



San Diego Unified School District
 Office of the Superintendent
 Accountability Office
 Monitoring & Accountability Reporting Department

DRAFT



District Advisory Council for Compensatory Education Programs

Harold J. Ballard Parent Center
 2375 Congress Street
 San Diego, CA 92110

**DRAFT General
 Meeting Minutes**

June 16, 2010, 6:00-8:00 p.m.

Item	Description/Actions	Meeting Summary
1. Welcome:	Informational: Elneda Shannon, Manager, Harold J. Parent Ballard Center	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shannon provided handouts and gave an update on the end of year classes and July events. A celebration was held to recognize close to 60 parents who have completed the spring parenting classes. Shannon announced the center applied for a Target grant to fund future Project Ujima classes. Project Ujima is devoted entirely to engaging African-American families to raise student academic achievement. Shannon continued to encourage everyone to visit the Ballard web site at http://www.sandi.net/2045101110104248150/site/default.asp. Elneda Shannon can be reached via email at eshannon@sandi.net or call the Ballard Parent Center at (619) 293-4431 for information.
<i>NEW – Talking Points Items of importance to report to your SSC</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informational: Jenee Peevy, 1st Vice-Chairperson 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peevy asked for a volunteer to share their experience on reporting information to their SSC from the May 19 DAC meeting. Euclid representative shared she was able to provide useful information which in turn has engaged her site SSC to ask more questions about Title I issues. Peevy explained the goal of the DAC is to empower representatives and parents with useful and correct information. Representatives can open dialogue around Title I issues with their SSC.
2. Call to Order: ➤ Approval of Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action: David Page, DAC Chairperson 	Meeting called to order by Page at 6:07 p.m. Quorum. Minutes from May 19, 2010, were reviewed. Motion to approve the minutes as presented made by Madison. Seconded by Kearny DMD. None opposed. Motion passed.
3. Chairperson’s Report: ➤ DAC Awards Celebration!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognition: David Page, DAC Chairperson, and Vikki Henton, Program Manager, Program Monitoring and Special Guest - Nellie Meyer, Interim Deputy Superintendent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following categories were recognized and received awards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Title I Academic Achieving Schools - California Distinguished Schools - AVID National Demonstration School - WASC (Western Association of Schools and Colleges) Page and Henton presented Perfect Attendance Awards (100% attendance from November 2009 through May 2010) and recognized district staff of the Harold J. Ballard Parent Center, Translation Department, School Police and Central Office. <i>Special “thank you” to the staff of Options Catering and to Mr. Gene Garibay, DAC Executive Board Member, who without his humble generosity, the buffet style dinner, may not have been.</i>

<p>3. Chairperson’s Report (<i>continued</i>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ State and Local BOE Meeting <p><i>BOE = Board of Education</i></p> <p>ITEM not on agenda - ADDED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Conference Report ➤ State Title I Conference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational: David Page, DAC Chairperson • Informational: David Page, DAC Chairperson <p><i>Informational Item: David Page, DAC Chairperson</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational: David Page, DAC Chairperson 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page expressed concerned that the district is not following the legal guidelines to ensure notification of regular and special BOE meetings. Page explained a section of the legal guidelines in the Brown Act (Govt. Code, Sections 54950-62) (Administrative Procedure 9066, revised 4-21-95) as it pertains to the district scheduling and notification of public meetings. Page stated the Brown Act gives the public <u>the right to know</u> that a public meeting is scheduled, <u>the right to be present</u> at a meeting, and <u>the right to hear and see</u> what is happening at a regular or special district meeting. Page expressed the importance for the general body to be aware of the serious issues currently addressed at the district regular and special meetings. <p>http://www.sandi.net/boe/site/default.asp Board of Education, SDUSD http://www.cde.ca.gov California Dept. of Education http://www.sandi.net/20451010611403253/site/default.asp School Budget Crisis, SDUSD</p> <p>Page asked for a motion to amend the 06/16/10 General Meeting agenda by adding two items for Informational to Item 5. District Reports/Training/Collaboration.</p> <p>Adding to Item 5. Budget Update Presenter: Debbie Foster, Director, Budget Operations</p> <p>Adding to Item 5: Waiver Process Presenter: Phil Stover, Interim Chief, Special Projects Officer</p> <p>Motion to add to the agenda items listed made by Franklin. Seconded by Foster. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Page and Jenee Peevy attended the Title I Conference on May 23-May 25th in Sacramento. Page reported on two specific workshops. One workshop focused on “<i>how to work with parents and how to have meetings that parents want to come back to</i>”. Second workshop addressed the process of learning, “<i>How to train teachers to work with students</i>”. Page will collaborate with members of the executive board on additional ways to encourage parents to be more involved.
<p>4. Executive Board Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Sub-Committee’s ➤ Title I Parent Involvement Policy (TI PIP) <p><i>NCLB =No Child Left Behind</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational: David Page, DAC Chairperson 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page asked by a show of hands from the general body who have looked at a school level Parent Involvement Policy. Page explained there is district TI PIP required by the state and a site TI PIP required by the district. The district level TI PIP, the State wants to know how does the district involve parents and how does the district implement parent involvement? In the NCLB act there is a State mandate for districts to implement a process to involve parents.

<p>4. Executive Board Report (<i>continued</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Sub-Committee’s <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Title I Parent Involvement Policy (TI PIP) <p><i>SSC = School Site Council</i></p> <p><i>DAC = District Advisory Council for Compensatory Education</i></p> <p><i>Cal-PIRC = California Parent Involvement Resource Center</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational: David Page, DAC Chairperson 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page explained on February 2010 the district TI PIP was reviewed and approved by the subcommittee for this year. The Consolidated Application, Part I addresses, “<i>How did the district involve parents</i>” in reviewing its effectiveness or in rewriting their parent involvement policy. <p>Page stated the subcommittee asked the district to provide a year timeline of SSC/DAC items scheduled by the district and State for review and approval. Page explained how valuable the timeline tool is for parents and representatives. Page stated he would like to have hyperlinks added to an electronic version of the timeline so that additional information could be accessed.</p> <p>Page stated the subcommittee requested a survey independent of the district. Page reported the California Parent Involvement Resource Center at http://www.calpirc.org/ has available a survey asking about parent involvement in your school or local district. All information is confidential. Page would like to utilize the same software “Survey Monkey” to develop a survey.</p> <p>Page stated the TI PIP committee is ready to submit the February 2010 TI PIP with two attachments (timeline and an independent parent involvement survey) to the BOE. Page explained to the general body adding the two items is only an attachment to, not a modification of the TI PIP.</p> <p>Page asked for a motion to approve to submit the existing February 2010 TI PIP with two attachments to the BOE. Motion by Franklin. Seconded by Morse. None opposed. Motion to submit February 2010 TI PIP with two attachments passed.</p>
<p>5. District Reports/Training/Collaboration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 2010-11 Con App, Part I <i>Con App = Consolidated Application</i> <p><i>CDE = California Department of Education</i></p> <p><i>EIA/LEP = Economic Impact Aid/Limited English Proficient</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational: Debbie Foster, Financial Planning Manager & David Page, DAC Chairperson 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page reported the CDE did not have the data available for the 2010-11 Consolidated Application, Part I because of technical difficulties with their new software. Page asked Foster to move forward with a presentation with the sections of the application to familiarize the general body. <p>Foster provided handouts and guided the general body to specific pages of interest within the Consolidated Application, Part I. Foster explained the differences between Part I and Part II. Foster explained the Consolidated Application is how the district asks for various funding. All funding but one comes from the federal government. EIA/LEP comes from the State.</p> <p>Foster stated in order for the district to receive funding, the Consolidated Application, Part I must be approved by the BOE and then submitted to the State by June 30th with or without signature from the DAC Chair. The signature page in the application verifies that the district had consultation with DAC Body.</p> <p>Foster explained how the application is used as another source of information for the State to confirm previously reported data such as Free & Reduced Lunch. Foster explained why there was a section for Private Schools to receive a percentage of district funding.</p> <p>Page explained when the CDE makes available the data, the Consolidated Application, Part I will be brought back for discussion at the first DAC meeting scheduled for September 2010.</p>

<p>5. District Reports/Training/Collaboration (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ LEA Plan/Addendum <i>LEA = Local Education Agency</i>➤ AYP = <i>Adequate Yearly Progress</i>➤ API = <i>Academic Performance Index</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Informational: Brenda Campbell, Executive Director, Federal & Special Programs Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Page read the goals of the district as written in the LEA plan. Page asked Dr. Brenda Campbell to give a report regarding the LEA plan. The review would take place during the 2010-11 school year. Due to the reorganization of the central office departments there is no information at this time as to which department will be responsible for the LEA plan. <p>Dr. Campbell formed a committee of parents (October 21, 2009) to review the LEA plan because the State identified SDUSD for Year 1, Program Improvement (see general meeting agenda minutes 10/21/09). The district was mandated to develop an addendum to the existing LEA Plan because AYP was not met in two targeted areas.</p> <p>Dr. Campbell explained the district must offer parents an opportunity to review and participate in any modifications or revisions of the LEA Plan. Dr. Campbell stressed the importance for parent participation in order to make decisions about where to focus spending money in an effort to improve student achievement.</p> <p>Dr Campbell reported that the State approved the district’s 2009-2014 LEA plan with addendum (BOE approved on 12/15/09). The State asked for the following additional information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Title of the department/division staff responsible for collecting information from each department.2. Report quarterly measurements on the strategy being implemented. <p>Dr. Campbell explained the data will verify to the State whether the district is moving forward towards and progressing in using the strategies written in the LEA. This is how the district will report annually to the State while in Program Improvement Year 1 and Year 2. Dr. Campbell stressed the importance for the district to come out of Program Improvement in Year 2 otherwise the State will take over the district and implement change in year 3. Dr. Campbell will turn over the LEA plan, complete with the two items, to the new leadership on July 1, 2010.</p> <p>The State now requires the district to align the SPSA to the LEA plan. The data, strategies and actions written in the LEA plan must be linked to the SPSA. The new template will be released in August to principals. In September schools will work on the SPSA and there is a specific page for sites to explain how the data, strategies, actions link to the LEA plan. The LEA plan will drive the entire process. The district will not get funded if the SPSA and LEA plan are not aligned. Contact Richard Graham at the CDE if you would like additional information. Dr. Campbell took questions from the general body.</p> <p>Dr. Campbell summarized what it means for a school site to be in Program Improvement Years 1-5+ versus the entire district. The Federal and State mandate the district must provide the following supports to sites currently in Program Improvement Years 1-5+.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Year 1 PI – School Choice w/transportation (Program Improvement School Choice).- Year 2 PI – School Choice w/transportation and Supplemental Services (SES).- Year 3 PI – School Choice w/transportation, SES and Corrective Action. Additional funds given to sites and FSP working with principals to review new curriculum to supplement what is being used at the school site.
---	---	--

<p>5. District Reports/Training/Collaboration (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ LEA Plan/Addendum <i>LEA = Local Education Agency</i> ➤ AYP = Adequate Yearly Progress <i>API = Academic Performance Index</i> 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Year 4 PI – School Choice w/transportation, SES and plan for restructuring (FSP worked with all sites to review SPSA, data and test scores to make decisions on how to restructure their school. Restructuring plans go to the BOE on June 29, 2010. The Restructuring plans will be implemented in 2010-11. - Year 5+ PI – School Choice w/transportation, SES and implement restructuring plan (review the Restructuring plan from year 4. Identify strategies and implement. Review how is the SPSA is aligned with the Restructuring plan. There is a step-by-step examination of the data and two plans. Sites are in the process of developing a new SPSA that will reflect only what the strategies that are working. <p>Campbell thanked the DAC general body for their support to increasing the funding for SES who was able to provide services to 4,000 students in the district.</p> <p>Page read from the Title I Parent Involvement Policy and Guidelines for Implementation (Attachment 7 of Administrative Circular #24 posted to the district website on 9/29/09):</p> <p><i>In order to assure collaborative partnerships among Title I schools, parents, and the community, the board, working through the administration, is committed to:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Involving parents/guardians in the joint development of the district’s Title I plan, and the process of school review and improvement. <i>The district will provide opportunities for parent involvement through:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Participation in the development or revision of the Local Education Agency (LEA) Plan. b. Participation in the Annual Evaluation of the LEA Plan, coordinated by District Advisory Council (DAC) for compensatory education programs. <p>Sharing of information, through local Board of Education (BOE) reports, through the district’s web page, and through local BOE reports at DAC meetings, on each school’s progress in meeting all accountability measures. (Adequate Yearly Progress, Academic Performance Index).</p>
<p><i>NOT ON AGENDA –Informal</i></p>	<p>Informational</p>	<p>Updates beginning July 1, 2010: Dr. Brenda Campbell, Executive Director leaves the Federal & Special Programs Division on June 30, 2010 and will become the new Area Superintendent over the Morse/Lincoln High School Cluster - Area 1.</p> <p>Nellie Meyer, Interim Deputy Superintendent, will be the new Area Superintendent over Mission Bay and Point Loma High School Cluster - Area 7.</p> <p>Phil Stover, Interim Chief, Special Projects Officer reported that the Superintendent Search Committee has submitted a report to the BOE with the names of three (3) finalists. The district has scheduled an open forum on June 17th for parents and the community to ask questions.</p>

<p>5. District Reports/Training/Collaboration (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Budget Update 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational: Nellie Meyer, Interim Deputy Superintendent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meyer stated despite the various cuts in funding and programs, Meyer was very pleased to participate in the awards recognition celebration of schools and staff. Meyer reported there has been 400 million dollars in cuts in the last four years. Even with these challenges, Meyer was pleased to see there are school sites and students continuing to show remarkable improvement. <p>Meyer explained with the recent BOE appointment of the nine area superintendents, this is the beginning of the districts commitment to stream line central office and to improve support services to the schools sites, students, parents and the community.</p> <p>Meyer reported on the items scheduled for review by the BOE on Tuesday, June 22, 2010:</p> <p><u>Title I funding</u> (sites that are Title I only will have) Grad Coaches Counselors</p> <p><u>Carry Over funding (amount of carry over not determined at this time)</u> Summer School – grades 1st, 3rd, 8th and for high school credit recovery</p> <p><u>ARRA – stimulus funds</u> (ends 2011) Prep-periods for teachers – use Title I funds</p> <p><u>Tier III programs</u> As the State has reduced the amount of funding to districts, the State has changed the rules for spending. Funds that used to be restricted are now unrestricted giving districts more flexibility. The money in Tier III will now be utilized to address the budget needs of the district.</p> <p>Meyer took questions from the general body.</p> <p>Page stated he is very concerned with the district supplanting. Page stated the district can not take a program funded in the current year (2009-10) with unrestricted dollars and then fund the program next year (2010-11) using restricted funds such as Title I dollars because the district knows there will be restricted funds available in the new year.</p> <p>Page explained there are some provisions in the law to address this issue.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IF the district is under severe financial pressure, the district can eliminate a program and then at a later date, rehire the staff using restricted funds such as Title I funds. 2. But the district can not in a “blanket vote” keep the program and fund under Title I (restricted funds) in the new year since the district has Title I carryover. <p>Page then asked, “<i>What basis is the Federal Government approving this decision?</i>”</p> <p><i>Is the District receiving approval from the federal government for filing the waiver because of severe financial crisis or as a just in case this happens, “blanket vote”?</i></p>
---	--	--

<p>5. District Reports/Training/Collaboration (continued)</p> <p>➤ Waiver to the CDE</p> <p>Amendment to Agenda: <i>Voted and approved by general body</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational: Phil Stover, Interim Chief, Special Projects Officer in place of Debbie Foster 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stover reported on the district’s decision to submit a waiver application to the State Board of Education (SBE) and California Department of Education (CDE) on June 1, 2010. Stover provided copies of the Title I waiver application and a copy of the memo addressed to the Board of Education (BOE) outlining the rationale to apply for the Title I, Part A waivers. <p>Stover stated the waiver is scheduled to be reviewed and approved at the June 22, 2010, BOE meeting after the fact, as permitted by the CDE.</p> <p>Discussion ensued with the general body over the validity of the district’s decision to submit the waivers to the SBE and CDE on June 1, 2010.</p> <p>Stover stated he has spoken to every person at every level in the district regarding the waivers and all said submitting the waiver is acceptable. Stover reported from the state level to the attorneys that were hired from the School Services of California, no one has given the district a verbal or written opinion that submitting the waiver was <u>not</u> acceptable.</p> <p>Stover stated the foremost Title I firm based in Washington D.C., was hired to review the recommendation of the district to submit the waiver. The legal firm was paid (\$5,000) to review and provide an opinion regarding the use of Title I, Part A funds. Stover stressed that the BOE did not vote until the legal opinion was received.</p> <p>Stover stated he could not bring a copy of the full legal opinion because the BOE has not waived their attorney/client confidentiality to release the full legal opinion. Stover could not confirm or deny that the BOE would even consider making a decision to waive their attorney/client confidentiality to release the full legal opinion to the public.</p> <p>Page stated that he has federal documents contradicting the district’s justification to utilize Title I, Part A funds. Page used the graduation coach position as an example to explain the following:</p> <p><i>This position has been funded out of unrestricted funds for an entire school year. When a position is funded out of restricted funds, the employee is required to fill out a Time Certification form confirming the job code descriptions performed and time spent at the site/program.</i></p> <p>Page commented: <i>Would the district fill out these Time Certifications and back date?</i></p> <p>Page further stated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>How does the district re-write the sites SPSA (Site Plan for Student Achievement) to reflect the graduation coach position has been paid out of Title I, Part A when all along it was not?</i> 2. <i>How do you re-write the LEA (Local Education Agency) plan that has already been approved by the BOE to reflect those changes?</i> <p>Page commented: The district is now coming to the DAC general body in order to conform with the district’s decision to submit the waivers to the CDE and SBE.</p>
--	---	---

<p>5. District Reports/Training/Collaboration (continued)</p> <p>➤ Waiver to the CDE (continued)</p> <p>Amendment to Agenda: Voted and approved by general body</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational: Phil Stover, Interim Chief, Special Projects Officer in place of Debbie Foster 	<p>Page then asked: Are we (the DAC body) being advised or are we (the DAC body) advising? Stover stated there will be Title I carryover from the 2009-10 year along with additional funds. Of the two, \$14-\$15 million that the board wants to use, \$13-\$13 1/2 million will be coming out of the 2010-11 funds together with 2009-10 Title I carryover. Stover stated the district is not going back to revise everything, we did not seek a waiver for that.</p> <p>Foster stated that the BOE only approved for the graduation coaches to be paid out of 2009-10. Other two items were out of the 2010-2011 funds.</p> <p>Page referenced a document showing the balances from May 29th, 2010. Page stated the funds were from this year not next year.</p> <p>KEARNY DMD rep comment: <i>Its all Title I funds, and stakeholders did not collaborate on the spending of it and no one from the DAC was there.</i></p> <p>MORSE HS rep asked question: <i>I Thought it was at the discretion of the principal to have a graduation coach. If the SSC wanted, could the SSC vote out the graduation coach at the site?</i></p> <p>Page asked for a motion to extend the general meeting by 15 minutes from 8:00 p.m. to 8:15 p.m., in order to allow the general body time for discussion. Motion made by Mann Middle. Seconded by Lincoln HS. Motion passed. None opposed.</p> <p>-- Budget discussion continued --</p> <p>Stover reported in the third year of the district’s budget crisis, and it is expected to continue over the next 3-4 years, the following can happen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Since February 2010, the district has cut over 100 million out of unrestricted dollars in anticipation of the next year’s deficit. - 2011-2012 year memo sent to BOE by the CDE the district’s deficit will be about \$129 million. Assuming that these are permanent cuts, the 2012-2013 year will be about \$70 million deficit. - IF the 2011-2012, \$129 million is <u>NOT permanent cuts</u>, then the deficit will increase to several hundred million dollars for 2012-2013 year. <p>Stover stressed how the district is going through a major transformation. Even with the 100’s of millions of dollars the district has cut from the budget over the last three years, the district can not keep making major cuts and keep business as usual. The district has made cuts to positions that will not come back in 2010-11. Stover explained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 91% of the 2010-11 budget is in staff positions. - By reclassing the SIO’s to Area Superintendents, there was a savings of \$500 million. - District eliminated all vacant position for a savings of \$4.7 million dollars. - In 2010-11 the district is looking at cutting actual programs.
--	---	--

<p>5. District Reports/Training/Collaboration (continued)</p> <p>➤ Waiver to the CDE (continued)</p> <p><i>Amendment to Agenda:</i> <i>Voted and approved by general body</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational: Phil Stover, Interim Chief, Special Projects Officer in place of Debbie Foster 	<p>Stover stated the district’s budget is balance for the 2010-11 year. However, IF the State’s Finance sub-committee votes to take \$9 million dollars in Special Education funds, retro-active from the 2009-10 budget, and then take another \$9 million dollars more in 2010-11, then the district will not be balanced.</p> <p>Stover reported the State’s Finance sub-committee did not vote one way or the other.</p> <p>Stover stated on June 22” 2010, 40%-45% in cuts were proposed to the BOE. The BOE reviewed \$300 million dollars in proposed cuts. Not all proposed cuts were approved.</p> <p>LINCOLN HS rep asked question: <i>How did the district use restricted funds to pay for positions not previously funded by Title I funds.</i></p> <p>Stover explained there are positions that will always be paid out of Title I funds. The district agreed to approve to no longer pay for graduation coaches and site counselors positions out of unrestricted funds. Only Title I funds will be used to pay for those positions at Title I sites only. Non-Title I schools will not have a counselor paid out of either unrestricted or restricted funds.</p> <p>LINCOLN HS rep asked question: <i>How come the district did not ask the advice of the DAC for opinion or consultation?</i></p> <p>Stover stated the BOE reviewed this item several weeks ago. Stover explained he is here tonight to speak to the DAC about the matter.</p> <p>LINCOLN HS rep asked question: <i>If Vice Principals stay or go and there are counselors paid out of Title I money who do not have a case load, can you explain?</i></p> <p>Stover stated there is a proposal for the BOE to eliminated 1/2 of the “base allocated” Vice Principals at the schools (40 VPs). The “site purchased” Vice Principals are not proposed for elimination. Stover did not have information about the counselors.</p> <p>RILEY school rep asked question: <i>Has the district made a decision about the \$18 million dollars (\$9 million in special education funds, retro to 2009-10 and \$9 million in 2010-11)?</i></p> <p>Stover stated the \$18 million dollars of special education funding is a state decision, not a BOE decision. The district waits for a response from the CDE.</p> <p>Page asked how are the two new deputy superintendent positions to be fund?</p> <p>Stover explained the two new deputy superintendents positions posted will be funded accordingly:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deputy Superintendent of Academics - majority of funding comes from unrestricted funds. 2. Deputy Superintendent of Business - restricted dollars such as funds from food services revenue, transportation funds, Prop S funds, State Facilities funds will be used, not Title I restricted dollars.
---	---	--

5. District Reports/Training/Collaboration
(continued)

CROWN POINT rep comment: Representative is overly frustrated with site SSC negativity and the decisions made by the BOE regarding cuts and expenditures. The district needs to focus on improving student achievement by implementing well programs that address student needs

Page feels the BOE is currently re-dividing the site allocation funds the DAC consulted on back in December 2009 or January 2010. Page stated the BOE is to consult with the DAC body each time decisions are made to spend Title I dollars. Page stated it is up to the DAC body to file a complaint against the district for approving recent proposals without consultation with the DAC in a timely manner.

Page urges the DAC body to voice their opinions to district at the BOE meetings. Page reminds the general body to keep in mind, “how is Title I dollars being spent to support student achievement”?

Page asked for a motion to extend time from 8:15 p.m. to 8:30 p.m., in order to give presenters time to answer questions from the general body regarding the items listed on the back of the June 15, 2010, memo to the BOE – Title I Waiver Application. Motion made by SCPA. Seconded by Hamilton. Motion approved. None opposed.

Page addressed the set aside requirements of the ARRA (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act) funds, \$15 million a year for two years for a total of \$30 million dollars.

Page asked Foster this question: Did the district set aside 10% for Program Improvement, 15% in carryover and 20% for SES (Supplemental Education Services) providers and transportation on top of what the district already does?

Page asked the DAC informally: Would you have said we would rather be more flexible with our funds and choose to spend extra on the SES providers or did we want to have a hard line of 20%, 10%, 30% set aside for SES and Professional Development so we would not have any flexibility with these funds at all?

Page directed question to Foster: What the district is looking for is some flexibility and ability to spend what ever money is left from those 10%, 20%, set asides or Title I allowable expenditures, is that correct?

Foster explained the purpose of the waiver was submitted “just in case” the district did not spend of the ARRA funds. Foster stated the waivers would most likely not go into effect. Foster explained the \$2.1 million set aside in ARRA funding for SES providers will be spent. All dollars are obligated through contracts for the year.

Foster stated **IF** at the end of the 2009-10 year not all the SES funds are spent, then any unused portion goes back into the fund pot. Foster explained that as a group, the district and the DAC must have a discussion to decide how the remaining ARRA funds are to be utilized.

6. Public Comment		Page opened the floor for public comment: Valentina Hernandez of Hamilton Elementary announced she is the 2010-11 DELAC Chair. An announcement was made for the Harold J. Ballard Parent Center. A Pow Wow celebration sponsored by the Soaring Eagles student dance troupe. The event is free to the public and everyone is invited to attend.
-------------------	--	---

Meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.
Minutes recorded. Transcribed by M. Johnson2