2017-18 USP BUDGET, FINAL DRAFT COVER LETTER

CHECKLIST

Items	Attachment
□ TUSD provides the Final Draft using a format similar to Draft #3 (all changes between drafts emphasized). The District	Cover Letter
includes the following sub-sections within this cover letter to provide additional information to the Special Master and	and Forms
Plaintiffs to ensure understanding of the proposed allocations and the decision-making processes that led to the proposed	
allocations: Section A, Proposed Allocations by Priority; Section B, Significant Changes Between Draft #3 and the Final	
Draft; Section C, Major Issues; and Section D, Responses to Comments and RFIs on Draft 3.	
The District provides the following, where applicable, for each activity:	
□ A summary of the Final Draft proposed aggregated allocations broken out by allocation from 910G and any other USP	Form 1-A
related funding sources, by activity with the 2017-18 Proposed Allocation [1-A], the 2016-17 Allocation [1-B], and the	Form 1-B
variance between the Final Draft 2017-18 proposed allocation and the 2016-17 allocation [1-C]	Form 1-C
□ Final Draft proposed allocation for the activity in the proposed budget year (2017-18), the current budget year (2016-17), and Draft #3 [Form 2]	Form 2
□ Actual expenditures for each activity for the previous budget year (2015-16), allocations and projections for each activity	Form 5
for the current budget year (2016-17), proposed allocations for each activity for the proposed budget year (2017-18) [Form 5]	
□ 910G budget detail, including Final Draft proposed 2017-18 allocations, current year (2016-17) budgeted allocations, and	Form 4
comments relating to any position and/or program changes [Form 3] and specific line item allocations by department [Form 4]	

A. FINAL DRAFT PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS BY PRIORITY

Within the portion of the 910(G) budget that is dedicated to USP implementation¹, close to ninety percent of the proposed allocations are dedicated to the following priorities: Integration (33%); Student Support (19%); Advanced Learning Experiences and Dual-Language (16%); Teacher Support / PD (12%); and CRCs, staff recruitment, and discipline (2% each). The chart below provides a high-level view of USP funding by priority category. However, the categories are by no means mutually exclusive. For example, large portions of Magnet and ALE funding could also be classified as teacher support, professional development, and student support. And, there are smaller investments in certain areas that are not included in this chart as it is intended to give a high-level view (e.g. extracurricular funding that supports students through tutoring is not included in this chart):

Related Priority	Description	% of
		\$55.5M in
		the Final
		Draft
Student Support, MTSS, Task Force	Academic Interventions / Student Supports (Activity Codes 106, 506, 511-516)	19%
ALEs (including Dual Language)	ALE (Activity Codes 501, 502, and 504)	16%
Integration	Magnet Schools (Activity Code 202)	15%
Integration	USP Transportation (Activity Codes 301 and 302)	16%
Teacher Support / PD	Teacher Support and PD (Activity Codes 409-418, and 508-509)	12%
Required	Attorney and Special Master Fees² (a portion of Activity Codes 101 and 102)	3%
CRCs	Culturally Relevant Courses (Activity Code 510)	2%
Recruitment	Staff Recruitment, Retention, Assignment (401-408)	2%
Integration	Student Assignment (Activity Codes 201, 203-205)	2%
Discipline	Discipline (Activity Codes 601-607)	2%
	TOTAL	89.00%

¹ Total 910G Budget is \$63.7M, allocated as follows (amounts are approximated): \$55.5M for USP compliance; \$8.1M for expenses related to ELD and/or OCR compliance. There is approximately \$55.5M in available 910G funding to implement the USP.

² The District must pay attorney fees to the Fisher and Mendoza Plaintiffs, and fees to the Special Master (and the three Implementation Committee members). The District also pays for internal and external counsel.