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Kindergarten Through College
The mission of the San Francisco Unified School District is:

- to provide each student – PreK through High School Graduation - with an equal opportunity to succeed by promoting intellectual growth, creativity, self-discipline, cultural and linguistic sensitivity, democratic responsibility, economic competence, and physical and mental health so that each student can achieve his or her maximum potential.
Our Vision for Student Success

Every student who enrolls in our schools will graduate from high school ready for college and careers and equipped with the skills, capacities, and dispositions necessary for 21st century success.
Our Goals

**Achievement:** Engage high achieving, joyful learners

**Accountability:** Keep our promises to students and families

**Access and Equity:** Make social justice a reality

**Student Success**
Our Focus

1. Strengthening the preK-12 instructional core for all students

2. Deepening and institutionalizing a culture of continuous improvement in service of all students
Keeping Our Promises

Superintendent’s Evaluation

Results
70%

- Establish and meet quantitative performance targets focused on our Social Justice Vision and Goals

Leadership
30%

- Effectively lead and manage the organization and authentically engage all key stakeholders
How are we doing?

• We have achieved an API Score of 807
• We have promising results in the Superintendent Zone and many schools outside the Zone who are narrowing the achievement gap and accelerating student progress.
• Our students are showing greater progress this year vs. last year on the Common Learning Assessments in Math and ELA.
• We are investing in district wide professional development to support our teachers.
• We have a sense of urgency to more rapidly adopt best practices to narrow the district wide opportunity gap that results in disparities in achievement among our students.

• We must focus our collective efforts on addressing disparity of outcomes for our special education students, particularly our African American students.
San Francisco Risks For Special Education; High Incidence Disability Identification; and Out-of-School Suspension (District 2011-12)
## District Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline 2012</th>
<th>Target 2013</th>
<th>Target 2014</th>
<th>Target 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Special Education Disproportionate referral for African American Students (risk ratio)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase number of schools meeting overall API goals and subgroup goals for African American, Latino and EL students</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coherent, Unified, Aligned System
Local Education Agency Plan

• Five-Year Plan
• Aligned with District Strategic Plan
• Outlines at a strategic, systemic level how we will achieve specific academic and support services goals for all students with a particular focus on historically under-performing student populations
Alignment, Connecting the Dots

Superintendent’s Evaluation Targets → School Site Targets

LEA Plan/ District Five-Year BSC

School Site BSC
1. Transition to the Common Core State Standards by 2014-15
2. Build the capacity for use of student data using a robust data system
3. Differentiate how central office supports schools
4. Provide schools with qualified teachers by building professional learning systems
5. Provide tiered levels of support and intervention to support all students
6. Provide students with disabilities specially designed instruction in the least restrictive environments
7. Create a preschool through third grade framework and ensure students graduate high school College and Career Ready
Going Deeper: Multi-Tiered System of Equitable Supports (MTSS)

• Differentiate how central office supports schools by providing tiered interventions based on qualitative and quantitative data about the needs of the student population and the school’s academic growth indicators.

• Year 1 has been about developing our tiers based on data and aligning the resources we have to those...
Developing a Tiered System of Support

Data Analysis

Qualitative Analysis

Multi-tiered levels of support
SFUSD Performance Tiers

- Superintendent’s Zone
- Intensive Support
- Strategic Support
- Benchmark Level
- Challenge Schools

As need increases, so does support.
Response to Intervention at the District Level

Superintendent’s Zone:
++++ Support, few schools receive

Intensive Support:
+++ Support

Strategic Support:
++ Support

Benchmark and Challenge Support:
+ Support, all schools receive

As need increases, so does support
Coherence and Alignment

If we have clear, aligned outcomes for where we want to go...

- District and Site Targets
- Human & Financial Resource Alignment
- District and Site Balanced Score Cards
- Student Success

Focus on building the capacity of SFUSD staff

...and we align our resources to build the capacity of SFUSD staff and provide equitable supports
The Work Ahead

• Coherent, high leverage, systemic strategies that further the unification of our system, adding to the strategies as additional funding becomes available

• Added capacity in strategic areas:
  – Instructional coaches
  – Centralized professional learning
  – Community schools approach
  – School improvement support
  – Guidance from school support teams
MTSS: Equitable, Aligned Allocation of Resources...

...Based on the resources available
For the first time in five years, school districts across California will see an increase in per-student funding, BUT:

– Funding is still about 10% less than the amount received in 2007-08 (the last time a Cost of Living Adjustment was funded)

– School districts will continue to receive 78 cents on the dollar (the “deficit factor” remains at 22% because of cuts in previous years and unpaid COLAs but is not projected to grow)

– California still ranks among the bottom of all states in per student ADA funding for education
California’s Education Spending

K-12 Education Expenditures per Average Daily Attendance (ADA)
2010-11

- California: $9,524
- National Average: $11,305
- Top 5 States: $18,660

*(Average of the five states with the highest expenditures per ADA)*

Source: National Education Association

© 2013 School Services of California, Inc.
Recent History of Revenue Limit Funding for SFUSD

Dollars Per ADA:
- Projected Statutory COLA
- Flat Funding
- Actual Funding

- Loss of cost of living adjustment (COLA)
- Loss of baseline dollars

© 2013 School Services of California, Inc
The Governor’s proposed budget includes

– $1.8 billion to reduce inter-year deferrals to $5.6 billion

– $1.6 billion to begin implementation of a new funding formula (LCFF) for school districts and charter schools

– $400.5 million to support energy efficiency projects in schools from Proposition 39 revenues

– $100 million increase for the K-12 Mandate Block Grant

– $62.8 million to fund a 1.65% COLA for selected categorical programs (including Special Ed)
Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF): Key Elements

- The LCFF would replace revenue limits and most state categorical programs
  - Funding allocated through the new formula would generally be flexible and could be used for any educational purpose
  - Timeline: Expected phase-in over seven years (by 2020-21)
  - Establishes a base grant target equal to the undeficited statewide average base revenue limit per ADA – $6,816 (includes the 1.65% statutory COLA)
  - Differential adjustments for grade spans (early primary, primary, middle, high school); added funding for K-3 Class-Size Reduction and 9-12 Career Technical Education
  - Additional funding in the form of supplemental and concentration grants based on the demographics of the schools, including:
    - English Learner students
    - Pupils eligible for free and reduced-price meals
    - Foster youth
Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF)

- Special Education, Child Nutrition, QEIA, After School Education and Safety (ASES), and several federally mandated programs are not included in the formula.
- Under the Governor’s proposal, Transportation and Targeted Instructional Improvement Grant (TIIG) funding will continue as add-ons to the formula for those school districts that currently receive this funding.
Current Status of the LCFF Proposal

• The California Department of Finance has released preliminary estimates of allocations under the LCFF for all school districts in California, but there are insufficient details on how these estimates were derived or whether the data used by the DOF reflects current data.

• The Legislature must enact the proposal as a change to current school finance statutes. Until state law is changed, the current funding systems will be in effect.

• The LCFF proposal is being taken up by the Legislature as a policy debate, and not part of the budget process, which could delay the passage and implementation of the funding formula until after the 2013-14 school year.

• It is uncertain what will happen to the resources dedicated to the Governor’s proposal if it does not pass the Legislature.
Current Status of the LCFF Proposal

• While Transportation & TIIG are currently outside of the formula and are proposed as add-ons to the LCFF, the Legislative Analyst’s Office has recommended that these resources be rolled into the funding formula. This could result in a significant reduction in the amount that SFUSD would otherwise receive, especially for TIIG.

• This leaves school districts in a position of needing to develop at least two plans (three, if TIIBG and Transportation are incorporated into the LCFF)
  
  – **Plan A**: A budget for 2013-14 that includes the 1.65% COLA, but not the additional revenues associated with the LCFF
  
  – **Plan B**: Governor Brown’s Proposal: A budget that includes additional revenues as the state begins “Year One” implementation of the LCFF

• SFUSD will need to plan for both possibilities until the details and the fate of the LCFF become clear
Additional Risks to the Governor’s Proposal

• Increased funding for K-12 education is dependent upon a continued improved economy at the state and national level
  – State and national economic growth remain uncertain
  – California tax revenues are heavily reliant (more than 60%) on personal income taxes, making individual incomes very important to the State Budget

• Rising health care costs will continue to strain the State Budget

• Outstanding budgetary borrowing totaling $35 billion will continue to limit the amount of available resources

• Other budgetary priorities could threaten resources designated for the Governor’s Budget Proposal

• Federal sequestration cuts now appear to be a reality
Multi Year Projections, UGF: FY 2012-13
(Updated for Governor’s 2013-14 Proposed Budget)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 12-13</th>
<th>FY 13-14</th>
<th>FY 14-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>$50.768</td>
<td>$28.103</td>
<td>$4.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$339.284</td>
<td>$344.078</td>
<td>$350.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$361.950</td>
<td>$367.887</td>
<td>$381.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revs. Less Expenses</td>
<td>($22.666)</td>
<td>($23.809)</td>
<td>($31.772)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
<td>$28.103</td>
<td>$4.294</td>
<td>($27.478)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Balance</td>
<td>$15.451</td>
<td>$15.565</td>
<td>$15.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated Balance</td>
<td>$12.652</td>
<td>($11.271)</td>
<td>($43.043)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (1) FY 12-13 reflects higher than projected beginning fund balance (FY 11-12 unaudited actuals ending fund balance). (2) FY 13-14 revenue assumes a 1.65% COLA & Deficit Factor at 22.272% (3) Revenue projections reflect increased contribution from city to Rainy Day Reserve funds and increase in MBG funds in 13-14 & 14-15 (4) FY 13-14 & FY 14-15 expenditures reflect lower contribution to Sp Ed, offset by higher revenue for Sp Ed due to COLA (5) FY 12-13 & FY 13-14 expenditures include furlough savings (1.5 days for certificated & paraprofessionals, and 2 days for all other classified). (6) Assumes contributions from UGF to Cafeteria Fund & Early Education Department remain unchanged from 12-13 levels. (7) SFUSD would need to identify additional revenues or expenditure reductions beyond FY 2012-13 in order to remain solvent.
On the Bright Side...

• Our schools continue to benefit from critical local investments in our children’s education
  – Public Education Enrichment Fund
  – Quality Teacher and Education Act
  – Facilities Bonds
  – City’s Department of Children, Youth & Families
  – City’s Rainy Day Reserve
  – Foundation and Philanthropic Support
  – City Treasurer’s Kindergarten through College Savings Plan

• Office of Sustainability’s “Shared Savings” plan allows schools to recoup $ from energy conservation
# Budget Development Timeline (Draft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 22</td>
<td>Preliminary Site Allocations Distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Deadline for Preliminary Notification of Certificated Layoffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 02</td>
<td>School Planning Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5</td>
<td>School Site Budgets and BSCs Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-May</td>
<td>Governor’s May Revise; Final notification of layoffs for certificated and other employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-June</td>
<td>Superintendent’s Recommended Budget developed based on updated projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25</td>
<td>Board of Education adopts FY 2013-14 Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summit Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30-9:00a</td>
<td>Kindergarten to College &amp; Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-10:00a</td>
<td>State of the School District with Superintendent Carranza &amp; Deputy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendents Guerrero &amp; Leigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:15a</td>
<td>Passing Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-11:00a</td>
<td>Session #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:15a</td>
<td>Complete your evaluation for Session #1 and travel to Session #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15-12:00p</td>
<td>Session #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:00p</td>
<td>Complete your evaluation for Session #2 and turn in your eval form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meet your site teams to debrief the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Early Ed: Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Elementary/ K8: Auditorium and 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Middle: 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High: 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Floor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>