

**Tucson Unified School District No. 1
Governing Board Special Meeting
Board Room, Morrow Education Center
1010 East Tenth Street
Tucson, Arizona**

**May 2, 2013
3:30 p.m.**

MINUTES

Present:

Adelita S. Grijalva, President – *[arr. @ 3:41 p.m.]*
Kristel Ann Foster, Clerk
Michael Hicks, Member
Cam Juárez, Member
Mark Stegeman, Member *[arr. @ 3:41 p.m.]*

Also Present:

John Pedicone, Ph.D., Superintendent
Martha Durkin, Legal Counsel
Maria Menconi, Ed.D., Interim Deputy Superintendent
Abel Morado, Ed.D., Assistant Superintendent, Secondary Leadership
Maggie Shafer, Assistant Superintendent, Elementary/K-8 Leadership
Yousef Awwad, Chief Financial Officer
Candy Egbert, Chief Operations Officer, Engineering, Facilities and Planning
John Gay, Chief Information Officer, Technology and Telecommunications Services
Jim Fish, Executive Director, Equity Intervention
Pamela Palmo, Interim Executive Director, Human Resources
Lorrane McPherson, Interim Executive Director, Exceptional Education
David Scott, Director, Accountability and Research
Cara Rene, Director, Communications and Media Relations
Herman House, Director, Interscholastics
David Vildusea, School Safety & Security Manager, and Staff
Augustine Romero, Director, Multicultural Curriculum
Richard Foster, Director, Professional Development
Noreen Wiedenfeld, Director, Student Community Services
Sam Brown, Legal Counsel
Marcus Jones, Bond & Architecture Program Manager
Jim Burns, Bus Office Coordinator, Operations
Heather Gaines, Outside Legal Counsel
Norma Faras, Program Coordinator, Desegregation Office
Christina Vasquez-Case, Program Coordinator, Human Resources
Patricia Cisneros, IT Program Manager, Technology Services
Rick Haan, Program Coordinator, Desegregation Office
Brian Lambert, Program Manager, Student Equity
Charlotte Brown, Compliance Liaison, Student Equity
Teresa Guerrero, Program Coordinator, Title I
Gina Pesqueria, Project Manager (Construction), Operations

Adele Edwards, Technology Services
Nancy Mueller, Financial Services
Mary Alice Wallace, Director of Staff Services to the Governing Board
Sylvia Lovegreen, Senior Staff Assistant II to the Governing Board
Alexis Huicochea, Arizona Daily Star

SPECIAL MEETING CALLED TO ORDER – 3:30 p.m.
Board Clerk Kristel Foster called the meeting to order.

ITEM

ACTION

ACTION ITEM

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Schedule an executive meeting at this time to consider the following matters –

A. Legal Advice/Instruction to Attorney pursuant to A.R.S.§38-431.03 (A)(3) and (A)(4)

1) Fisher-Mendoza | Cam Juárez moved approval, Michael Hicks seconded. Approved 3-0 in a voice vote. Adelita Grijalva and Mark Stegeman were not present for vote. |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

RECESS SPECIAL MEETING – 3:30 p.m.

RECONVENE SPECIAL MEETING – 4:25 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mark Stegeman led the Pledge of Allegiance.

STUDY ITEM

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| 2. Study of Proposed SY 13-14 Desegregation Budget | Studied only. |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------|

Dr. Pedicone asked Sam Brown to present the item.

Ms. Grijalva asked board members to hold their questions until the end of the presentation.

Using Power Point [available with other documents as attachments to the agenda item posted on the TUSD web], Mr. Brown brought the Board up to date on the budget process. The Unitary Status Plan (USP) budget must include non-deseg and deseg sources. The deseg budget are the 15-910(G) sources levied through local taxes to pay for deseg and other OCR (Office of Civil Rights) obligations. He indicated the collaboration with the Special Master, Plaintiffs and the Special Master's expert in creating this version of the budget and described the

ITEM

ACTION

STUDY ITEM (continued)

2. Study of Proposed SY 13-14 Desegregation Budget (continued)

timeline for the 2.0 budget from submission 30 days before today, through review and recommendations by the Parties, creation of recommendations by the Special Master, and revision resulting in the 3.0 budget presented today, which is scheduled for Board action at the May 7 board meeting. Within ten days of approval by the Board, the Parties and the Special Master have an opportunity to object in court on any item in the final budget with which they disagree. He reported the USP also requires creation of a methodology and proposal entitled the "USP expenditure plan."

Mr. Brown indicated the total funding amount is \$83m, while the deseg funding is \$63-\$64m. The remaining \$19m comes from other sources and is required to be included by the USP; it reflects activities already being funded which contribute toward meeting USP goals.

In discussing project management, Mr. Brown recognized and expressed appreciation for the amazing work of the project managers in the audience who have developed budgets and the plans to implement them in approximately 75 days since the USP came out in February, all in addition to their normal work duties.

Mr. Brown reviewed the 13 individual Projects in the budget and the goals of each. He pointed out the sequence of events resulted in budgets being developed before plans were finalized which was the opposite of how it should have been done, and which caused many estimations and assumptions to be included in advance of final versions.

Mr. Brown indicated the deseg portion of funding sources in the budget is a few hundred thousand dollars over the actual amount available in deseg funding. He reported working with Finance and due to some attrition that happens every year, the amount is within a margin of error.

Additionally, Mr. Brown reported that the USP mandates the designation or hiring of certain positions. The process

ITEM

ACTION

STUDY ITEM (continued)

2. Study of Proposed SY 13-14 Desegregation Budget (continued)

used was to review current staffed positions, review job classifications and descriptions, and develop new classifications and descriptions where necessary, which resulted in only one new Director level position being required of the 19 positions mandated in the USP, the ALE Director. All others have been designated to current staff with proper and adequate number of support staff to take on added duties, with some adjustments and combinations in positions.

In highlighting and explaining the columns in the budget, he noted that the Magnet FTE number has not been finalized but will be in the version submitted on May 7.

Mr. Brown indicated the Special Master's recommendations were lengthy and available at www.tucsonusp.com, and he encouraged the Board to read the full report to get the context and intent. He presented the staff summary of the report and described the nine recommendations, only one requiring immediate action by the Board, with action on another one over the summer, and others by December. Recommendation Nine requires providing the description for the initial stages of family center implementation to the Parties, the Special Master and the Board prior to the Board's vote on May 7, which Mr. Brown said would be provided.

He reported major issues between parties are transportation and magnets, overhead, silos and duplication, support strategies and alternative education, support services in general, pre-K, amount of money toward exceptional education, use of deseg funding for fine arts, designation of one person as the director of both multicultural and culturally relevant director, not enough money being spent on discipline, family centers, repair and maintenance of facilities, and assessment using deseg funding.

Mr. Hicks stated he visited non-magnet schools and was told the schools were not allowed to have deseg funding

ITEM

ACTION

STUDY ITEM (continued)

2. Study of Proposed SY 13-14 Desegregation Budget (continued)

because of an order by the Special Master that only magnet and fine arts programs were to get deseg funds. Mr. Brown indicated that was incorrect and explained the difference between how funds were allocated previously and the current process. Mr. Hicks asked for schools to be informed correctly.

Ms. Foster inquired if there is a plan for making the transition between the previous site-based allocation process and the current process in accordance with the new direction of the USP, and if some of the funding for overhead could be utilized for the transition. Mr. Brown responded planning started with leadership to determine what programs are valued in order to move forward. He confirmed Ms. Grijalva's clarification that there is no longer discretionary funding of projects or grants at schools that had no deseg funding. Dr. Pedicone commented that principals had been advised the previous application process for funds was temporary and would be ended with the new USP. He further stated that the District is now working with specific objectives of the USP with accountability, which is what the Plaintiffs have advocated for years.

In response to Mr. Juárez' inquiry concerning accountability and whether complaints are being tracked for the purpose of providing proper information, Mr. Brown responded there had been many meetings with principals where information had been provided so there should have been no surprise. Mr. Juárez asked for further follow up with principals.

Ms. Grijalva asked for an explanation concerning overhead. Mr. Awwad explained that overhead is indirect costs that can not be traced to a specific objective or function, e.g., depreciation of equipment, utilities, Finance, HR, Technology, which support all functions in the District. Ms. Grijalva asked if an overhead budget could be provided which reveals line items, dollar amounts, percentages. Mr. Awwad responded overhead

ITEM

ACTION

STUDY ITEM (continued)

2. Study of Proposed SY 13-14 Desegregation Budget (continued)

is allocated in each department's budget. Ms. Foster commented the Special Master's response stated overhead was 14% (\$8m). Mr. Awwad responded 14% is approximately \$9m, but only \$5m is included in the plan. Dr. Pedicone commented that the Special Master and the Special Master's expert suggested 14% which Mr. Awwad agreed was a reasonable number. In response to Ms. Grijalva and Ms. Foster, Mr. Awwad addressed issues of overhead for HR, School Safety and Preschool.

Mr. Brown confirmed Dr. Stegeman's understanding that none of the first choice programs are going to be funded except those at magnet schools. In response to Dr. Stegeman's request for discussion of the disagreement and/or resolution between the District and Plaintiffs on Item 1, Magnets and Transportation, Mr. Brown indicated there was also disagreement between the Plaintiffs and the Special Master on this particular issue. Currently 25% of total transportation is funded by deseg. He reported that the Special Master had asked how many students were getting free transportation because of the magnet program, and that the Special Master agrees and supports the result of 33% as reasonable; one Party is asking for further justification. Mr. Brown further explained the factors that contribute to transportation costs are hard to quantify, and stated the 37% included in the plan is more accurate than the previous 25% as a direct result of the deseg plan. He indicated in response to Dr. Stegeman that this is the first version of a budget that has all functions broken out. Dr. Stegeman inquired what assumptions are being used to establish the level of funding regarding Project 6, which contains Multicultural and Culturally Relevant Courses. Mr. Brown explained the difficulty of predicting when enrollment and teacher requirements are unknown for all classes. Dr. Morado provided information on FTE required for the freshman and junior multicultural courses (5 for 3 schools - Rincon [1+], Sahuaro [2+] and Santa Rita [1]); and for the junior and senior culturally relevant courses (Tucson High 2.0, Pueblo 1.0 and Cholla 1.6). He stated additional courses may be added contingent on funding and Board approval.

ITEM

ACTION

STUDY ITEM (continued)

2. Study of Proposed SY 13-14 Desegregation Budget (continued)

Mr. Juárez expressed appreciation for the work being done. Regarding preschools, he inquired how the three in place were determined, and how they will be expanded, which the Special Master has indicated as important. Mr. Brown explained criteria for placement was where preschools will address both Plaintiff classes and stay within the structure offered in other areas. One site was chosen because of high disproportionate Latino students and the other two because of high disproportionate African American students as compared to the District average. He explained it was unclear if the same model would be used to expand the project in the future.

Mr. Hicks asked where family centers are located. Mr. Brown responded they are located throughout the district in an attempt to recreate the services offered centrally in School Community Services with one-on-one interaction. Mr. Hicks commented concerning a reference to the organization of Mexican American Student Support Services and inquired if there was a plan to change that. Mr. Brown replied that currently all student support services fall under the Office of Equity and Intervention, but changes in organization are always a possibility.

Ms. Foster inquired that since the plan and its budget are still being developed, what room for adjustment will there be after the Board approves the budget on May 7. Mr. Brown replied there will be a process to address when situations occur that require a change in the budget. The process will be followed so there will be a paper trail in order to show accountability and transparency.

Ms. Foster inquired whether there was justification for two directors for Multicultural and Culturally Relevant since scrutiny of this portion of the USP was so high. Mr. Brown indicated the analysis for having one director now was because the USP came out late and the emphasis now is on trying to leverage resources in the Curriculum & Instruction and Professional Development departments. He further indicated the situation might change next year when there is more information and experience.

ITEM

ACTION

STUDY ITEM (continued)

2. Study of Proposed SY 13-14 Desegregation Budget (continued)

Concerning the Project 6 section on School Environment and the identification of Exceptional Education students, Mr. Juárez inquired how the remedial amount will fund the individual positions. He commented the plan references three techs to monitor and ensure compliance, but specifically mentions only one staff person. Mr. Brown reported on results of a task force addressing exceptional education identification issues which indicated parents make decisions about IEPs, so the recommendation was more family engagement in order for parents to be able to make informed decisions. Lorrane McPherson provided information on the responsibilities of compliance techs to monitor on a monthly basis that the District is staying in compliance and that definitions remain consistent. The family liaison staff person is to serve as a point of information and as a connection between school and parent training on special education services and resources. She addressed Mr. Juárez' concern with the level of need for assistance to families and teachers with an explanation of increases in services.

Ms. McPherson confirmed Dr. Stegeman's point that IEPs are developed by committees, not just a parent, by indicating the parent is a member of the IEP team.

Referencing the multicultural and culturally relevant director position, Dr. Stegeman stated he thought the effort to minimize administrative overhead costs was good. He expressed his opinion that this structure will set up and improve the clarity of the process and the use of deseg funds as they should be.

Mr. Hicks asked for clarification on whether the multicultural and the culturally relevant courses in the USP are mandatory or elective. Mr. Brown explained the language is not clear and is a matter of interpretation but indicated that the courses are not mandated at this point.

Mr. Hicks asked for clarification on the issue of the budget being submitted to the Court after Board approval. Mr. Brown indicated the District would know of any objections

ITEM

ACTION

STUDY ITEM (continued)

2. Study of Proposed SY 13-14 Desegregation Budget
(continued)

by the eleventh day following submission to the Court, and predicted the budget should be final after any adjustments by June 1.

Ms. Foster inquired if efforts are being duplicated in different areas of the USP. Mr. Brown explained the requirement to do an assessment of all core strategies to provide the foundational piece which will determine where there is duplication or gaps requiring additional effort, and indicated there has not been time enough to do that yet.

Ms. Grijalva expressed concern there could be duplication between student support services and dropout prevention and asked if the Board could receive more information before the May 7 meeting on how those projects work together. She also commented this is the first time the Board has the opportunity to discuss the budget, and suggested that Board members send additional questions they may have to Dr. Pedicone or through the Board office prior to the May 7 meeting. Mr. Brown explained how duplication is being addressed. He confirmed Ms. Grijalva's clarification that the USP is flexible and doesn't prevent changing the format of student support services with the exception of Native American Student Support Services. He explained that the USP specifically gives the District the authority to organize itself in any way it sees fit. The Plaintiffs could object but would have to make argument in court. In response to Ms. Grijalva's comments about duplication of student services and the ability to show proof of success for this method, Mr. Brown indicated the key will be assessment of services, and Dr. Pedicone commented that was a reason to reorganize the student services departments.

In response to Ms. Foster's question on whether there is a plan for extending the dual language program in the budget, Mr. Brown indicated there is a plan for expanding dual language within the magnet plan but it is still in the process of being developed. He commented it is not named as an ALE (Advanced Learning Experience) in the USP, but that would not prevent it being considered. Ms.

ITEM

ACTION

STUDY ITEM (continued)

2. Study of Proposed SY 13-14 Desegregation Budget
(continued)

Foster commended that the USP does not prevent the District from going above and beyond what is required.

Ms. Grijalva clarified that the conversation would be whether the District has discretion to include dual language in the budget for the USP if dual language is not court approved. Mr. Brown confirmed that dual language expansion will happen whether it's called ALE or not because it's in the USP and will go forward.

Ms. Foster expressed appreciation for staff's work.

SPECIAL MEETING ADJOURNED – 5:43 p.m.

Approved this 11th day of March, 2014.

TUCSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. ONE

By _____
Kristel Ann Foster, Clerk
Governing Board

sl/maw
Minutes\05-02-13Special