

## DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROPOSED BUDGET (JUNE) AND CURRENT PROPOSED BUDGET

| <b>Projects</b>                            | <b>2013-14</b>      | <b>June Version</b> | <b>Proposed Version</b> | <b>Difference</b> |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Project 1 – Personnel                      | \$526,296           | \$566,131           | \$475,683               | (\$90,448)        |
| Project 2 – Student Assignment & Magnets   | \$8,409,810         | \$10,574,364        | \$11,032,034            | \$457,670         |
| Project 3 – Transportation                 | \$8,612,937         | \$9,337,929         | \$9,063,042             | (\$274,887)       |
| Project 4 – ALEs                           | \$5,875,365         | \$6,471,424         | \$9,148,380             | \$2,676,956       |
| Project 5 – Achievement Support            | \$8,956,716         | \$8,179,225         | \$7,752,665             | (\$426,560)       |
| Project 6 – Inclusive School Environments  | \$4,657,203         | \$2,701,589         | \$2,742,646             | \$41,057          |
| Project 7 – Discipline                     | \$2,025,082         | \$1,915,715         | \$1,918,649             | \$2,934           |
| Project 8 – Family Engagement              | \$722,548           | \$677,557           | \$716,315               | \$38,758          |
| Project 9 – Facilities                     | \$819,755           | \$1,674,985         | \$1,677,967             | \$2,982           |
| Project 10 – Technology                    | \$547,013           | \$588,000           | \$632,130               | \$44,130          |
| Project 11 – Administration, Budget, NARAs | \$8,417,990         | \$7,600,715         | \$6,433,225             | (\$1,167,490)     |
| Project 12 – Professional Development      | \$1,961,408         | \$1,943,291         | \$2,120,949             | \$177,658         |
| Project 13 – Transparency/ Accountability  | \$1,410,065         | \$1,950,878         | \$1,664,896             | (\$285,982)       |
| Project 14 – ELL and OCR                   | \$10,437,535        | \$9,200,874         | \$8,332,486             | (\$868,388)       |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                               | <b>\$63,379,720</b> | <b>63,382,677</b>   | <b>\$63,711,067</b>     |                   |

## **DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROPOSED BUDGET (JUNE) AND CURRENT PROPOSED BUDGET**

On June 2, 2014, the District submitted a Proposed USP Budget for 2014-15 to the Special Master and Parties. Between June 2, 2014 and today, the District continues to work collaboratively with the Special Master and Plaintiffs through an ongoing exchange of comments, feedback and responses; and through two teleconferences devoted solely to collaboration on the developing the budget. After reviewing, analyzing, and incorporating comments and feedback from the Special Master and Plaintiffs, the District has revised the budget to include more accurate benefits and salary information<sup>1</sup>, changes based on discussions with the Special Master and Plaintiffs, and additional staff to implement the USP more efficiently and effectively in a manner that is aligned to the District's overall reorganization<sup>2</sup>. This list includes additional changes that the District has incorporated into the revised proposed USP budget. The projected impacts are estimated based on the most current information, dollar-for-dollar impacts cannot be calculated at this time.

---

<sup>1</sup> The average salaries and average benefit rates were not yet calculated as of June 2, 2014. The revised version of the Proposed USP Budget for 2014-15 uses real salaries where possible (in place of average salaries), and uses the appropriate benefit rates.

<sup>2</sup> The District's reorganization was based in large part on the results of the Curriculum and Efficiency Audits, both of which were produced in April/May 2014. The District's response to those audits had not yet been finalized by June 2, 2014.

**Benefits**

As of June 2, 2014, the District had yet to calculate the new benefit rates that would affect salaries across the board, including changes required by the ACA. The District used the 2013-14 benefit rates to create the Proposed USP Budget that was submitted on June 2, 2014.

IMPACT TO PROPOSED BUDGET: REDUCTION (BUT ADDITIONAL POSITIONS WERE ADDED, RESULTING IN AN ADDITION OF \$300k)

**Salaries**

As of June 2, 2014, the District used average salaries (based on the average salaries from 2013-14) to create the Proposed USP Budget that was submitted on June 2, 2014. The revised budget includes a teacher salary adjustment resulting from the Districtwide initiative to address teacher salary compression<sup>3</sup>. Since June 2014, the District has corrected the salary figures to accurately reflect the appropriate teacher average salary.

IMPACT TO PROPOSED BUDGET: INCREASE (ADDITIONAL POSITIONS WERE ADDED)

---

<sup>3</sup> In December 2013 the Governing Board directed staff to address teacher salary compression in three phases. (Salary compression can be described as equalizing salaries to address pay inequity where new employees receive salaries higher than those salaries being paid to the current employees in similar jobs).

**Overhead**

As a response to comments and feedback from the Special Master, the Mendoza Plaintiffs, and the Fisher Plaintiffs, the District eliminated the budget lines for overhead while direct billing costs allocable to specific USP activities that had received 910(g) funding in the past. These include: a portion of AP teacher salaries, a portion of dual-language teacher salaries; funding CRC teachers, and funding capital items to support ELL students.

**IMPACT TO PROPOSED BUDGET:**

- TRANSFERRED APPROXIMATELY \$3.1M FROM PROJECT 11 TO VARIOUS OTHER PROJECTS;
- INCREASE TO THE OVERALL BUDGET OF APPROXIMATELY \$160,000, REPRESENTING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PREVIOUS OVERHEAD AMOUNT (\$3.11M) AND THE AMOUNT NOW BEING CHARGED DIRECTLY TO SPECIFIC ITEMS (\$3.27M)

**Communications / AAAATF Recommendations**

As a response to comments and feedback from the Mendoza and Fisher Plaintiffs, the District reallocated approximately \$470,000 from the Communications Department (Project 2) to Family Engagement (Project 8) and towards implementation of the African American Academic Achievement Task Force (AAAATF) Recommendations (Project 5). Of the total amount transferred, approximately \$30,000 went to Project 8 to fund the Community Outreach Coordinator, and approximately \$440,000 went to Project 5 to fund the implementation of the AAAATF Recommendations (in addition to another \$60,000 from contingency).

**IMPACT TO PROPOSED BUDGET:**

- TRANSFERRED APPROXIMATELY \$30,000 FROM PROJECT 2 TO PROJECT 8
- TRANSFERRED APPROXIMATELY \$440,000 FROM PROJECT 2 TO PROJECT 5
- INCREASE TO CONTINGENCY OF APPROXIMATELY \$40,000<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> The District had earmarked \$100,000 of contingency for implementing the AAAATF Recommendations (acknowledging that the amount may rise significantly), but is using only \$40,000 of the previously earmarked amount of \$100,000. The total amount (\$500,000) has been separated from contingency, converted into a separate line item, and now represents an increase in allocation towards this activity from \$100,000 to \$500,000.

**Facilities / UHS Portables**

As a response to the Court Order of June 25, 2014 approving the District's Notice and Request for Approval, the District has allocated \$400,000 to Project 9 to relocate portables to UHS.

IMPACT TO PROPOSED BUDGET: INCREASE TO PROJECT 9 OF APPROXIMATELY \$400,000

**Assistant Superintendents**

In response to comments and feedback from the Special Master, the District removed 910(g) funding from Assistant Superintendents and their support staff.

IMPACT TO PROPOSED BUDGET: REDUCE PROJECT 5 BY APPROXIMATELY \$137,000 (INCLUDES BENEFITS)

**Sr. Director of Desegregation Compliance and Equity**

To implement the USP in a more efficient and effective manner, the District created an Assistant Superintendent for Student Support Services who supervises a Senior Director for Desegregation Compliance and Equity, who in turn supervises the Director of Desegregation, the Family Engagement Director, and the four student services directors. This change is budget neutral as it merely renames and repurposes what had been titled "Executive Director for E&I" in the June 2, 2014 Proposed USP Budget.

IMPACT TO PROPOSED BUDGET: NO IMPACT

**Family Engagement Director (.5 Deseg / .5 Title I)****Community Outreach Coordinator (.5 Deseg / .5 Title I)****Family Engagement Coordinator (.5 Deseg / .5 Title I)**

In response to comments and feedback from the Special Master and Mendoza Plaintiffs, the District hereby describes in detail how it has reallocated resources to support family engagement.

Under the reorganization, and to demonstrate our commitment to student success through family and community engagement, the District created a structure to implement districtwide family engagement strategies for all students and families, with a special focus on struggling students. This structure includes a Senior Director for Desegregation Compliance and Equity that supervises a Family Engagement Director, who in turn works closely with the four student services directors, Title I, and other related departments and directly with schools. In the June 2, 2014 Proposed USP Budget, a .5 FTE (\$30,000) for “Community Outreach Coordinator” was allocated to Project 2; this position has been transferred to Project 8 (see above description of change to Communications). The total 1.0 FTE for the other two positions (approximately \$98,000 with benefits) is being reallocated from the original \$500,000 amount allocated to implement the Family and Community Engagement Plan.

**IMPACT TO PROPOSED BUDGET:**

- REDUCED PROJECT 2 BY APPROXIMATELY \$30,000
- INCREASED PROJECT 8 BY APPROXIMATELY \$30,000
- SPECIFIED THE ALLOCATION OF \$98,000 OF THE TOTAL \$500,000 PREVIOUSLY ALLOCATED TO IMPLEMENT THE FAMILY ENGAGEMENT PLAN

**Sr. Director of Curriculum Development (.25 Deseg / .75 M&O)**

To implement the USP in a more efficient and effective manner, and in response to the Curriculum and Efficiency Audits, the District created this position to oversee curriculum development, including directly supervising the Director of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy and Instruction and the Director of Multicultural Curriculum, and will ensure that the District is meeting the implementation timelines and goals associated with these programs in a manner that is consistent with the overall curriculum development in the District.

IMPACT TO PROPOSED BUDGET: INCREASE TO PROJECT 6 OF APPROXIMATELY \$36,000 (INCLUDES BENEFITS)

**Sr. Director of Curriculum Deployment (.25 Deseg / .75 M&O)**

This person will ensure compliance with all USP professional development activities and supervise the Learning Support Coordinators at each site. A primary function will be to ensure that the Multi Tiered System of Support (MTSS) is being implemented with fidelity. This funding draws on the funding available from removing the previous function titled “Director of Professional Development” in Project 12 (.8 FTE). This is the USP-required “director-level employee to coordinate professional development and support efforts” (USP Section IV.B.3)

IMPACT TO PROPOSED BUDGET:

- REDUCE PROJECT 12 BY \$67,000;
- TRANSFER \$33,000 TO PROJECT 5 (INCLUDES BENEFITS)

**Sr. Director of Curriculum Assessment and Evaluation (.5 Deseg / .5 M&O)**

This person will ensure that data systems are in place to track performance data at sites, will develop metrics for the program evaluation of key aspects of the Unitary Status Plan, and will be integral to EBAS development.

IMPACT TO PROPOSED BUDGET: INCREASE TO PROJECT 13 OF APPROXIMATELY \$62,000

**Transition Counselors**

In accordance with the Court Order from February 15, 2013 (approving school closures, and requiring the District to “allocate extra financial resources for support services for incoming and current students enrolled in D or C- receiving schools to mitigate the negative effects of the transition”) additional school counselor services were needed at receiving schools. In the June 2, 2014 budget this item was not included as this issue was not identified and addressed until after June 2. This item would maintain funding from SY 2013-14.

During the 2013-14 school year, it was evident that one school year of services would not be enough. The social, emotional, academic and personal issues that arose as a result of merging schools were greater than expected. Transitioning two cohorts of students on to high school is needed to complete the assimilation process. Also, merging the schools created larger numbers of students in each grade level, however, not to the extent that the staffing formula would provide additional counselor FTE. All three schools have enrollments that fund one counselor by formula (1:500) and are close to numbers to fund two. Doolen (904), Mansfeld (801) and Secrist (670) were all receiving schools in SY 2013-14 (receiving kids from Townsend, Wakefield, and Carson, respectively). With the additional enrollment numbers and the compounded issues resulting from merging these middle schools, there is substantial need to continue this funding.

IMPACT TO PROPOSED BUDGET: INCREASE TO PROJECT 11 OF APPROXIMATELY \$150,000 (INCLUDES BENEFITS)