

## PART I – QUESTIONS FROM JUNE 2<sup>ND</sup> COW AND JUNE 9<sup>TH</sup> 1<sup>ST</sup> READING

### LCAP:

**1. *How can LCAP be used to underscore importance of chronic absenteeism?***

The LCAP represents a district-level accountability tool that is comparable to the site Balanced Scorecards (BSC's). It is intended to identify key indicators including chronic absenteeism, determine outcome targets, articulate strategies and actions to meet the desired results, and monitor results annually. Section 2 of the LCAP is also drafted to align closely with the Superintendent's evaluation, which will reinforce and raise awareness the importance of the indicators and targets throughout the SFUSD community and across our schools. The school BSC will continue to be the main vehicle to drive site-level planning and accountability, and we will continue to draw explicit connections between the LCAP and site BSC's.

### District Priorities:

**2. *What are the amounts of recommended investments across priority areas?***

See slides 6-9 of presentation for 6/16/15 COW and amended PEEF spending plan.

**3. *What are the funding sources for the recommended investments (especially PEEF vs. Unrestricted General Fund)***

See slides 6-9 of presentation for 6/16/15 COW and amended PEEF spending plan.

**4. *Can budget book highlight: private donations, utility savings / sustainability?***

We will incorporate content regarding these topics into the Second Reading version of the budget book.

### Increased and New Funding:

**5. *How much of the rising transportation costs are for a new contract vs. expanded services? Special education vs. general education?***

Most of the projected increase in total transportation costs is related to a new contract, which is estimated to increase by \$2.4 million, or ten percent (10%). Approximately eighty-four percent (84%) of the total transportation budget is associated with special education services, and the remaining twenty-six percent (26%) is for general education services. Detailed information is available on Exhibit 13 of the budget book (p. 82 in the First Reading version).

**6. *How will a school marketing specialist be connected to school improvement and site-based fundraising efforts?***

The school marketing specialist will absolutely work closely with the leaders and supervisors of the selected schools. We realize that outreach and marketing efforts connected to any school must be closely aligned to the programmatic features and qualities of the school itself and we hope that the marketing specialist can help inform and contribute to school improvement efforts.

FY 2015-16 Budget Development  
Notes and Clarifications

**General Budget Related:**

**7. *Are investments recommended for: workforce housing, EAP, substitutes, technology training, computer science, student assignment/enrollment system, Future Dining Experience, 7-period day, behavioral/mental health support, homeless families***

Specific UGF- and/or PEEF-funded investments are recommended for behavioral/mental health support, substitute staffing, and services to homeless families as outlined in the meeting materials and/or the budget book. Technology investments will also include necessary training for teachers and other users. Investments in computer science, the Future Dining Experience and workforce housing will largely be supported through private donations or City funding for FY15-16, but these priorities will continue to be considered for district funding in future years. Staff is engaged in analysis to review options for expanding course-taking (including a 7-period day), workforce housing and reviewing the district's student enrollment portal. Additional analysis and proposals will likely be forthcoming in the first half of the upcoming year.

**8. *How solid are CA Dept. of Finance cost-of-living adjustment projections?***

DOF's multi-year projections reflect the Department's estimates of state revenue growth (which determines total funding for Prop 98) and the Administration's current perspectives on budget and policy priorities (how much of Prop 98 should be directed toward LCFF vs. other K-14 priorities). CDE and county offices approve LEAs' reliance on DOF planning factors in evaluating annual budgets and interim reports. The Administration has tended to be conservative in projecting revenues; however, the multi-year planning factors published by the DOF have also been adjusted downward on several occasions. I.e., these projections are not systematically understated. Due to this element of uncertainty, districts are advised to consider a range of outcomes and not to rely completely on the DOF planning factors.

**9. *How do we spend Title I resources and is it wise to 'backfill' federal cuts?***

Staff has provided information to the Board about the Title I budget, and we will modify how we characterize the rationale for moving certain expenses from Title I to the UGF. The Superintendent's budget does not reflect an automatic 'backfill' of the federal funding being reduced; rather, we have viewed as an intentional budget priority the continuation of most of the programs and services that have been previously funded by now-reduced Title I dollars.

## PART II – QUESTIONS POST JUNE 9<sup>TH</sup>

Commissioner Rachel Norton:

- 1. LCAP: I see we've embedded the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) throughout the goals instead of having it as a separate goal as we did last year. How do we think that is going to make a difference in achieving the Annual Measurable Outcomes (AMOs)?**

MTSS is a strategic method for allocating resources across sites, with an emphasis on supporting sites and student populations with high needs. The aim of MTSS was to provide not only additional interventions and services, but also build the capacity of staff at sites to support students. These interventions and services range from academic supports to social emotional supports – and as such they span a range of the Goals and the associated AMOs within the LCAP. By embedding MTSS within each Goal and its associated AMOs, this provides a better representation of the actions and services that can contribute to the AMOs. In 15-16, the district plans to conduct analysis to build a deeper understanding of how MTSS interventions and services contribute to AMOs.

- 2. LCAP: Specific Annual Measurable Outcomes - When can we expect to see the data on chronic absence? When can we expect to see data on the number of appropriately credentialed teachers? I support adding additional metrics to Goal 4 and I have a few specific ones to suggest: Teacher vacancies by Tier, Principal turnover by Tier, and average years of service for teachers by Tier, compared to the district as a whole.**

Chronic absenteeism data for 2014-15 is being reviewed and we aim to provide it by end of June.

Regarding the additional metrics for Goal 4 Highly Qualified Teachers and Staff, we will include the teacher vacancy rate and principal turnover rate as part of the LCAP for 2015-2018. The average years of service of teachers can be data we provide. We believe it is important to conduct additional analysis to forecast the landscape of our human capital prior to setting targets for this measure.

- 3. LCAP: What do we mean on page 65 of the LCAP where we say we are incorporating the Office of Family and community Engagement strategic plan as part of the actions? Can you give me some specific examples where we did that? Not sure what that means.**

The Annual Update on page 65 describes how we changed this Goal (Increase Family Engagement) from 2014-15 to 2015-16. The actions on page 45-46 (actions for Family Engagement 2015-16) incorporated components of the Office of Family and Community Engagement, including dual-capacity building (of families AND staff) and providing data to families that is aligned to both the Culture and Climate surveys as well as SFUSD's Family Engagement Standards.

- 4. LCAP: I want to specifically support the recommendations from the PAC where they asked for additional information on which supports were being increased from year to year, and also for a narrative on how MTSS funds are allocated, coordinated and prioritized in the LCAP itself.**

We also believe it is important to build understanding of MTSS to our broader community and have built out initial communications for MTSS. These are incorporated as part of the written responses to the PAC

FY 2015-16 Budget Development  
Notes and Clarifications

and DELAC. Additionally, an overview of MTSS and the allocations to sites are included in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading of the Budget Book for the public.

- 5. BUDGET BOOK: Contributions from the UGF - The SpEd transportation contribution is different on the handout we received last week (June 2<sup>nd</sup>) and what is printed in the budget itself (June 9<sup>th</sup>). On page 27 of the Budget Book narrative it says the SpEd transportation contribution will be \$15.6M but on the handout last week it said \$19.5M. Please clarify which it is and how does that compare to the prior year?**

The total contribution to transportation is \$19.5M. Of this, \$15.6M is from district unrestricted general fund, and \$5.0M is from the COE unrestricted general fund. Of the \$15.6M of district UGF contribution, \$14.5M goes to supporting Special Ed transportation, and \$1.1M is for support of general education transportation.

The increase in support for General Ed transportation is because support for general education transportation provided by Title IA funds is gradually being reduced to realign to the intent of the use of Title I funds for transportation. As a requirement under the CORE waiver, transportation funded by Title I is limited to eligible students who were previously provided transportation under NCLB to continue to receive this service until they matriculate.

Exhibit 13 on page 96 of Volume 1 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading Budget Book summarizes the transportation budget, including revenues, expenditures and contributions.

- 6. BUDGET BOOK: Similarly, for the SpEd contribution, I see \$71.5M on page 27. What was it last year, for comparison sake? Could I have a time series of data showing our SpEd and SpEd transportation contributions each of the past 10 years?**

The Unrestricted General Fund SpEd contribution is \$71.5M for 15.16. Last year the UGF contribution was \$61.4M. This information can be found in the Budget Book, 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading, Volume 1, pg 79.

Information for the SpEd and SpEd transportation contribution over the last 10 years will be forthcoming.

- 7. BUDGET BOOK: Also, in the SpEd budget breakdown on page 165, there appears to be a 10 percent increase in staff allocated to sites, the majority of it being paraprofessionals. I thought with the staffing guide we were reducing paraprofessionals. What are these staff and what specific goals are they supporting?**

The increase in paraprofessional FTE's appears to be related to an increase in the extent to which IEPs include paraprofessional support for students, including one-to-one para support. Staff members from Special Education and Budget Services will continue to meet with the Deputy Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents to more closely analyze site-based staffing trends throughout the coming year.

- 8. BUDGET BOOK: What is the \$2.6 million UGF contribution to Fund 40? Could I get more detail than what is provided on page 53?**

FY 2015-16 Budget Development  
Notes and Clarifications

The \$2.6M is to fund the annual debt service on the district's long-term energy retrofit capital lease. The lease agreement, with an option to purchase, runs through 2022. The outstanding balance as of June 30, 2015 is \$20.7M.

The annual debt service payment is run through Fund 40-Special Reserve Fund for Capital Outlay. Contributions are made from the district unrestricted general fund to Fund 40 to fund the annual payments.

**9. BUDGET BOOK: UGF Instructional supports for schools, pages 67-70: In the footnote on page 70 it says that the Office of Family & Parent Engagement, Access & Equity, Afterschool programs and Textbooks are being combined into one Department. What Department is that and where is it listed?**

The new Org 153: Office of Family Engagement & Community Partnerships is a combination of the Office of Family & Parent Engagement and Afterschool Programs and this department is listed on pg 209 of the Budget Book, 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading, Volume I.

In an effort to streamline department (Org) codes across SFCSD, the Office of Family Engagement and Community Partnerships is now in one org: Org 153. Org 153 used to be called Afterschool Programming, but it is important to note that Org 153 is being expanded to include Family Engagement and BOTH Family Engagement and Afterschool will co-exist under individual resource codes in Org 153.

No funding was reduced from the previous Org 022 Family Engagement from 14-15 to 15-16. The previous amount of \$1,017,256 was actually INCREASED by \$157,145 for a total of \$1,213,197.

The previously funded \$1,017,256 can be found in Org 150 (\$335,000) to support the Office of Family Voice which now comes under Pupil Services. The remaining \$711,093 was transferred to Org 153 to support the exact same positions funded in 14-15.

The increased investment of \$157,145 for Family Engagement will support the design and development of the Family Academy by hiring a central office staff to oversee this new program (\$114,338). A portion of the \$157,145 also went to the negotiated salary increases for all employees (\$42,807).

*Note: The inclusion of Access & Equity and Textbooks is incorrect. Only the Office of Family Engagement and Afterschool Programs are being combined.*

**10. BUDGET BOOK: Also, I note a large increase in the Section 504 services Department - can I get more detail on that?**

In order to fully implement recommendations of Section 504 Task Force in alignment with CEIS plan, additional funds were required. More students are being considered for a Section 504 accommodation plan (and not an IEP) and as such requests for support have significantly increased. The number of students qualified for a Section 504 accommodation plan have almost doubled (from 230 to 447) and the student need/acuity is higher. Additional funds will be used to complete recommendations of Section 504 Task Force to develop a more robust Section 504 process which includes staffing an interdisciplinary team to provide direct support and consultation to school sites.

FY 2015-16 Budget Development  
Notes and Clarifications

- 11. BUDGET BOOK: Preliminary site-base budget Allocations, pages 74-75: I note that a number of schools -- particularly the MS (See Aptos, Marina, Presidio, Francisco) are seeing enrollment declines. Is this part of our efforts to rationalize MS school enrollment capacities?**

Total projected enrollment for Fall 2015 for these schools is lower than actual enrollment for Fall 2014 based on a combination of factors including (graduating) 8<sup>th</sup> grade cohorts that are larger than incoming 6<sup>th</sup> grade cohorts and modest intentional reduction of enrollment capacities.

- 12. BUDGET BOOK: Also the last line on page 75 says "Placeholder school" and has an allocation of \$2.9 million but no students . . . Is this where we're "holding" additional site-based allocations that derive from the growth in the budget since schools got their preliminary allocations?**

Yes, that is what this placeholder is for. The \$2.9M will be allocated to sites with their fall site allocations. This will bring the total increase to direct site allocations up to \$6.9 M (\$4.0M has already been allocated in the Spring).

### ***Questions from June 16<sup>th</sup> Committee of the Whole***

#### ***PUBLIC COMMENT QUESTIONS:***

- 13. Georgia and Miranda (PAC): It would be helpful to understand how the Family Engagement Plan is being resourced, whether dedicated personnel or dollars to ensure implementation.**

The Office of Family Engagement and Community Partnership will continue to support these efforts. We combined all of Family Engagement and Community Partnerships into one department (see Org 153). For 2015-16, the previous amount of \$1,017,256 that was in Org 022 (formerly Family Engagement) was increased by \$157,145 for a total of \$1,213,197. These funds support the Office of Family Voice, as well as the same positions funded in 14-15 for Family Engagement. The increased investment of \$157,145 for Family Engagement will support the design and development of the Family Academy by hiring a central office staff to oversee this new program.

- 14. AJ (Coleman Advocates): Section 3 of LCAP does not say how funds to ELL and FY are increasing/improving services.**

Additional information is now provided in the revised LCAP Section 3 for 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading. Additionally, in partnership with the LCAP Task Force, communication tools are being developed to share this information with families and our school communities moving forward.

- 15. Elena (Public Counsel): There is a need for additional Restorative Practices; more needs to be done in site staff.**

Please see additional details on the Safe and Supportive Schools initiative (question 25).

- 16. Elena (Public Counsel): School climate Action 2.5 states, "Provide safe/clean facilities, nutrition, wellness..." This is a big part of funding but source is not cited. It would be great to see fund sources listed as this is a huge part of school climate.**

FY 2015-16 Budget Development  
Notes and Clarifications

The LCAP for 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading has been revised to include fund sources across the areas listed in Action 2.5.

**BOARD OF EDUCATION QUESTIONS:**

**17. Wynns: Can we have a funding plan for the Common Core funds for 15-16?**

Below is an overview of the Common Core funds for 2015-16, including the continuation of the one-time CCSS State Implementation Funds provided for 13-14 and 14-15 as well as an additional 0.7M from Unrestricted General Funds. Please note the work to implement Common Core extends beyond these funds and is housed across the Instruction, Innovation & Social Justice, Curriculum & Instruction, Research, Planning & Assessments, and Information Technology divisions.

Due to timing of the publication of the Budget Book, this was not incorporated into the printed versions of the Budget Book for June 23<sup>rd</sup>.

		<b>2015-16</b>		
		<b>Continuation of CCSS Implementation Funds</b>	<b>Additional UGF</b>	
<b>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</b>				
Staff Professional Development	Designated for direct classroom staff to build skills and knowledge of formative assessment needs	-	\$538,527	
2.0 Coaches (TSAs) to support RTI Academic	Designed to support teachers in implementation of instructional programs for students not meeting benchmark in CCSS; work with content developers and teachers on the Tier II and III interventions	2.0	\$176,500	
0.5 Supervisor 1.0 Program administrator	Plan, develop, support and provide professional development for CCSS-ELA	1.5	\$205,257	
1.0 Coach (TSA)	Supports professional learning for formative assessments (i.e., IWA, PALS) and development of materials and coaching	1.0	\$88,020	
9.5 Coaches Consulting Services	Provides additional coaching for literacy and math across grade levels  Additional funds support additional coaching and professional development for balanced literacy	9.5	\$1,041,190	\$98,000
1.0 Program administrator 1.0 TSA PD for Staff	Expand History/Social Sciences, Ethnic Studies and LGBTQ Studies	2.0		\$180,000
<b>INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS</b>				
Instructional Materials	Provides instructional materials to support printing and development of benchmark materials for school sites and contracts with IntelAssess which allows the district to design and develop assessments	-	\$250,000	
<b>TECHNOLOGY</b>				

FY 2015-16 Budget Development  
Notes and Clarifications

		2015-16		
		Continuation of CCSS Implementation Funds		Additional UGF
Integration of Technology	Equipment and Other Services // Purchase wireless connectivity and laptop carts to conduct SBAC field test in 13-14 and additional equipment for full SBAC implementation in 14-15	-	\$2,946,691	
	0.25 IS Engineer; 4.0 Desktop Support Staff // Provide additional support to design, develop, launch and provide assistance to school sites related to technology assessment needs  Additional funds support increased network connectivity support for sites	4.25	\$498,614	\$437,636
	0.5 Program Administrator; 0.5 Evaluator // Provide training and administration of SBAC	1.0	\$94,675	
	Adopt, implement and provide training for Illuminate (replace Amplify / Data Director), a system that will allow for access to school-level data for sites		\$200,000	
<b>Total:</b>		<b>21.25</b>	<b>\$6,039,474</b>	<b>\$715,636</b>
<b>TOTAL 2015-16 FUNDING:</b>		<b>\$6,755,110</b>		

**18. Wynns: Regarding the \$500 million K-12 block grant from the State, can we see details on this, how does it relate to current budget?**

Changes from the State on the budget will be further analyzed and will be incorporated throughout Fall semester and included in the first interim report.

**19. Fewer: How we can leverage PEEF funds to support and expand the Bay Area Urban Debate League and a Science Equity Fund?**

Staff have reviewed PEEF funds and believe both the Bay Area Urban Debate League and the Science Equity Fund can be supported with additional PEEF dollars. We are awaiting confirmation from the City about final planning numbers for FY15-16, and once we receive official word, we will establish budgets for those two items.

**20. Norton: Please clarify the Multilingual Pathways funding and provide understanding of what the funding is for.**

The additional \$390,000 for Multilingual Pathways provided by PEEF will increase coherence across language pathways, provide additional Mandarin support and assessment support. 2.0 FTE Program Administrators (elementary level and secondary level) to build site based capacity for development and implementation of language pathways, identify and/or develop accessible curricular resources for language pathway implementation, identify and/or develop formative assessments in the pathway language, evaluate systems and structures supporting language pathways. Overall, program administrators will help strengthen the systems and infrastructure to ensure quality and consistent implementation of the pathway. Additionally a 1.0 FTE Teacher on Special Assignment will support Mandarin Language Pathways. This new position will provide support for Mandarin teachers at the



FY 2015-16 Budget Development  
Notes and Clarifications

elementary, middle and high school levels. And lastly, funds will also provide for primary language assessment.

*Note: there was an error pointed out in the Budget Book, Volume I, 1<sup>st</sup> Reading. This has been corrected. Please see the Budget Book, Volume I, 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading, pg 142.*

**21. Wynns: It is difficult to see which funds support what activities. Can there be more clarity on what funds are used to support what activities/initiatives?**

As we continue to refine our communication tools regarding our budget, we do aim to provide clarity on how funds are connected to the services and supports for our students. Examples of these include spending plans such as those provided for PEEF, QTEA and CCSS. Additionally, for 15-16, we have developed a summary of the additional investments that are planned for.

**22. Wynns: In the State budget details, the reimbursement for early childcare rate is raised. Will that show up in our budget? Will we see higher amount of revenue in Early Education?**

EED and budget staff are analyzing the fiscal impact of the increase in the early childcare reimbursement rate, and, to the extent that the higher rate provides additional state funding for our EED programs, the district's contribution to the EED will be reduced accordingly.

**23. Haney // Mendoza-McDonnell // Walton: What is the district's investment in our most "at-risk" youth, specifically Foster Youth and Homeless students?**

**FOSTER YOUTH Service (FYS) Program**

The 15-16 SFUSD LCAP budget shows an increase in funding of \$109,000 bringing the total funding to \$259,094 from SFUSD. This represents 30% of the total Foster Youth Services budget.

The FYS Program is also supported by:

State and Federal Funding:	\$402,320
Human Services Agency (HSA) Title IV E:	\$203,244
SFUSD LCAP/LCFF:	\$259,094
<b>TOTAL 15/16 Budget</b>	<b>\$864,658</b>

There are a total of 6.0 FTEs that support the 500-600 students in Foster Care throughout the year. In addition, there are non-personnel budgeted items totaling \$238,955 that includes contracts for tutoring services, evaluation, program activity materials, supplies to support Foster Care events, Guardians Summer Academy and travel/mileage.

**FAMILIES & YOUTH IN TRANSITION (FYIT) - Homeless**

The 15-16 SFUSD Budget to support FYIT has been increased by \$46,000 from 14-15. In 14-15, 0.35 FTE of a Program Administrator's salary and benefits was charged to the district's Title I budget and the 0.65 FTE of this staff came from Pupil Services general fund.

For 15-16, the entire 1.0 FTE of the Program Administrator salary will be paid through the Pupil Services (ORG 150) general fund, freeing up \$46,000 to go directly to support the need of our Homeless youth.

FY 2015-16 Budget Development  
Notes and Clarifications

In addition, \$208,000 supports FYIT through Title I. This funding provides school supplies (backpacks, uniforms, PE clothes), contract to UCSF to provide tutoring, public transportation passes (50% of BART Fees, 100% of MUNI for the 19-21 year olds.)

The entire FYIT budget consists of:

ORG 150 (General fund)	\$131,380
State & Federal Title I	\$208,000
<b>TOTAL 15/16 Budget</b>	<b>\$339,380</b>

Staff is also reviewing additional needs for these students and pursuing grant funding. If it appears more resources are needed, additional support may be provided during the year.

**24. Haney: How is this year's LCAP development process different from last year?**

Based on recommendations from the Parent Advisory Council (PAC) and District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) last year, in fall 2014 we convened staff and representatives of student and family advisory groups, bargaining units and community organizations to work collaboratively as the LCAP Task Force. Members of the Task Force developed the content and outreach plan, and helped convene and lead conversations, for community engagement in spring 2015.

By conducting conversations at schools and in trusted community settings we were successful in reaching our goal of hearing from participants reflecting the diversity of SFUSD's students and families across differences in ethnicity, language, neighborhood and socioeconomic background. We also prioritized hearing from students, families and communities intended to be served by LCFF and SFUSD funding priorities: English Learners, low-income students, youth in foster care, African American students and students who receive Special Education services.

The level of stakeholder engagement achieved through the planning efforts of the LCAP Task Force were instrumental in shaping the LCAP for 2015-16. Additionally, moving forward, we recognize there is need for ongoing and earlier engagement for future development and revision of the LCAP and more effective strategies to engage youth.

**25. Haney: What is the increased investment in the 15/16 school year budget to support the ongoing implementation of the Safe and Supportive Schools initiative?**

There are several positions that help contribute and support a safe and positive learning environment. These staff have a variety of qualifications, training and areas of expertise that determine their job code/title, but supporting a safe, positive, pro-social learning environment shows up on many job descriptions such as: teachers, paraprofessionals, Wellness staff, and many more. We all know that a truly safe and supportive school environment is supported by the entire community – students and families included!

That being said, as it relates to implementing a Behavioral/Academic RtI model as part of the Safe and Supportive Schools initiative, the positions specifically supporting this are listed below followed by the INCREASE HIRES for 15-16 and whether they are SCHOOL ASSIGNED or CENTRAL SUPPORT.

FY 2015-16 Budget Development  
Notes and Clarifications

Job Title	14/15 FTEs	15/16 FTEs	# at schools
Board Certified Behavior Analysts (BCBAs)	7.0	8.0	Directly support cohorts of schools
Restorative Practices (RP) Coaches	10.0	10.0	
Positive Behavior Intervention Specialist (PBIS) Coach	8.0	10.0	
Peer Resources	8.15	12.75 FTEs	0.25, 0.5 or more at 18 schools
Social Workers	59.5	62.0	59.0
Nurses	38.8	39.3	36.3
Counselors	31.5	32	32
Early Education Mental Health Consultants	4.2	4.2	4.2

**In addition to the above positions, we are providing intensive and strategic support in the 15/16 school year to the 5 Elementary schools with a SOAR Program.** This support is not for the SOAR classroom, but to build the school site capacity to be safe, welcoming, and positive environment for all students. This is in direct response to some situations we encountered this year at these schools that experienced challenges that were, in some cases, inappropriately attributed to the SOAR program. **The increased support to Feinstein, ER Taylor, Flynn, McKinley and Tenderloin means that each of these schools will receive BOTH a full-time 1.0 FTE school social worker and .5 FTE nurse, in addition to on-site coaching by a PBIS coach, Behaviorist, Instructional Coach and Restorative Practices Coach.** (The coaches will work as a team supporting all 5 of the schools.)

*Note: Family Liaisons, Elementary Advisors and Early Education Family Engagement Specialists also contribute to a safe and supportive school environment, but those numbers have remained constant for 15/16 school year – no increases, no decreases.*

**26. Norton: If we want to know how much is being spent on pensions, where do we find it?**

Unfortunately, there is no one single place in the budget document for this information. Each salary district-wide is charged a proportionate percentage to pay for the cost of pensions, retiree medical and other post-employment benefits. For example, the employer contribution rate for STRS of 10.73% for 205-16 is charged across the board on each budgeted certificated payroll. Similarly, for SFERS, the classified retirement system, a percentage is charged to each classified salary budget.

The District’s contributions to CALSTRS were \$23.7M in 2013-14 and are projected to increase by approximately \$1.4M in 2014-15 and by \$4.1M in 2015-16. Contributions to SFERS, the classified employee retirement system, were \$12.9M in 2013-14 and are projected to increase by 8%-10% in 2014-15 and 2015-16.

Other post-employment benefits include providing health care coverage to eligible retired employees and their spouse/partners until the employee or dependent becomes eligible for Medicare. Annual cost to the district to provide this coverage is approximately \$63.0M.

**27. Public Counsel: The district should invest in additional school-site based mental health and trauma-informed counselors to support historically marginalized students and families.**

Please see additional details on the Safe and Supportive Schools initiative (question 25).

FY 2015-16 Budget Development  
Notes and Clarifications

**28. Public Counsel: Efforts to reduce office referrals, suspensions and expulsions should be included in Actions / Services for foster youth**

In both the SFUSD LCAP and SFCOE LCAP, we have included measurable outcomes focused on reducing office referrals, suspensions and expulsions and explicitly call out the need to disaggregate these targets for Foster Youth. The Actions 2.3 and 2.3.1 are intended to provide tiered interventions for foster youth students in support of these measurable outcomes.

**29. Public Counsel: Create stronger goals for reductions in suspensions for African American students**

We will continue to review and refine our targets for measurable outcomes for our focal student populations. Over the past two years, we have decreased suspension rates of African American students by nearly 10 percent and continue to focus efforts to reduce rates further.

**30. Public Counsel: To ensure the LCAP is a transparent planning document and is accessible to the community, the LCAP should include all LCFF base, supplemental and concentration expenditures and other budgetary amounts**

We continue to refine our LCAP development process and have made significant strides to provide a broader representation of LCFF funds within this year's LCAP. We also produce a comprehensive overview of our district and county budget in our annual budget publication – Volume I provides detailed budgets for all central office departments and Volume II provides detailed budgets for school sites. As recommended in the LCAP, this document is provided as an additional reference and a link is included. Moving forward, we will continue to refine development of the LCAP to help ensure accessibility and transparency.