principal Carmen Glaister. The presentation will provide an overview of the school’s unique attributes and outstanding accomplishments.

Resolution: ACUSD 19/20-022 National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month (Mr. Snider)
The district supports the designation of February, 2020 as National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month.

GOVERNANCE TEAM/BOARD OF TRUSTEES INFORMATIONAL ITEM (President Ross)

This standing agenda item is intended to: (a) educate the community about the roles and responsibilities of the Governance Team and (b) provide time for the Board to have related discussion.

MINDFULNESS MOMENT (Student Board Member Dacier)

PUBLIC COMMENTS

A person wishing to be heard by the Board shall first be recognized by the president and shall then proceed to comment as briefly as the subject permits. Individual speakers shall be allowed three minutes to address the Board on non-agenda items. The Board shall limit the total time for public input on each item to 20 minutes. With Board consent, the Board president may increase or decrease the time allowed for public presentation, depending on the topic and the number of persons wishing to be heard. The president may take a poll of speakers for or against a particular issue and may ask that additional persons speak only if they have something new to add. NOTE: If you wish to address the Board please complete a speaker card and give it to the Board Clerk or Communications Specialist.

CONSENT AGENDA

The Board of Trustees received these items under separate cover as an addendum. Public copy available during regular Board meeting and on the district website.
13.1 **Minutes**  
13.1a Board Meeting 2-12-20

13.2 **Personnel** (Mr. Vicari)  
13.2a Current Personnel Recommendations  
13.2b Tentative Agreement Regarding the 2018-2021 CSEA Successor Agreement

13.3 **Business** (Mr. Critchfield)  
13.3a Warrants issued between February 7, 2020 – February 18, 2020 - $922,294.08

13.4 **Donations**  
13.4a Pioneer Elementary School received a donation of school supplies from Shaneika Parrish.
13.4b Pioneer Elementary School received a monetary donation from the Up Country Lions Club for the 6th grade science camp.
13.4c Sutter Creek Elementary School received a monetary donation from the Amador Youth Basketball League for their basketball programs.

13.5 **Surplus**  
13.5a Argonaut High School – 2 metal engine lathes, outdated  
13.5b Argonaut High School – 2 drill presses, outdated

13.6 **Miscellaneous**  
13.6a Argonaut High School would like to send one instructor to an out-of-state conference for the National Restaurant Association Summer Institute in Madison, WI.
13.6b Argonaut High School would like to send one instructor to an out-of-state conference for in Reno, NV.

14.0 **DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS**  
Public comments regarding Discussion/Action Items will be addressed during the Discussion/Action agenda items. A person wishing to be heard by the Board shall first be recognized by the president and shall then proceed to comment as briefly as the subject permits. Individual speakers shall be allowed three minutes to address the Board on each agenda item. The Board shall limit the total time for public input on each item to 20 minutes. With Board consent, the Board president may increase or decrease the time allowed for public presentation, depending on the topic and the number of persons wishing to be heard. The president may take a poll of speakers for or against a particular issue and may ask that additional persons speak only if they have something new to add. **NOTE:** If you wish to address the Board please complete a speaker card and give it to the Board Clerk or Communications Specialist.

14.1 **Budget Outlook and Silent Recession Report – Discussion** (Mr. Critchfield)  
The District is on track to replenish the reserve fund to the State required level of 3% by the end of the 2020 fiscal year. In order to maintain a fiscally healthy reserve fund and to prepare for a future recession, it is recommended that the Board of Trustees continue to make responsible budgetary decisions regarding expenditures and to continue to grow the reserve fund.

14.2 **Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Midyear Update – Discussion** (Mr. Snider)  
This report will serve as an update on the status of the 2019-20 LCAP goals, actions, and services.

14.3 **Local School and Wellness Update – Discussion** (Mr. Snider)  
A Wellness Committee was established in October, 2018 to accomplish the work of updating the Local School Wellness Policy. Local School Wellness Policies are an important tool for parents and school districts in promoting student wellness, preventing and reducing childhood obesity, and providing assurance that school meal nutrition guidelines meet the minimum federal school meal standards.

---

The Board may not take action on any item which is not on this agenda, except when (1) an emergency situation exists, (2) there is need to take immediate action and the need for the action came after posting, or (3) the item was posted for a prior meeting within specified time limits.  
[Government Code §54954.2]
14.4 **California School Board Association (CSBA) Recommended Board Policy Updates – Discussion/Action** (Mr. Snider)
CSBA provides multiple policy update packets each fiscal year. The policies presented for updating at this time are in the area of Educational Services. The descriptions summarize the changes made to each policy. It is recommended that districts review the materials and modify their policies accordingly.

14.5 **Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Regarding Transfer of Classified Employees Related to Transfer of Special Education Programs – Discussion/Action** (Mr. Vicari)
The purpose of this MOU is to establish terms of the timelines and procedure to protect the interests of CSEA Unit 239 and CSEA Unit 827 members while allowing the parties and other constituents the time necessary to finalize the terms of transfer of Special Education programs from the ACOE to the ACUSD.

14.6 **Resolution: ACUSD 19/20-019 General Liability Coverage for Volunteers – Discussion/Action** (Mr. Critchfield)
For the purposes of extending coverage to official volunteers of the District, all individuals who directly volunteer to provide services to the District, and whose volunteer services are accepted in accordance with District regulations and policy shall be covered by the District’s Liability insurance program. The type of approved volunteer service shall be on file in the appropriate District or local site office prior to commencing volunteer services.

14.7 **Resolution: ACUSD 19/20-020 Increase in Level 1 Developer Fees – Discussion/Action** (Mr. Critchfield)
Education Code 17620 authorizes school districts to levy a fee against any development project for the construction or reconstruction of school facilities as long as the district can show justification for levying of fees.

15.0 **REPORTS**
15.1 **Facilities Update Report** (Mr. Critchfield)
15.2 **Report from Superintendent** (Dr. Slavensky)
15.3 **Reports and Remarks from Board Members**

16.0 **NEXT MEETING**
ACUSD Regular Meeting: Wednesday, March 11, 2020, Amador County Administration Building, 810 Court St., Jackson, CA. Open Session starts at 6:30 PM.

17.0 **ADJOURNMENT**
* The Amador County Unified School District complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Should you require special accommodations, or more information about accessibility, please contact the Superintendent’s Office by calling (209) 257-5353. All efforts will be made for reasonable accommodations.

* Any writings or documents that are provided to the governing board in open session will be made available for public inspection at the meeting or at the Amador County Public Schools District Office located at 217 Rex Avenue, Jackson, CA during normal business hours.
AGENDA ITEM #: 9.3

SUBJECT: Resolution: ACUSD 19/20-022 February 2020 as National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
Every February across the United States, teens and those who support them join together for a national effort to raise awareness to teen dating violence. Dating violence is more common than many people think. One in three teens in the United States will experience physical, sexual, or emotional abuse by someone they are in a relationship with before they become adults.

The district supports the designation of February, 2020 as National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month. Pending Board approval, this resolution will be distributed to all schools in the district and the community at large via community outreach and social marketing campaigns that are culturally appropriate to raise awareness about the dynamics of teen dating violence and support youth in learning the skills to have safe and healthy relationships.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:
None

RECOMMENDATION:
The Superintendent recommends approval of this resolution declaring February 2020 as National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month.

PRESENTED BY:
Sean Snider, Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services
BEFORE THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
AMADOR COUNTY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
COUNTY OF AMADOR, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

RESOLUTION NO. ACUSD 19/20- 022
Expressing support for designation of the month of February 2020 as
“National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month”.

WHEREAS teen dating violence, also known as dating abuse, is a serious and growing
problem throughout California; and

WHEREAS teen dating violence intervention and prevention programs can help to ensure a
positive school climate and safe learning environment for all youth ages 12 to 24; and

WHEREAS education and outreach programs to community members address warning signs
of teen dating violence among youth before behaviors escalate, and protect the safety of
targeted youth; and

WHEREAS consistent with the Center for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC)
recommendations for a comprehensive primary prevention program, multiple strategies
are required such as teaching safe and healthy relationship skills, engaging influential
adults and peers, disrupting the developmental pathways toward partner violence,
creating protective environments, strengthening economic supports for families, and
supporting survivors to increase safety and lessen harm; and

WHEREAS each year, an estimated 1 in 10 high school students is physically hurt on purpose
by a dating partner; and

WHEREAS according to the CDC, Dating Matters: Strategies to Promote Healthy Teen
Relationships, 1 in 3 adolescents report verbal, emotional, physical, or sexual dating
abuse each year; and

WHEREAS according to the CDC, 1 in 11 female teens and 1 in 15 male teens reported
experiencing physical violence in the last year; and

WHEREAS according to the CDC, 1 in 9 female teens and 1 in 36 male teens reported
experiencing sexual dating violence in the last year; and

WHEREAS 43% of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning teens reported
experiencing physical dating violence, compared to 29% of heterosexual youth; and

WHEREAS 59% of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning teens reported
emotional abuse, compared to 46% of heterosexual youth; and

WHEREAS 50% of transgender youth reported experiencing sexual violence at some point in
their lives; and
WHEREAS teen dating violence has been linked to other forms of violence and aggression against peers, including bullying, sexual harassment, sexual violence, and physical violence; and

WHEREAS survivors of teen dating violence have increased risk for truancy, dropout, teen pregnancy, suicide, having eating disorders, and engaging in other harmful behaviors such as use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs; and

WHEREAS nearly half of students who experience dating violence have reported that some of the abuse took place on school grounds; and

WHEREAS survivors of teen dating violence are also at increased risk for carrying a weapon to school, being threatened or injured with a weapon at school, and damaging school property; and

WHEREAS youth who are survivors in high school are at higher risk for victimization during college, and adolescent perpetrators of dating violence are more likely to abuse their intimate partners as adults; and

WHEREAS the establishment of the month of February 2020 as National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month will benefit schools, communities, families, and all youth;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Trustees of the Amador County Unified School District, that the Amador County Unified School District supports the designation of February, 2020 as National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this resolution be distributed to all schools in the district and the community at large via community outreach and social marketing campaigns that are culturally appropriate to raise awareness about the dynamics of teen dating violence and support youth in learning the skills to have safe and healthy relationships.

Adopted by the Board of Trustees of Amador County Unified School District, on the 26th day of February in 2020.

______________________________________________  ______________________________________
Susan Ross Kandi Thompson
President, Board of Trustees Clerk, Board of Trustees
AGENDA ITEM #: 10.1

SUBJECT:
Understanding the Roles of the Governance Team – Informational Item

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
Our ACUSD/ACOE Board Bylaws, our ACUSD Governance Handbook, the California Schools Boards Association (CSBA), other organizations, professional books, and other resources provide guidance and expectations regarding the important roles and working relationships of the Board of Trustees, the superintendent, other administration, teachers, staff, and the broader community.

This standing agenda item is intended to: (a) educate the community about the roles and responsibilities of the Governance Team and (b) provide time for the Board to have related discussion.

FISCAL IMPLICATION:
None

RECOMMENDATION:
The Superintendent recommends that the Board have discussion.

PRESENTED BY:
Board President Ross
Superintendent Amy Slavensky
EDUCATIONAL EQUITY DEFINED

In education, the term equity refers to the principle of fairness. While it is often used interchangeably with the related principle of equality, equity encompasses a wide variety of educational models, programs, and strategies that may be considered fair, but not necessarily equal. Equity is the process; equality is the outcome.

Equity is achieved when all students receive the resources they need so they graduate prepared for success after high school.


THE ROLE OF EQUITY-DRIVEN SCHOOL BOARDS

School board members are local policymakers who can support access to programs that serve the educational needs of all students. Therefore, it is critical that board members understand their role in relation to the intersection between educational policy, leadership, and equity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Recommendations for Board Members to Consider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create a common definition and understanding of equity for the district and county office of education and what it means for Board Members, staff, parents and guardians, students, and other community members.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyze and question relevant data to identify root causes of opportunity and achievement gaps and use these analyses as drivers of an equity agenda.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultivate alliances with the community and advocate for policies that have an impact beyond schools, reaching the community.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Embrace all stakeholder voices to provide ongoing assessment of progress toward educational equity goals.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discover strategic ways to effectively discuss, interpret, leverage, and implement policy while aligning with and supporting current district or county office of education initiatives.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communicate the message of equity effectively and often, beyond teachers and students, out to the larger community.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listen to and consider student voice as an important lever for change in the educational system.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES
AMADOR COUNTY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Wednesday, February 12, 2020
CLOSED SESSION 5:30 PM OPEN SESSION 6:30 PM

Meeting Location: Amador County Administration Building, 810 Court St, Jackson, CA

NOTE: If you need a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services to participate in the public meeting, please contact the Superintendent’s Office at 209-257-5353 at least 24 hours before the scheduled Board meeting. (Government Code §54954.2) [Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, §202.]

NOTE: A copy of the Board agenda and backup materials is available for inspection and review at Amador County Office of Education, 217 Rex Ave., Jackson, CA during regular business hours. In addition, this agenda has been posted on the Amador County Unified School District Website at www.amadorcoe.org. An audio recording of the Board Meeting is made.

Board of Trustees meetings are meetings of the Board in public, as per the Brown Act open meeting law. All five Board Members may not have discussion outside an open meeting. This meeting is their opportunity to have discussion in order to conduct their business. Board Meetings are not meetings for the public to interact informally with the Board. Members of the public may speak formally to the Board by completing a speaker card and giving it to the Board Clerk or Communication Specialist.

If a person or group of persons disrupt the orderly conduct of a meeting, the legislative body has a right to order those persons removed from the meeting. If order still cannot be restored after removal of the individuals disrupting the meeting, members of the legislative body can order the room cleared and continue with the meeting. (Government Code §54957.9; Penal Code §8403; Elections Code §18340; Acosta v. City of Costa Mesa (9th Cir. 2013) 718 F.3d 800; White v. City of Norwalk (9th Cir. 1990) 900F.2d 1421, 1425.)

OUR UNITY OF PURPOSE: We work as a cohesive Governance Team through discussions, actions and decisions that are thoughtful, respectful, and sensitive. We support one another in and away from the Board Room through active listening, vulnerability and honesty. We make policy decisions that ensure equitable support to increase student achievement and foster social, emotional, and physical well-being for all students.

OUR MISSION: Enriched by the diversity and deep traditions of our unique community, Amador County Public Schools will prepare, support, and inspire each student to achieve career and college success in a rapidly evolving world through highly engaging teaching, rigorous learning and innovative pathways supported by strong partnerships in a safe, caring and collaborative environment.

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

2.0 BOARD MEMBERS
[X] Susan Ross – Board President
[X] Kandi Thompson – Board Clerk
[X] Deborah Pulskamp
[X] James Marzano
[X] Janet White
[X] Hailey Dacier – Student Board Member
[ ] Sophia Davis – Student Board Member
[X] Kailey Pace – Student Board Member
[X] Rebecca Morla – Student Board Member
3.0 ROLL TAKEN BY THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

4.0 PUBLIC COMMENTS ON CLOSED SESSION

5.0 CLOSED SESSION
5.1 Minutes – 1-22-2020
5.2 Superintendent’s Evaluation/Midyear Discussion (Dr. Slavensky)
5.3 Negotiations – with ACTA and CSEA (Government Code §54950 and §54957) (Mr. Vicari)
5.4 Teleconference with Legal Counsel – Potential Litigation. Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to paragraph (2) or (3) of subdivision (d) of Government Code section 54956.9. Significant Exposure to Litigation: two potential lawsuits. (Mr. Critchfield)
5.5 Teleconference with Legal Counsel – Potential Litigation. Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to paragraph (2) or (3) of subdivision (d) of Government Code section 54956.9. Significant Exposure to Litigation: one potential lawsuit. (Mrs. Brown)

6.0 RECONVENE TO OPEN SESSION/REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION
Board President Ross reported item 5.1, Minutes, were approved; item 5.2, Superintendent’s Evaluation/Midyear Discussion, the Board had discussion; item 5.3 Negotiations, the Board had discussion; item 5.4, Potential Litigation, the Board had discussion; and item 5.5, Potential Litigation, the Board had discussion and approved a settlement agreement.

7.0 ADDITIONS/DELETIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA
There were no additions/deletions or corrections to the agenda.

8.0 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Brody Romo, student at Jackson Elementary School, led the pledge of allegiance.

9.0 PRESENTATION AND RECOGNITION
9.1 Block A Awards (Mr. Vicari)
   1. Riley Leatherman
   2. Trevor Morris
   3. Natalia Silva
   4. Lauren Werner

9.2 Spotlight on Schools – Adult Education School (Mr. Vicari)
This Spotlight on Schools presentation featured the Adult Education School with Principal Kelly Hunkins. The presentation provided an overview of the school’s unique attributes and outstanding accomplishments. Mr. Vicari requested the Board to combine this agenda item with item 14.1, Adult Education Update. The Board approved the change and Mr. Vicari introduced Principal Kelly Hunkins who spoke about the funding, mission, and different partnerships of Adult Education which bring a variety of options to the adult community of Amador County. Board President Ross expressed her gratitude for Ms. Hunkins and her team’s hard work.

9.3 Recognition: Jackson Elementary School CA Distinguished School Award (Dr. Slavensky)
Jackson Elementary School was awarded the California Distinguished School Award. Schools selected for this award demonstrate significant gains in narrowing the achievement gap. Dr. Slavensky spoke about the award program and the eligibility criteria Jackson Elementary School had to meet in order to be awarded. She introduced Barbara Magpusao, Principal of Jackson Elementary School. Ms. Magpusao spoke regarding the three significant factors that resulted in Jackson Elementary School closing the student achievement gap and becoming eligible for the award. She recognized the district and school leadership, the teachers, staff and parents’ collaboration, and the School Site Council who developed a site plan to provide the school with the support and supplies they need. Board President Ross and Dr. Slavensky invited the Jackson...
Elementary School team forward and presented them with a plaque and pins. Board President Ross thanked the team for their outstanding work.


Proposition 13, the Public Preschool, K-12, and College Health and Safety Bond Act of 2020, provides resources for the renovation and upgrade of existing classrooms, for campuses that increase student and staff safety, for classrooms and laboratories that enhance teaching and learning, for the construction and expansion of schools to accommodate growth, and for career technical education facilities to improve job and career training. Mr. Critchfield presented the resolution to the Board. Board President Ross asked Mr. Critchfield to clarify if Proposition 13 will not raise property taxes. Mr. Critchfield answered that this proposition will not raise property taxes. Board Member Pulskamp commented that this Proposition 13 is basically a bond measure for the state, so money is involved but it does not affect the amount people pay in property taxes.

Mr. Critchfield spoke regarding the differences between Proposition 13 of 2020 and Proposition 13 of 1978. They are two very different propositions. Board Member Pulskamp commented on the use of developer fee funds to pay for modernization of schools. Mr. Critchfield answered that developer fees are not enough to cover the significant needs of our school facilities and this is why supporting Proposition 13 of 2020 is very important. Board Member Pulskamp motioned to approve the resolution, and Board Clerk Thompson seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0 with 3 student advisory votes in favor of the motion.

10.0 **GOVERNANCE TEAM/BOARD OF TRUSTEES INFORMATIONAL ITEM** (President Ross)

10.1 This standing agenda item is intended to: (a) educate the community about the roles and responsibilities of the Governance Team and (b) provide time for the Board to have related discussion. Board President Ross spoke to the Board and members of the public regarding the primary responsibilities of the Board.

11.0 **MINDFULNESS MOMENT** (Student Board Member Dacier)

Student Board Member Dacier led the Board Members and members of the public in a mindfulness moment focused on perseverance.

12.0 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

A person wishing to be heard by the Board shall first be recognized by the president and shall then proceed to comment as briefly as the subject permits. Individual speakers shall be allowed three minutes to address the Board on non-agenda items. The Board shall limit the total time for public input on each item to 20 minutes. With Board consent, the Board president may increase or decrease the time allowed for public presentation, depending on the topic and the number of persons wishing to be heard. The president may take a poll of speakers for or against a particular issue and may ask that additional persons speak only if they have something new to add. **NOTE:** If you wish to address the Board please complete a speaker card and give it to the Board Clerk or Communications Specialist.

Steve Cannon, community member and secretary of the Sober Grad Committee, spoke to the Board regarding Sober Grad, the importance of the graduation date, and the committee’s desired support of the district to ensure the success of Sober Grad.

13.0 **CONSENT AGENDA**

The Board of Trustees received these items under separate cover as an addendum. Public copy available during regular Board meeting and on the district website. Board Clerk Thompson motioned to approve the consent agenda, and Board Member Marzano seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0 with 3 student advisory in favor of the motion.

13.1 **Minutes**

13.1a Special Board Meeting Workshop – January 22, 2020

*The Board may not take action on any item which is not on this agenda, except when (1) an emergency situation exists, (2) there is need to take immediate action and the need for the action came after posting, or (3) the item was posted for a prior meeting within specified time limits. [Government Code §54954.2]*
13.2a Board Meeting – January 22, 2020

13.2 Personnel (Mr. Vicari)
13.2a Current Personnel Recommendations

13.3 Business (Mr. Critchfield)
13.3a Warrants issued between January 17, 2020 – January 30, 2020 – $344,769.95

13.4 Donations
13.4a Ione Elementary School received a monetary donation from the Jackson Rancheria for the school library.
13.4b Ione Jr. High School received a monetary donation from Raley’s Supermarket for the installation of water bottle fill stations.
13.4c Pioneer Elementary School received a monetary donation from Bobbi Laughton for 6th grade science camp.
13.4d The District Office received a donation of a low level camera stabilizer and Kids National Geographic magazines from Rebecca Bozzo.
13.4e Pioneer VAPA Elementary School received a donation of holiday presents for all students from Colleen Edwards.

13.5 Surplus
13.5a Jackson Jr. High School – 2 Computers, broken
13.5b Jackson Jr. High School – 8 Computer screens, broken
13.5c Jackson Jr. High School – 2 Gateway monitors, broken
13.5d Jackson Jr. High School – 8 Dell computer, broken
13.5e Jackson Jr. High School – 2 Frigidaire microwaves, broken
13.5f Jackson Jr. High School – 2 Frigidaire mini fridges, broken
13.5g Jackson Jr. High School – Windows 7 program, outdated
13.5h Jackson Jr. High School – 2 Impressions screen, broken
13.5i Jackson Jr. High School – 7 HP computers, broken
13.5j Sutter Creek Elementary School – 6 Dell computers, outdated/broken
13.5k Sutter Creek Elementary School – 1 HP computer, outdated/broken
13.5l Sutter Creek Elementary School – 1 laptop, outdated/broken
13.5m Sutter Creek Elementary School – 3 Smartboards, broken
13.5n Plymouth Elementary School – 26 Acer Chromebooks, outdated
13.5o Plymouth Elementary School – 25 Acer Chromebooks chargers, outdated
13.5p Plymouth Elementary School – 3 iPads, outdated
13.5q Plymouth Elementary School – 1 Dell computer tower, outdated
13.5r Plymouth Elementary School – 2 Smartboard projectors, outdated
13.5s Plymouth Elementary School – 2 Smartboard screens, outdated

13.6 Miscellaneous
13.6a Argonaut High School would like to take 1 student and 1 chaperone to the FCCLA State Executive Council Meeting in Sacramento.
13.6b Argonaut High School would like to take 1 student and 3 chaperones to the Ski and Snowboard State Championship in Truckee.
13.6c Amador High School would like to take 9 students and 3 chaperones to the Ski and Snowboard State Championship in Truckee.

14.0 DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS
Public comments regarding Discussion/Action Items will be addressed during the Discussion/Action agenda items. A person wishing to be heard by the Board shall first be recognized by the president and shall then proceed to comment as briefly as the subject permits. Individual speakers shall be allowed three minutes to address the Board on each agenda item. The Board shall...
limit the total time for public input on each item to 20 minutes. With Board consent, the Board president may increase or decrease the time allowed for public presentation, depending on the topic and the number of persons wishing to be heard. The president may take a poll of speakers for or against a particular issue and may ask that additional persons speak only if they have something new to add. NOTE: If you wish to address the Board please complete a speaker card and give it to the Board Clerk or Communications Specialist.

14.1 Adult Education Update – Discussion (Mr. Snider) This item was combined with item 9.2. Adult education is a public education program for all adults. Adult schools offer free to low-cost classes for adults 18 and older. Students can get a high school diploma, general education diploma (GED), learn about jobs, learn to speak English, and learn how to become a U.S. citizen.

14.2 Special Education Study Team Report and Recommendation(s) – Discussion/Action (Dr. Slavensky, Mr. Critchfield, Mr. Snider, Mrs. Brown)
On January 22, 2019, the Board heard a full report from staff regarding the work of the Study Team and the history and current reality of Special Education in Amador County Public Schools. The Study Team worked hard to collaborate, learn together, and understand the complexities in both our history and our current reality in order to better address them and make the most appropriate, sustainable recommendation(s) to the Board.

Dr. Steve Russell, ACOE Superintendent, spoke to the Board regarding his support of the transfer of the Special Education mild-moderate program and related staff from the ACOE to the ACUSD. He cited the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to educating students in the least restrictive environment.

Tracy Hinman, Special Education teacher at Argonaut High School and member of the Study Team, spoke to the Board regarding the recommendation from the Study Team and her concerns about the potential cost savings information which was presented.

Haley Van Lieshout, Special Education teacher at Ione Junior High School, submitted a speaker card but chose not to speak.

Michaelynn Angie, Special Day Class Teacher at the Triglia Center and member of the Study Team, spoke on behalf of Anne Roeth who could not attend the board meeting. She expressed concerns regarding the transfer of Designated Instructional Services providers.

Rachael Shaw-Escalona, Special Education teacher at Ione Elementary and member of the Study Team, spoke to the Board regarding her support of a 3-5 year timeline for transfer.

Dr. Slavensky welcomed the following members of the Study Team to assist in the presentation: Assistant Superintendent of Business Services Jared Critchfield, Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services Sean Snider, Director of Special Education Kathryn Brown, ACTA Leader Julia Mandeson, SEAC Leader Rachael Shaw-Escalona, and CSEA Leader Megan Mathison. CSEA Leader Theresa Cramer was invited but was not able to attend.

Dr. Slavensky introduced the presentation of information including background information, the members and purpose of the Study Team, and the Study Team’s process.

Mr. Snider explained the Study Team’s collaborative work to determine various options and study them by exploring the payoffs, risks, and some mitigating strategies for each option. Dr. Slavensky and Mrs. Brown assisted with this information, and the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) attachment was referenced for additional information. Dr. Slavensky reported that the district’s goal is to support all employees and keep employees whole during a potential program transfer, citing Education Code 44903.7 and 45120.2 which state that employees will maintain
their seniority and compensation in the event of a transfer from one local educational agency to another local educational agency.

Mr. Critchfield spoke regarding the positive fiscal impact of transferring the mild-moderate Special Education program and the negative impacts of maintaining the status quo (i.e., not transferring any Special Education programs). He spoke about the positive impact a transfer would have on the employees who serve the Transportation Department and the associated cost savings.

Dr. Slavensky spoke to the Board regarding the required 2018-19 ACUSD Cost Savings Plan submitted to the California Department of Education. Board President Ross asked if the Board decides not to transfer a Special Education program and the ACOE’s reserve fund drops, would that affect the ability to offer raises to employees? Mr. Critchfield answered yes.

Mr. Snider and Ms. Brown spoke to the Board about the process used by the Study Team to reach a consensus. Using the gradients of agreement, the team was able to prepare a recommendation to bring forward to the Board.

Dr. Slavensky invited the Labor Leaders to the podium and Board President Ross opened the discussion to the Board Members.

Board Member Pulskamp asked if the Transportation Department was consolidated under the ACUSD, would it still serve ACOE students, and if so, how would the cost be shared? Mr. Critchfield answered that all students would be served by the consolidated Transportation Department. Also, through LCFF, there are funds set aside for the “shared” cost amount. He reported that the ACOE receives an amount from the District for transportation costs. In the case of a consolidation, the funds currently being sent to the ACOE for this purpose would remain with the ACUSD and be used for transportation costs.

Board President Ross asked if Special Education teacher jobs would be threatened by a possible program transfer. Mr. Snider answered no, there are no plans for any layoffs. Mr. Snider said that any cost savings will be found through attrition. Further, due to our enrollment growth and because Special Education teacher positions are hard-to-fill positions throughout the state, we anticipate vacancies.

Board President Ross asked if current SEAC contract agreements with the District would be threatened if the union group merged with another union group. Julia Mandeson answered that ACTA plans to honor the current SEAC agreements and make sure that employees stay whole. Dr. Slavensky also referenced again the Education Codes which protect employees and that the District is always committed to abiding with the law.

Board Members discussed the movement of employees from one union to another, the process and time needed to negotiate employee contracts, related laws, concerns about employee pay, the effect that merging unions may have, and the effect of Multi-tiered Systems of Support. Several members of the audience approached the dais and spoke directly to the Board, expressing concerns about the timeline of a potential transfer of Special Education teachers.

Board Clerk Thompson expressed her desire for employees who may transfer to remain whole and have their needs met. She expressed concerns about possible negative fiscal impact if the transfer of the mild-moderate Special Education program is delayed.

Board Member Pulskamp asked if students would be negatively affected if the program transfer occurred in October. Mr. Critchfield answered that there should be no effect on students.
Board President Ross motioned to direct and authorize the District to plan and support the negotiations process with labor leaders for the transfer of the Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA), the Administrative Unit (AU), the Transportation Department, and all classified and administrative staff related to the mild-moderate Special Education services and program from the ACOE to the ACUSD, with oversight and support by a representative steering committee, effective July 1, 2020. Board Member White seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0 with two student advisory votes abstaining.

Board President Ross motioned to direct and authorize the District to plan and support the negotiations process with labor leaders for the transfer of all mild-moderate credentialed teachers from the ACOE to the ACUSD effective October 1, 2020. Mr. Critchfield commented that the First Interim Budget Report is due on October 31st and the transfer would align well with the Interim Report. Board President Ross amended her motion to make the transfer by October 31, 2020, and Board Member White seconded the amended motion. The motion passed 5-0 with two student advisory votes abstaining.

Board President Ross moved to approve a stakeholder study team to engage in a Special Education visioning process and explore transfer of Designated Instructional Services program and staff and moderate-severe Special Education program and staff from ACOE to ACUSD by July 1, 2021, and Board Clerk Thompson seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-1, with Board Member Pulskamp voting no, and two student advisory votes abstaining.

14.3 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Midyear Update – Discussion (Mr. Snider)
This report will serve as an update on the status of the 2019-20 LCAP goals, actions, and services. Due to the late hour, Dr. Slavensky recommended that item 14.3 be postponed to the next Board meeting and the Board agreed.

15.0 REPORTS
15.1 Facilities Update Report (Mr. Critchfield)
Due to the late hour, no report was given.

15.2 Report from Superintendent (Dr. Slavensky)
Due to the late hour, no report was given.

15.3 Reports and Remarks from Board Members
Due to the late hour, no report was given.

Board President Ross motioned to extend the Board’s meeting to 10:30 PM, and Board Member Marzano seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0 with no student advisory votes present.

16.0 NEXT MEETING
ACUSD Regular Meeting: Wednesday, February 26, 2020, Amador County Administration Building, 810 Court St., Jackson, CA. Open Session starts at 6:30 PM.

17.0 ADJOURNMENT 9:57 PM
* The Amador County Unified School District complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Should you require special accommodations, or more information about accessibility, please contact the Superintendent’s Office by calling (209) 257-5353. All efforts will be made for reasonable accommodations.

* Any writings or documents that are provided to the governing board in open session will be made available for public inspection at the meeting or at the Amador County Public Schools District Office located at 217 Rex Avenue, Jackson, CA during normal business hours.
AGENDA ITEM #: 13.2a

SUBJECT:
Human Resources Consent Agenda for February 26, 2020

CURRENT PERSONNEL RECOMMENDATIONS

Certificated ~ Retirement
Steve Immer, full-time social science teacher, Jackson Junior High School, effective June 6, 2020
James Whitaker, full-time industrial/social science teacher, Argonaut High School, effective June 6, 2020

Certificated ~ Induction, Intern & CTE Mentors, $1,000 Stipend
Laurie Braun, for Emily Gaskins, induction, Pine Grove STEM Elementary School
Jonathan Gilliam, for Jazmin Haedrich, induction, Argonaut High School
Jonathan Gilliam, for Jessica McCarty, induction, Amador High School
Matt Gough, for Greg Reading, induction, Amador High School
Sinead Klement, for Kirsten Higman, induction, Jackson Junior High School
Julia Mandeson, for Karissa Cabri, induction, Ione Elementary School
Patricia McKay, for Ashley Costello, induction, Ione Elementary School
Patricia McKay, for Congetta Davie, induction, Ione Elementary School (.5 year, $500 Stipend)
Bonnie Miller, for Melissa Scholtes, induction, Sutter Creek Elementary School
Brittany Price, for Jared Carson, induction, Argonaut High School
Amy Reilly, for Jamie Swisher, induction, Sutter Creek Elementary School
Kelli Sanders, for Kelly Ward, induction, Jackson Elementary School
Matt Gough, for Naor Karkay-Selea, intern, Argonaut High School
Shannon Clark, for Erik Lucas, intern, Argonaut High School
Terry Riggle, for Jeremiah Cloud, intern, Amador High School
Jeni DeWalt, for Patricia Fisher-Misuraca, intern, Ione Elementary School
Matt Gough, for Valerie Davidson, CTE preliminary, Argonaut High School
Nancy (Ali) Crane, for Jenny Neely, CTE preliminary, Amador High School

Stipends Amador 2019-2020 Correction
Malinda Hemig, Sophomore Class Advisor

Coaches 2019-2020 School Year
Argonaut High School

Board Date February 26, 2020
Jon Gilliam, Varsity Boys Basketball
Brain Jones, Junior Varsity Boys Basketball
Damion Wyckoff, Freshman Boys Basketball
Morgan Roots, Varsity Girls Basketball
Pete Gascon, Junior Varsity Girls Basketball
Gary Landergen, Varsity Boys Wrestling
Brian Whaling SR, Varsity Girls Wrestling
Rick Davis JR, Varsity Ski (50% Co-Coach)
Juan Manuel Villegas-Cruz, Varsity Girls Soccer
Jorge Martinez, Junior Varsity Girls Soccer
Laura Cruz Diaz (Zanelli), Varsity Boys Soccer
Andrew Zanelli, Junior Varsity Boys Soccer
Laurie Floyd, Cheer Advisor (50% Pay)

Amador High School
Kaleb Cagle, Varsity Boys Basketball
Dale Cagle, Junior Varsity Boys Basketball
Marty Giannini, Freshman Boys Basketball
Christian Santinelli, Varsity Girls Basketball (50% Co-Coach)
Andy Scholl, Varsity Girls Basketball (50% Co-Coach)
Frank Orlando, Varsity Co-ed Wrestling
Austin Clymer, Junior Varsity Co-ed Wrestling
Anthony Peters, Varsity Girls Soccer
Debbie Guidera, Junior Varsity Girls Soccer
Greg Wall, Varsity Boys Soccer
Jenny Upchurch, Cheer Advisor (50% Pay)
Tim Keys, Varsity Co-ed Ski

Classified ~ Resignation
Cori Dorris, Campus Supervisor, 3.5 hours/11 months, Jackson Junior High, effective February 29, 2020

RECOMMENDATION:
Approve Human Resources Consent Agenda.

PRESENTED BY:
David Vicari, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources & Labor Relations
AGENDA ITEM #: 13.2b

SUBJECT:
Tentative Agreement Regarding the 2018-2021 CSEA Successor Agreement

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
This tentative agreement is between Amador County Unified School District (ACUSD) and Classified School Employees Association, Unit 239 (CSEA #239). The district and CSEA #239 have been engaged in productive negotiations. This tentative agreement is the result of regular and collaborative negotiation sessions.

The articles herein were sun shined on May 16, 2018 as the opener for subsequent negotiations. Following Board approval, the agreement shall be in effect and shall continue in effect until June 30, 2021.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:
To be determined by the Board.

RECOMMENDATION:
Superintendent Slavensky recommends that the Board of Trustees approve the agreement.

PRESENTED BY:
David Vicari, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources & Employee Relations
Tentative Agreement

California School Employees Association and Its Amador County Unified Chapter #239
“CSEA” and Amador County Unified School District “District” for the 2018-2021
Successor Agreement

April 17, 2019

ARTICLE VII........................................ PAY AND ALLOWANCES

The District and CSEA agree to commence negotiations for Pay and Allowances, upon request of either party, once the District reserve for economic uncertainties reaches 2% beyond the State mandated amount of 3% of the budget. It is the intent of the Parties to increase the Salary schedule in concert with increases to the California State minimum wage.

ARTICLE IX................................. HEALTH AND WELFARE BENEFITS

The District and CSEA agree to commence negotiations for Health and Welfare Benefits, upon request of either party, once the District reserve for economic uncertainties reaches 2% beyond the State mandated amount of 3%.

ARTICLE VIII............................. EMPLOYEE EXPENSES AND MATERIALS

8.1 Uniforms - The District shall pay the full cost of the purchase, lease, rental, cleaning, (except for District provided T-Shirts) and maintenance of uniforms, identification badges, emblems, and cards required by the District to be worn or used by bargaining unit employees. Uniforms/T-Shirts that are worn out/discolored/damaged will be replaced upon request of the employee, with the approval of the Immediate Supervisor.

ARTICLE XVIII..................CONTRACTING AND BARGAINING UNIT WORK

18.1 Work that is normally and customarily performed by bargaining unit members will not be contracted out pursuant to Education Code 45103.1.

18.1 Restriction on Contracting Out—The parties agree that the District may contract with private vendors for services or materials as necessary so long as such contracting out for services or materials does not cause a reduction of the number of classified employees or a reduction in the regular hours worked by members of the classified service.

18.1.1 Should any such reduction be anticipated, the District must first negotiate the decision and effects to contract out with CSEA.
18.2 Bargaining Unit Work—Supervisors and managers may perform work that is considered by them to be essential to the operation of the school district. This provision shall not be construed to authorize the reduction of bargaining unit positions or hours of work.

18.3 Non-CSEA personnel may not perform bargaining unit work to the extent that said work has been Amador County Unified School District, CSEA #239 Contract, 2015-2018 performed in the past by CSEA. This will not restrict the District from having work performed by outside entities that is outside the capabilities of the CSEA workforce as long as such work does not result in the layoff or reduction in hours for bargaining unit employees. An example would be work that requires equipment that the District does not possess.

ARTICLE XXIV DURATION

24.1 This Agreement shall be in effect as of the date of ratification and shall continue in effect until midnight June 30, 2021.

24.2 REOPENERS: The parties may reopen the contract for negotiations in 2019-2020, and 2020-2021, for Article VII Pay and Allowances and Article IX Health and Welfare Benefits, and two (2) articles of either parties’ choice. In 2021 a new successor contract will be negotiated.

ME TOO PROVISION

For the 2018-2019 school year, if any other Amador County Unified School District bargaining unit receives salary schedule and or health and welfare benefit increases and or other benefit, greater, as a percentage of total compensation, than those outlined in this agreement, ACUSD (CSEA #239) members will receive the same.

For CSEA Theresa R. Gamel Date 4/17/19
For CSEA Christina Cardenas Date 4/17/19
For CSEA Estelle Allen Date 4/17/19
For CSEA Esperanza Gonzalez Date 4/17/19
For CSEA Kyle Harvey Date 4/17/19
For District David Verani Date 4/17/19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warrant #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60052028</td>
<td>AMADOR STEEL AND SUPPLY</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>179.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052029</td>
<td>AUS WEST LOCKBOX</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>425.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052030</td>
<td>BOOKER COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>733.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052031</td>
<td>CONSOLIDATED ELECTRICAL DI</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>192.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052032</td>
<td>FASTENAL COMPANY</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>33.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052033</td>
<td>FERGUSON ENTERPRISES INC #</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>962.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052034</td>
<td>GEARY PACIFIC SUPPLY</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>149.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052035</td>
<td>GLASS DOCTOR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>250.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052036</td>
<td>GLOBAL EQUIPMENT COMPANY I</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>364.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052037</td>
<td>GUYS SAW CENTER</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>214.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052038</td>
<td>IONE ACE HARDWARE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>52.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052039</td>
<td>JACKSON ACE HARDWARE &amp; GAR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>113.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052040</td>
<td>KELLY-MOORE PAINT CO INC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>262.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052041</td>
<td>LOWE'S</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>2,016.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052042</td>
<td>MEEK'S LUMBER &amp; HARDWARE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>223.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052043</td>
<td>OFFICE DEPOT</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>14.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052044</td>
<td>PIONEER ACE HARDWARE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>20.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052045</td>
<td>PLYMOUTH ACE HARDWARE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>23.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052046</td>
<td>RICK MCCARLEY CONSULTING</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052047</td>
<td>RIEBES AUTO PARTS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>39.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052048</td>
<td>SIERRA YARD SUPPLY &amp; EQUIP</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052049</td>
<td>SIGNAL SERVICE INC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052050</td>
<td>SLAKEY BROTHERS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>2,303.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052051</td>
<td>SWEET PEA SEPTIC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052052</td>
<td>TRANE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>512.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052053</td>
<td>TRI SIGNAL INTEGRATION INC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>1,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052054</td>
<td>VOX NETWORK SOLUTIONS INC.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052055</td>
<td>ACES WASTE SERVICES INC.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>3,084.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052056</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>3,832.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052057</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>12,260.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052058</td>
<td>CITY OF JACKSON</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>5,497.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052059</td>
<td>COMCAST</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052060</td>
<td>KAMPS PROPANE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>4,292.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052061</td>
<td>PG &amp; E</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>12,923.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052062</td>
<td>CVT-CALIFORNIA'S VALUED TR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>402,805.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052063</td>
<td>AIM</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>645.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052064</td>
<td>ALL SIERRA ROOF CO INC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>4,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052065</td>
<td>AMADOR CO ENVIRONMENTAL HE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>878.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052066</td>
<td>AMADOR PLUMBING</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052067</td>
<td>AMERICAN TECHNOLOGIES INC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>1,741.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052068</td>
<td>AVID CENTER</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>3,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052069</td>
<td>BLAIN STUMPF CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>693.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052070</td>
<td>CAMPBELL CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>2,435.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052071</td>
<td>CAPITOL PUBLIC FINANCE GRO</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>3,025.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052072</td>
<td>DALY, LINDA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>63.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052073</td>
<td>FRANCISCO ROMERO</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>1,040.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052074</td>
<td>LOTERY, JENNIFER</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>523.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052075</td>
<td>NORMAC INC.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>33.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052076</td>
<td>PETTY CASH</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>154.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052077</td>
<td>PETTY CASH</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052078</td>
<td>PETTY CASH</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>129.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052079</td>
<td>SLAVENSKY, AMY</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>1,039.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052080</td>
<td>SNIDER, SEAN R.</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052081</td>
<td>STANISLAUS CO OFFICE OF ED</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>1,576.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052082</td>
<td>TAILORED TREE INC</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>6,870.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052083</td>
<td>THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLO</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052084</td>
<td>CCAE</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>2,694.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052085</td>
<td>LOWE'S</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>510.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052086</td>
<td>CAMPBELL CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>4,119.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052087</td>
<td>AMADOR CO USD CLEARING ACC</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>6,558.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052088</td>
<td>CDW GOVERNMENT INC</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>10,268.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052089</td>
<td>FLINN SCIENTIFIC INC</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>310.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052090</td>
<td>LOWE'S</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>89.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052091</td>
<td>MAUREEN O'LEARY BURNESS</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>5,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052092</td>
<td>MOMETRIX MEDIA LLC</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>219.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052093</td>
<td>PERMA BOUND</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>1,153.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052094</td>
<td>SANTANDER LEASING LLC</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>179,920.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052095</td>
<td>SIGNAL SERVICE INC</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>14,822.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052096</td>
<td>STARFALL EDUCATION</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052097</td>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052098</td>
<td>ALHAMBRA</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>28.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052099</td>
<td>OFFICE DEPOT</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052100</td>
<td>PG &amp; E</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>16,401.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052101</td>
<td>VOLCANO TELEPHONE</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>225.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052102</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION FFA</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>660.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052103</td>
<td>CARSON, LAURIE</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>147.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052104</td>
<td>DILLARD, JACQUELI</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>41.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052105</td>
<td>EAGLE SOFTWARE</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052106</td>
<td>HUNKINS, KELLY</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>304.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052107</td>
<td>MAYFIELD, ANGELA</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>82.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052108</td>
<td>PLACER COUNTY OFFICE OF ED</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052109</td>
<td>WHITCHURCH, LINDSAY</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>175.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052110</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, LORETTA</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>50.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052111</td>
<td>ARMSTRONG, MARK</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>17.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052112</td>
<td>JENNIFER HENDERSON</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052113</td>
<td>MACIEJEWSKI, TRAVIS</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052114</td>
<td>A-Z BUS SALES</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>1,955.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052115</td>
<td>ATR INC</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>1,625.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052116</td>
<td>CAPITOL CLUTCH AND BRAKE I</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>1,147.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052117</td>
<td>CREATIVE BUS SALES</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>201.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052118</td>
<td>GIBSON'S GARAGE</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>1,184.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052119</td>
<td>KIMBALL MIDWEST</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>278.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052120</td>
<td>MAITA CHEVROLET</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052121</td>
<td>RELIABLE TIRE</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>201.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052122</td>
<td>STERLING AUTO REPAIR</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>7,423.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052123</td>
<td>BANK OF EL DORADO/PETTY CA</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>36.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052124</td>
<td>BETH FARB CONSULTING</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>5,663.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052125</td>
<td>JB'S AWARDS</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>731.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052126</td>
<td>PITNEY BOWES/ RENTAL ACCT</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>119.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052127</td>
<td>PREMIERE EVENT RENTALS</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>314.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Vendor Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052128</td>
<td>PTM DOCUMENT SYSTEMS</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>241.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052129</td>
<td>SCHOLASTIC INC</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>97.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052130</td>
<td>School Services of Califor</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052131</td>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>2/7/2020</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052148</td>
<td>ANDREWS,LISA</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052149</td>
<td>MACIEJEWSKI, TRAVIS</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>18.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052150</td>
<td>AUS WEST LOCKBOX</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>82.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052151</td>
<td>GLASS DOCTOR</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>197.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052152</td>
<td>HUNT &amp; SONS INC</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>12,064.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052153</td>
<td>JACKSON TIRE SERVICE INC</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>318.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052154</td>
<td>NORCAL KENWORTH</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>379.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052155</td>
<td>RELIABLE TIRE</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>2,373.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052156</td>
<td>ALHAMBRA</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>188.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052157</td>
<td>CDW GOVERNMENT INC</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>163.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052158</td>
<td>CENTRAL CAROLINA SCALE INC</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>1,452.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052159</td>
<td>COSTLESS FOOD CO.</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>244.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052160</td>
<td>E. PETERSON DESIGNS</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>321.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052161</td>
<td>ENTERPRISE FM TRUST</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>3,181.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052162</td>
<td>LOWE'S</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>205.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052163</td>
<td>NASCO</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052164</td>
<td>OFFICE DEPOT</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>407.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052165</td>
<td>SILLWORKS</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>486.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052166</td>
<td>SOUTHWEST SCHOOL SUPPLY IN</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>424.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052167</td>
<td>SYSCO FOOD SERV.OF CENTRAL</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>516.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052168</td>
<td>DBA CI SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>299.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052169</td>
<td>ENTERPRISE FM TRUST</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>512.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052170</td>
<td>ACES WASTE SERVICES INC.</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>9,841.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052171</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>50.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052172</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>2,940.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052173</td>
<td>CITY OF IONE</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>972.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052174</td>
<td>CITY OF SUTTER CREEK</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>20,932.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052175</td>
<td>KAMPS PROPANE</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>1,602.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052176</td>
<td>PG &amp; E</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>2,389.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052177</td>
<td>BORBA, SARAH</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>35.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052178</td>
<td>CABE</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>520.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052179</td>
<td>CBDA</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>340.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052180</td>
<td>DILLARD, JACQUELI</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052181</td>
<td>DORRIS, JESSICA</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>134.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052182</td>
<td>FLINT,DALE</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>141.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052183</td>
<td>KLEMENT, SINEAD</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>810.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052184</td>
<td>MACIEL, HALEY</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052185</td>
<td>PARR, JULIE</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052186</td>
<td>PCOE</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052187</td>
<td>SNIDER, SEAN R.</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>474.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052188</td>
<td>HUNKINS, KELLY</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>691.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052189</td>
<td>CLOVER STORNETTA FARMS INC</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>6,041.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052190</td>
<td>DANIELSEN CO</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>11,962.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052191</td>
<td>FOOTHILL APPLIANCE SERVICE</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>2,371.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052192</td>
<td>GENERAL PRODUCE CO LTD</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>6,462.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052193</td>
<td>HUBERT COMPANY LLC</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>143.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052194</td>
<td>HUNT &amp; SONS INC</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>141.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60052195</td>
<td>SYSCO FOOD SERV.OF CENTRAL</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>13,454.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052196</td>
<td>GUYS SAW CENTER</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>18.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052197</td>
<td>HOME DEPOT PRO</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>10,292.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052198</td>
<td>IONE ACE HARDWARE</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>91.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052199</td>
<td>LOWE'S</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>897.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052200</td>
<td>MEEK'S LUMBER &amp; HARDWARE</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>323.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052201</td>
<td>OFFICE DEPOT</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>12.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052202</td>
<td>STANDARD APPLIANCE PARTS C</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>135.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052203</td>
<td>TRANE</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>309.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052204</td>
<td>CECAL ENTERPRISES INC.</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>12,032.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052205</td>
<td>AMERICAN TECHNOLOGIES INC</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>23,245.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052206</td>
<td>CALAVERAS UNIF SCHOOL DIST</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>1,168.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052207</td>
<td>PETTY CASH</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>11.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052208</td>
<td>SACRAMENTO BEE</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>1,215.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052209</td>
<td>SISC II</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052210</td>
<td>SONORA UNION HIGH SCHOOL D</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>585.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052211</td>
<td>THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLO</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052212</td>
<td>U.S. POSTAL SERVICE</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052213</td>
<td>YAN-MAR COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>882.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052214</td>
<td>AUS WEST LOCKBOX</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>64.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052215</td>
<td>CDW GOVERNMENT INC</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>4,553.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052216</td>
<td>GLASS DOCTOR</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052217</td>
<td>HERFF JONES INC</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>1,197.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052218</td>
<td>J's COMMUNICATIONS INC</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>686.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052219</td>
<td>SAVE MART SUPERMARKET</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>608.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052220</td>
<td>SULLIVAN CHIROPRACTIC CENT</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>285.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052221</td>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052222</td>
<td>CCAE</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052223</td>
<td>MAUREEN O'LEARY BURNESS</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>151.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60052224</td>
<td>U.S. POSTAL SERVICE</td>
<td>2/18/2020</td>
<td>147.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: 922,294.08**

If there are any questions regarding any of the payments, please contact Jared Critchfield @ 257-5375 or Nancy Kohlman @ 257-5333
AGENDA ITEM #: 14.1

SUBJECT: Budget Outlook and Silent Recession Report – Discussion

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
The District is on track to replenish the reserve fund to the State required level of 3% by the end of the 2020 fiscal year. In order to maintain a fiscally healthy reserve fund and to prepare for a future recession, it is recommended that the Board of Trustees continue to make responsible budgetary decisions regarding expenditures and to continue to grow the reserve fund.

Education expenses have continued to grow far beyond the revenue increases resulting from the LCFF. From 2012-2017 these rising expenses have included increases of approximately 49% for employee benefits, 21% for teacher salaries, and 75% for books and supplies. Many California school districts are experiencing a “silent recession” as they struggle to address these rising costs which outpace increases in state revenues.

FISCAL IMPLICATION: None

RECOMMENDATION: The Superintendent recommends that the Board have discussion.

PRESENTED BY: Jared Critchfield, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services
SILENT RECESSION

WHY CALIFORNIA SCHOOL DISTRICTS ARE UNDERWATER DESPITE INCREASES IN FUNDING

Kelsey Krausen
Jason Willis

APRIL 2018
INTRODUCTION

“[I]T’S EXACTLY THIS SILENT RECESSION SCENARIO.... THOUGH WE ARE RECEIVING MORE DOLLARS EACH YEAR PER STUDENT, THE COSTS THAT WE’RE BEING SADDLED WITH ARE GREATER THAN THOSE REVENUES. SO, WE END UP IN A PERPETUAL CUTTING MODE.”

DISTRICT BUDGET OFFICER

Despite projected increases in state and local education funding between 2017/18 and 2021/22, California school districts face fiscal pressures that threaten to destabilize school district budgets and force reductions in services to students. Examples of these fiscal pressures include reduced funding due to declining enrollment; the costs of upkeep and renovations for aging school facilities; increasing special education program costs; increasing employee health care costs; and the costs associated with recruiting, retaining, and training teachers, including ensuring competitive wages. Still, for many California school districts, the most daunting fiscal pressure is the rising cost of employee pensions, totaling a $1-billion increase over the previous year in costs to districts statewide in the 2017/18 school year alone.

Many of these pressures on school district budgets are largely hidden from public view because they do not take the form of new services or programs and instead are part of what is often referred to as the “cost of doing business.” Furthermore, school district spending on employee pensions is expected to nearly double between 2015/16 and 2020/21, based on complicated retirement and earnings forecasts that are not well understood by the public — or by many state policymakers or district leaders. These costs create pressures on district budgets and erode districts’ abilities to make new investments in programs. They mark a new era of fiscal constraint for California’s school districts — a Silent Recession — which will likely force many districts to make dramatic program adjustments and reductions or risk significant deficit spending, despite overall increases in K–12 funding provided by the state.

This paper suggests that despite efforts to help school districts recover from the recent Great Recession by bringing school district spending power back to pre-recession levels, growth in expenses to maintain operations means that school districts across the state are now experiencing the Silent Recession. Although California’s education funding formula provides revenues that grow incrementally each year, these increases are not based on the actual growth in the costs of operating a school. Consequently, some school districts are experiencing cost increases that are outpacing revenue increases. The fiscal challenges that this dynamic creates will likely require school districts to find new strategies to prioritize how they spend limited dollars and may lead to reductions in investments in current employees and programs, as rising costs effectively crowd out other investments. The Tradeoffs section of this paper presents a conceptual framework for school district leaders to use in considering the tradeoffs and choices they may need to make. In particular, the framework highlights the importance of focusing on budget strategies that address areas in which districts have greater control over expenditures and which have the potential to make a substantial impact on district budgets.

1 http://www.lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/3716 (The most recent projections from this report of the state’s Legislative Analyst’s Office show projected increases under a “Growth Scenario”; the report also provides projections under a “Recession Scenario.”)
2 http://www.lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/3549
To explore the implications of the growing fiscal pressures in a range of school districts, WestEd analyzed publicly available single-year budgets and multiyear projections (MYPs) for 25 California school districts that were selected to be representative of the range of sizes, types, and regions of California school districts. To check if districts that tend to have higher levels of revenues also tend to forecast the same budget issues as districts in the 25-district sample, MYP analyses were also conducted for two additional samples: 15 school districts that have high unduplicated student counts (74–98 percent of the district’s enrollment is from targeted groups) and 15 Basic Aid school districts.

In addition, WestEd conducted interviews with district and county leaders involved in WestEd’s Smarter School Spending Community of Practice, as well as interviews with chief business officers from districts across the state. (Additional information on how this paper was developed is in the Appendix.)

Purpose

The purpose of this paper — the first in a two-part series — is to provide a detailed picture of the fiscal pressures that districts face and to outline the implications of the Silent Recession for school districts. The second paper builds on this urgent matter and offers budget strategies and approaches that school districts may use to mitigate these pressures. The implications include tradeoffs faced by districts, potential effects on collective bargaining and broader conversations with the public about the budget, and the implications for deficit spending and for achieving the Local Control Funding Formula legislation’s key goals of closing the budget gap and the achievement gap.

In particular, this paper draws attention to the rising cost of pensions and to other fiscal pressures on school districts in an effort to broadcast these issues so they are no longer silent. These are complex budget issues that are difficult to explain to the public, but they can be of significant impact and importance to maintaining academic and fiscal solvency for many school districts in California, as well as elsewhere. Many school districts will be forced to navigate formidable budget choices ahead, and this paper is written from the assumption that it is easier to foster authentic engagement and transparent conversations with the public about these choices when there is a shared understanding of current budget realities. Importantly, the current budget challenges in many districts are not new and are not due solely to external pressures. Rather, they are part of a larger story about how district leadership, including local governing boards, have historically made budget decisions — in some cases deferring difficult budget choices — and about the increasing demands placed on the education system and the levels of funding provided for California school districts over time.

Although this paper briefly addresses some of the broader issues related to the adequacy of school funding in California, it does not delve deeply into the debate about whether the funding gap is caused by the adequacy of K–12 education funding in California. Rather, this paper is intended to serve as a springboard for discussions about how districts are dealing with current budget realities.

3 Each district is required to submit to its county office of education a single-year budget and a multiyear projection of its budget along with its Local Control and Accountability Plan by July 1 each year. These multiyear projections include information on the next three budget years.

4 The term unduplicated student counts refers to the total number of English learner (EL) students, low-income students, and foster youth in the district. Unduplicated students may also be referred to as targeted student groups because school districts receive additional funding to target the educational needs of these students, as explained further in the Funding for K–12 Education in California section of this paper.

5 The term Basic Aid school district refers to a district in which local property tax revenues exceed the amount that the district would receive from the state under California’s education funding formula.

6 WestEd has received support from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation through the Smarter School Spending project, which provides school districts with tools and strategies to align investments, to prioritize investments based on the districts’ goals for student achievement, and to evaluate program success relative to student outcomes. This paper is part of the project’s body of work, as the paper captures some of the discussions that occurred through a WestEd-facilitated Smarter School Spending Community of Practice, and is intended to be a potential resource for school district budget leaders.
Funding for K–12 Education in California

The passage of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) legislation in 2013 dramatically transformed California’s education funding system. The LCFF gives greater local control to school districts based on the idea that those who work most closely with students are better situated to make spending decisions (i.e., ‘subsidiarity’) and in order to increase equity in school funding and provide districts with additional funding to increase and improve services for students with the greatest needs. The LCFF gave school districts greater flexibility in spending decisions in exchange for greater budget transparency through the requirement that each local education agency (LEA) create a Local Control and Accountability Plan — with input from the community — that details how the district will allocate funds to meet its goals for improving student outcomes.

Under the LCFF, the bulk of the funding that the state provides to each school district is based on the district’s average daily attendance (ADA), referred to as base grant funding. In addition, the LCFF designates that school districts may receive supplemental funding and concentration funding from the state. Supplemental funding is based on unduplicated student counts (meaning students from targeted populations): English learner (EL) students, low-income students, and foster youth in the district; and the state provides concentration funding to a district if more than 55 percent of the district’s enrollment is from these targeted student populations. Importantly, school districts must demonstrate that they are increasing or improving services for the student populations that generated the supplemental and concentration funds. Consequently, school districts that receive more supplemental and concentration funding are working to use such funds to address the needs of targeted students and may experience greater pressure from stakeholders to show that the additional dollars are improving outcomes and helping to eliminate the achievement gap for the targeted student groups.

The passage of the LCFF coincided with California’s recovery from the Great Recession, which meant that the LCFF formula was used to determine how most of the significant increases in funding for K–12 education resulting from the state’s post-recession economic growth were distributed. However, much of the increased funding simply offset the 15–20 percent budget reductions and the suspension of cost-of-living adjustments in state and local funding that school districts had experienced previously, between 2008/09 and 2011/12. While the LCFF provided a mechanism to distribute funding to K–12 education, it was not intended and does not operate as an adequacy formula — it is not meant to determine how much money would be adequate for meeting the state’s student outcome expectations for each district. Instead, increases in funding for K–12 education related to the LCFF were based on a commitment to returning school districts to pre-recession levels (2007/08), adjusted for inflation.

Notably, the LCFF formula provides for revenues that grow by cost-of-living adjustments each year based on a general measure of the growth in cost for governmental agencies that is inclusive of, but not limited to, education. In other words, the LCFF generates revenue increases without reference to actual growth in the costs that are specific to operating schools. However, as of April 2018, the state legislature is considering new legislation (introduced by assembly member Al Muratsuchi, from Torrance) to increase the LCFF target to provide school districts with additional funding to cover rising fixed costs (e.g., pensions, fuel, maintenance) — a bill directly focused on addressing the adequacy of state funding for education.

https://www.wested.org/resources/path-toward-equity/

7 Defined by eligibility for the federal Free and Reduced-Price Meals program.
8 As discussed in a later section of this paper, school districts that find they must cut services, even services to targeted student groups, due to rising fiscal pressures may need to focus on strategies to improve services to students during times of budget constraint. According to a 2013 report (http://www.lao.ca.gov/reports/2013/edu/lcff/lcff-072913.aspx), “Under the LCFF, districts will have to use supplemental and concentration funds to ‘increase or improve services for EL/LI pupils in proportion to the increase in supplemental and concentration funds.’ The exact meaning and regulatory effect of this proportionality clause is currently unknown.” Some stakeholders in the education community remain concerned about the absence of explicit requirements regarding how districts increase or improve services for targeted student groups.
Since the LCFF was enacted, revenue for K–12 education has increased steadily from a statewide average of $8,987 per pupil in 2013 to $10,657 per pupil in 2017. In particular, those school districts with large populations of EL, low-income, and foster students have experienced the largest increases in funding. Statewide in 2017/18, school districts received $1.4 billion more in LCFF funding than in the previous year, and K–12 revenue is expected to continue to increase through 2020/21. In fact, Governor Jerry Brown’s January 2018 budget proposal includes nearly $3 billion to fund full implementation of the LCFF in 2018/19, two years ahead of the schedule that had been previously set for fully funding the LCFF.

However, by design, not all school districts have experienced the transition to the LCFF equally. The demographics of a district determine how much is generated from the supplemental and concentration components of the LCFF. As a result, districts of similar size, but different demographics, may receive considerably different per-pupil funding under the LCFF. The variation in per-pupil funding rates and local contextual factors (e.g., enrollment growth or decline, age of workforce, size of the district) affect how different districts will experience the significant projected increases in pension costs. According to the Legislative Analyst’s Office, pension costs will constitute an estimated 30–40 percent of future LCFF funding growth. In some cases, districts are already experiencing increases in pension costs that exceed their LCFF funding growth (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Increased pension expenditures outpace LCFF revenue increases in some districts

For this sample school district in 2017-18 (San Bernardino Unified), salary-related expenditure increases will outpace LCFF revenue increases by $10.9 million.
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10 [http://www.lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/3549](http://www.lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/3549) - in inflation adjusted dollars
FISCAL CHALLENGES

This section includes a description of the increasing pressures on school district budgets, as well as the difficult choices faced by school district leaders and the community at large. Specifically, these fiscal challenges include pension liabilities; special education costs; costs associated with recruiting, retaining, and training teachers; employee health care costs; aging facilities; and declining enrollment.

Pension Liabilities

For California — as for many other states — the rising cost of pension obligations presents a serious challenge, particularly for school districts. There are two major pension funds for employees in K–12 education in California: the California State Teachers Retirement System (CalSTRS) and the California Public Employees’ Retirement System (CalPERS). CalSTRS, which administers pension benefits for teachers, principals, and other certificated employees such as speech therapists, school psychologists, and nurses, is the nation’s second-largest public employee pension fund. CalPERS provides pension benefits for classified employees such as classroom aides, school security officers, and food services, maintenance, and clerical staff. To provide benefits to their members, CalSTRS and CalPERS funds rely on contributions from members, employers, and the state, as well as income from investments. Unfunded pension costs are the difference between the benefits promised to employees and the current savings available in the funds to meet those financial commitments. It is this unfunded liability that has driven dramatic increases in the amount that school districts must contribute to the funds.

The value of funds in CalPERS and CalSTRS fell dramatically during the 2008 recession and has never fully recovered. In response, California’s 2014/15 budget included a plan to fully fund CalSTRS within about 30 years by more than doubling district contribution rates between 2013/14 and 2020/21 — from 8.3 percent of each district’s payroll in 2013/14 to 19.1 percent of payroll by 2020/21 (Table 1). The state will also have to increase its contribution to the fund to make up for the shortfall. According to EdSource, increased payments from the state will likely have a trickle-down effect on districts as well. ‘Money for pensions will divert funding from other priorities at a time when Brown is predicting slower state revenues and the possibility of a recession.’ As one district budget leader interviewed for this report stated, ‘Issues with the CalSTRS and CalPERS, that is huge…. When you look at how much increase it is every year . . . there’s no way that it can be sustainable the way it’s going, because your base dollar that comes in, it gets eaten up already by just your additional increase in your CalSTRS and CalPERS already.’ Another district budget leader explained that the rising cost of pensions — outpacing increases in funding — will force school districts to reduce services for students.

When the state adopted the Local Control Funding Formula, it made a promise to restore the 07/08 purchasing powers of school districts…. And then a year later they passed the STRS and PERS Reform Acts, which pretty much invalidated that promise. There’s no way a school district can get back to those purchasing levels with all of these new mandated payments. So they should have adjusted the LCFF base targets when they changed PERS and STRS because there was a new cost that was never factored in when they set the targets. So, we’ve been saying . . . for several years that students are going to get fewer services because much of the new money is going to go to employees’ deferred compensation.

This concern over rising costs — particularly for CalSTRS and CalPERS — exceeding increases in revenues was repeated by many of the district leaders interviewed for this report.

Table 1. Large increases in K–12 districts’ pension contribution rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalSTRS</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalPERS</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Total School District Contributions (in millions):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalSTRS</td>
<td>$2,086</td>
<td>$2,463</td>
<td>$3,120</td>
<td>$3,840</td>
<td>$4,478</td>
<td>$5,305</td>
<td>$6,203</td>
<td>$6,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalPERS</td>
<td>$1,122</td>
<td>$1,104</td>
<td>$1,214</td>
<td>$1,509</td>
<td>$1,710</td>
<td>$2,006</td>
<td>$2,341</td>
<td>$2,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$3,208</td>
<td>$3,567</td>
<td>$4,334</td>
<td>$5,349</td>
<td>$6,188</td>
<td>$7,311</td>
<td>$8,544</td>
<td>$9,596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [http://www.lao.ca.gov/Education/EdBudget/Details/82](http://www.lao.ca.gov/Education/EdBudget/Details/82)

A 2017 report by the Pew Charitable Trust reveals that many other states’ pension systems are faced with addressing growing and significant pension obligations. The report indicates that the gap between the assets of state pension systems across the United States and the benefits promised to employees — referred to as the net pension liability — was $1.1 trillion in 2015 and was expected to increase by approximately $200 billion in 2016.

WestEd’s analysis of districts’ annual budgets illustrates the varied impact of the increases in CalSTRS and CalPERS costs on district budgets. For one district, its contribution to CalSTRS was 57 percent higher from one year to the next (Figure 2). These increases represent millions of dollars in increased contributions for some districts. The average increase across the 25 districts in WestEd’s sample was 16 percent for CalSTRS, or just under $1.5 million in increased contributions on average, and 19 percent for CalPERS, or just under $0.5 million in increased contributions, on average. Yet, the steepest increases in district contributions to these funds are still to come.

Special Education Costs

Districts also struggle to cover the increasing costs of special education programs. As student needs and the costs of meeting those needs continue to rise, providing appropriate support to meet the needs of students with disabilities is an ongoing concern for districts. The LAO estimates that the cost of educating students with disabilities is, on average, twice as much as the cost of educating general education students.  

In 2016/17, California enrolled over 680,000 K–12 students eligible for special education services, or approximately 11 percent of all K–12 students in the state. As with other areas of K–12 funding, the funding provided to districts for special education services has grown based on a modest cost-of-living adjustment, yet funding for special education has generally lagged behind the overall K–12 funding increase. The increases to special education funding have not matched the escalating cost of maintaining high-quality, legally compliant services.

One source of increased costs has been from greater awareness of and investment in programs to support students with a primary disability of autism. Although autism was once considered a high-cost, low-incidence disability, California’s population of students with a primary disability of autism...
has increased from fewer than 40,000 students to more than 100,000 students over the last 10 years (2006/07 to 2016/17).\textsuperscript{19} The total number of special education students in California has also increased during this same period, from 679,602 students to 754,277 students, while overall K–12 enrollment in the state has decreased.\textsuperscript{20}

Each student with a disability, as a regularly enrolled student, generates LCFF funding for a district and additionally generates funding for the district through the AB 602 formula, which distributes 80 percent of the state's special education funds. This formula, like the LCFF, is based on the total enrollment numbers of all students within each Special Education Local Planning Area (SELPAs); it is not based on the number of students with disabilities. A 2016 Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) report asserts that this current system for funding special education in California provides widely different rates of funding for local districts.\textsuperscript{21}

Special education spending in California public schools totals over $12 billion annually. The largest share (62 percent) of the funding comes from local school district sources. AB 602 state sources provide 29 percent of the funding, and the federal government provides 9 percent. According to PPIC's 2016 report, “The number of students with [individualized education plans] (IEPs) and their share of the school population began to increase in 2010 after many years of being relatively flat. At the same time, overall K–12 student attendance, which drives funding, did not rise. As a consequence, total state funding for students with special needs has fallen in both nominal and constant dollars.”\textsuperscript{22} This reduction in available dollars to support the needs of students with disabilities has further increased pressure on district budgets.

As one county leader reported to WestEd staff during an interview for this paper, the combination of declining enrollment and increasing special education costs has put enormous pressure on some districts: “Our declining enrollment takes down our special education revenue. And our special education costs are just soaring with autism and additional social, emotional-type needs. And so that’s kind of a big one that is different for every district, but they’re all experiencing larger encroachments because they’re not getting more money from the federal government. They’re not getting more money from the state government. So, it’s coming down to the local dollars and the unrestricted dollars too to fund more and more of that piece.” As this county leader suggests, special education costs exceed the funding provided by the state and federal governments, a circumstance also stated by other district budget leaders.

Another district leader interviewed for this paper expressed concern over the unpredictable nature of special education costs in his district. “In Special Ed the costs are so crazy, variable, and unpredictable.... You can wind up having a non-public school placement. We can have settlements, we can have kids that come in that are extremely expensive to educate and not get the funding back from the state.... In Special Ed, like within a week, we can wind up spending hundreds of thousands of dollars of money that we didn’t anticipate.... And that’s a challenge.” The unpredictable nature of special education costs was also cited by several other district budget leaders as one of the challenges in managing rising costs in their districts.

**Costs Associated with Recruiting, Retaining, and Training Teachers**

According to the Learning Policy Institute, 8 percent of all teachers in the United States, or approximately 200,000 teachers, leave the profession each year.\textsuperscript{23} Moreover, attrition rates are much higher than 8 percent for new teachers and for teachers in high-poverty schools and school districts.\textsuperscript{24}

Attrition in the teaching workforce comes at a high cost to school districts in California and nationally. At the national

---

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid. (This report also notes that California’s autism caseload increased 5.4 times between 2001/02 and 2013/14.)

\textsuperscript{20} https://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/

\textsuperscript{21} http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_1116LHR.pdf

\textsuperscript{22} http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_1116LHR.pdf (p. 7)

\textsuperscript{23} Estimates from the Learning Policy Institute’s September 2016 report suggest only around a third of teachers who exit the profession ever return. Also see http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/op/OP_601EBOP.pdf.
level, the cost of replacing teachers who leave the classroom is more than $8 billion annually. The cost to replace individual teachers ranges from $10,000 in rural and small suburban districts to $20,000 or more in urban districts. Some of these costs are driven by investments in professional development for the teachers who enter the district to fill positions that have been vacated. Another “cost” of the teacher shortage is in terms of an increase in the number of teachers who are entering the profession with waivers, permits, and intern credentials. In other words, they have not necessarily had full preparation to handle the challenges associated with teaching, which may also impact the quality of student learning.

Often, districts must resort to long-term substitute teachers in the scramble to fill all of the district’s vacancies. Many school districts across California are struggling to recruit and retain enough teachers to fill all of their vacancies, particularly in high-poverty, urban, and rural school districts. Teacher vacancies are also greater for science, mathematics, and special education.

These shortages have led to competition among some school districts to attract teachers through higher wages. Some school districts in which the shortages are the most acute have gone further to incentivize prospective teachers to come to the district. For example, the Natomas Unified School District has offered to cover most of the cost of teacher credential programs and provides free use of a MacBook and a bonus payment to teachers who live in the district. The district also provides $5,000 in signing bonuses to bilingual and minority teachers. The Natomas district projects a cost of over $800,000 for its three-year recruiting effort. Similarly, the Golden Plains Unified School District, a district of fewer than 2,000 students, offered a $3,000 signing bonus for all new teachers in 2016/17. This signing bonus was increased to $5,000 for new hires in 2017/18, with new bilingual teachers receiving a $7,300 bonus. Other districts offer to pay moving expenses for teachers coming into the district, or match the salaries of veteran teachers from the previous districts of the incoming teachers. These bonuses represent substantial investments by school districts that are already struggling to cover other costs.

Employee Health Care Costs

The costs of providing health care benefits for employees and for retirees have also increased, and many districts do not have the funds set aside to cover the growth in these costs. Nevertheless, nearly all school districts in California provide benefits to current employees (covering medical, dental, and optometric costs either in part or in full, depending on the district, at least until employees turn 65), and about two-thirds of the state’s school districts also provide health benefits to retired employees.

According to the LAO, districts are now spending about twice as much on retiree health benefits as they did in the early 2000s, and the LAO notes, “This added cost pressure comes at a time when districts are facing other pressures — most notably, rising pension costs and expectations to enhance services for low-income students and English learners.” Based on districts’ annual audit reports, the LAO calculated an unfunded liability for retiree health benefits alone of $24 billion statewide.

However, the same report from the LAO indicates that only a few large urban districts account for most of the unfunded liability. These districts have unfunded liabilities ranging from $3,800 up to $27,000 per pupil, while the average unfunded liability for all other districts in the state is approximately $1,500 per pupil. Yet, even $1,500 in additional funding per pupil represents a substantial cost for districts that currently receive about $10,657 per pupil on average in state funding.

WestEd’s analysis of the general sample of 25 districts reveals that between 2016/17 and 2017/18 alone, 10 of these school districts anticipate an increase of at least $0.5 million in their expenditures.
health-related expenditures, with 7 of these 10 anticipating the increase to exceed $1 million. In 2016/17, these districts ranged in enrollment from fewer than 3,000 students in one district to more than 53,000 students in another. Moreover, the average increase in spending on health-related expenses between 2016/17 and 2017/18 among the sample of 25 school districts is approximately $800,000, representing a 4-percent increase in just a single year.

### Aging Facilities

Another looming cost to California school districts is the cost to repair, replace, and modernize school facilities. Many districts have delayed costly repairs to school sites due to a lack of funding to support these efforts. A policy research paper by the Center for Cities and Schools at the University of California, Berkeley, identified an “ongoing, structural pattern of inadequate and inequitable spending in many school districts” on K–12 public school facilities in California. Consequently, more than half of the school districts in California continue to underspend on facilities each year, resulting in costly repairs and health and safety risks in some cases. The paper also identified that school districts serving higher numbers of low-income students “spent less on capital outlay per student and more on maintenance and operations per student than districts serving higher-income students…. This means school building operations cost more in these poorer districts, leaving fewer dollars for education programs.”

As the costs of aging facilities increase, districts are left with fewer dollars overall, creating further pressure on their already constrained budgets.

To meet industry standards for facilities, schools would need to spend on maintenance and improvements an amount each year that is equivalent to about 7 percent of what it would cost to replace each building, according to a 2016 report by the Center for Green Schools, the National Council on School Facilities, and the 21st Century School Fund. In California, such maintenance and improvement costs would translate into an additional $6.7 billion, or $1,083 per student, each year. Yet, California is not alone in the inadequacy of spending for facilities. The report ranks California’s spending — $806 per student on maintenance and operations in 2013 — as being “average” in a nation of what it calls “underspenders.”

A 2017 report from California’s Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) confirms the existence of a gap in funding for facilities — specifically, a gap between what is necessary to address the facilities needs of local school districts and what the state has proposed under a new bond measure passed by voters in 2016. According to the report, the governor’s $655-million bond proposal “would clear the $370 million in already approved school projects awaiting funding (but) only $285 million would be available to address the remaining $2 billion in projects on the acknowledged list.” The LAO has raised concerns about funding for facilities in California previously as well. In 2015, the LAO wrote the following:

> Many groups over the years have raised serious concerns with the state’s current school facilities program. Notably, the existing program fails to treat school facility costs as an ongoing expense despite the recurring nature of facility needs, allows disparities based on school district property wealth, fails to target funding according to greatest need, results in excessive administrative complexity, and lacks adequate accountability mechanisms.

To raise additional dollars for school facilities, districts can go to their local voters for approval of general obligation bonds. However, voter willingness to approve such bonds varies by city and region, and this willingness is not necessarily in accordance with school district need. According to an Ed-Data analysis of local school facilities funding, “With notable exceptions, large urban districts or districts with relatively few businesses and high concentrations of lower-income families have more difficulty generating support for schools. This circumstance results in inequities that are outside the
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scope of the Serrano v. Priest guidelines for more nearly equal treatment of taxpayers and of students.34

The district chief business officers (CBOs) who were interviewed for this report detailed the difficulty of keeping up with the rising cost of facilities. One CBO focused specifically on the challenge of raising revenue locally through general obligation bonds to cover the gap between local needs and state funding for facilities. Giving an example, the CBO noted the difficulty of covering the costs associated with aging facilities as well as the rising costs of basic utilities such as water and electricity. “Although we may be getting an increase with the Local Control Funding Formula, $4 million of our new money is already spoken for… That doesn’t even include utilities and facility needs… It’s just a real challenge that our base funding is not adequate to cover all of our needs.” Similarly, another CBO talked about the need to maintain and modernize aging facilities through a $10-million project in a district with an annual budget of $100 million. To fund the project, the district plans to ask the community to pass a new bond measure while the district is still paying off an earlier bond. The CBO recognized that getting support for the new bond would be difficult. “It’s going to be a tough sell… Our high school, our infrastructure system is like 50 years old. It was built back in 1967, I believe. And we still have the old infrastructure… So that, right now, what we’re doing is that project, regardless if we have a bond or not, we have to fix it.” From the experience of these CBOs, there simply is not enough state funding or local borrowing capacity to keep up with the demands of maintaining or replacing their district facilities.

**Declining Enrollment**

Under the LCFF, funding for school districts in California is directly tied to enrollment as measured by average daily attendance (ADA). Over the last 20 years, California has had a relatively flat level of student enrollment, and the Department of Finance projects a decline of 181,000 students over the next decade. While the overall enrollment is declining in the majority of California school districts, there are some areas with more significant declines in student enrollment. The Department of Finance projects that enrollment will decline in 28 of 58 counties by 2026/27, including 18 counties that will lose 5 percent or more of their enrollment. Ventura and Santa Cruz Counties are each projected to lose over 10 percent of their K-12 enrollment by 2026/27. In the same time period, Orange County and Sonoma County are each projected to lose over 14,000 students, while Los Angeles County is projected to lose nearly 120,000 students.35

Enrollment has declined since 2014/15 in 11 of the 25 districts in the general sample analyzed for this report (Table 2). Although reductions in the actual number of students were not particularly substantial, the decline in enrollment still represents a loss of spending power and economy of scale for these districts. With state funding at approximately $10,657 per pupil, a reduction of even 55 students equates to a loss of over half a million dollars for a district. Yet, declines in enrollment are not uniform across districts. Accordingly, school districts may benefit from tools to accurately project student enrollment changes, as well as a flexible state policy environment so that district leaders can anticipate changes in funding and adjust classroom, staffing, and budgeting allocations accordingly.

---

35 http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Projections/Public_K-12_Graded_Enrollment/
Table 2. Changing enrollment in sample districts, 2014/15 to 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>Enrollment Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 21</td>
<td>9,277</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>8,782</td>
<td>-495</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>10,921</td>
<td>10,632</td>
<td>10,362</td>
<td>-559</td>
<td>-5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 19</td>
<td>16,935</td>
<td>16,702</td>
<td>16,426</td>
<td>-509</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 24</td>
<td>14,996</td>
<td>14,736</td>
<td>14,554</td>
<td>-442</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>32,938</td>
<td>32,454</td>
<td>32,004</td>
<td>-934</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 11</td>
<td>23,947</td>
<td>23,885</td>
<td>23,696</td>
<td>-251</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 10</td>
<td>22,258</td>
<td>22,205</td>
<td>22,039</td>
<td>-219</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 13</td>
<td>53,365</td>
<td>53,303</td>
<td>53,152</td>
<td>-213</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 12</td>
<td>28,999</td>
<td>28,719</td>
<td>28,958</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 16</td>
<td>9,914</td>
<td>9,948</td>
<td>9,904</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>14,768</td>
<td>14,754</td>
<td>14,778</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 6</td>
<td>62,888</td>
<td>62,767</td>
<td>63,061</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 9</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 23</td>
<td>42,339</td>
<td>42,462</td>
<td>42,769</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 17</td>
<td>15,584</td>
<td>15,717</td>
<td>15,772</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 18</td>
<td>3,353</td>
<td>3,424</td>
<td>3,397</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 15</td>
<td>31,954</td>
<td>32,255</td>
<td>32,425</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 20</td>
<td>20,415</td>
<td>20,530</td>
<td>20,779</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>11,259</td>
<td>11,374</td>
<td>11,547</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 14</td>
<td>6,349</td>
<td>6,511</td>
<td>6,579</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 8</td>
<td>37,318</td>
<td>38,070</td>
<td>38,705</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 22</td>
<td>6,555</td>
<td>6,714</td>
<td>6,814</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 7</td>
<td>11,204</td>
<td>11,438</td>
<td>11,722</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 25</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample District Totals</td>
<td>493,936</td>
<td>494,001</td>
<td>494,799</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Totals</td>
<td>6,235,520</td>
<td>6,226,737</td>
<td>6,228,235</td>
<td>-7,285</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/
A decline in enrollment can also mean that districts do not require as much funding to meet current student needs. For example, the district may not need to hire as many teachers, counselors, or staff. Yet, reductions in funding in response to declines in student enrollment are complicated by several factors. First, when district enrollment declines, the district’s fixed costs (e.g., heating, lighting, maintenance) then consume a larger share of the budget and districts do not generally see declines in demands for specialized programs such as special education and English learner supports (see the Increasing Special Education Costs section for additional detail). In addition, certain adjustments can be difficult to scale to the reduction in the number of students. For example, a reduction of 6 students per grade level may not be enough to allow for reducing the number of teachers. If the district loses 30 students in a single grade level, however, staffing reductions — and therefore cost savings — may be more straightforward for the district.

In addition to experiencing declining enrollment caused by shifts in the number of school-age children, many California school districts have experienced enrollment declines as students exit the traditional public school system for charter schools. The number of charter schools has increased each year, as has the number of students enrolled in charter schools. Currently, there are over 1,200 charter schools in California, with approximately 630,000 enrolled students. Charter school enrollment now represents nearly 10 percent of the state’s overall student enrollment. Furthermore, charter schools are expected to continue to increase enrollment by nearly 30,000 students in California in 2017/18.

Increased enrollment in charter schools in California contributes to reductions in school district budgets. When students leave their district to attend a local charter school, state funding follows them out of the district. With the state’s per-pupil funding at approximately $10,657 per student, a loss of enrollment of 30,000 students equates to a loss of nearly $320 million in funding for California’s school districts.

36 [http://www.ccsa.org/understanding/numbers/](http://www.ccsa.org/understanding/numbers/)
IMPLICATIONS OF THE SILENT RECESSION

The fiscal challenges outlined in this paper are a clear sign that many California school districts face a tough road ahead with wide-ranging implications for students, community, staff, and district leadership. Moreover, several of the fiscal challenges outlined in this paper tend to have a disproportionately negative impact on high-poverty districts with larger concentrations of at-risk student groups. These costs, therefore, have the potential to exacerbate inequities in funding at the same time that the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) is designed to make funding more equitable.

Importantly, the current budget challenges faced by a number of California school districts cannot be wholly explained by external pressures and rising costs. Rather, some districts have put off difficult budget choices (such as spending on school facilities) and have struggled to communicate the implications of budget and collective bargaining decisions to the community and other key stakeholders. Furthermore, in some districts, decisions about the budget have been complicated by the decisions of local school board members who have failed to heed the advice of chief business officers (CBOs) and other district leadership about the need for fiscal constraint. Other school districts have faced their budget challenges directly, suggesting the need to reduce this variation across districts and move more consistently toward better decision-making across all of California’s school districts.

Outlining these fiscal challenges and the variety of responses to them, as well as raising awareness about these challenges, are critical to helping decision-makers and the public understand the ways in which districts, with increasing constraints on their budgets, will likely be pushed to conduct business differently in the future. Laying out the challenges ahead may also help to highlight where districts can plan for growing costs that are outside of the districts’ control. For example, many commentators have noted that pension costs, which are largely outside of the control of district leaders, will likely reduce investments in current employees and programs, effectively crowding out other investments.\(^{38}\)

Tradeoffs

Such crowding out means that school districts may be forced to make tradeoffs as they balance competing costs and adjust to constrained revenues. District leaders will need to consider how to make spending (and cutting) decisions, while keeping their goals for student success at the center of their decision-making process. Yet, district leaders must also contend with having limited control over some of the rising costs. Figure 3 is a conceptual framework for exploring the level of control that districts have over these encroaching costs and their relative impact on district budgets. The framework is intended to represent the range of controls and costs among districts, since district costs and — in some cases — level of control are impacted by local factors. For example, enrollment remains steady in some districts in California, while other districts are disproportionately impacted by declines in enrollment and the resulting reductions in state funding provided to these districts.

The framework is also intended to help district superintendents, CBOs, and policymakers pinpoint where districts may need additional support from the state in order to make changes, and where they have greater control over district expenditures. For example, districts have little control over costs such as their rising contributions to pension funds, which have a large impact on district budgets. However, districts may have more control over facilities costs, where planned investments in maintenance may reduce potentially larger expenditures in the future.

The second paper in this series, in development for publication in 2018, focuses on budget strategies and addresses those strategies that fall into the upper-left circle in the framework shown in Figure 3. These are strategies over which districts have greater local control and which have the potential to make a substantial impact on district budgets.

Since employee salaries and benefits represent such a large share of district budgets (approximately 82 percent in California in 2015/16), the tradeoffs that districts make will almost certainly include decisions about how much to invest in salaries and benefits for employees. The tradeoff between investing in employee costs versus other costs has implications for each district’s ability to compete with other, better-resourced districts and with other industries to attract quality staff. It also will likely impact whether districts are able to provide livable wages for employees, allowing them to live in the communities in which they teach. General Fund expenditures on employees have continued to climb over the years, driving up total expenditures in districts across the state (Figure 4).

39  http://www.ed-data.org/
40  According to the California School Boards Association, “The General Fund includes both a restricted and unrestricted portion. We often refer to the General Fund unrestricted as the ‘fund of last resort’ because it is where most of the district’s discretionary dollars reside. The majority of all salaries and benefits, on average approximately 84% of the district's expenditures, reside in the General Fund.” (http://csba.org/TrainingAndEvents/~media/CSBA/Files/TrainingAndEvents/AllEvents/MastersInGovernance/Course3_FIN/2014_07_SchoolFinanceTerms.ashx)
The crowding out caused by increasing employee-related costs and other expenses will also impact the types of programs and services that districts are able to provide. With fewer General Fund dollars available, districts may have to reduce some of the resources offered to children and families. These decisions must be made in light of the LCFF’s requirement to use supplemental and concentration funds to “increase or improve” services for targeted student groups, and may be influenced by pressure from advocacy groups to ensure that these funds reach the students they are intended to serve, as well as being driven by education leaders’ desire to close achievement gaps.41

**Deficit Spending**

WestEd’s analysis also indicates that the current fiscal pressures have pushed many school districts into deficit spending. Specifically, for all of the 55 districts selected for this paper’s analyses, WestEd determined the net increase or decrease in each district’s unrestricted funds, according to the districts’ multiyear projections (MYPs).42 The MYPs for all but three of the districts in this sample indicate that the districts’ unrestricted expenditures will exceed revenues in at least one of the three years following the current budget year, and more than half of the school districts in the sample anticipate that expenditures will exceed revenues in all of the next three years (Figure 5).43 Table A3 has additional details.
on the net increase or decrease in unrestricted funds for the sample districts.

Figure 5. Sample districts’ expectations for future expenditures and revenues

A majority of 55 sample districts do not expect revenues to cover expenditures over the period of 2017/18 to 2019/20.

WestEd also analyzed MYPs for a sample consisting of 15 Basic Aid school districts, a type of district that tends to have high revenues. Thirteen of the districts in the Basic Aid sample anticipate that their expenditures will exceed revenues in at least one of the next three years, and two-thirds of these districts project that their expenditures will exceed revenues in all of the next three years.

These analyses indicate that even among districts that are benefitting most from the state’s new funding formula and among districts that might be considered better off financially due to their property tax base, most of these districts expect that their expenditures will outpace revenues. At the same time, most of these districts also project healthy ending fund balances, with only one district projecting a negative fund balance in 2019/20.

WestEd’s analyses also indicate that deficit spending is projected despite the fact that many school districts plan to make substantial reductions in expenditures over the next three years. In addition, districts have several strategies at their disposal in the short term to deal with revenue shortfalls, including using short-term Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANs) and borrowing funds from other funding sources or from their reserves. However, these strategies do not address more serious structural deficits, with expenditures continuing to exceed revenues even during more favorable economic times.

Source: Authors’ analysis of multiyear budget projections from sample districts

Since the LCFF provides additional funding to districts that have a high proportion of students from targeted student populations (also known as unduplicated student counts, as noted earlier), WestEd analyzed the net increase or decrease in unrestricted funds in the MYPs for a sample of 15 districts that were selected for having among the highest proportions of targeted students (ranging from 74 percent to 98 percent of the total number of students in these districts).

Ten of these 15 districts project that their unrestricted expenditures will exceed their revenues in at least one of the three years following the current budget year, and 6 of these districts anticipate that their revenues will exceed expenditures in all of the next three years.

44 Based on data from http://ias.cde.ca.gov/lcffsnapshot/lcff.aspx as of February 22, 2018
45 A school district is considered Basic Aid if local property tax revenues exceed the amount that the district would receive under California’s education funding formula.
LOOKING AHEAD: STRATEGIES

To extend the topics covered in this paper, WestEd is conducting interviews with chief business officers (CBOs) and other district leaders from across the state. The purpose of these interviews is to gather information on the strategies that CBOs are using to mitigate the Silent Recession and preserve quality educational programs for students. As one state education leader observed, it is the ability and willingness of districts to make difficult decisions that "will impact the opportunities and outcomes for students as much external cost pressures." Findings from these interviews will be included in a second paper that is in development for publication in 2018.

WestEd will explore these strategies in light of the goals of the Smarter School Spending project. The project’s goals — stronger alignment between fiscal services and programs, improved planning and decision-making, and prioritizing investments that provide the greatest benefit for students — provide a critical lens through which to view the strategies outlined by CBOs and the potential impact on district budgeting, operations, programs, and ultimately, students. WestEd researchers anticipate that the strategies suggested by CBOs will fall into several broad categories that correspond to the goals of the Smarter School Spending project and that include increasing effectiveness (which requires stronger alignment between fiscal services and programs) and prioritizing investments that provide the greatest benefit for students and increase efficiency (which requires improved planning and decision-making). The following paragraphs describe these strategies in broad terms.

Increase Effectiveness

In times of fiscal constraint — when districts have to make more difficult choices about where to invest limited dollars — measuring the return on investment (ROI) provides district leaders with information on how to direct resources to investments with the highest returns. As part of this work, district leaders may need to continue eliminating silos that separate the budget office and program offices to ensure collection of the right data to measure ROI, as well as continuing to ensure appropriate monitoring and response to the data.

Increase Efficiency

Times of fiscal constraint also require that districts find ways to increase efficiencies within their systems, stretching available dollars so that they have the greatest impact. While the analyses conducted for this paper indicate that districts are relying on strategies such as deficit spending, interviews have revealed numerous other strategies that districts have also begun to employ to more efficiently use resources. These strategies include a focus on marketing the district to the community to increase enrollment, as well as closer budget monitoring, particularly as it relates to staffing and eliminating unfilled positions that do not support core classroom functions.

COMMUNITY UPDATE FROM THE BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

January 16, 2018

A series of economic and fiscal conditions and factors are putting pressures on school district budgets across the State of California. One of these is the fact that there have been several years in which state education funding has not kept pace with expenses. Furthermore, the mandate for funding state employee pensions has risen significantly (an estimated $1.3 million annual increase for Berkeley each year through 2020–21), and school districts have needed to address employee compensation after several lean years during the Great Recession (2007–12).

Serve High-Need Students

Another set of strategies aims to address the supports and opportunities provided to high-need students such as those from low-income backgrounds, English learners, foster youth, and/or those with disabilities. Consideration of how resources are used to direct supports to these student populations is vital. It is also important that school districts are
clear about the use of both base, supplemental, and concentration funds as a way to meet the needs of targeted student groups, as well as the needs of the entire student population. These strategies may include investments in programs and supports from a school district’s base and supplemental/concentration resources as well as strategically including state and federal resources to target support to lower-performing student groups.

Respond to Change

Another component of both increasing efficiency and effectiveness within school districts is the ability to respond to change. Yet, for a variety of reasons, school districts have not always been quick to respond to shifts in the demographics of schooling or reductions in available funding. For example, school districts are subject to collective bargaining rules that may make it difficult to make expedient changes in staffing during periods of declining enrollment. In addition, reductions in enrollment may necessitate school mergers or even the sale of school district property, both of which can take considerable time and may be politically difficult as well as painful for the community. Consequently, school districts tend not to be particularly nimble when it comes to fluctuations in funding due to enrollment.

Use Data and Communication as Tools

There are several core underpinnings to many of the efforts that districts undertake to address budget challenges, including a strong focus on data collection and monitoring (both program and budget), and on continuous improvement, or measuring program effectiveness and making adjustments as needed. In addition, districts might benefit from focusing more on communication with the public and with existing teachers and staff about the districts’ need to make difficult tradeoffs. Collective bargaining can be a contentious process in many districts, even during healthier budget periods. School districts will likely need to continue to communicate with the public and with employees about current budget challenges and about the implications for collective bargaining with teachers and other school site staff. (See the Community Update from the Berkeley Unified School District sidebar as an example.) This communication can require a greater degree of transparency surrounding the budget, something that policymakers intended the Local Control and Accountability Plan to provide for the public, but has not been wholly achieved. Moreover, it often requires district leaders to be willing to make difficult choices, to be clear about the rationale for their decisions with staff and with the public, and to ensure that fiscal stewardship is prioritized in the district before the district is in fiscal crisis.

Communication with the public about the pension liability is likely to be particularly important for many districts. Pension costs are different from typical district spending because paying for pensions supports instruction only indirectly. Furthermore, pension plans are often complex, involving varying levels of member contributions, difficult-to-understand investment earnings and forecasts, and differing accounting and disclosure practices. Calculating pension expenses and assets is mathematically complex and involves a set of predictions regarding employee turnover and mortality, length of employee service, the frequency of early retirement, and future salary and compensation levels, as well as predictions about the future health of the economy. Yet, messages about the pension liability are increasingly highlighted in the news and in district budget conversations. Therefore, despite the complexity of communicating with the public about employee pensions, it will likely become increasingly important for district leaders to intentionally bring the public into these conversations and build understanding about the importance of pension costs to district finances.

46 https://www.crpe.org/sites/default/files/crpe-better-together.pdf
A PATH FORWARD

As this paper indicates, increases in funding under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) were based on a commitment to returning school districts to pre-recession funding levels (2007/08), adjusted for inflation. The funding formula also provides some growth in revenue each year. And this accomplishment should be acknowledged and celebrated as California’s continued commitment to the importance and power of public education for the state’s future growth. However, this growth in revenues is not based on actual growth in the costs of operating a school or school district. This paper outlines how these growing costs and the associated growth in expenses required to simply maintain operations are placing increasing financial pressure on school districts — the effects of what can be called the Silent Recession.

At the same time, Governor Brown’s January 2018 budget, which includes a proposal to fully fund the LCFF more quickly than previously planned, has the potential to provide some degree of relief for school districts as they face the looming budget crisis created by the rising costs outlined in this paper. Governor Brown’s proposal also includes $55 million for county offices of education to assist local school districts identified for assistance under the state’s new accountability system (known as the “system of support”). This infusion of funding to county offices of education may also increase their ability to provide fiscal support to local districts. In addition, the magnitude of the education system’s pension liability problem has led to three legal cases that are headed to the California Supreme Court to challenge current pension reform law.

Yet, regardless of the outcome of the new budget or pending litigation, the Silent Recession will continue to constrain district budgets into the foreseeable future. Therefore, school district leaders must continue to engage in discussions internally and externally about how to most effectively and efficiently leverage their resources in order to realize their goals for improving student outcomes. The Silent Recession is likely to demand new strategies in order for school districts to be able to continue working toward creating the type of education system that all children deserve.
APPENDIX

Methodology
The development of this paper grew out of discussions among California school district and county budget and education services leaders, representing three school districts and two county offices of education, who were involved in WestEd’s Smarter School Spending Community of Practice (CoP) from February 2016 to June 2018, which was funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. WestEd researchers began developing this paper by conducting a review of news articles outlining the fiscal pressures facing California school districts in August 2017. Next, researchers facilitated a more formal discussion among CoP members about the current budget challenges in their districts and counties. Following this discussion, WestEd researchers invited each of the members of the CoP to participate in a 45- to 60-minute interview about the most pressing budget challenges they were facing and the strategies they were employing to mitigate some of these rising costs. All members of the CoP participated in the interviews with the exception of one district, which opted instead to send in written responses to interview questions.

WestEd staff decided to expand the interview pool to include an additional group of chief business officers (CBOs) to gather greater insight into the most pressing issues facing school districts and to better understand the types of strategies that districts are employing to navigate these increased costs. Many of the CBOs were selected based on having worked with WestEd in the past and being considered by WestEd staff to take a reflective and strategic approach to budgeting. Other CBOs were selected in order to ensure that the sample of interviewees represented the full range of sizes, types, and regions of California school districts. WestEd sent invitations to 25 school districts and 3 county offices of education to participate in an interview. In response, budget and education leaders from a total of 17 school districts and 3 county offices of education, including CoP members, were interviewed for this paper. Most interviews were conducted with a single interviewee, but some were done in a small-group format with 2–4 interviewees.

For all of the districts that were invited to participate in the interviews — 25 districts total — WestEd staff analyzed the multiyear projections (MYPs) and annual budgets from June 2017. These budget documents are publicly available through the districts’ board meeting notes or the districts’ websites. Financial data available for the state through Ed-data.org was also used to supplement the analyses of district budgets. Specifically, it was used to determine increases in employee costs over time.

Because two particular types of districts — those with a high percentage of students from targeted student groups (high unduplicated student counts) and Basic Aid districts — tend to have higher revenues than other districts, WestEd researchers conducted an additional review of a sample of districts in each of these two categories. For districts with high unduplicated student counts, WestEd staff randomly selected 15 districts that had at least 70 percent of their student population consisting of students from targeted student populations (English learner students, low-income students, and foster youth). In the randomly selected sample of 15 such districts, the unduplicated student counts ranged from being 74 to 98 percent of total district enrollment. WestEd staff also randomly selected 15 districts from among those designated as Basic Aid districts, meaning that each district’s local property tax revenues exceed the amount that the district would receive from the state under California’s education funding formula. WestEd was not able to find the MYPs for all of the districts that were randomly selected for these samples in an initial round of selection, so WestEd staff randomly selected from the list again until enough districts with publicly available MYPs were selected.

Tables A1, A2, and A3 provide more details about the sample districts that were analyzed for this paper.

Limitations
Although the samples were selected to be representative, they might not fully represent all districts in California or in other states, particularly because the CBOs who were interviewed...
were selected intentionally for their perceived approach to budgeting. Moreover, the sample of districts used to inform this paper is relatively small (California has nearly a thousand school districts in all), and school district revenues and expenditures vary considerably from district to district based on many factors.

Table A1. Breakdown of sample by district size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016/17 Enrollment</th>
<th># of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–5,000</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000–10,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000–15,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000–35,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000+</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/

Table A2. Increasing cost of CalSTRS and CalPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CalSTRS/CalPERS Unrestricted General Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalSTRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Multiyear budget projections from sample districts
Table A3. Net increase/decrease in fund balances for unrestricted funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of districts</th>
<th>% of districts that project to deficit spend in all 3 years</th>
<th>% of districts that project to deficit spend in 2 of next 3 years</th>
<th>% of districts that project to deficit spend in 1 of next 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Districts in the general sample</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts with high unduplicated student counts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Aid districts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ analysis of sample districts’ multiyear projections
AGENDA ITEM #: 14.2

SUBJECT:
LCAP Mid-Year Report – Discussion

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
The Board of Trustees approved the 2019-2020 LCAP on June 26, 2019. Since then, many actions and services have been implemented. This report will serve as an update on the status of the 2019-2020 LCAP goals, actions, and services.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:
None

RECOMMENDATION:
Superintendent Slavensky recommends the Board of Trustees listen to the report and have discussion.

PRESENTED BY:
Sean Snider, Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services
Agenda

1. Strategic Plan & LCAP Alignment
2. LCAP Actions/Services Accomplished & Ongoing
3. LCAP Actions /Services Under Consideration
4. LCAP Metrics
5. Next Steps: 2020 LCAP Stakeholder Engagement Process
6. Questions & Discussion
Goal 1

By 2020, all students will advance along multiple academic measures toward meeting/exceeding standards in order to close achievement gaps and accelerate progress, including increasing the number of students successfully completing college preparatory and career technical education (vocational) courses by 100%.

Goal 1

Action 1: Continue robust, standards-aligned professional development, for TK-12 teachers and staff, through subject-level cohorts, staff meeting professional development, principal coaching, instructional coaches, instructional leadership team, and high-poverty/high-achieving school visits.

Items Accomplished & Ongoing:
- Teacher on Special Assignment (Secondary)
- Teacher on Special Assignment (Elementary)
- Cohort Professional Development (Limited)
- Staff Meeting Professional Development
- Principal Coaching
- Instructional Leadership Team
- Professional Learning Communities
- Instructional Coaches
- Teacher Induction
- New Employee Orientation / Professional Development

Goal 1

Action 2
Provide increased and targeted English learner support in schools with a significant unduplicated English learner population.

Items Accomplished & Ongoing:
- EL Aide Continuing Services (3)
- English Learner Home/School Liaison
- ELD Supplemental Materials
- EL Aide Additional Hours
- 1 FTE High School Guidance Counselor for E.L. Support
- 1 FTE Elementary Principal for E.L. Support
Goal 1

Action 3
Develop, implement and monitor multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) at every school including differentiated instruction, tiered interventions and progress monitoring to improve social/emotional learning, behavioral health, and academic progress for all students including low income students, foster youth, English learners, expelled pupils, and students with special needs.

Items Accomplished & Ongoing:
- MTSS Cohort (Principals / VPs)
- MTSS / Differentiated Instruction
- Professional Development
- Data Systems/Cycles
- Illuminate
- Intervention Teachers
- MTSS Intervention Supports (Benchmark Steps to Advance, iReady, Fountas and Pinell)
- Secondary Math Intervention
- Summer School Secondary
- TK / K Aides
- Psychologists- Student Testing
- Elementary Principals (.5 FTE of 2 positions for district MTSS support)
- LCFF Supplemental Site Allocations for Site-Specific MTSS Support

Goal 1

Action 4
Implement and support continuous improvement cycles and equitable access to rigorous courses through CCSS aligned instruction and schoolwide, classroom-based data inquiry cycles.

Items Accomplished & Ongoing:
- Instructional Leadership Training
- Principal Coaching
- Teacher Professional Development
- Data System / Cycles
- Illuminate
- Naviance College/Career Readiness Technology Solution
- Edgenuity Online Blended Learning (Core & Credit Recovery)
- Technology Chromebook Refresh
- History Social Science Textbook Adoption Part 1- Secondary
Goal 2
By 2020, through multiple measures, all students will show an increase in positive school engagement and connectedness with staff, peers, and community, including demonstrating improvement in social/emotional and physical health.


Goal 2 Action 1
Create, implement and support a college-going and career culture on every school campus.

Items Accomplished & Ongoing:
• Elementary Social-Emotional Curriculum (Junior High and High School too)
• AVID Maintain (7th and 8th Grade)
• WEB/Link Crew (All Secondary)
• CTE Courses A-G Compliant (4)
• High School Graduation Requirements Planning & Implementation Year 3
• AVID Expansion to 9th Grade
• Turnitin Program for all High School Students (Proper Citing of Sources and avoiding Plagiarism)
Goal 2

Action 2

Increase home/school communication, outreach and parent/guardian engagement and education for/with parents of low income students, foster youth, English learners, and students with special needs.

Items Accomplished & Ongoing:

- Family Nights/Activities (Schools)
- Family Resource Centers (Schools)
- School Site Councils (Schools)
- Parent Teacher Organizations (Schools)
- Amador Parent Advisory Committee (District)
- Aeries Parent Portal
- LCAP Surveys
- Community Advisory Committee (CAC) for Families of Students with IEPs

Goal 2

Action 3

Further develop and strengthen welcoming, resourceful, safe and inclusive school climates at every school campus.

Items Accomplished & Ongoing:

- Counselors
- Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)
- Mindfulness (Elementary)
- Restorative Justice
- District Professional Development
- Safe and Civil Schools (Secondary)
- Associated Student Body (Secondary)
- Student Leadership
- Trauma Informed Practices
- Arts Education (Secondary Site Allocations)
- Junior High Instructional Administrators (2)
- Student Board Members
Goal 2

Action 3 (CONTINUED)
Further develop and strengthen welcoming, resourceful, safe and inclusive school climates at every school campus.

Items Accomplished & Ongoing:
- Music / Band Techer
- Arts Education (Elementary and Junior High Site Allocations)
- Support for Home to School Transportation

Goal 2

Action 4
Further coordinate services and refine systems and supports for foster youth by implementing a program plan that addresses working with the county child welfare agency, providing education-related information to the county child welfare agency, responding to requests from the juvenile court for information, and establishing a mechanism for the efficient transfer of health and education records.

Items Accomplished & Ongoing:
- Best, first instruction
- MTSS Intervention Supports
- Counselor support/case management
- MOU with Child Welfare Services
- Partnership/communication with Juvenile Court
- Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports (PBIS)
- District Professional Development
- Coordinated Services through Executive Advisory Council consisting of many community/county agencies
- Foster Youth Support Materials
- Trauma Informed Practices Professional Development
Goals 1 & 2

Items Under Consideration
- High achieving / high poverty school visitations
- Classified Professional Development
- Summer School Elementary
- Amador Community University
- Strategic Plan Stakeholder Team

LCAP Metrics

Examples of Work In Progress
- CA Healthy Kids Survey, Grades 5, 7, 9, 11
- CA School Dashboard
- Local Indicators
- CAASPP Interim Assessment Blocks, Grades 3-8, 11
- ILT/ Assessment Committee for Assessment Development in ELA and Math, Grades TK-6
Next Steps: 2020-21 LCAP Stakeholder Engagement Process

January – February 2020:

- Meetings with all ACUSD/ACOE, school staff & parent/community groups
- Presentation, data, and survey posted on the District website. All stakeholders complete survey.
- Feedback (survey) due by March 13, 2020

LCAP Stakeholder Engagement

March – May 2020:

- LCAP Advisory Committee reviews survey results and how they compare to 2019-2020 goals and priorities.
- Using data and the survey feedback, the LCAP Advisory Committee makes recommendations and drafts the new three year LCAP (2020-23) by June 1, 2020.
LCAP Stakeholder Engagement

**June 2020:**

- First reading of Draft LCAP – Board of Trustees, June 10, 2020
- Draft LCAP posted to the District website – June 13, 2020
- Public comment period – June 13 – June 24, 2020
- Second reading/approval of LCAP – Board of Trustees, June 24, 2020

Questions & Discussion
FEBRUARY 26, 2020

AGENDA ITEM #: 14.3

SUBJECT:
Local School and Wellness Update – Discussion

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
A Wellness Committee was established in October, 2018 to accomplish the work of updating the Local School Wellness Policy. Local School Wellness Policies are an important tool for parents and school districts in promoting student wellness, preventing and reducing childhood obesity, and providing assurance that school meal nutrition guidelines meet the minimum federal school meal standards.

The Wellness Committee was comprised of a broad representation of stakeholders, including parents/guardians, Nutrition Services staff, Governing Board members, school administrators, teaching staff members, physical education teachers, school health professionals, and representatives from several community agencies.

This report will serve to update the Board and community on the progress and work around student and employee wellness in Amador County Unified School District.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:
None

RECOMMENDATION:
Superintendent Slavensky recommends the Board hear the local school and wellness update and have discussion.

PRESENTED BY:
Sean Snider, Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services
Agenda

- Nutrition Education and Wellness
- Physical Activity and Wellness
- Social Emotional Wellness
- Positive School Climate
- Next Steps
- Questions and Discussion
Nutrition education and wellness

Partnership with UC CalFresh

- Harvest of the Month tastings
- Reinvigorating Garden at Jackson Elementary
- Teens as Teachers Program with Independence High
- Healthy Environment in Cafeterias with Posters
- P.E. and Nutrition Newsletter
- Nutrition and P.E. Classes
- Summer Meal Program
- Free meals for all students at qualifying schools

Nutrition education and wellness (Continued)

- Cooking in the Classroom
- Plate Waste Study at Plymouth Elementary
- Some teachers Implementing “Up4It” Curriculum (focused on all areas of health including social-emotional)
Nutrition education and wellness

Partnership with Dairy Council of California

- Smarter Lunchroom Training for all Food Service Staff
- Implementing Smarter Lunchrooms Movement
- Distributing free Nutrition Education Curriculum
- Highlighted ACUSD Wellness Policy at 2019 State of California SNAP-ED Local Implementing Agency Forum

Nutrition education and wellness

- Recess before lunch where possible (4 of 6 elementary schools)
- School gardens at 4 of 6 elementary schools
- Healthy Living elective at North Star and Jackson Junior High School with one full unit on nutrition
- Alternative assignments in PE for non-participating students with a focus on nutrition
- Culinary classes at high schools
Physical Activity and wellness

- All students receiving required physical education minutes
- UC CalFresh Combined Nutrition and P.E. Classes
- Recess before lunch
- Mileage Club
- Walk laps before school starts (“Wake up our brain”)
- Daily PE

Physical Activity and wellness

- “Walking Wednesday”
- All students enrolled in PE
- Recess twice per day at Ione Junior High (IJHS)- no phones
- Outdoor lunch / free time for IJHS
- PE electives at North Star and IJHS
- Dance and PE instructors provide movement opportunities in addition to classroom teachers’ lessons
- Grade level rotations / variation in PE courses
Social emotional wellness

- 5 School Counselors
  - Classroom presentations
  - Small group lessons
  - 1:1 counseling
- Sanford Harmony curriculum at some sites
- Second Step curriculum at some sites
- High schools piloting social emotional wellness courses in Edgenuity

Social emotional wellness

- Mindfulness activities in many elementary classrooms
- “Brain breaks” in elementary classrooms
- Aspire student assistance program (new this year)
- Social emotional component to health class
- Positive behavior interventions and supports
- Restorative justice / alternative discipline strategies
Social emotional wellness

- Trauma Informed Practices / Youth Mental Health First Aid
- Participation in Amador County Behavioral Health Advisory Board (ACBHAB)
- Resilient Amador- Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACES) Committee
- Amador County Behavioral Health clinicians in select school sites
- Nexus Youth and Family Services providing support to sites

Social emotional wellness

Monthly “School Based Mental Health Early Intervention Strategies” Meetings

- School referral flow-chart and forms
- List of Local providers
- Universal screening tools being reviewed
- Preparing grant application
Positive School Climate

- Kindness clubs at elementary level
- Focus on teacher-student relationships
- Awards assemblies for recognition of accomplishments
- Peep squad
- WEB lessons in tutorial
- “Pawsitivity” Fridays, tickets for positive behavior
- ASB spirit days / dances
- School orientation / pictures for North Star/Independence

Next Steps

- Reconvene Wellness Committee
- Nutrition education curriculum taught in all grade levels
- Behavioral health wellness event (Spring)
- Assessment of plan in three years
- Consider adding social media wellness section to plan
- Create implementation priorities and implementation plan for 2020-2021
Questions / Discussion
AGENDA ITEM #: 14.4

SUBJECT: California School Board Association (CSBA) Recommended Board Policy Updates – Discussion/Action

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
CSBA provides multiple policy update packets each fiscal year. The policies presented for updating at this time are in the area of Educational Services. The descriptions summarize the changes made to each policy. It is recommended that districts review the materials and modify their policies accordingly.

BP 0460 - Local Control and Accountability Plan (BP revised)
Policy updated to delete the section on "Technical Assistance/Intervention," as that material is now addressed in BP 0520 - Intervention for Underperforming Schools. Paragraph added to generally address actions that may be taken whenever a school or a numerically significant student subgroup is not making sufficient progress toward the goals in the local control and accountability plan (LCAP). Regulation updated to reflect NEW LAW (AB 1240) which adds, as a measure of student achievement, the percentage of students who have successfully completed both college entrance courses and career technical education courses.

BP 4119.22 - Dress and Grooming (BP revised)
Policy updated to reflect NEW LAW (SB 188) which prohibits discrimination against traits historically associated with race, including hair texture and "protective hairstyles" such as braids, locks, and twists.

BP 0520 - Intervention for Underperforming Schools (BP added)
New policy contains material formerly in BP 0460 - Local Control and Accountability Plan regarding interventions to support the continuous improvement of student performance within the priorities identified in the district's LCAP. Paragraph added to reference interventions that will be provided to schools identified by the California Department of Education (CDE) for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI), targeted support and improvement (TSI), and additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI).

BP 0520.1 - Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement (BP added)
New policy addresses the state's accountability system, developed in response to federal Title I requirements, to provide interventions to schools identified by CDE for CSI, TSI, or ATSI. Policy includes criteria for the identification of schools, requirements for a school improvement plan, and actions to be taken if implementation of the school plan is unsuccessful after a specified period of years.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:
None

RECOMMENDATION:
The Superintendent recommends that the Board approve the Board Policy updates.

PRESENTED BY:
Sean Snider, Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services
The Board of Trustees desires to ensure the most effective use of available funding to improve outcomes for all students. A comprehensive, data-driven planning process shall be used to identify annual goals and specific actions and to facilitate continuous improvement of district practices.

(cf. 0000 - Vision)
(cf. 0200 - Goals for the School District)

The Board shall adopt a districtwide local control and accountability plan (LCAP), based on the template adopted by the State Board of Education, that addresses the state priorities in Education Code 52060 and any local priorities adopted by the Board. The LCAP shall be updated on or before July 1 of each year and, like the district budget, shall cover the next fiscal year and subsequent two fiscal years. (Education Code 52060, 52064; 5 CCR 15494-15497)

(cf. 3100 - Budget)

The LCAP shall focus on improving outcomes for all students, particularly those who are "unduplicated students" or are part of any numerically significant student subgroup that is at risk of or is underperforming.

Unduplicated students include students who are eligible for free or reduced-price meals, English learners, and foster youth, as defined in Education Code 42238.01 for purposes of the local control funding formula. (Education Code 42238.02)

(cf. 3553 - Free and Reduced Price Meals)
(cf. 6173.1 - Education for Foster Youth)
(cf. 6174 - Education for English Learners)

Numerically significant student subgroups include ethnic subgroups, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, English learners, students with disabilities, foster youth, and homeless students, when there are at least 30 students in the subgroup or at least 15 foster youth or homeless students, or as otherwise defined by the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI). (Education Code 52052)

(cf. 6164.4 - Identification and Evaluation of Individuals for Special Education)
(cf. 6173 - Education for Homeless Children)

The Superintendent or designee shall review the single plan for student achievement (SPSA) submitted by each district school pursuant to Education Code 64001 to ensure that the specific actions included in the LCAP are consistent with strategies included in the SPSA. (Education Code 52062)

(cf. 0420 - School Plans/Site Councils)
The LCAP shall also be aligned with other district and school plans to the extent possible in order to minimize duplication of effort and provide clear direction for program implementation.

(cf. 0400 - Comprehensive Plans)
(cf. 0440 - District Technology Plan)
(cf. 0450 - Comprehensive Safety Plan)
(cf. 5030 - Student Wellness)
(cf. 6171 - Title I Programs)
(cf. 7110 - Facilities Master Plan)

Any complaint that the district has not complied with legal requirements pertaining to the LCAP may be filed pursuant to AR 1312.3 - Uniform Complaint Procedures. (Education Code 52075)

(cf. 1312.3 - Uniform Complaint Procedures)

Plan Development

The Superintendent or designee shall gather data and information needed for effective and meaningful plan development and present it to the Board and community. Such data and information shall include, but not be limited to, data regarding the number of students in student subgroups, disaggregated data on student achievement levels, and information about current programs and expenditures.

The Board shall consult with teachers, principals, administrators, other school personnel, employee bargaining units, parents/guardians, and students in developing the LCAP. Consultation with students shall enable unduplicated students and other numerically significant student subgroups to review and comment on LCAP development and may include surveys of students, student forums, student advisory committees, and/or meetings with student government bodies or other groups representing students. (Education Code 52060; 5 CCR 15495)

(cf. 1220 - Citizen Advisory Committees)
(cf. 4140/4240/4340 - Bargaining Units)
(cf. 6020 - Parent Involvement)

Public Review and Input

The Board shall establish a parent advisory committee to review and comment on the LCAP. The committee shall be composed of a majority of parents/guardians and shall include at least one parent/guardian of an unduplicated student as defined above. (Education Code 52063; 5 CCR 15495)
Whenever district enrollment includes at least 15 percent English learners, with at least 50 students who are English learners, the Board shall establish an English learner parent advisory committee composed of a majority of parents/guardians of English learners. (Education Code 52063; 5 CCR 15495)

The Superintendent or designee shall present the LCAP to the committee(s) before it is submitted to the Board for adoption, and shall respond in writing to comments received from the committee(s). (Education Code 52062)

The Superintendent or designee shall notify members of the public of the opportunity to submit written comments regarding the specific actions and expenditures proposed to be included in the LCAP. The notification shall be provided using the most efficient method of notification possible, which may not necessarily include producing printed notices or sending notices by mail. All written notifications related to the LCAP shall be provided in the primary language of parents/guardians when required by Education Code 48985. (Education Code 52062)

(cf. 5145.6 - Parental Notifications)

As part of the parent and community engagement process, the district shall solicit input on effective and appropriate instructional methods, including, but not limited to, establishing language acquisition programs to enable all students, including English learners and native English speakers, to have access to the core academic content standards and to become proficient in English. (Education Code 305-306)

The Board shall hold at least one public hearing to solicit the recommendations and comments of members of the public regarding the specific actions and expenditures proposed to be included in the LCAP. The public hearing shall be held at the same meeting as the budget hearing required pursuant to Education Code 42127 and AR 3100 - Budget. (Education Code 42127, 52062)

(cf. 9320 - Meetings and Notices)

Adoption of the Plan

The Board shall adopt the LCAP prior to adopting the district budget, but at the same public meeting. This meeting shall be held after the public hearing described above, but not on the same day as the hearing.

The Board may adopt revisions to the LCAP at any time during the period in which the plan is in effect, provided the Board follows the process to adopt the LCAP pursuant to Education Code 52062 and the revisions are adopted in a public meeting. (Education Code 52062)
LOCAL CONTROL AND ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN (continued)

Submission of Plan to County Superintendent of Schools

Not later than five days after adoption of the LCAP, the Board shall file the LCAP with the County Superintendent of Schools. (Education Code 52070)

If a county superintendent of schools has jurisdiction over a single school district, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction shall perform the duties specified in this section. (Education Code 52070 (e). The LCAP is submitted directly to the California Department of Education for review and approval.

If the County Superintendent sends, by August 15, a written request for clarification of the contents of the LCAP, the Board shall respond in writing within 15 days of the request. If the County Superintendent then submits recommendations for amendments to the LCAP within 15 days of receiving the Board's response, the Board shall consider those recommendations in a public meeting within 15 days of receiving the recommendations. (Education Code 52070)

Monitoring Progress

The Superintendent or designee shall report to the Board, at least annually in accordance with the timeline and indicators established by him/her and the Board, regarding the district's progress toward attaining each goal identified in the LCAP. Evaluation shall include, but not be limited to, an assessment of district and school performance reported on the California School Dashboard. Evaluation data shall be used to recommend any necessary revisions to the LCAP.

(cf. 0500 - Accountability)

The Superintendent or designee shall seek and/or accept technical assistance or other intervention that may be required pursuant to Education Code 52071 or 52072 when a school or a numerically significant student subgroup is not making sufficient progress toward the goals in the LCAP.

(cf. 0520 - Intervention for Underperforming Schools)
(cf. 0520.1 - Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement)

Technical Assistance/Intervention

When it is in the best interest of the district, the Board may submit a request to the County Superintendent for technical assistance, including, but not limited to: (Education Code 52071)

1. Assistance in the identification of district strengths and weaknesses in regard to state priorities, and review of effective, evidence-based programs that apply to the district's goals
2. ______ Assistance from an academic expert, team of academic experts, or another district in the county in identifying and implementing effective programs to improve the outcomes for student subgroups

3. ______ Advice and assistance from the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence established pursuant to Education Code 52074

In the event that the County Superintendent requires the district to receive technical assistance pursuant to Education Code 52071, the Board shall review all recommendations received from the County Superintendent or other advisor and shall consider revisions to the LCAP as appropriate in accordance with the process specified in Education Code 52062.

If the SPI identifies the district as needing intervention pursuant to Education Code 52072, the district shall cooperate with any action taken by the SPI or any academic advisor appointed by the SPI, which may include one or more of the following:

1. ______ Revision of the district's LCAP

2. ______ Revision of the district's budget in accordance with changes in the LCAP

3. ______ A determination to stay or rescind any district action that would prevent the district from improving outcomes for all student subgroups, provided that action is not required by a collective bargaining agreement

Legal Reference:

EDUCATION CODE
305-306 English language education
17002 State School Building Lease-Purchase Law, including definition of good repair
33430-33436 Learning Communities for School Success Program; grants for LCAP implementation
41020 Audits
41320-41322 Emergency apportionments
42127 Public hearing on budget adoption
42238.01-42238.07 Local control funding formula
44258.9 County superintendent review of teacher assignment
47604.33 Submission of reports by charter schools
47606.5 Charter schools, local control and accountability plan
48985 Parental notices in languages other than English
51210 Course of study for grades 1-6
51220 Course of study for grades 7-12
52052 Numerically significant student subgroups
52059.5 Statewide system of support
52060-52077 Local control and accountability plan

Legal Reference: (continued next page)
LOCAL CONTROL AND ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN (continued)

Legal Reference: (continued)

52302 Regional occupational centers and programs
52372.5 Linked learning program
54692 Partnership academies
60119 Sufficiency of textbooks and instructional materials; hearing and resolution
60605.8 California Assessment of Academic Achievement; Academic Content Standards Commission
64001 School plan for student achievement
99300-99301 Early Assessment Program

WELFARE AND INSTITUTIONS CODE
300 Dependent child of the court

CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 5
4600-4670 Uniform complaint procedures
15494-15497 Local control and accountability plan and spending requirements

UNITED STATES CODE, TITLE 20
6311 State plan
6312 Local educational agency plan
6826 Title III funds, local plans

Management Resources:

CSBA PUBLICATIONS
Promising Practices for Developing and Implementing LCAPs, Governance Brief, November 2016
LCFF Rubrics, Issue 1: What Boards Need to Know About the New Rubrics, Governance Brief, rev. October 2016

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PUBLICATIONS
California School Accounting Manual
California School Dashboard
LCFF Frequently Asked Questions
Local Control and Accountability Plan and Annual Update (LCAP) Template
California Career Technical Education Model Curriculum Standards, 2013
California Common Core State Standards: English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects, rev. 2013
California Common Core State Standards: Mathematics, rev. 2013
California English Language Development Standards, 2012

WEB SITES
CSBA: http://www.csba.org
California Department of Education: http://www.cde.ca.gov
California School Dashboard: http://www.caschooldashboard.org

Policy
adopted: May 9, 2018
revised: February 12, 2020

AMADOR COUNTY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Jackson, California
The Board of Trustees believes that appropriate dress and grooming contribute to a productive learning environment. The Board expects students to give proper attention to personal cleanliness and to wear clothes that are suitable for the school activities in which they participate. Students' clothing must not present a health or safety hazard or cause a substantial disruption, which would interfere with the educational process, as determined by school administration, to the educational program as determined by school administration.

(Dress and Grooming)
(Freedom of Speech/Expression)

District and school rules pertaining to student attire shall be included in student handbooks, may be posted in school offices and classrooms, and may be periodically reviewed with all students as necessary.

Students shall not be prohibited from dressing in a manner consistent with their gender identity or gender expression or with their religious or cultural observance.

(Nondiscrimination/Harassment)
(Sexual Harassment)

In addition, the dress code shall not discriminate against students based on hair texture and protective hairstyles, including, but not limited to, braids, locks, and twists. (Education Code 212.1)

Students and parents/guardians shall be informed about dress and grooming standards at the beginning of the school year and whenever these standards are revised. A student who violates these standards shall be subject to appropriate disciplinary action.

(Discipline)

The principal or designee is authorized to enforce this policy and shall inform any student who does not reasonably conform to the dress code. The dress code shall not be enforced in a manner that discriminates against a particular viewpoint or results in a disproportionate application of the dress code based on students' gender, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, household income, or body type or size.

(Nondiscrimination in District Programs and Activities)
(Equity)
(Freedom of Speech/Expression)

School administrators, teachers, and other staff shall be notified of appropriate and equitable enforcement of the dress code.
When practical, students shall not be directed to correct a dress code violation during instructional time or in front of other students.

Repeated violations or refusal to comply with the district's dress code may result in disciplinary action.

(Gang-Related Apparel)

The principal, staff and parents/guardians at a school may establish a reasonable dress code that prohibits students from wearing gang-related apparel when there is evidence of a gang presence that disrupts or threatens to disrupt the school's activities. Such a dress code may be included as part of the school safety plan and must be presented to the Board for approval. The Board shall approve the plan upon determining that it is necessary to protect the health and safety of the school's students.

When determining specific items of clothing that may be defined as gang apparel, the school shall ensure that the determination is free from bias based on race, ethnicity, national origin, immigration status, or other protected characteristics.

Legal Reference:
- **EDUCATION CODE**
  - 212.1 Nondiscrimination based on race or ethnicity
  - 32281 School safety plans
  - 35183 School dress codes; uniforms
  - 35183.5 Sun-protective clothing
  - 48907 Student exercise of free expression
  - 49066 Grades; effect of physical education class apparel
- **CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 5**
  - 302 Pupils to be neat and clean on entering school
- **COURT DECISIONS**

Policy

AMADOR COUNTY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

adopted: May 9, 2018

revised: February 12, 2020
INTERVENTION FOR UNDERPERFORMING SCHOOLS

The Board of Trustees desires that all district schools provide a high-quality educational program that maximizes the achievement of each district student. The district shall provide assistance to schools to support the continuous improvement of student performance within the priorities identified in the district's local control and accountability plan (LCAP) and to enhance the achievement of low-performing student subgroups.

(cf. 0460 - Local Control and Accountability Plan)
(cf. 0500 - Accountability)

At its discretion, the Board may submit a request to the California Department of Education for technical assistance regarding the following: (Education Code 52071)

1. Identifying the district's strengths and weaknesses in regard to state priorities addressed in the LCAP, including collaboration between the district and County Superintendent to review performance data on the state and local indicators included in the California School Dashboard and other relevant local data and to identify effective, evidence-based programs or practices that address any areas of weakness.

2. Securing assistance from an academic, programmatic, or fiscal expert, or team of experts, to identify and implement effective programs and practices that are designed to improve performance in any areas of weakness identified by the district.

In the event that the California Department of Education requires the district to receive technical assistance based on a determination that one or more numerically significant student subgroups in a district school meet the performance criteria established pursuant Education Code 52064.5, the Board shall work with the California Department of Education and shall provide the California Department of Education timely documentation of the district's completion of the activities listed in items #1-2 above or substantially similar activities. (Education Code 52071)

With the approval of the California Department of Education, the district may, at its own expense, engage another service provider, including, but not limited to, another school district, the county office of education, or a charter school, to act as a partner to the district in filling the district’s need for technical assistance. (Education Code 52071)

If referred to the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence by the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI), the district shall implement the recommendations of that agency in order to accomplish the goals set forth in the district's LCAP. (Education Code 52071, 52074)

If the SPI identifies the district as needing intervention, the district shall cooperate with any action taken by the SPI or any academic advisor appointed by the SPI, which may include one or more of the following: (Education Code 52072)
INTERVENTION FOR UNDERPERFORMING SCHOOLS

1. Revision of the district's LCAP

2. Revision of the district's budget, in conjunction with changes in the LCAP, that would allow the district to improve the outcomes for all student subgroups in regard to state and local priorities

3. A determination to stay or rescind any district action that would prevent the district from improving outcomes for all student subgroups, provided that action is not required by a collective bargaining agreement

In addition, any school identified by the California Department of Education for comprehensive support and improvement, targeted support and improvement, or additional targeted support and improvement shall develop and implement a school plan in accordance with 20 USC 6311. Such schools may be required to partner with an external entity, agency, or individual with demonstrated expertise and capacity to identify and implement more rigorous interventions.

(cf. 0420 - School Plans/Site Councils)
(cf. 0520.1 - Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement)

Legal Reference:
- EDUCATION CODE
  - 52052 Numerically significant student subgroups
  - 52059.5 Statewide system of support
  - 52060-52077 Local control and accountability plan
  - 60640-60649 California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress
  - 64001 School plan for student achievement
- UNITED STATES CODE, TITLE 20
  - 6311-6322 Improving basic programs for disadvantaged students, especially:
  - 6311 State plans

Management Resources:
- CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PUBLICATIONS
  - California School Dashboard
  - CSI/TSI/ATSI Frequently Asked Questions
  - California ESSA Consolidated State Plan, 2017
- U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PUBLICATIONS
  - Non-Regulatory Guidance: Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments, 2016
- WEB SITES
  - California Department of Education: http://www.cde.ca.gov
  - California School Dashboard: http://www.caschooldashboard.org
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adopted: February 12, 2020

Jackson, California
COMPREHENSIVE AND TARGETED SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT

The Governing Board is committed to enabling all district students to meet state academic achievement standards. The district shall provide support and assistance to increase student achievement in all district schools, especially any school that has been identified by the California Department of Education (CDE) as in need of comprehensive support and improvement (CSI), targeted support and improvement (TSI), or additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI).

(cf. 0500 - Accountability)
(cf. 0520 - Intervention for Underperforming Schools)
(cf. 6011 - Academic Standards)
(cf. 6171 - Title I Programs)

When any school is identified for CSI, TSI, or ATSI, the Superintendent or designee shall notify the school community, including the principal, teachers, and parent/guardians of students of the school, of the identification and, if applicable, shall inform the school of the student subgroup(s) which are consistently underperforming at the school.

School Plan

Upon receiving notification from CDE that a district school has been identified as eligible for CSI, TSI, or ATSI, the district shall, in partnership with principals, other school leaders, teachers, and parents/guardians, develop and implement a plan to improve student outcomes at the school. The plan shall: (20 USC 6311)

1. Be based on all state indicators in the California School Dashboard, including student performance against state-determined long-term goals, except that any school subject to the state's Dashboard Alternative School Status that has fewer than 100 students may focus on the state indicators that are more applicable to the nature of its program

2. Be based on a school-level needs assessment

3. Include evidence-based interventions

4. If the school is identified for CSI or ATSI, identify resource inequities, which may include a review of district and school-level budgets, to be addressed through implementation of the plan

(cf. 0400 - Comprehensive Plans)
COMPREHENSIVE AND TARGETED SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT (continued)

The school plan for student achievement developed pursuant to Education Code 64001 may serve as the school improvement plan required for CSI, TSI, or ATSI, provided that the plan meets the requirements of 20 USC 6311. (Education Code 64001)

(cf. 0420 - School Plans/Site Councils)

The school improvement plan shall be submitted to the Board for approval. (20 USC 6311)

If any district school is identified for CSI, the district's local control and accountability plan shall include descriptions of how the district provides support to CSI school(s) in developing the CSI plan and how the district will monitor and evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the CSI plan to support student and school improvement.

(cf. 0460 - Local Control and Accountability Plan)

Monitoring and Intervention

The Board and the Superintendent or designee shall regularly review the performance of each school identified for CSI, TSI, or ATSI.

After two years of implementing the school plan, if any such school has been unsuccessful in improving student outcomes to a level that exceeds initial eligibility criteria, the district shall identify the problem and take additional action as necessary.

If a school identified for CSI fails to improve student outcomes within four years to a level that exceeds the CSI eligibility criteria, it shall be subject to more rigorous interventions that include, but are not limited to, partnering with an external entity, agency, or individual with demonstrated expertise and capacity to:

1. Conduct a new needs assessment that focuses on systemic factors and conduct a root cause analysis that identifies gaps between current conditions and desired conditions in student performance and progress

2. Use the results of the analysis along with stakeholder feedback to develop a new improvement plan that includes:

   a. A prioritized set of evidence-based interventions and strategies

   b. A program evaluation component with support to conduct ongoing performance and progress monitoring
COMPREHENSIVE AND TARGETED SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT  (continued)

Legal Reference:

EDUCATION CODE
52052 Numerically significant student subgroups
52059.5 Statewide system of support
52060-52077 Local control and accountability plan
64001 School plan for student achievement

UNITED STATES CODE, TITLE 20
6311-6322 Improving basic programs for disadvantaged students, especially:
6311 State plans
6313 Eligibility of schools and school attendance areas; funding allocation

Management Resources:

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PUBLICATIONS
California School Dashboard
CSI/TSI/ATSI Frequently Asked Questions
California ESSA Consolidated State Plan, 2017

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PUBLICATIONS
Non-Regulatory Guidance: Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments, 2016

WEB SITES
California Department of Education: http://www.cde.ca.gov
California School Dashboard: http://www.caschooldashboard.org

Policy
AMADOR COUNTY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
adopted: February 12, 2020
Jackson, California
AGENDA ITEM #: 14.5

SUBJECT: Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Regarding Transfer of Classified Employees Related to Transfer of Special Education Programs – Discussion/Action

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: This MOU is between Amador County Unified School District (ACUSD), Amador County Office of Education (ACOE), Classified School Employees Association, Unit 239 (CSEA #239) and Classified School Employees Association, Unit 827 (CSEA #827).

The purpose of this MOU is to establish terms of the timelines and procedure to protect the interests of CSEA Unit 239 and CSEA Unit 827 members while allowing the parties and other constituents the time necessary to finalize the terms of transfer of Special Education programs from the ACOE to the ACUSD.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS: There are associated cost savings as presented to the Board of Trustees at their February 12, 2020 meeting.

RECOMMENDATION: Superintendent Slavensky recommends that the Board of Trustees approve the MOU.

PRESENTED BY: David Vicari, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources & Employee Relations
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING TRANSFER OF CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES RELATED TO TRANSFER OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is made and entered into by and between the Amador County Unified School District ("District"), Amador County Office of Education ("ACOE"), Classified School Employees Association, Unit 239 ("CSEA" Unit 239), and Classified School Employees Association, Unit 827 ("CSEA" Unit 827) (collectively, the "Parties") on the terms and conditions that follow.

RECITALS

A. CSEA Unit 239 represent the District's classified bargaining unit employees pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement with the District.

B. CSEA Unit 827 represents ACOE's classified bargaining unit employees pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement with the County Superintendent of Schools.

C. The purpose of this MOU is to establish terms for the timelines and procedures to protect the interests of CSEA Unit 239 and CSEA Unit 827 members while allowing the parties and other constituents the time necessary to finalize the terms of transfer of Special Education programs from ACOE to the District.

D. The Special Education Study Team (i.e., Transfer Committee) was scheduled to start its work in six (6) full-day sessions on October 9 and October 30, 2019. On both days, the schools were closed due to PG&E's Public Safety Power Shutoff events. Due to this unexpected delay outside of Administration's control, the Study Team began its work on November 12, 2019 and continued on November 21, 2019, December 10, 2019, and January 9, 2020 with a fifth date scheduled for January 28, 2020.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties agree as follows:

AGREEMENT

1. Recitals. The Recitals set forth above are true and correct.

2. Waiver of Local Plan Procedures. The Amador County Special Education Local Plan Area ("SELPA") Local Plan prescribes certain procedures for the receiving local educational agency ("LEA") when a program is being transferred from one LEA to another. For program transfers effective July 1, 2020, the Parties agree to waive the procedures set forth in Section IX.A. of the Program Transfer Policy in the Local Plan.

3. Alternative Procedures. For program transfer effective July 1, 2020, the Parties agree to the following procedures in lieu of those set forth in Section IX.A of the Local Plan (a) all Parties agree to the contents of this MOU; and (b) the SELPA Board of Trustees waives the procedures of the Local Plan in lieu of this, adheres to EC 45120.2 which ensures all classified permanent employees who transfer from one LEA to another LEA retain all their rights associated with seniority and compensation.
4. **No Precedent or Establishment of Past Practice.** This MOU does not establish or set a precedent for future employees, CSEA grievances or complaints, nor can it be used to interpret the existing CBA language in any manner. This MOU is unique to the facts and circumstances in this instance.

5. **Complete Understanding.** This MOU represents a full and complete understanding between the Parties.

6. **Authorization to Execute Agreement.** The undersigned Parties represent that they have read and understand the terms of this MOU and are authorized to execute this MOU.

7. **Board Approval.** The effectiveness of the MOU is contingent upon approval by the District’s Governing Board.

District

Dr. Amy L. Slavensky, Superintendent  
Dated: 2/18/2020

ACOE

Dr. Steve Russell, Superintendent  
Dated: 2/18/2020

CSEA Unit 239

Theresa Cramer, President  
Dated: 2/18/2020

CSEA Unit 827

Megan Mathison, President  
Dated: 2/18/2020
AGENDA ITEM #: 14.6

SUBJECT: Resolution: ACUSD 19/20-019 General Liability Coverage for Volunteers – Discussion/Action

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
For the purposes of extending coverage to official volunteers of the District, all individuals who directly volunteer to provide services to the District, and whose volunteer services are accepted in accordance with District regulations and policy shall be covered by the District’s Liability insurance program. The type of approved volunteer service shall be on file in the appropriate District or local site office prior to commencing volunteer services.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:
There will be no cost to the District. Liability cost would be covered through Tuolumne Joint Powers Authority (JPA)

RECOMMENDATION:
Superintendent Slavensky recommends the Board approve resolution ACUSD 19/20-019 General Liability Coverage for Volunteers.

PRESENTED BY:
Jared Critchfield, Assistant Superintendent of Business Services
BEFORE THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
AMADOR COUNTY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
COUNTY OF AMADOR, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

RESOLUTION NO. ACUSD 19/20-019
GENERAL LIABILITY COVERAGE FOR VOLUNTEERS

WHEREAS, Amador County Unified School District recognizes the need for and the benefit derived from individuals and groups providing volunteer services to the District; and

WHEREAS, Amador County Unified School District desires to provide General Liability coverage for individuals in their capacity as volunteers to the District while they are performing services for the District in accordance with District regulations and policy;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, For the purposes of extending this coverage to official volunteers of the District, all individuals who directly volunteer to provide services to the District, and whose volunteer services are accepted in accordance with District regulations and policy shall be covered by the District’s Liability insurance program. The type of approved volunteer service shall be on file in the appropriate District or local site office prior to commencing volunteer services.

Adopted by the Board of Trustees of Amador County Unified School District, on the 26th day of February in 2020.

__________________________________  __________________________________
Susan Ross                                  Kandi Thompson
President, Board of Trustees               Clerk, Board of Trustees
AGENDA ITEM #: 14.7

SUBJECT:
Resolution: ACUSD 19/20-020 Increase in Level 1 Developer Fees – Discussion/Action

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
Education Code 17620 authorizes school districts to levy a fee against any development project for the construction or reconstruction of school facilities as long as the district can show justification for levying of fees.

FISCAL IMPLICATION:
Allowable fees will increase from $3.79 per square foot to $4.08 per square foot for residential construction, and fees will remain $.54 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Superintendent recommends that the Board adopt resolution ACUSD 19/20-020, authorizing the new school facilities fees for residential and commercial/industrial construction, to become effective 60 days after adoption of the resolution.

PRESENTED BY:
Jared Critchfield, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services
BEFORE THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
AMADOR COUNTY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
COUNTY OF AMADOR, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

RESOLUTION NO. ACUSD 19/20-20
Adopting and Implementing an Increase in Level 1 Developer Fees Levied On Residential Development and Levying Fees On Commercial and Industrial Development to Fund the Construction and Reconstruction of School Facilities

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code section 65995 and Education Code section 17620 the Amador County Unified School District (“District”) may levy a fee on all residential, commercial, and industrial development within the District boundaries, to fund the construction or reconstruction of school facilities; and

WHEREAS, the District has a facilities plan which states an overall vision for new school construction in order to meet the needs of District students; and

WHEREAS, the District has performed a study to assess the impact on the District’s facilities from residential, commercial, and industrial development and established a nexus between such development and the need for funding to construct and improve schools; and

WHEREAS, there is a continuing and urgent need for expansion and reconstruction of school facilities due to the impact of new residential construction as well as commercial and industrial development; and the State Allocation Board has established the maximum fee that can be levied by a school district is $4.08 per square foot of habitable residential development and $0.54 per square foot for commercial and industrial development for chargeable covered and enclosed space, which sums shall be used to fund the delivery of improvements to the District’s existing facilities and construction of new facilities; and

WHEREAS, the District intends to spend developer fees on hand and additional fees received on eligible projects as defined in the Developer Fee Justification Study dated February 2014; and

WHEREAS, the District conducted a public hearing to discuss the proposed increase in developer fees for residential and commercial/industrial development and has considered the comments provided therefrom.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the District shall change the fees levied on new residential development from $3.48 per square foot to $3.79 per square foot for all new residential development within the District boundaries, in accordance with Education Code section 17620.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the District fees levies on new commercial and industrial development shall remain $0.54 per square foot on new commercial and industrial development, in accordance with Education Code section 17620.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees of the Amador County Unified School District (the “Board”) authorizes District staff to give notice to the County of Amador and the Cities of Amador City, Ione, Jackson, Plymouth and Sutter Creek, and other applicable agencies, of the Board’s adoption and implementation of this Resolution by serving a copy of the Resolution to each agency and by requesting that no building permits and no certificates of occupancy for residential, manufactured homes, mobile homes, commercial or industrial construction be issued without certification from the District that the specified fees, including any subsequent increases authorized by the State, have been paid.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the District preserve a separate account where in all developer fees, including those fees collected pursuant to this Resolution will be deposited and the District shall review and provide the Board a report on the reconciliation of that account every fiscal year.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if the District has unexpected or uncommitted fees within five (5) years of collection of those fees, the District will make the statutorily required findings or refund those fees.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the developer fees established by this Resolution, including any increases for inflation as authorized by the State, shall be collected prior to the issuance of a building permit on each eligible unit.

Adopted by the Board of Trustees of Amador County Unified School District, on the 26th day of February in 2020.

__________________________________  __________________________________
Susan Ross Kandi Thompson
President, Board of Trustees Clerk, Board of Trustees