

# *The* FISCAL REPORT *an informational update*

Copyright © 2018 School Services of California, Inc.

Volume 38

For Publication Date: January 12, 2018

No. 1

Special Fiscal Report: Governor's Proposals for the 2018-19 State Budget and K-12 Education

## **Preface**

What if life gave each of us a “mulligan” which in golf allows us to replay a shot to see if we can do better? How would we use that “mulligan” to our best advantage?

Well, Governor Jerry Brown got that “mulligan” and used it fully. The opportunity to be Governor at a young age, leaving office in 1974, then holding a variety of elected positions over nearly three decades, then becoming Governor again in 2010 gave Governor Brown the replay he wanted. Equipped with the experience and knowledge gained over a long political life, Governor Brown was clearly ready to put his mark on the state a second time as Governor. However, this was going to be the toughest course he had ever played!

## **The Challenge**

Most of us remember what California looked like when Governor Brown was elected in the middle of the Great Recession: Unemployment rates of 14%, among the highest in the nation; cuts to school funding totaling an ongoing 22%; the worst credit rating of any state in the U.S.; companies moving out of California for greener pastures elsewhere; state revenues that consistently came in lower than projected and left the state so cash-poor that it could not even pay annual apportionments to schools without substantial deferrals; reductions in school staffing of more than 20%, in addition to layoffs, furlough days, increased class sizes, reductions in the school year, and a 20% cut to categorical programs.

And the dysfunction extended far beyond public education. The rancorous environment and partisan bickering in the Legislature led to State Budgets that were consistently months late and filled with gimmicks to try to survive another year. The state General Fund carried a negative reserve that was getting worse, not better. Federal judges were ordering the state to release prisoners to reduce overcrowding. The housing market had collapsed to the extent that the median price of homes was half what it had been four years before. Anyone longing for the bad old days?

## **The Path to Recovery**

Crisis leadership is about defining the key controllable elements of a critical situation and massing resources at those points to bring about positive change. To accomplish that in a situation like Governor Brown inherited, he used his extensive experience in governance, built legislative support often by supermajority, and put his own personal charisma and reputation on the line.

Later on, when the national economic recovery started, the Governor's plan received a needed and expected boost, but for the first three years of his term we remained mired in the Great Recession and there was no external help to be had. California needed to create jobs, opportunities for employers, and a stronger more sustainable tax base, all while supporting the needs of former tax payers who had suddenly become tax receivers. Aided by temporary taxes, spending reductions and difficult policy choices, Governor Brown tackled the problems facing the state.

We are advocates for public education and do not like the fact that during the Great Recession the bulk of the State Budget cuts were taken by education. We felt the same about the classified, certificated, and management staff members in school districts shouldering the sacrifice of lower budgets and fewer jobs. But we also recognize that in order to save the ship you may have to offload the heaviest cargo, so sometimes the gold (in this case, our children's education) must be jettisoned. Moving the needle on California's recovery required bold, immediate actions; and Governor Brown took those actions. There was no guarantee that the Governor's plan would save our state, but the absence of action would guarantee defeat.

### **The Recovery**

Aided by improving national and state economic conditions, California's recovery allowed the Governor to reshape major state institutions. No more property tax diversions to Redevelopment Agencies, a long-term solvency plan for the state's defunct pension plans, greater reliance on the top one-percent of taxpayers, and of course, restructuring of the entire educational delivery model.

Beginning in 2013, and continuing today, we have enjoyed revenues that are higher than those projected by the state in every year. Conservative budgeting has allowed the Administration to avoid the temptation to restore spending too quickly and risk falling back into the downward spiral. The constitutionally required "true-up mechanism" for Proposition 98 is intended to ensure that education will eventually receive at least the minimum guarantee. By paying significant amounts in arrears, each year the Administration created a safety net in case future revenues did not come in as planned.

For public education, reform has come in the form of the Local Control Funding Formula/Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCFF/LCAP). Now in its fifth year, an accumulation of longitudinal data from multiple measures and new testing processes are beginning to paint a pastiche of the effectiveness of the new system compared to the known deficiencies of the old Revenue Limit/Categorical model. While no new system is expected to be perfect or produce measurable results instantly, five years is, in our opinion, long enough to see evidence either confirming or denying that closure of the achievement gap is occurring. It will take longer to evaluate the full effect of all of the reforms, but after five years we believe there should be at least preliminary indications of success. With each year that passes the evaluation model should become a stronger indicator of progress—or lack thereof.

### **The Capstone**

Apologizing for the lengthy history and foundation, we can now turn our attention to 2018-19 and the Governor's final State Budget. According to all of our most reliable sources, revenues for 2018-19 are again projected to be higher than the state has previously estimated. The Governor's proposals for 2018-19 include the Administration's revenue and expenditure estimates and planned program decisions based upon those estimates. We detail major program and budgetary effects later in this *Special Fiscal Report*.

Specifically, the Governor proposes significant actions in the following areas:

- **Proposition 98 Funding:** The proposed 2018-19 Governor's Budget includes Proposition 98 funding of \$78.3 billion for 2018-19. The current-year Proposition 98 level increases by \$700 million to \$75.2 billion and when combined with more than \$100 million in settle-up payments for prior years, the Budget proposes an increase of \$4.6 billion in K-14 education over 2017-18.
- **Local Control Funding Formula:** The Governor's Budget proposes nearly \$3 billion to fully fund the LCFF, including a 2.51% cost-of-living adjustment (COLA), two years ahead of the initial implementation timeline.
- **Discretionary Funds:** The Budget proposes \$1.8 billion in one-time Proposition 98 General Fund money for school districts, charter schools, and county offices of education (COEs) to use at local discretion, which would be counted by the state as offsetting mandate reimbursement claims for these entities.
- **Career-Technical Education (CTE):** The Budget proposes an ongoing increase of \$200 million to establish a K-12 specific component of the California Community College's Strong Workforce Program to encourage the establishment and support of K-12 CTE programs that are aligned with needed industry skills. The Administration also proposes an ongoing increase of \$12 million to fund local industry experts who will provide technical support to LEAs operating, or proposing to operate, CTE programs.

All of these issues and more are detailed below and will be further expanded in our presentation of our Governor's Budget Workshop on January 16 and 17, 2018.

## **The Legacy**

Stepping back to the big picture for a moment, it would be inappropriate and misleading to judge this Governor, or any leader, on short-term results. The body of work accumulated by Governor Brown over these past two terms have had a profound effect on the state's prospects for the future. Who had ever heard of the word "subsidiarity" before the Governor's Budget Proposals for 2009-10? Now we see that on the basis of that single word a new philosophy of distribution of governmental functions was born.

Cities, counties, prisons, jails, school districts and community colleges have all been affected by subsidiarity. Under the Governor's direction, governmental functions have purposefully been pushed downward to make local control much more local. Time will tell if subsidiarity really produces the expected results, but it was the genesis for major reform.

Clearly the centerpiece of the Governor's reform effort is public education. The Governor placed his confidence in Dr. Michael Kirst, in our opinion one of the most talented educators in the history of our country, as Chair of the State Board of Education (SBE). Given the opportunity to paint his life's work across the landscape of California, Dr. Kirst led the way. How many times have we held on to a failing system because we had nothing else to replace it? Dr. Kirst, backed by a very strong SBE, provided the leadership to cut loose the old and embrace the new.

As we mentioned earlier, the LCFF/LCAP model is still evolving. There are never any guarantees that a new system will realize its full potential. But failure to try guarantees failure. Measured against that standard, the LCFF/LCAP model provided a reasonable risk/reward ratio. But a distribution model can only do so much. At full implementation of the LCFF, California will retain among the lowest per-pupil funding rates in the nation. Distribution and equity can help, but quantity of dollars brings a quality all its own. It isn't only about dollars, but resources do count and even with the recovery, California still spends much less than other states—that too will be part of every Governor's legacy until it is corrected.

### **Overview of the Governor's Budget Proposals**

On Wednesday, January 10, 2018, shortly after 10:00 a.m., Governor Jerry Brown unveiled his final proposed State Budget for the upcoming 2018-19 fiscal year. He completed his "prepared" remarks on his State Budget proposal in about five minutes and then turned to questions from the press.

The Governor led off with a statement that he was presenting a solid State Budget that prepares California for the future. Repeating the theme that has remained consistent throughout his second stint as Governor, Brown warned of the dire consequences of a recession, especially given the state's volatile tax system. He noted that there have been ten recessions since World War II and that we must prepare for the eleventh. As a result, he is again highlighting the need to build up the state's Rainy Day Fund and referenced last year's Department of Finance (DOF) analysis of the devastating impacts of even a normal recession—a loss of \$20 billion in revenues a year for three years.

He also highlighted his crowning achievement in K-12 education, implementation of the LCFF and his proposal to reach full funding of the targets in 2018-19. He indicated that with regard to subsidiarity (which was a central theme for the LCFF), from his point of view, "The age of micromanagement from Washington and Sacramento is over."

During the Q&A period, the Governor was asked by former Sacramento Bee columnist Dan Walters about his proposal to aggressively fund the Rainy Day Fund. The Governor responded with, "I thought you retired," which got a big laugh. He then went on to say, "This is about steady as you go or exuberance followed by regret and pain," noting the effects of the dot-com bubble under the Davis Administration and the fiscal aftermath inherited by former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger.

In addition to significant proposals in Proposition 98, some of the major initiatives of the Governor's State Budget include:

**Full Funding of the Rainy Day Fund:** Proposition 2, approved by California voters in 2014, established a constitutional goal of reserving 10% of tax revenues in a Rainy Day Fund. The Governor's Budget proposes a \$3.5 billion supplemental payment in addition to the constitutionally required transfer to the Rainy Day Fund for 2018-19. The two payments would bring the total Rainy Day Fund to \$13.5 billion, which hits the 10% goal.

**Higher Education:** The Budget proposes an LCFF-style funding formula for the California Community Colleges and the establishment of a wholly online community college in California. The online college would provide access to higher education for those who do not currently access the California community college system. Additionally, the Budget increases state support for the University of California and the California State University by \$92.1 million, to avoid a tuition increase in 2018-19.

**Health Care Expansion:** Amidst growing uncertainty at the federal level, the Governor's Budget provides funding to increase health care coverage to low-income Californians under the federal Affordable Care Act (ACA).

**Transportation Infrastructure:** The Budget reflects the first full year of funding under the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (Senate Bill 1), which provides stable, long-term funding for both state and local transportation infrastructure. This act provides \$55 billion in new funding over the next decade, split evenly between state and local projects. For 2018-19, the Budget includes \$4.6 billion in new transportation funding.

In closing his press conference, the Governor responded to a question about the changes he has seen in California since first becoming Governor in 1974. He noted the influence of Proposition 13, which inserted Sacramento decision making into the affairs of local government. He also said that there was more bipartisanship in the Legislature four decades ago, noting that both Republicans and Democrats elected the leadership of their houses. With regard to the State Budget, the Governor pointed out that prisons now account for 9% of the Budget compared to 3% during his first term as Governor in the late 1970s. He did acknowledge, however, that a Governor has a greater impact now than 40 years ago.

## **The Economy and Revenues**

### **Economic Outlook**

While acknowledging the continued strength of both the state and national economies, and the subsequent increased revenues they produce, the Governor still has his eyes on ensuring California is prepared for the next inevitable downturn. In both his State Budget proposal and press conference, the Governor calls our attention to the fact that by the end of 2018-19 this recovery will match the longest recovery in post-war history. The previous periods of balanced State Budgets were all followed by large State Budget shortfalls, and the effects on California of the passage of the new federal tax bill, among other federal policies, are still largely unknown.

In light of these realities, Governor Brown proposes another State Budget based on the implementation of prudent fiscal practices that provide a balanced State Budget while continuing

to plan and save for the future. While the economy continues to expand, even a moderate recession could significantly impact state revenues for several years to come. To ensure the state is ready for a potential slow down, the Governor's State Budget proposes fully funding the Rainy Day Fund and allocating the majority of the revenue surplus to one-time expenses. The State Budget is clear that fully funding the Rainy Day Fund may not eliminate the need for spending reductions should a recession or federal policy changes come to pass, but it should allow for the softening of potential cuts and/or shortening of the length of time any potential cuts would be effective.

At the national level, the stock market has reached an all-time high with no signs of slowing down. All three major indices reached new levels the first week in January, with the Dow Jones surpassing 25,000 for the first time. In spite of the Federal Reserve's continued interest rate hikes, housing prices continue to rise and mortgage rates remain historically low. Wages are increasing and the unemployment rate for both the nation and California dropped to 4.6% and 4.1%, respectively, further narrowing the gap between the two. In addition, the country added 228,000 jobs in November 2017 and, as previously noted, the Governor's State Budget anticipates modest growth for the California economy.

## **State Revenues**

The Governor's State Budget presents a rosy picture, with revenues higher than projections. Total state revenues are higher year over year, and the economy continues to grow, though modestly. The higher revenues, as expected, are due largely to an increase in personal income tax collections with sales and use tax also seeing an increase over those estimated by the DOF in the adopted 2017-18 Budget Act.

The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) forecast released in November 2017 also estimated a significant increase in General Fund revenues. The LAO continued to provide two long-term estimates—one based on an economic growth scenario and another based on a mild recession scenario. Under the economic growth scenario, the State Budget will retain a surplus, with increases in revenues from the personal income tax driving the majority of the growth, while the recession scenario reflects a roughly \$80 billion revenue loss, compared to the growth scenario, over the three fiscal years between 2019-20 and 2021-22.

## **Proposition 98**

Adopted by state voters in 1988, Proposition 98 sets in the State Constitution a series of complex formulas that establish the minimum funding level for K-12 education and community colleges from one year to the next. This target level is determined by prior-year appropriations that count toward the guarantee and (1) workload changes as measured by the change in average daily attendance (ADA), and (2) inflation adjustments as measured by the change in either per capita personal income or per capita state General Fund revenues, whichever is less. Over the last several years, Proposition 98 has provided significant gains to schools as funding cuts endured through the Great Recession have been restored.

## **Current-Year Minimum Guarantee**

For the current year, the Governor’s State Budget acknowledges that revenues are higher than projected in the adopted 2017-18 Budget Act, resulting in the increase of the current-year minimum guarantee. For the current year, the Proposition 98 guarantee is now estimated at \$75.2 billion, up approximately \$700 million from the enacted level.

Proposition 98 also requires the state to account for state funding that falls below the long-term target established by Test 2 (i.e., adjustments required by annual changes in per capita personal income). This cumulative shortfall is termed Maintenance Factor. The Governor’s State Budget notes that as of the end of 2017-18, the Maintenance Factor will be down to \$228 million, as the Budget proposes a payment of \$1.12 billion in the current year.

### **2017-18 Minimum Guarantee**

For 2018-19, the Governor’s State Budget proposes a Proposition 98 guarantee of \$78.3 billion, an increase of \$3.1 billion year over year. The guarantee is based on Test 3, the change in per-capita General Fund revenues, plus 0.5%, and the change in K-12 ADA, which is expected to decline in the budget year. The Governor’s State Budget notes that an additional \$92 million in Maintenance Factor will be created—due to it being a Test 3 year—totaling just over \$320 million at the end of 2018-19.

### **Cost-of-Living Adjustment and Average Daily Attendance**

The estimated statutory COLA for K-12 education programs in 2018-19 is 2.51%, and is applied to the LCFF base grant targets, as well as other education programs that are funded outside of the LCFF. Those programs include Special Education, Child Nutrition, Foster Youth, Preschool, American Indian Education Centers, and the American Indian Early Childhood Education program, all of which are proposed to receive the statutory COLA.

Statewide, ADA is expected to decrease in 2018-19 by 17,163 ADA from 2017-18 levels to an estimated ADA of 5,944,090.

### **Local Control Funding Formula**

The Governor’s 2018-19 Budget proposal fully implements the LCFF two years earlier than originally projected with an infusion of nearly \$3 billion. The LCFF provides funding to transition all LEAs toward target funding levels, and provides supplemental revenues through percentage weighting factors to increase or improve services for students who are not English language proficient, who are from low-income families, or who are in foster care.

### **LCFF Target Entitlements for School Districts and Charter Schools**

The target base grants by grade span for 2018-19 are increased over 2017-18 by 2.51% to reflect the estimated statutory COLA:

<b>Grade Span</b>	<b>2017-18 Target Base Grant Per ADA</b>	<b>2.51% COLA</b>	<b>2018-19 Target Base Grant Per ADA</b>
-------------------	--	-------------------	--

TK-3	\$7,193	\$180	\$7,374
4-6	\$7,301	\$183	\$7,484
7-8	\$7,518	\$189	\$7,707
9-12	\$8,712	\$219	\$8,931

In addition, the 2018-19 Transitional Kindergarten (TK)-3 grant increase for the class-size reduction (CSR) grade span adjustment is \$767 per ADA, and the grade 9-12 base grant per ADA is increased by \$232 in recognition of the need for CTE courses provided to students in the secondary grades.

School districts and charter schools are entitled to supplemental increases equal to 20% of the adjusted base grant (includes CSR and CTE funding) for the percentage of enrolled students who are English learners, eligible for the free and reduced-price meals program, or in foster care. An additional 50% per-pupil increase is provided as a concentration grant for each eligible student enrolled beyond 55% of total enrollment.

### **LCFF Transition Entitlements and Gap Funding**

The difference between an LEA's current funding and its target entitlement is called the LCFF gap, and it is this gap that is funded with the additional dollars dedicated each year to implementation of the LCFF. For 2018-19, the Governor's Budget proposes to spend almost \$3 billion to move from 97% implemented to fully close the LCFF funding gap—two years ahead of the intended 2020-21 implementation date.

The table below shows the DOF's LCFF gap percentages through 2018-19:

<b>District and Charter School LCFF Funding and Gap Closure Estimates (Dollars in Millions)</b>					
	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>
LCFF Funding	\$4,722	\$5,994	\$2,942	\$1,362	\$2,883
Gap Closure %	30.16%	52.56%	56.08%	44.97%	100.00%
COLA	0.85%	1.02%	0.00%	1.56%	2.51%

Pupil transportation and Targeted Instructional Improvement Grants continue as separate add-ons to the LCFF allocations and do not receive a COLA.

### **Fiscal Transparency**

Citing expressed concerns about the direct services being provided to the students that generate LCFF dollars, the Governor's Budget proposes requiring LEAs to show how their budget expenditures align with the strategies detailed in their LCAPs for serving students that generate supplemental grants. Additionally, the Governor proposes calculating and reporting on a single website the total amount of supplemental and concentration funding provided to each LEA under the LCFF.

## **County Offices of Education**

COEs receive funding under a similar formula, with funding provided in recognition of direct instructional services for pupils in juvenile court schools and community schools and an allocation for countywide services based on the number of school districts and total ADA within the county. As of 2014-15, the LCFF for COEs is fully implemented and, therefore, LCFF increases for COEs in 2018-19 are provided through the estimated COLA only, with COEs that are at their LCFF target receiving a 2.51% increase. COEs that are more than 2.51% above their LCFF target will receive no additional funding through the formula in the budget year.

COE funding for 2018-19 is increased under the Governor's Budget proposal by a net of \$6.2 million to account for a COLA on LCFF entitlements and changes in ADA.

## **Community-Funded School Districts**

School districts with property tax revenues that exceed the formula funding levels will continue to retain their local tax growth, and will receive a minimum state aid allocation that is reduced by the cuts incurred during the recession which, under the LCFF, are carried forward into future years for these districts.

## **System of Support**

Full funding of the LCFF is coupled with additional investments in the final phase of implementation of the LCFF, namely the accountability provisions. With the development and official launch of the California School Dashboard, the focus is now on making sure that LEAs are using their dollars to demonstrate improvements in student performance.

The state's new accountability system includes a statewide system of support tasked with providing varying levels of assistance for LEAs. The Dashboard has been used to identify school districts—for the first time under LCFF—that require differentiated assistance because one or more of their student groups have low performance across multiple state priorities.

The Governor's proposed Budget invests \$55.2 million in ongoing funding for COEs to work with districts identified for differentiated assistance. COEs are required to work with identified school districts to determine the causes of poor student performance and to connect school districts with resources as needed. Recognizing that certain COEs are better poised to work with their districts as required under the system of support, the 2018-19 State Budget includes \$4 million ongoing for a competitive grant for eight COEs to serve as leads to provide training, resources, and support for other COEs to do the work to support their districts.

Finally, the Budget has invested an additional \$6.5 million of ongoing funding for the California Collaborative for Education Excellence to work with COEs to provide assistance to school districts as part of the state system of support.

## **Special Education**

The Governor proposes modest one-time and ongoing funding for special education programs. In addition to applying a 2.51% COLA increase, the Governor proposes \$100 million in one-time funding for programs to increase and retain special education teachers (see Teacher Workforce Development section below).

The 2018-19 State Budget proposal also contains \$10 million in ongoing funding for SELPAs to work with COEs to provide technical assistance to LEAs to improve student outcomes as part of the statewide system of support.

The Governor proposes \$167 million, of which \$125 million is ongoing, to establish an “Inclusive Education Expansion Program” aimed at increasing availability of programs for children ages 0 to 5, aimed at improving school readiness and long-term academic outcomes for low-income children and children with exceptional needs.

The State Budget also contains proposals that revise special education budget transparency and accountability by requiring SELPAs to complete a SELPA local plan template that aligns the services and resources noted in the local plan with the goals identified in their member district’s LCAP and to summarize how a SELPA’s planned expenditures and services align with the improved student outcome strategies noted in the SELPA’s plan.

### **Teacher Workforce Development**

The Governor’s Budget proposes \$100 million in one-time funding for Teacher Workforce Development targeted to special education educators. The Administration notes that two-thirds of school districts have been identified as having poor special education performance.

Specifically, the Administration proposes:

- \$50 million one-time funding to support locally sponsored, one-year intensive, mentored, clinical teacher preparation programs aimed at preparing and retaining special education teachers
- \$50 million one-time funding to provide competitive grants to local educational agencies to develop and implement new, or expand existing, locally identified solutions that address a local need

This infusion is focused on special education and comes on the heels of successive years of funding to address the teacher shortage in California in the areas of professional development, classified employee credentialing grants, and four-year credentialing programs.

### **Career-Technical Education**

The Governor’s 2018-19 State Budget proposal includes \$200 million in ongoing funding to establish a K-12 specific component of the community college-administered Strong Workforce Program. The Governor notes the new funding is aimed at encouraging “the establishment and support of K-12 CTE programs that are aligned with needed industry skills.” The Governor proposes an ongoing increase of \$12 million to fund local industry experts who will provide

technical support to LEAs operating, or proposing to operate, CTE programs. The Governor notes, “This proposal creates a predictable, targeted, and sustained funding stream to support an industry and student-focused infrastructure for workforce development collaboration at the state, regional, and local levels.”

### **Discretionary Funds**

The Governor’s Budget proposes \$1.8 billion in one-time Proposition 98 funds for school districts, charter schools, and COEs to use at the discretion of local governing boards. This equates to approximately \$295 per ADA. These funds, like prior years, would be counted by the state as offsetting prior-year mandate reimbursement claims on a dollar-for-dollar basis. The 2018-19 State Budget Summary notes that this infusion, coupled with past years’ payments, reduces the amount owed to LEAs for mandates from a recent high of \$6 billion to less than \$1 billion.

### **Child Care and Preschool**

Maintaining a three-year agreement with the Legislature to increase investments in child care and preschool, the Governor’s Budget proposes to increase reimbursement rates and fund the final tranche of state preschool slots. Specifically, the 2018-19 State Budget proposes to:

- Increase the Standard Reimbursement Rate by 2.8%, for a total General Fund and Proposition 98 investment of \$47.7 million—\$16.1 million and \$31.6 million, respectively
- Provide an ongoing \$34.2 million to convert the temporary Regional Market Rate (RMR) “hold harmless” provision to a permanent provision, beginning in 2019-20
- Fund an additional 2,959 full-day State Preschool slots, beginning in April 2018
- Fulfill the fiscal year 2017-18 increase to the RMR to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of the 2016 regional market rate survey, beginning January 1, 2018
- Make a modest adjustment to California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Stage 2 and Stage 3 to reflect caseload and estimated costs of care
- Provide \$125 million in one-time Proposition 98 funding and \$42.2 million in federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families funds to create the Inclusive Early Education Expansion Program to increase the availability of early education and care for children ages 0 to 5, targeting children in low-income areas

The Governor also acknowledges the operation of state-approved pilot programs in 13 counties that authorizes providers in those counties to earn their full contracts through greater program flexibility. His proposal commits to working with providers in those counties to help streamline requirements.

### **School Facilities**

In light of last summer’s action by the SAB to approve a Grant Agreement required by all applicants of the School Facility Program, alongside impending changes to facility project

expenditure audits as part of the K-12 annual audit, the 2018-19 State Budget proposes to authorize a total of \$640 million in Proposition 51 bond authority.

Additionally, the Budget proposes an ongoing appropriation of \$28.3 million to the Charter School Facility Grant Program (CSFGP), which assists charters with the payment of rent and lease obligations, to reflect anticipated program participation.

The 2018-19 Governor's State Budget includes no additional investments in the Clean Energy Jobs Creation Fund (Proposition 39) as fiscal year 2017-18 was the final year of the five-year program approved by the voters in 2012.

### **Federal Programs**

At the federal level, there remains continued uncertainty regarding federal appropriations for public education programs. In December 2017, Congress passed a Continuing Resolution (CR) that funds all discretionary funding at current levels until January 19, 2018. There are rumors that the CR will be extended through mid-February to allow Congress to work out deals on immigration and health care issues.

In his 2018-19 State Budget proposal, Governor Brown notes that, "California's relationship with the federal government has never been more uncertain." The Budget proposal does not factor in the ramifications of the recently enacted federal tax bill, nor any additional proposed federal cost shifts resulting from the repeal of the ACA or other federal entitlements. The Governor indicates the May Revision will include a preliminary analysis of the proposed impact of the tax cuts and any enacted cost shifts on the state's economy and revenues.

### **In Closing**

In closing, remember that the Governor's Budget proposals mark the beginning of the process, not the end. We expect the Legislature to push back on the Governor's priorities and especially his revenue estimates. As the various proposals are considered by legislative committees, we can expect both confrontation and compromise; in our opinion, the Governor continues to win on the issues most important to him.

There was a time, not so long ago (certainly during Governor Brown's political lifetime), when California was the envy of the world. We had the best public education system in the world. The best jobs, the best homes, the best weather, the best beaches, and we even had Disneyland! Employers came here for our educated work force and created high-paying jobs in aerospace, medicine, manufacturing, agriculture and construction. We were leaders in all those areas.

Then came Proposition 13 and the erosion of our infrastructure began. Our education system suffered immediate damage and we dropped from the top 5 to the bottom 10 states by any measure. The roads lasted, but not forever. The jobs first stopped coming to California, then started leaving. High-paying technical and professional jobs left and were replaced by lower-paying service industry jobs. More of California's governmental and education expenditures were funded by volatile sales and income taxes as opposed to the more stable property tax. By

the 1980s, for the first time in our history, the population of tax receivers was growing faster than the economy itself.

We, and all of our readers, care about public education because we know it is the great equalizer. Not just economics, or safety, or social justice, or human dignity—but all of them are dependent upon an education system that builds our country one student at a time. No one Governor or one State Budget can be expected to address all of our needs, but every State Budget should be expected to make progress on the ones we hold most dear. We think this State Budget continues to advance those choices and priorities.

We also think Governor Brown is going out on top. He didn't address every issue, perhaps not even to his own satisfaction, but he was our Winston Churchill and he "never gave up" on California, even in our "darkest hour." Perhaps that is his greatest legacy.

—*SSC Staff*

posted 01/10/2018



# Pacific Elementary School

50 Ocean St. • Davenport, CA 95017 • 831.425.7002 • Grades K-6

Eric Gross, Principal  
egross@pacificesd.org  
<http://www.pacificesd.org>

## 2016-17 School Accountability Report Card Published During the 2017-18 School Year

### Pacific Elementary School District

50 Ocean St.  
Davenport, CA 95017-1007  
831.425.7002  
<http://www.pacificesd.org/>

#### District Governing Board

Gwyan Rhabyt  
Don Croll  
Cari Napoles

#### District Administration

Eric Gross  
Superintendent

### School Description

#### **Mission Statement**

Pacific School's mission is to prepare children for life through experiential learning that addresses the needs of the whole child. We create a safe and secure school environment that promotes social and academic growth and develops an enthusiasm for learning, a positive self-image, and cross-cultural understanding.

#### **School Profile**

Pacific School offers children, parents, and staff the unique opportunity to work together in a small, harmonious environment, giving individual attention and individualized instruction. The School Plan focuses on an integrated curriculum that allows learning to take on greater meaning and connection to the world and to students' lives.

The staff intends to provide a school environment that nourishes each child's emotional, physical, and social development while stimulating curiosity and creativity. The staff endeavors to generate a love of learning, which will sustain children as they grow and develop. Classrooms and materials are well cared for, creating beautiful, stimulating environments. Pride in the school is demonstrated in the care that the children show to the materials, buildings, and garden.

During the 2016-17 school year, the school served about 115 students in grades Kindergarten through six.

## About the SARC

By February 1 of each year, every school in California is required by state law to publish a School Accountability Report Card (SARC). The SARC contains information about the condition and performance of each California public school. Under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) all local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to prepare a Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), which describes how they intend to meet annual school-specific goals for all pupils, with specific activities to address state and local priorities. Additionally, data reported in an LCAP is to be consistent with data reported in the SARC.

- For more information about SARC requirements, see the California Department of Education (CDE) SARC Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/>.
- For more information about the LCFF or LCAP, see the CDE LCFF Web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/>.
- For additional information about the school, parents/guardians and community members should contact the school principal or the district office.

2016-17 Student Enrollment by Grade Level	
Grade Level	Number of Students
Kindergarten	19
Grade 1	19
Grade 2	16
Grade 3	13
Grade 4	20
Grade 5	14
Grade 6	5
<b>Total Enrollment</b>	<b>106</b>

2016-17 Student Enrollment by Group	
Group	Percent of Total Enrollment
Black or African American	0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0
Asian	0.9
Filipino	0
Hispanic or Latino	33
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0
White	58.5
Two or More Races	6.6
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	33
English Learners	16
Students with Disabilities	10.4
Foster Youth	0

## A. Conditions of Learning

### State Priority: Basic

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: Basic (Priority 1):

- Degree to which teachers are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject area and for the pupils they are teaching;
- Pupils have access to standards-aligned instructional materials; and
- School facilities are maintained in good repair.

Teacher Credentials			
Pacific Elementary School	15-16	16-17	17-18
With Full Credential	7	8	7
Without Full Credential	0	0	0
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	0	0	0
Pacific Elementary School District	15-16	16-17	17-18
With Full Credential	♦	♦	7
Without Full Credential	♦	♦	0
Teaching Outside Subject Area of Competence	♦	♦	0

Teacher Misassignments and Vacant Teacher Positions at this School			
Pacific Elementary School	15-16	16-17	17-18
Teachers of English Learners	0	0	0
Total Teacher Misassignments	0	0	0
Vacant Teacher Positions	0	0	0

\* "Misassignments" refers to the number of positions filled by teachers who lack legal authorization to teach that grade level, subject area, student group, etc. Total Teacher Misassignments includes the number of Misassignments of Teachers of English Learners.

**Quality, Currency, Availability of Textbooks and Instructional Materials (School Year 2017-18)**

Pacific School District endeavors to provide sufficient and current textbooks and materials to support instructional programs. Pacific School District held a Public Hearing on September 29, 2016, and determined that the school has sufficient and good quality textbooks and instructional materials pursuant to the settlement of Williams vs. the State of California.

All students, including English Learners, are given their own individual standards-aligned textbooks or instructional materials, or both, in core subjects for use in the classroom and to take home. All textbooks and instructional materials used within the District are aligned with the California State Content Standards and Frameworks. Textbooks and supplementary materials are adopted according to a cycle developed by the California Department of Education, making the textbooks used in the school the most current available. The table displays information collected in September 2017 about the quality, currency, and availability of the standards-aligned textbooks and other instructional materials used at the school.

Textbooks and Instructional Materials Year and month in which data were collected: 9/2017	
Core Curriculum Area	Textbooks and Instructional Materials/Year of Adoption
Reading/Language Arts	Benchmark Adopted in 2017  The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0
Mathematics	Eureka Math Adopted in 2014  The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0
Science	Scott Foresman Adopted in 2007  The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0
History-Social Science	History Alive Adopted in 2006  Scott Foresman Adopted in 2006  The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: Yes Percent of students lacking their own assigned textbook: 0
Science Laboratory Equipment	N/A The textbooks listed are from most recent adoption: N/A

Note: Cells with N/A values do not require data.

**School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements (Most Recent Year)**

The physical environment of Pacific School is continually maintained to the best of our ability. Classrooms and grounds are kept free of litter and graffiti. Students are expected to participate in daily cleanup. The playground, classrooms, fire extinguishers, and emergency exit lights are formally inspected at least monthly. Repairs to damage are made as quickly as possible. The principal conducts at least two comprehensive inspections a year, in the fall and spring, using the inspection checklist from the State Office of Public School Construction. The inspection covers the school site, including office, classrooms, kitchen, and playground safety.

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year) Year and month in which data were collected: 3/9/17				
System Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned
	Good	Fair	Poor	
<b>Systems:</b> Gas Leaks, Mechanical/HVAC, Sewer	X			The old furnaces were replaced on 10/18/17 with new, highly efficient models.
<b>Interior:</b> Interior Surfaces	X			Several rooms have damaged ceiling tiles.

School Facility Good Repair Status (Most Recent Year) Year and month in which data were collected: 3/9/17					
System Inspected	Repair Status			Repair Needed and Action Taken or Planned	
	Good	Fair	Poor		
<b>Cleanliness:</b> Overall Cleanliness, Pest/ Vermin Infestation	X			Playground and play structure: Playing field has a gopher infestation. Blacktop was repaved in 4/16.	
<b>Electrical:</b> Electrical	X			New energy-efficient lighting was installed in entire campus in spring 2016.	
<b>Restrooms/Fountains:</b> Restrooms, Sinks/ Fountains	X			Low flow plumbing fixtures were installed in all bathrooms in spring 2017. Drinking fountain was repaired 12/17.	
<b>Safety:</b> Fire Safety, Hazardous Materials	X				
<b>Structural:</b> Structural Damage, Roofs	X			Roof leak around skylight in hallway was repaired 11/17.	
<b>External:</b> Playground/School Grounds, Windows/ Doors/Gates/Fences	X			Windows in dining rooms were sealed July 2016.	
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	
		X			

## B. Pupil Outcomes

### State Priority: Pupil Achievement

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: Pupil Achievement (Priority 4):

- Statewide assessments (i.e., California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress [CAASPP] System, which includes the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for students in the general education population and the California Alternate Assessments [CAAs] for English language arts/literacy [ELA] and mathematics given in grades three through eight and grade eleven. The CAAs have replaced the California Alternate Performance Assessment [CAPA] for ELA and mathematics, which were eliminated in 2015. Only eligible students may participate in the administration of the CAAs. CAA items are aligned with alternate achievement standards, which are linked with the Common Core State Standards [CCSS] for students with significant cognitive disabilities); and
- The percentage of students who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the University of California and the California State University, or career technical education sequences or programs of study

2016-17 CAASPP Results for All Students						
Subject	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding the State Standards (grades 3-8 and 11)					
	School		District		State	
	15-16	16-17	15-16	16-17	15-16	16-17
<b>ELA</b>	53	54	53	54	48	48
<b>Math</b>	61	54	61	54	36	37

\* Percentages are not calculated when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

CAASPP Test Results in Science for All Students						
Subject	Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced (meeting or exceeding the state standards)					
	School		District		State	
	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16	14-15	15-16
<b>Science</b>	75	85	75	85	60	56

Note: Science test results include California Standards Tests (CSTs), California Modified Assessment (CMA), and California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) in grades five, eight, and ten.

Note: Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

Note: The 2016-17 data are not available. The California Department of Education is developing a new science assessment based on the Next Generation Science Standards for California Public Schools (CA NGSS). The new California Science Test (CAST) was piloted in spring 2017. The CST and CMA for Science will no longer be administered.

Grade Level	2016-17 Percent of Students Meeting Fitness Standards		
	4 of 6	5 of 6	6 of 6
<b>5</b>		33.3	50

\* Percentages are not calculated when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

**2015-16 CAASPP Results by Student Group  
Science (grades 5, 8, and 10)**

Group	Number of Students		Percent of Students	
	Enrolled	with Valid Scores	w/ Valid Scores	Proficient or Advanced
<b>All Students</b>	13	13	100.0	84.6

\* Science test results include CSTs, CMA, and CAPA in grades five, eight, and ten. The “Proficient or Advanced” is calculated by taking the total number of students who scored at Proficient or Advanced on the science assessment divided by the total number of students with valid scores. Scores are not shown when the number of students tested is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

**School Year 2016-17 CAASPP Assessment Results - English Language Arts (ELA)  
Disaggregated by Student Groups, Grades Three through Eight and Eleven**

Student Group	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Met or Exceeded
<b>All Students</b>	56	52	92.86	53.85
<b>Male</b>	32	31	96.88	41.94
<b>Female</b>	24	21	87.5	71.43
<b>Asian</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	14	13	92.86	7.69
<b>White</b>	36	34	94.44	64.71
<b>Two or More Races</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</b>	23	21	91.3	33.33
<b>English Learners</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Students with Disabilities</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Students Receiving Migrant Education Services</b>	--	--	--	--

Note: ELA test results include the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the CAA. The “Percent Met or Exceeded” is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment plus the total number of students who met the standard (i.e., achieved Level 3–Alternate) on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

Note: Double dashes (--) appear in the table when the number of students is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

Note: The number of students tested includes all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; however, the number of students tested is not the number that was used to calculate the achievement level percentages. The achievement level percentages are calculated using only students who received scores.

**School Year 2016-17 CAASPP Assessment Results - Mathematics  
Disaggregated by Student Groups, Grades Three through Eight and Eleven**

Student Group	Total Enrollment	Number Tested	Percent Tested	Percent Met or Exceeded
<b>All Students</b>	56	52	92.86	53.85
<b>Male</b>	32	31	96.88	51.61
<b>Female</b>	24	21	87.5	57.14
<b>Asian</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	14	13	92.86	30.77
<b>White</b>	36	34	94.44	58.82
<b>Two or More Races</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</b>	23	21	91.3	42.86
<b>English Learners</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Students with Disabilities</b>	--	--	--	--
<b>Students Receiving Migrant Education Services</b>	--	--	--	--

Note: Mathematics test results include the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and the CAA. The “Percent Met or Exceeded” is calculated by taking the total number of students who met or exceeded the standard on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment plus the total number of students who met the standard (i.e., achieved Level 3–Alternate) on the CAAs divided by the total number of students who participated in both assessments.

Note: Double dashes (--) appear in the table when the number of students is ten or less, either because the number of students in this category is too small for statistical accuracy or to protect student privacy.

Note: The number of students tested includes all students who participated in the test whether they received a score or not; however, the number of students tested is not the number that was used to calculate the achievement level percentages. The achievement level percentages are calculated using only students who received scores.

## C. Engagement

### State Priority: Parental Involvement

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: Parental Involvement (Priority 3):

- Efforts the school district makes to seek parent input in making decisions for the school district and each schoolsite.

### Opportunities for Parental Involvement (School Year 2017-18)

Pacific Elementary School values parents as an integral part of the educational process. To that end, the following is a summary of our three major areas for parental involvement: volunteering in the classroom, on field trips, and during events, joining the Pacific School Foundation/Pacific School Parents' Club, and serving on committees such as the School Site Council or Board of Trustees.

Parents are vitally important to Pacific School and the school actively encourages their participation. Parents overwhelmingly say they feel welcome and included when surveyed each year. Parents should contact their child's teacher if they are interested in volunteering in the classroom on a regular basis. Classroom volunteer needs are discussed each year at Back-to-School Night. In our Independent Studies Program, which is a hybrid between home schooling and a traditional school program, parents are the teachers of their own and each others' children. Field trips are frequent and parents are crucial to their smooth functioning. Some field trips, for the older students, involve multi-day excursions and depend upon actively involved parents to make them possible.

The Pacific School Foundation (PSF)/Pacific School Parents' Club (PSPC) is an important volunteer organization that meets at least monthly. PSF/PSPC is responsible for coordinating several large fundraisers, managing donations, organizing family/community events such as Potato Night and Bingo Night. PSF/PSPC is always eager to recruit new members to maintain and invigorate our culture of active support.

The School Site Council (SSC) is made up of five parent/community members and five staff members. The Site Council is responsible for revising and recommending several important plans that provide direction of the school in key areas. The SSC reviews the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP), the Comprehensive School Safety Plan, the Wellness Plan, and the Technology Plan. They also act as an advisory committee to the school board. The Site Council is also responsible for surveying parents to determine concerns and program needs. In this capacity, parent members serve as a link between parents, staff, and the governing board. When there is an empty seat available on the Site Council, all parents are encouraged to participate in the election of a new member. All meetings are open to the public.

Parents who have special skills are encouraged to share their expertise with the children, both as demonstrations and as lessons during school hours. Also, parents sometimes seek the opportunity to give classes to students after school. The school is happy to provide support for these classes when scheduling and space is available. In the past, parents have given lessons in art, dance, sewing, knitting, Spanish, music, and drama. Parents are also actively involved in helping to meet needs with the school library, Life Lab garden, landscaping, and maintenance. Indeed, our school would be notably deficient without their continued generosity.

### State Priority: School Climate

The SARC provides the following information relevant to the State priority: School Climate (Priority 6):

- Pupil suspension rates;
- Pupil expulsion rates; and
- Other local measures on the sense of safety.

### School Safety Plan

Pacific School District has developed a comprehensive School Safety Plan that addresses the emotional safety as well as the physical safety of all members of the school community. The School Safety Plan was developed by the Pacific School Site Council, made up of parents and staff members, and is reviewed and revised annually. The School Safety Plan is available for viewing in the school's office.

Components of the Pacific School Safety Plan:

#### Section 1. A Safe and Orderly Environment

##### A. Social Climate

1. Mission and Vision
2. Current assessment of school crime
3. Supervision
4. Rules, Problem Solving, and Discipline Procedures
5. Support Programs
6. Staff Development

##### B. Physical Environment

1. Safe and clean facilities
2. Supervision

3. Security
4. Safety Inspections

C. Emergency Procedures

1. Illness
2. Injury
3. Fire & Earthquake drills and procedures (evacuation)
4. Lockdown procedures
5. Bomb threats
6. Emergency Response/Crisis Management
7. Threat Assessment

Pacific Elementary School District Board Policies in the following areas support the Comprehensive Safe School Plan:

1. Disaster Procedures & Crisis Response
2. Safe Ingress and Egress
3. Child Abuse Reporting
4. Suspension and Expulsion
5. Notifying teachers of dangerous pupils
6. Discrimination and Harassment
7. School-wide dress code
8. Discipline Procedures
9. Hate Crimes
10. Uniform Complaint Procedures

Suspensions and Expulsions			
School	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Suspensions Rate			
Expulsions Rate			
District	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Suspensions Rate			
Expulsions Rate			
State	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Suspensions Rate			
Expulsions Rate			

D. Other SARC Information

The information in this section is required to be in the SARC but is not included in the state priorities for LCFF.

2017-18 Federal Intervention Program		
Indicator	School	District
Program Improvement Status		
First Year of Program Improvement		
Year in Program Improvement		
Number of Schools Currently in Program Improvement		
Percent of Schools Currently in Program Improvement		

Academic Counselors and Other Support Staff at this School	
Number of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)	
Academic Counselor	0
Counselor (Social/Behavioral or Career Development)	0
Library Media Teacher (Librarian)	0
Library Media Services Staff (Paraprofessional)	0
Psychologist	.1
Social Worker	0
Nurse	0
Speech/Language/Hearing Specialist	.3
Resource Specialist	.9
Other	
Average Number of Students per Staff Member	
Academic Counselor	0

\* One Full Time Equivalent (FTE) equals one staff member working full time; one FTE could also represent two staff members who each work 50 percent of full time.

Average Class Size and Class Size Distribution (Elementary)												
Grade	Average Class Size			Number of Classrooms*								
				1-20			21-32			33+		
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
K	8	8	7	2	2	3						
1	7	7	9	2	2	2						
2	9	9	8	2	2	2						
3	8	8	9	2	2	2						
4	7	7	8	2	2	2						
5	8	8	7	2	2	2						
6	9	9	7	2	2	2						

\* Number of classes indicates how many classes fall into each size category (a range of total students per class).

### Professional Development provided for Teachers

Pacific School professional development activities are designed by staff, in conjunction with the other three single school districts in the county, to be pertinent to their needs and enhance student learning. A variety of staff development opportunities are provided to increase interest and expertise, acquire new ideas and materials, and develop teaching, organization, and classroom management skills.

Pacific School's staff meets throughout the year, in various settings, to both plan and deliver the training in a reciprocal fashion. First, the needs are identified during the previous year. Second, the teachers and principal meet monthly to discuss needs, review research, and share best practices. Any new opportunities are discussed at that time. Third, subcommittees of teachers meet to work on various aspects of improving our practice on a monthly basis. The work of these groups is then brought to the entire faculty for implementation. Assessments of student progress and staff strengths and competencies are considered when professional development is planned.

Recommendations from the School Board and the School Site Council are considered when planning activities. Staff members are encouraged to participate in professional development programs given by Santa Cruz County Office of Education, and Pacific School staff members collaborate with the other three small school districts in the county for at least one professional development day per year. Whenever possible, the principal takes part in professional development programs along with staff members.

Teachers are provided with release time to attend special workshops and classes, and time is allowed at staff meetings and in-service days for staff members to share information they have gained that will benefit other staff members. Mentor teachers provide expertise in areas of strength and the school's Technology Coordinator provides technical assistance and staff technology training on a frequent basis.

Since the 2011-12 school year, two professional development days are scheduled in coordination with the three other small school districts to collaborate and share best practices. The staff continues to assess needs and either take advantage of minimum days every Wednesday, or take individual staff development opportunities to attend workshops. Staff have focused on math, writing, science with a focus on garden curriculum, English Language Development, and differentiating instruction to meet the needs of gifted students. Other staff development topics include Step Up To Writing, the Common Core Standards implementation, Environmental Education, Next Generation Science Standards, and the Visual And Performing Arts (VAPA) standards.

A restructured week with four longer days and a shorter day on Wednesdays provides time for weekly meetings and collaboration, as well as development of curriculum and materials in each classroom.

The school participates in the state-sponsored Beginning Teachers Support and Assessment program (BTSA), as appropriate. The goals of the BTSA program are to help new teachers succeed, foster increased retention of quality teachers within the teaching profession, and improve instruction for students.

FY 2015-16 Teacher and Administrative Salaries		
Category	District Amount	State Average for Districts In Same Category
Beginning Teacher Salary		\$42,598
Mid-Range Teacher Salary		\$62,232
Highest Teacher Salary		\$80,964
Average Principal Salary (ES)		\$102,366
Average Principal Salary (MS)		\$104,982
Average Principal Salary (HS)		
Superintendent Salary		\$117,868
Percent of District Budget		
Teacher Salaries	28%	32%
Administrative Salaries	9%	7%

\* For detailed information on salaries, see the CDE Certificated Salaries & Benefits webpage at [www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/cs/).

### Types of Services Funded

The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and federal grants (Title II A and REAP) provide the following services at Pacific Elementary School:

Technology/Media Literacy  
 Art & Music instruction  
 Gifted and Talented Education (GATE)  
 Instructional Materials  
 Classroom Aide support  
 Teacher Professional Development  
 Response to Intervention Services  
 Special Education  
 Physical Education materials  
 Educational Field Trips  
 Food Lab  
 Life Lab

### DataQuest

DataQuest is an online data tool located on the CDE DataQuest Web page at <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/> that contains additional information about this school and comparisons of the school to the district and the county. Specifically, DataQuest is a dynamic system that provides reports for accountability (e.g., test data, enrollment, high school graduates, dropouts, course enrollments, staffing, and data regarding English learners).

### Internet Access

Internet access is available at public libraries and other locations that are publicly accessible (e.g., the California State Library). Access to the Internet at libraries and public locations is generally provided on a first-come, first-served basis. Other use restrictions may include the hours of operation, the length of time that a workstation may be used (depending on availability), the types of software programs available on a workstation, and the ability to print documents.

FY 2015-16 Expenditures Per Pupil and School Site Teacher Salaries				
Level	Expenditures Per Pupil			Average Teacher Salary
	Total	Restricted	Unrestricted	
School Site	9,844	2,796	7,423	54,803
District	♦	♦	7,423	7,423
State	♦	♦	\$6,574	\$61,939
Percent Difference: School Site/District			0.0	638.3
Percent Difference: School Site/ State			12.9	-11.5

\* Cells with ♦ do not require data.

# **Pacific Elementary School District**

Board of Trustees Meeting  
**Tuesday, January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018 @ 4:00 PM**  
Pacific Elementary School, Davenport, CA

## **Pacific School Mission Statement**

Pacific School's mission is to prepare children for life through experiential learning that addresses the needs of the whole child. We create a safe and secure school environment that promotes social and academic growth and develops an enthusiasm for learning, a positive self-image, and cross-cultural understanding.

All persons are encouraged to attend and, where appropriate, to participate in, meetings of the Pacific School Board of Trustees. Persons wishing to address the Board are asked to state their names for the record. Consideration of all matters is conducted in open session except for those relating to litigation, personnel, and employee negotiations, which, by law, may be considered in executive (closed) session.

Meeting facilities are accessible to persons with disabilities. By request, alternative agenda document formats are available to persons with disabilities. To arrange an alternative agenda document format or to arrange aid or services to modify or accommodate persons with a disability to participate in a public meeting, please provide a written request to: Eric Gross, Superintendent/Principal at the Pacific School District Office at least three working days prior to any public meeting.

## **Board Meeting Agenda**

### **1. OPENING PROCEDURES FOR OPEN SESSION**

- 1.1. Call to Order
- 1.2. Roll Call & Establishment of Quorum
  - 1.2.1. Gwyan Rhabyt, Board President
  - 1.2.2. Don Croll, Board Trustee
  - 1.2.3. Cari Napoles, Board Trustee
- 1.3. Approval of the agenda for January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018
  - 1.3.1. Agenda deletions, additions, or changes of sequence

### **2. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

- 2.1. For items not on the agenda, this is an opportunity for the public to address the board directly related to school business. The Board President may allot time to those wishing to speak, but no action will be taken on matters presented (EC §35145.5).
- 2.2. For items on the agenda, the public will have the opportunity to speak at the time the agenda item is discussed. Please address the Board President.

### **3. REPORTS**

- 3.1. Superintendent Report
- 3.2. Board Member Reports
- 3.3. School Site Council Report
- 3.4. Parents Club Report

### **4. CONSENT AGENDA:** These matters may be passed by one roll call motion. Board

Members may remove items from the agenda for a separate discussion and vote.

4.1. Approval of Minutes of the Board Meeting on: December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2017

4.2. Approval of Warrant Registers

4.3. School Accountability Report Card (SARC)

**5. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

5.1. None

**6. BOARD RESOLUTIONS**

6.1. Resolution # 2018 – 6 Fair Funding

6.2. Resolution # 2018 – 7 Fund Balance

**7. ITEMS TO BE TRANSACTED AND/OR DISCUSSED**

7.1. Approval of Board Policies, Administrative Regulations, Board Bylaws, & Exhibits

7.1.1. BP & AR 0420.4 Charter School Authorization

7.1.2. BP 1325 Advertising and Promotion

7.1.3. BP 3100 Budget

7.1.4. BP 3515.7 Firearms on School Grounds

7.1.5. AR 3517 Facilities Inspection

7.1.6. BPs 4119.21, 4219.21, & 4319.21 Professional Standards

7.1.7. ARs 4144, 4244, & 4344 Complaints

7.1.8. BP & AR 4200 Classified Personnel

7.1.9. BP 5144 Discipline

7.1.10. BP & AR 5144.1 Suspension & Expulsion/Due Process

7.1.11. AR 5148.2 Before/After School Programs

7.1.12. BP 6146.1 High School Graduation Requirements

7.1.13. BB 9150 Student Board Members

7.2. Withdrawal of Board Policies, Administrative Regulations, Board Bylaws, & Exhibits

7.2.1. E 3515.7 Firearms on School Grounds

7.2.2. BP 3517 Facilities Inspection

7.2.3. BP & AR & E 6162.52 High School Exit Examination

7.3. Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA) policy

7.4. 1<sup>st</sup> Interim – Staff will present the 1<sup>st</sup> Interim Budget Revision

**8. SCHEDULE OF COMING EVENTS**

8.1. Next Regular Board Meeting: February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2018

**9. CLOSED SESSION**

9.1. Public Employee Appointment (Section 54957)

9.1.1. Aide

**10. REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION**

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

If requested, this agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. section 12132) and the federal rules and regulations implementing the Act. Individuals requesting a disability-related modification or accommodation may contact the District Office.

The board book for this meeting, including this agenda and any back-up materials, may be viewed or downloaded online: <http://www.pacificesd.org/governance.html> or may be viewed at the school: 50 Ocean St. Davenport CA 95017.

**Translation Requests:** Spanish language translation is available on an as-needed basis.

***Solicitudes de Traducción:*** *Traducciones del inglés al español y del español al inglés están disponibles en las sesiones de la mesa directiva.*

## Internet Safety Policies and CIPA: An E-Rate Primer for Schools and Libraries

Prepared by E-Rate Central

The Children's Internet Protection Act ("CIPA"), enacted December 21, 2000, requires recipients of federal technology funds to comply with certain Internet filtering and policy requirements. Schools and libraries receiving funds for Internet access and/or internal connection services must also meet the Internet safety policies of the Neighborhood Children's Internet Protection Act ("NCIPA") which addresses the broader issues of electronic messaging, disclosure of personal information of minors,<sup>1</sup> and unlawful online activities. The Protecting Children in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act, enacted October 10, 2008, adds an additional Internet Safety Policy requirement<sup>2</sup> covering the education of minors about appropriate online behavior.<sup>3</sup>

### Introduction to CIPA Compliance

CIPA (and the associated NCIPA) requirements for E-rate purposes are governed by rules promulgated by the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") and administrated by the Schools and Libraries Division ("SLD"). The basic FCC rules are summarized below.

1. Applicability: CIPA compliance is required for any school or library receiving E-rate funds for three of the four eligible service categories – Internet Access, Internal Connections, and Basic Maintenance of Internal Connections. Applicants for Telecommunications services only, are exempt.
2. Timing: Full compliance is required in an applicant's second year of funding after CIPA's enactment. For most applicants, full compliance has been required since FY 2002 (beginning July 1, 2002). An applicant applying for E-rate for the first time need only to certify that it is "undertaking actions" so as to be in compliance by its second year.
3. Filtering: CIPA requires the implementation of a "technology protection measure" – generally referred to as an Internet filter – to block access to visual depictions deemed "obscene," "child pornography," or "harmful to minors."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For CIPA purposes, a "minor" means "any individual who has not attained the age of 17 years."

<sup>2</sup> The new requirement applies only to schools, not to libraries.

<sup>3</sup> The FCC has clarified that the determination of what matter is considered inappropriate for minors is a local decision to be made by the school board, local educational agency, library, or other authority. Most specifically, the FCC found that social network Websites (e.g., Facebook and MySpace) do not fall into one of the categories that must be blocked.

<sup>4</sup> The terms "obscene," "child pornography," and "harmful to minors" are strictly and legally defined (see footnote to the sample Internet Safety Policy in Appendix B).

Filtering is required for all of an E-rate recipient's Internet-enabled computers whether used by minors or adults. For E-rate funding purposes, filtering for adult Internet usage can be disabled for "bona fide research or other lawful purpose."<sup>5</sup>

The FCC has not established any standards with regard to the type or effectiveness of Internet filters required for CIPA compliance.

4. Internet Safety Policy: CIPA requires the adoption and enforcement of an "Internet safety policy" covering the filtering discussed above.<sup>6</sup> For schools, the policy must also address "monitoring the online activities of minors."<sup>7</sup>

NCIPA provisions, applicable to E-rate recipients, requires the policy to address the following five components:

- Access by minors to inappropriate matter on the Internet and World Wide Web;
- The safety and security of minors when using electronic mail, chat rooms, and other forms of direct electronic communications (including instant messaging);
- Unauthorized access, including so-called 'hacking,' and other unlawful activities by minors online;
- Unauthorized disclosure, use, and dissemination of personal identification information regarding minors; and
- Measures designed to restrict minors' access to materials harmful to minors.<sup>8</sup>

A separate, but related, provision of the Protecting Children in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act requires that the policy include measures for educating minors about appropriate online behavior.

Prior to adoption, CIPA requires that "reasonable public notice" and "at least one public hearing or meeting" be held to address the proposed Internet Safety Policy. Applicants must be careful to retain documentation of their Policy adoption actions.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Although the ESEA and LSTA sections of CIPA permit the disabling of filters for both adults and minors, no such disabling provision for minors is included in the E-rate section (SEC. 1721). No provision, however, prevents schools and libraries from setting different levels of filtering for minors on an age-determinant or individual use basis.

<sup>6</sup> In addition to the three types of material that must be blocked, CIPA explicitly permits schools and libraries to block any content deemed inappropriate for minors by local standards.

<sup>7</sup> "Monitoring" appears to require only supervision, not technical measures. Specifically, CIPA does not require "tracking of Internet usage by any identifiable minor or adult user."

<sup>8</sup> Not just visual depictions.

<sup>9</sup> Applicants must retain Internet Safety Policy documentation — including both the Policy itself and the adoption records — for a period of five years after the end of the funding year that relied on that Policy. Although five years is the standard record retention rule, the FCC has been careful to note that this may mean the retention of Policy documentation far longer than five years. If, for example, a Policy adopted in

The FCC has not established any specific criteria for evaluating an Internet safety policy, nor has it set any specific standards for what constitutes reasonable public notice or a public meeting.

5. Certification: The only specific compliance requirement established by the FCC is that an E-rate applicant must certify that it is in compliance with the CIPA provisions summarized above. Certification is required only after funding is awarded by filing a Form 486 indicating receipt of services.<sup>10</sup> Certification is required annually.
6. Enforcement: No specific enforcement provisions, other than applicant certifications on FCC Form 486, have been established by the FCC. The only two principles of enforcement are:
  - No Universal Service Fund payments will be made on behalf of any applicant that does not file the requisite certifications; and
  - If certifications are found to be false — as determined by subsequent review or audit — applicants will have to reimburse the Fund for any funds and discounts received for the period covered.

### **Internet Safety Policy Guidelines**

Although neither the FCC nor the SLD has established specific criteria for an Internet Safety Policy, certain practical guidelines can be suggested as a means of complying with the CIPA policy requirements.

#### *Basic Components of a CIPA-compliant Internet Safety Policy:*

At a minimum, to fully comply with the spirit of the Internet Safety Policy requirements for E-rate funding, four key guidelines should be met.

1. The policy should apply to both minors and adults. Although called the “Children’s Internet Protection Act,” and requiring specific protections for minors, CIPA clearly applies to certain aspects of adult usage as well. Therefore, the policy should deal with both staff and students (or library patrons). As discussed below, a student Acceptable Use Policy may not fully suffice.
2. The policy should specify use of an Internet filtering mechanism to, at a minimum, block access to the three categories of visual depictions specified by CIPA – obscene, child pornography, and harmful to minors. Conditions and procedures should be incorporated under which filtering can be disabled (for adults) or made less restrictive (for minors).

---

2005 was used as the basis of a Form 486 certification in a later funding year, the documentation must be retained for at least an additional five years.

<sup>10</sup> Members of a consortium must certify status on Form 479s that must be submitted to the consortium leaders before the leader files a consortium-wide Form 486.

3. The policy should emphasize staff responsibilities in educating minors on appropriate online behavior and in supervising such activities. This provision is needed to meet the monitoring and education requirements imposed on schools and libraries.
4. The policy should address the NCIPA issues for minors (but is also appropriate for adults). As discussed above, these issues concern the safe use of e-mail and other forms of electronic messaging, unauthorized disclosure of personal information, and unlawful online activities.

A sample Internet Safety Policy, minimally addressing these four CIPA-related guidelines, is provided in Appendix B.

*Optional Internet and Network Policy components:*

The sample Internet Safety Policy provided in Appendix B is designed solely to meet the basic E-rate requirements for CIPA compliance. Although not the primary purpose of this Primer, it should be noted that many schools and libraries may already have, or may wish to adopt, much broader policies addressing other Internet or network issues. A brief summary of other typical policy components is provided below. Several examples of broader policies are provided in the Internet links listed in Appendix A.

1. Statement of objective. Discussion as to the purpose and importance of the organization's computer network and Internet access. Access to these resources may be designated a privilege, not a right.
2. Penalties for improper use. Failure to adhere to network policies and rules may subject users to warnings, usage restrictions, disciplinary actions, or legal proceedings.
3. Organizational responsibility and privacy. Disclaimers indicating that:
  - The organization does not warrant network functionality or accuracy of information.
  - The organization does not warrant the effectiveness of Internet filtering.
  - The privacy of system users is limited.
4. Acceptable use. Provisions dealing with such issues as:
  - Network etiquette.
  - Vandalism and harassment (e.g., "cyberbullying").
  - Copyrights and plagiarism.
  - Access to social networking or chat room Web sites.
  - Downloading (e.g., music files)
5. Web site. Special provisions dealing with the use and modifications of an organization's own Web site.

6. Personnel responsibilities. Designation of an organization's personnel who are responsible for various aspects of network and user administration and use.

#### *Review and Revision of Existing Policies:*

Many schools and libraries may have existing policies in place that fully, or at least partially,<sup>11</sup> meet the CIPA requirements for an Internet safety policy. If a review indicates the need for a revision, the following suggestions are offered for consideration:

1. Title. To indicate CIPA compliance, it would be useful to include the words "Internet Safety Policy" in the title or introductory text.
2. Specific terms. Terminology may be important to CIPA compliance.
  - a. Prohibited activity should specifically include access to material deemed "obscene," "child pornography," or "harmful to minors."
  - b. Reference should be made to supervision or "monitoring" of online activities by minors.
  - c. References to disabling of filtering should refer to "disabling or relaxing" for "bona fide research or other lawful purposes."
3. Specific problems. Although not a CIPA issue, it may be appropriate to expand portions of earlier policies to deal more explicitly with problems recently faced by schools and libraries such as student and staff harassment, plagiarism, and copyright violations.
4. Adult usage. The policy should address usage by adults, not simply students and/or minors. Adult-oriented policies are becoming commonplace in corporate and governmental organizations to establish standards of behavior for network usage.
5. Companion policies. Schools, with an existing student-oriented acceptable use policy, may be able to adopt a broader, but simpler, Internet Safety Policy referencing and/or incorporating the acceptable use policy.
6. Public hearing. Revised, CIPA-compliant, Internet safety policies should be adopted in a pre-announced public meeting. A regular school or library board meeting, at which the policy adoption is listed in a pre-released agenda, should be sufficient.

#### *Appendices:*

Appendix A – Internet links for further information

Appendix B – Sample, CIPA-compliant, Internet Safety Policy

---

<sup>11</sup> An acceptable use policy for students, for example, may cover many aspects of student behavior, but may not address adult staff usage, monitoring, and education responsibilities.

## **Internet Links for Additional Information on CIPA and Internet Safety Policies**

### **CIPA Background**

- Full text of the Children’s Internet Protection Act  
<http://www.ifea.net/cipa.html>
- FCC regulations implementing CIPA: FCC 01-120  
[http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/edocs\\_public/attachmatch/FCC-01-120A1.pdf](http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-01-120A1.pdf)
- FCC 2011 regulation update: FCC 11-125  
[http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/edocs\\_public/attachmatch/FCC-11-125A1.pdf](http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-11-125A1.pdf)
- SLD reference material and FAQs on E-rate certification procedures  
<http://www.universalservice.org/sl/applicants/step10/cipa.aspx>  
<http://www.sl.universalservice.org/reference/CIPAfaq.asp>

### **Internet Safety Policies and Issues**

- Resources from the American Library Association (“ALA”)  
<http://www.ala.org/ala/issuesadvocacy/advocacy/federallegislation/cipa/index.cfm>
- NTIA Study of Technology Protection Measures  
<http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/cipareport08142003.pdf>

## **Sample CIPA-Compliant Internet Safety Policy**

Note: The following Internet Safety Policy was developed by E-Rate Central solely to address the basic policy compliance requirements of CIPA and NCIPA for E-rate funding. Schools and libraries adopting new or revised Internet policies may wish to expand or modify the sample policy language (as suggested in the accompanying Primer) to meet broader policy objectives and local needs. Neither the FCC nor the SLD has established specific standards for a CIPA-compliant Internet Safety Policy and neither has reviewed, much less endorsed, this sample policy.

### **Internet Safety Policy For <School or Library>**

#### **Introduction**

It is the policy of <School or Library> to: (a) prevent user access over its computer network to, or transmission of, inappropriate material via Internet, electronic mail, or other forms of direct electronic communications; (b) prevent unauthorized access and other unlawful online activity; (c) prevent unauthorized online disclosure, use, or dissemination of personal identification information of minors; and (d) comply with the Children's Internet Protection Act [Pub. L. No. 106-554 and 47 USC 254(h)].

#### **Definitions**

Key terms are as defined in the Children's Internet Protection Act.\*

#### **Access to Inappropriate Material**

To the extent practical, technology protection measures (or "Internet filters") shall be used to block or filter Internet, or other forms of electronic communications, access to inappropriate information.

Specifically, as required by the Children's Internet Protection Act, blocking shall be applied to visual depictions of material deemed obscene or child pornography, or to any material deemed harmful to minors.

Subject to staff supervision, technology protection measures may be disabled for adults or, in the case of minors, minimized only for bona fide research or other lawful purposes.

## **Inappropriate Network Usage**

To the extent practical, steps shall be taken to promote the safety and security of users of the <School or Library> online computer network when using electronic mail, chat rooms, instant messaging, and other forms of direct electronic communications.

Specifically, as required by the Children's Internet Protection Act, prevention of inappropriate network usage includes: (a) unauthorized access, including so-called 'hacking,' and other unlawful activities; and (b) unauthorized disclosure, use, and dissemination of personal identification information regarding minors.

## **Education, Supervision and Monitoring**

It shall be the responsibility of all members of the <School or Library> staff to educate, supervise and monitor appropriate usage of the online computer network and access to the Internet in accordance with this policy, the Children's Internet Protection Act, the Neighborhood Children's Internet Protection Act, and the Protecting Children in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act.

Procedures for the disabling or otherwise modifying any technology protection measures shall be the responsibility of <Title> or designated representatives.

[For schools only] The <Title> or designated representatives will provide age-appropriate training for students who use the <School's> Internet facilities. The training provided will be designed to promote the <School's> commitment to:

- a. The standards and acceptable use of Internet services as set forth in the <School's> Internet Safety Policy;
- b. Student safety with regard to:
  - i. safety on the Internet;
  - ii. appropriate behavior while on online, on social networking Web sites, and in chat rooms; and
  - iii. cyberbullying awareness and response.
- c. Compliance with the E-rate requirements of the Children's Internet Protection Act ("CIPA").

Following receipt of this training, the student will acknowledge that he/she received the training, understood it, and will follow the provisions of the District's acceptable use policies.

## **Adoption**

This Internet Safety Policy was adopted by the Board of <School or Library> at a public meeting, following normal public notice, on <Month, Day, Year>.

---

\* CIPA definitions of terms:

**MINOR.** The term “minor” means any individual who has not attained the age of 17 years.

**TECHNOLOGY PROTECTION MEASURE.** The term “technology protection measure” means a specific technology that blocks or filters Internet access to visual depictions that are:

1. **OBSCENE**, as that term is defined in section 1460 of title 18, United States Code;
2. **CHILD PORNOGRAPHY**, as that term is defined in section 2256 of title 18, United States Code; or
3. Harmful to minors.

**HARMFUL TO MINORS.** The term “harmful to minors” means any picture, image, graphic image file, or other visual depiction that:

1. Taken as a whole and with respect to minors, appeals to a prurient interest in nudity, sex, or excretion;
2. Depicts, describes, or represents, in a patently offensive way with respect to what is suitable for minors, an actual or simulated sexual act or sexual contact, actual or simulated normal or perverted sexual acts, or a lewd exhibition of the genitals; and
3. Taken as a whole, lacks serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value as to minors.

**SEXUAL ACT; SEXUAL CONTACT.** The terms “sexual act” and “sexual contact” have the meanings given such terms in section 2246 of title 18, United States Code.

# **Pacific Elementary School District**

Board of Trustees Meeting  
**Tuesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2017 @ 4:00 PM**  
Pacific Elementary School, Davenport, CA

## **Pacific School Mission Statement**

Pacific School's mission is to prepare children for life through experiential learning that addresses the needs of the whole child. We create a safe and secure school environment that promotes social and academic growth and develops an enthusiasm for learning, a positive self-image, and cross-cultural understanding.

All persons are encouraged to attend and, where appropriate, to participate in, meetings of the Pacific School Board of Trustees. Persons wishing to address the Board are asked to state their names for the record. Consideration of all matters is conducted in open session except for those relating to litigation, personnel, and employee negotiations, which, by law, may be considered in executive (closed) session.

Meeting facilities are accessible to persons with disabilities. By request, alternative agenda document formats are available to persons with disabilities. To arrange an alternative agenda document format or to arrange aid or services to modify or accommodate persons with a disability to participate in a public meeting, please provide a written request to: Eric Gross, Superintendent/Principal at the Pacific School District Office at least three working days prior to any public meeting.

## **Board Meeting Agenda**

### **1. OPENING PROCEDURES FOR OPEN SESSION**

#### 1.1. Call to Order

**The meeting was called to order at 4:09 PM**

#### 1.2. Roll Call & Establishment of Quorum

##### 1.2.1. Gwyan Rhabyt, Board President

##### 1.2.2. Don Croll, Board Trustee

##### 1.2.3. Cari Napoles, Board Trustee

**All trustees were present and a quorum was established.**

#### 1.3. Approval of the agenda for December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2017

##### 1.3.1. Agenda deletions, additions, or changes of sequence

**Ms. Napoles moved approval of the agenda as presented except for the deletion of item 4.3; Mr. Croll seconded; and the motion passed unanimously.**

### **2. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

2.1. For items not on the agenda, this is an opportunity for the public to address the board directly related to school business. The Board President may allot time to those wishing to speak, but no action will be taken on matters presented (EC §35145.5).

2.2. For items on the agenda, the public will have the opportunity to speak at the time the agenda item is discussed. Please address the Board President.

### **3. REPORTS**

#### 3.1. Superintendent Report

Mr. Gross reported the following:

The Division of State Architects sent the plans for solar panels back to the architects for changes; approval expected in late spring

We received a \$6,000 anonymous donation to Food Lab

We hosted about 20 Inside Education guests; they gave a \$400 donation to Food Lab

We received a grant for \$3,500 for fence from insurance JPA

Hosted Faris Sabah, Deputy Asst. Sup for COE

The Santa Cruz Warriors basketball team visited students to support literacy as part of the Read to Achieve program

The Winter Concert took place in the church

Molly earned recognition from CalPADS for her timely and accurate work

Threat Assessment meetings concluded with new plan due soon

SELPA is deficit spending at a rate of \$100,000/yr; with only about \$600,000 in reserves

A Licensed Children's Institute opened in SC, charging \$500,000/yr for 4 students

Staff attended an ELPAC training (new test for ELs)

18 observations for evaluations have been completed so far

The school was formally recognized as a Green Business in Good Times newspaper & by the Board of Supervisors

### 3.2. Board Member Reports

Mr. Croll reported that Joby Aviation met with the DNCA & the Superintendent to discuss impacts on the school by repurposing the cement plant into an aeronautics research and development facility.

### 3.3. School Site Council Report

Mr. Gross reported that the Site Council revised the Classroom Visitation Policy and the Parent Involvement Plan

### 3.4. Parents Club Report

Ms. Napoles reported that the Parents Club voted to support the preschool fundraiser.

## 4. **CONSENT AGENDA:** These matters may be passed by one roll call motion. Board Members may remove items from the agenda for a separate discussion and vote.

4.1. Approval of Minutes of the Board Meeting on: November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2017

4.2. Approval of Warrant Registers

4.3. Williams Report

This item was deleted from the agenda

4.4. Fiscal and Energy Savings due to Proposition 39 Projects

Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously.

## 5. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### 5.1. School Facilities Fees

There were no comments from the public

## 6. **BOARD RESOLUTIONS**

### 6.1. School Facilities Fees

Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously.

## 7. **ITEMS TO BE TRANSACTED AND/OR DISCUSSED**

- 7.1. Approval of Board Policies, Administrative Regulations, Board Bylaws, & Exhibits
    - 7.1.1. AR 5113.11 Attendance Supervision
      - Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously.
    - 7.1.2. BP & AR 5117 Interdistrict Attendance
      - Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously. Option 1 was chosen.
    - 7.1.3. AR 5125.2 Withholding Grades, Diploma, or Transcripts
      - Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously.
    - 7.1.4. BP 5131.6 Alcohol and Other Drugs
      - Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously.
    - 7.1.5. BP & AR 6020 Parent Involvement
      - Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously. The non-Title 1 option was chosen.
    - 7.1.6. AR 6112 School Day
      - Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously. Option 1 was chosen, options 2 & 3 were rejected, and the sections that apply to grades 7-12 were rejected.
    - 7.1.7. BP 6153 School-Sponsored Trips
      - Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously.
    - 7.1.8. BP 6170.1 Transitional Kindergarten
      - Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously. All options 1-4 were adopted.
    - 7.1.9. AR 6173.1 Education for Foster Youth
      - Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously. Both options 1 & 2 were adopted.
    - 7.1.10. BP & AR 6173.2 Education of Children of Military Families
      - Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously.
  - 7.2. Withdrawal of Board Policies, Administrative Regulations, Board Bylaws, & Exhibits
    - 7.2.1. E 5131.63 Steroids
      - Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously.
  - 7.3. Salary Schedule – Change certificated salary schedule for School Psychologist from \$75/hr to \$80/hr.
    - Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously.
  - 7.4. E-Rate – Re-examine CIPA compliance policy and resolution
    - Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously.
    - The Board requested that this item be put on the next agenda to discuss again.
  - 7.5. 1<sup>st</sup> Interim – Staff will present the 1<sup>st</sup> Interim Budget Revision
    - Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously.
    - The Board requested that this item be put on the next agenda to discuss again.
  - 7.6. Parent Involvement Policy
    - Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously.
  - 7.7. Classroom Visitation Policy
    - Ms. Napoles moved, Mr. Croll seconded, passed unanimously.
- 8. SCHEDULE OF COMING EVENTS**

8.1. Next Regular Board Meeting: January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2017

Mr. Croll will be absent

**9. CLOSED SESSION**

**9.1.** Public Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release (Section 54957.6)

**9.1.1.** Aide

**9.1.2.** Garden Instructor

**10. REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION**

The board accepted resignations of Aide (Theo Andrew) & Garden Instructor (Trish Hildinger).

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourned at 5:35

If requested, this agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. section 12132) and the federal rules and regulations implementing the Act. Individuals requesting a disability-related modification or accommodation may contact the District Office.

The board book for this meeting, including this agenda and any back-up materials, may be viewed or downloaded online: <http://www.pacificesd.org/governance.html> or may be viewed at the school: 50 Ocean St. Davenport CA 95017.

**Translation Requests:** Spanish language translation is available on an as-needed basis.

**Solicitudes de Traducción:** Traducciones del inglés al español y del español al inglés están disponibles en las sesiones de la mesa directiva.

**Payables Prelist****1/12/2018 ()****PSD****Check****72 - ALBA ORGANICS**

PO 18-00196-produce	13-5310-0-0000-3700-4700-200-3101	\$3,096.10
PO 18-00196-produce	01-1100-0-1110-1000-5800-204-3000	\$51.25
		<b>\$3,147.35</b>

**39 - AT&T**

PO 18-00187-through 12/23/2017	01-0000-0-0000-2700-5900-200-2801	\$97.68
		<b>\$97.68</b>

**294 - Bay Quality Roofing**

PO 18-00184-Roff work for new HVAC	01-0000-0-0000-8100-5620-200-2801	\$1,300.00
		<b>\$1,300.00</b>

**21 - CA DEPT. OF SOCIAL SERVICES**

PO 18-00190-Annual Fee	12-9010-0-8500-2700-5300-200-3020	\$242.00
		<b>\$242.00</b>

**168 - Department of Justice**

PO 18-00182-Finger print	01-0000-0-0000-2700-5800-200-2801	\$113.00
		<b>\$113.00</b>

**86 - JENNY CROSS**

PO 18-00189-reimbursement	01-0000-0-1113-1000-4300-206-1103	\$70.17
		<b>\$70.17</b>

**79 - Lerner, Joan**

PO 18-00179-Dec 2017	01-6500-0-5770-3140-5808-200-1304	\$980.83
		<b>\$980.83</b>

**174 - Marla Lyons**

PO 18-00188-reimbursement	01-0102-0-1110-1000-4300-200-2630	\$81.30
		<b>\$81.30</b>

**164 - PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY**

PO 18-00185-due 1/9/2018	01-0000-0-0000-8100-5511-200-2801	\$42.67
PO 18-00185-due 1/9/2018	12-9010-0-8500-8100-5511-200-3020	\$1,125.54
		<b>\$1,168.21</b>

**166 - PALACE ART & STATIONERY**

PO 18-00178-Purchases through 12/25/2017	01-0000-0-0000-2700-4350-200-2801	\$7.83
PO 18-00178-Purchases through 12/25/2017	01-1100-0-1110-1000-4300-200-3000	\$479.08
		<b>\$486.91</b>

**22 - PERFORMANCE FOOD SERVICE**

PO 18-00176-12/5-12/12	13-5310-0-0000-3700-4700-200-3101	\$1,021.53
PO 18-00176-12/5-12/12	01-0000-0-0000-8100-4370-200-2801	\$38.05
		<b>\$1,059.58</b>

**55 - ROBERTSON & ASSOC. CPAS INC**

PO 18-00180-Audit fees	01-0000-0-0000-7191-5809-200-2801	\$450.00
PO 18-00194-June 30,2016/17	01-0000-0-0000-7191-5809-200-2801	\$3,500.00
		<b>\$3,950.00</b>

**7 - San Lorenzo Lumber**

PO 18-00186-through 12/31/2017	01-0000-0-0000-8100-4370-200-2801	\$51.96
PO 18-00186-through 12/31/2017	01-0102-0-1110-1000-4300-200-2630	\$12.77
		<b>\$64.73</b>

**285 - Santa Cruz Community Credit Union**

**Payables Prelist****1/12/2018 ()****PSD**

PO 18-00192-period ending 12/31/2017	01-0000-0-0000-2700-5802-200-2801	\$75.00
PO 18-00192-period ending 12/31/2017	13-5310-0-0000-3700-4700-200-3101	\$555.39
PO 18-00192-period ending 12/31/2017	13-5310-0-0000-3700-4390-200-3101	\$198.69
PO 18-00192-period ending 12/31/2017	01-9010-0-1110-1000-4300-204-3056	\$57.36
PO 18-00192-period ending 12/31/2017	01-1100-0-1110-1000-5800-202-3000	\$125.00
PO 18-00192-period ending 12/31/2017	01-1400-0-1110-1000-4300-200-2801	\$44.53
PO 18-00192-period ending 12/31/2017	01-0000-0-0000-2700-4350-200-2801	\$27.37
PO 18-00192-period ending 12/31/2017	01-0000-0-0000-2700-5915-200-2801	\$52.00
PO 18-00192-period ending 12/31/2017	01-0102-0-1110-1000-4300-200-2630	\$854.98
		<b>\$1,990.32</b>
<b>20 - SCHOLASTIC MAGAZINE</b>		
PO 18-00193-5/6 SCHOLASTIC MAGAZINE	01-1100-0-1110-1000-4300-204-3000	\$103.95
		<b>\$103.95</b>
<b>179 - School and College Legal Services</b>		
PO 18-00181-Workshop New Legislation	01-0000-0-0000-7110-5215-200-2801	\$50.00
		<b>\$50.00</b>
<b>82 - SISC - SELF-INSURED SCHOOLS</b>		
PO 18-00177-Through 1/31/2018	13-0000-0-0000-0000-9514-000-0000	\$462.50
PO 18-00177-Through 1/31/2018	12-0000-0-0000-0000-9514-000-0000	\$1,850.00
PO 18-00177-Through 1/31/2018	01-0000-0-0000-0000-9514-000-0000	\$9,090.50
		<b>\$11,403.00</b>
<b>260 - Swanton Pacific Ranch</b>		
PO 18-00195-Food	13-5310-0-0000-3700-4700-200-3101	\$375.00
		<b>\$375.00</b>
<b>2 - Candace Tanner</b>		
PO 18-00197-reimbursement	01-1400-0-1110-1000-4300-200-2801	\$26.45
PO 18-00197-reimbursement	01-0000-0-0000-2700-4350-200-2801	\$36.00
PO 18-00197-reimbursement	01-0000-0-0000-8100-4370-200-2801	\$4.36
		<b>\$66.81</b>
<b>273 - Terra X Pest Services</b>		
PO 18-00183-Monthly visit	01-0000-0-0000-8100-5524-200-2801	\$162.00
		<b>\$162.00</b>
<b>Payment Type Check Total</b>		<b>\$26,912.84</b>

**Payables Prelist****1/12/2018 ()****PSD****Grand Total :****\$26,912.84****Amount**

Fund 01

\$17,986.09

Fund 12

\$3,217.54

Fund 13

\$5,709.21

**Grand Total :****\$26,912.84**-----  
PRESIDENT-----  
SECRETARY

PREPARED BY: -----

DATE: -----

REVIEWED BY: -----

DATE: -----

## Payables Prelist

12/18/2017 ()

PSD

## Check

282 - Bumgarner, Dona		
PO 18-00170-Fall 2017	01-0102-0-1110-1000-5800-200-2630	\$1,500.00
		<b>\$1,500.00</b>
249 - California Department of Education		
PO 18-00165-Food	13-5310-0-0000-3700-4700-200-3101	\$46.80
		<b>\$46.80</b>
299 - Cengage Learning		
PO 18-00163-textbooks	01-6300-0-1110-1000-4100-200-3000	\$94.94
		<b>\$94.94</b>
69 - CIT TECHNOLOGY FIN SERV INC		
PO 18-00174-December	01-0000-0-0000-7200-5650-200-2801	\$203.98
		<b>\$203.98</b>
306 - Duerr Heating and Air, Inc		
PO 18-00175-Room 7 furnace repair	01-0000-0-0000-8100-5620-200-2801	\$672.50
		<b>\$672.50</b>
305 - Educational Data Systems		
PO 18-00164-CELDT test	01-1100-0-1110-1000-4300-200-3000	\$20.94
		<b>\$20.94</b>
287 - Encompass Community Services		
PO 18-00173-November service	01-0000-0-1110-3110-5808-200-2801	\$925.00
		<b>\$925.00</b>
91 - Fisher, John		
PO 18-00171-reimbursement	01-0102-0-1110-1000-4300-200-2630	\$40.10
		<b>\$40.10</b>
68 - GREEN WASTE		
PO 18-00167-trash	01-0000-0-0000-8100-5523-200-2801	\$232.55
		<b>\$232.55</b>
66 - Emelia Miguel		
PO 18-00169-reimbursement	13-5310-0-0000-3700-4700-200-3101	\$91.69
PO 18-00169-reimbursement	13-5310-0-0000-3700-4390-200-3101	\$32.68
		<b>\$124.37</b>
166 - PALACE ART & STATIONERY		
PO 18-00172-Supplies	01-1100-0-1110-1000-4300-200-3000	\$351.97
		<b>\$351.97</b>
64 - Stacey Reynolds		
PO 18-00166-reimbursement	12-9010-0-8500-1000-4300-200-3020	\$11.45
PO 18-00166-reimbursement	01-0000-0-8502-5000-4300-200-3008	\$29.01
PO 18-00166-reimbursement	01-0000-0-8100-5100-4300-200-3010	\$24.86
		<b>\$65.32</b>
268 - Seabright Speech Therapy		
PO 18-00168-12/5-12/14	01-3310-0-5770-1190-5808-200-1320	\$2,070.00
		<b>\$2,070.00</b>
<b>Payment Type Check Total</b>		<b>\$6,348.47</b>

**Payables Prelist****12/18/2017 ()****PSD**

---

**Grand Total :** **\$6,348.47****Amount**

Fund 01 \$6,165.85

Fund 12 \$11.45

Fund 13 \$171.17

**Grand Total :** **\$6,348.47**-----  
PRESIDENT-----  
SECRETARY

PREPARED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

REVIEWED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Resolution Calling for Full and Fair Funding of California's Public Schools Resolution # 2018-06**

WHEREAS, California has the sixth largest economy in the world, and the largest Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of any state in the nation; and

WHEREAS, despite California's leadership in the global economy, the state falls in the nation's bottom quintile on nearly every measure of public K-12 school funding and school staffing; and

WHEREAS, California ranks 45<sup>th</sup> nationally in the percentage of taxable income spent on education, 41<sup>st</sup> in per-pupil funding, 45<sup>th</sup> in pupil-teacher ratios and 48<sup>th</sup> in pupil-staff ratios; and

WHEREAS, K-12 school funding has not substantially increased, on an inflation-adjusted basis, for more than a decade; and

WHEREAS, under the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), state funding for K-12 schools has only this year recently returned to levels predating the Great Recession of 2007; and

WHEREAS, the modest revenue increases since the implementation of LCFF have been eroded by rapidly increasing costs for health care, pensions, transportation and utilities; and

WHEREAS, 58 percent of California's public school students are eligible for free and reduced-price lunch — 13 percent above the national average — and 23 percent of California students are English learners, more than twice the national average; and

WHEREAS, California's investment in public schools is out of alignment with its wealth, its ambitions, its demographics and the demands of a 21<sup>st</sup>-century education; and

WHEREAS, in 2007, a bipartisan group of California leaders commissioned a report titled *Getting Down to Facts*, which stated it would take an additional \$17 billion annually to meet the State Board of Education achievement targets for K-12 schools; and

WHEREAS, in 2016, a California School Boards Association (CSBA) report, *California's Challenge: Adequately Funding Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, updated the *Getting Down to Facts* data and determined that, adjusting for inflation, an additional \$22 billion to \$40 billion annually would be required to provide all public school students with access to a high-quality education; and

WHEREAS, California funds schools at roughly \$1,961 per student less than the national average, which translates to approximately \$3,462 per student when adjusted for California being a high-cost state; and

WHEREAS, California trails the average of the top 10 states by almost \$7,000 in per-pupil funding; and

WHEREAS, in *Robles-Wong v. State of California*, a group of plaintiffs led by CSBA argued that California's school funding system violated Article IX of the State Constitution by denying all students access to an education that prepares them for economic security and full participation in our democratic institutions; and

WHEREAS, the California Supreme Court declined to hear the case by a 4-3 margin, prompting Justice Goodwin H. Liu to write: “It is regrettable that this court, having recognized education as a fundamental right in a landmark decision 45 years ago [*Serrano v. Priest* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 584], should now decline to address the substantive meaning of that right.”; and

WHEREAS, in order to prepare our students for participation in a democratic society and an increasingly competitive, technology-driven global economy, California must fund schools at a level sufficient to support student success; and

WHEREAS, despite its vast wealth, California has consistently underfunded public education while widening its scope, adding new requirements and raising standards without providing appropriate resources to prepare all students for college, career and civic life; and

WHEREAS, if California is to close opportunity and achievement gaps and create a public school system that offers consistently high levels of education, the State must provide schools with the resources to meet the needs of their specific populations;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the governing board of the Pacific Elementary School District urges the State Legislature to fund California public schools at the national average or higher by the year 2020, and at a level that is equal to or above the average of the top 10 states nationally by 2025 and to maintain, at a minimum, this level of funding until otherwise decreed.

Adopted this 16<sup>th</sup> day of the month of January in 2018.

Motion made by: \_\_\_\_\_

Second made by: \_\_\_\_\_

List members voting “aye:” \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

List members voting “no:” \_\_\_\_\_

List members abstaining: \_\_\_\_\_

List members not present: \_\_\_\_\_

**RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH FUND BALANCE POLICIES  
AS REQUIRED BY GASB 54  
Resolution #2018 -7**

At a regular meeting of the Pacific School District Board of Trustees held on January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018, on a motion made by \_\_\_\_\_ and seconded by \_\_\_\_\_, the Board adopts the following resolution:

**WHEREAS**, the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) has adopted Statement Number 54 (GASB 54), *Fund Balance Reporting and Governmental Fund Type Definitions*, that is effective as of fiscal year 2010-2011, and

**WHEREAS**, the Pacific School District wishes to comply with GASB 54 as required;

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Board of Trustees hereby adopts the following policy:

***FUND BALANCE POLICY***

Fund balance measures the net financial resources available to finance expenditures of future periods. The District's Unassigned General Fund Balance will be maintained to provide the District with sufficient working capital and a margin of safety to address local and regional emergencies without borrowing. The Unassigned General Fund Balance may only be appropriated by resolution of the Board of Trustees.

Fund Balance of the District may be committed for a specific source by formal action of the Board of Trustees. Amendments or modification to the committed fund balance must also be approved by formal action of the Board of Trustees. Committed fund balance does not lapse at year-end. The formal action required to commit fund balance shall be by board resolution or majority vote.

The Board of Trustees delegates authority to assign fund balance for a specific purpose to the Chief Business Official of the District.

For purposes of fund balance classification, expenditures are to be spent from restricted fund balance first and then unrestricted. Expenditures incurred in the unrestricted fund balances shall be reduced first from the committed fund balance, then from the assigned fund balance and lastly, the unassigned fund balance.

The Board of Trustees recognizes that good fiscal management comprises the foundational support of the entire District. To make that support as effective as possible, the Board intends to maintain a minimum fund balance of 10% of the District's general fund annual operating expenditures. If a fund balance drops below 10%, it shall be recovered at a rate of 1% minimally, each year. This policy should be revisited each year for review.

The above Resolution is adopted this 16<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2018.

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

---