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Fresno Unified School District
Board Communication

BC Number S-1

From the Office of the Superintendent
To the Members of the Board of Education
Prepared by: Robert G. Nelson, Superintendent
Cabinet Approval:

Date: February 11, 2022
Phone Number: 457-3884

Regarding: Superintendent Calendar Highlights

The purpose of this communication is to inform the Board of notable calendar items:

- Met with Executive Cabinet
- Attended CART Board Meeting
- Participated in weekly call with Fresno County Superintendents
- Attended California State University, Fresno Alumni Board Meeting
- Gave interview with Patiño student, Ryan McFarland, for a documentary on Phillip J. Patiño School of Entrepreneurship for the Slick Rock Film Festival
- Gave interview with Larry Powell regarding Fresno Unified
- Attended the Wallace Equity Centered Pipeline Initiative Superintendent’s Meeting
- Attended the Fresno K-16 Collaborative Planning Meeting

Approved by Superintendent
Robert G. Nelson Ed.D.       Date: 02/11/2022
From the Office of the Superintendent
To the Members of the Board of Education
Prepared by: Kim Kelstrom, Executive Officer
Cabinet Approval:

Regarding: School Services Weekly Update Report for February 04, 2022

The purpose of this communication is to provide the Board a copy of School Services of California’s (SSC) Weekly Update. Each week SSC provides an update and commentary on different educational fiscal issues. In addition, they include different articles related to education issues.

The SSC Weekly Update for February 04, 2022 is attached and includes the following articles:

- New COVID-19 Paid Sick Leave Expected – February 03, 2022
- Student Mental Health Is Overwhelming Schools. Can Congress Help? – February 01, 2022
- After Setbacks, Dyslexia Screening for Young Students Moves Forward in California Schools – February 03, 2022

If you have any questions or require further information, please contact Kim Kelstrom at 457-3907.

Approved by Superintendent
Robert G. Nelson Ed.D. Date: 02/11/2022
Assembly Budget Subcommittee on Education Finance

On Tuesday, the Assembly Budget Subcommittee on Education Finance, chaired by Assemblymember Kevin McCarty (D-Sacramento), held their first meeting of the year to discuss Governor Gavin Newsom’s 2022-23 State Budget proposal. This is the subcommittee that is tasked with vetting Governor Newsom’s education proposals and approving proposals that capture the Assembly’s education priorities for the 2022-23 fiscal year.

The agenda for Tuesday’s hearing consisted of an overview of Proposition 98 and the largest one-time and ongoing proposals, the School Facility Program, special education, and a presentation on the state of school fiscal health from the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT). Every item on the agenda, except for the FCMAT presentation, included testimony from the Department of Finance, Legislative Analyst’s Office, and the California Department of Education. Below we highlight some of the member’s comments and reactions to the presentations, which signal how they are leaning toward various proposals.

Proposition 98 and LCFF Proposals

Assemblymember Patrick O’Donnell (D-Long Beach) echoed his comments from the full budget hearing a few weeks ago that this is not the year to invest in new programs. He stressed that instead of burdening schools with new mandates and programs, lawmakers should put more money into the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) base by going beyond the 5.33% statutory cost-of-living adjustment. He also highlighted that the Governor’s proposal does not include any additional funding for the California State Teachers’ Retirement System (CalSTRS) and California Public Employees’ Retirement System (CalPERS) and hinted that he would like to see some relief for employers included in the State Budget.

ADA Proposal

There was a robust discussion about declining enrollment and the Governor’s proposal to allow districts to use the higher of their current-year average daily
attendance (ADA), prior-year ADA, or the computed average of the prior three years’ ADA. Assemblymember McCarty asked the Department of Finance representative why they landed on this proposal to address the 2022-23 ADA cliff and not move to an enrollment-based system. The Department of Finance defended their proposal arguing that it provides districts a softer landing for the ADA decline while keeping the tenets of the LCFF intact. Assemblymember McCarty accepted that answer, but also signaled that the Legislature could have their own proposal for this issue and alluded to the several bills introduced that look to mitigate the ADA decline. The bottom line is that the ADA solution will require ongoing negotiations between the Administration and the Legislature before the State Budget is finalized in June.

School Facility Program

The members reacted positively to the Governor’s proposal to provide $1.4 billion in the remaining Proposition 51 K-12 school bond fund allocations, and an additional $2.175 billion in one-time General Fund for school facilities after the exhaustion of bond funds for new construction and modernization. Both Assemblymembers McCarty and O’Donnell said that they would like to invest even more into school facilities, especially with the availability of one-time funding in this year’s State Budget.

Special Education

For special education, Assemblymember Suzette Martinez Valladares (R-Santa Clarita) asked about investing $25-$30 million more dollars into the Special Education Extraordinary Cost Pool to assist Special Education Local Plan Areas. The Department of Finance responded that they are focused on ensuring students with disabilities are educated in the least restrictive environment, and they worry that adding more money to this cost pool would incentivize placement into more restrictive environments.

FCMAT

FCMAT Chief Executive Officer Michael Fine made his annual report to the subcommittee on school fiscal health. For more information you can view the slide deck from his presentation here.

Leilani Aguinaldo
New COVID-19 Paid Sick Leave Expected

By Leilani Aguinaldo and Danyel Conolley
School Services of California Inc.’s Fiscal Report
February 3, 2022

As anticipated through a recent announcement by Governor Gavin Newsom, Senate President pro Tempore Toni Atkins, and Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon, COVID-19 supplemental paid sick leave is poised to be resurrected in 2022. On February 2, 2022, details of the new supplemental paid sick leave were released in Assembly Bill (AB) 84.

When enacted, AB 84 will reinstate COVID-19 leave as a provision of state law and is applicable to all public and private employers with 26 or more employees, including local educational agencies (LEAs). AB 84 is retroactive to January 1, 2022, and would expire September 30, 2022.

Unlike previous mandated COVID-19 leave, AB 84 initially provides only 40 hours of supplemental paid sick leave. An employee who is considered full-time or who worked, or was scheduled to work, an average of at least 40 hours per week in the two weeks before the leave is taken is entitled to 40 hours of COVID-19 supplemental paid sick leave. Employees who don’t meet this criteria are entitled to a prorated amount of leave according to the number of hours the employee works as defined by AB 84.

The qualifying reasons for the new leave are similar, but not identical, to prior iterations (see “Legislation Expands COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave” in the March 2021 Fiscal Report). To qualify for the leave, an employee must be unable to work due to one of the following reasons:

- The employee is subject to a federal, state, or local quarantine or isolation order related to COVID-19
- The employee is advised by a health care provider to quarantine or isolate due to COVID-19
- The employee is attending an appointment for themselves or a family member to receive a COVID-19 vaccine
- The employee is experiencing symptoms, or caring for a family member experiencing symptoms, related to a COVID-19 vaccine that prevents the employee from being able to work
- The employee is experiencing symptoms of COVID-19 and seeking a medical diagnosis
- The employee is caring for a family member who is subject to a COVID-19 quarantine or isolation order, or has been advised by a health care provider to quarantine or isolate
- The employee is caring for a child whose school or place of care is closed or otherwise unavailable for reasons related to COVID-19 on the premises

In addition, for leave taken due to symptoms related to a COVID-19 vaccine, an employer may limit the total supplemental paid sick leave to three days or 24 hours unless the employee provides verification from a health care provider that the employee or family member is continuing to experience symptoms from the vaccine.
In the biggest change from previous COVID-19 leaves, employees are entitled to an additional 40 hours of supplemental paid sick leave (or lesser amount if the employee receives a prorated amount of supplemental paid sick leave) only if the employee tests positive for COVID-19. This additional leave also is provided for employees who must care for a family member that tests positive for COVID-19. The total maximum amount of COVID-19 supplemental paid sick leave mandated by AB 84 shall not exceed 80 hours, and this leave shall be in addition to any paid sick leave that may be available to employees.

If your LEA extended leave entitlements for COVID-related reasons beyond the expiration of previous mandated leaves, we recommend that you work closely with legal counsel to ensure the application of leave is legally compliant (see “FAQs: Expansion of COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave” in the April 2021 Fiscal Report).

AB 84 must still be passed by the Legislature and signed into law by Governor Newsom. These steps are expected to occur in the next week or so and will be shared in a future article.

Note: The pandemic has exacerbated student mental health issues across the country including California, and many experts are turning to Congress to invest in resources to assist students and educators.

**Student Mental Health Is Overwhelming Schools. Can Congress Help?**

By Andrew Ujifusa
*EducationWeek*
February 1, 2022

A recent high school graduate’s plea for schools to do more to support students’ mental well-being was powerful enough to move a U.S. senator to tears.

The show of emotion took place during testimony from Claire Rhyneer in a U.S. Senate hearing on mental health disorders and substance abuse. She has worked at the National Alliance on Mental Illness as an advocate on issues affecting young people.

Rhyneer, who graduated last spring, recounted her own struggles and called for schools to adopt curricula that incorporates material about mental health. Doing so, Rhyneer told senators, would make it easier for students to identify any symptoms they might have and seek help, and make them less likely to try to search for answers by themselves online.

“I am representing the tip of the iceberg,” Rhyneer said. “I am more than an anecdote.”

Near the end of his speaking time in the hearing, Sen. Bill Cassidy, R-La., thanked Rhyneer for her work and said his own family had been affected by suicide.

At that point, Cassidy choked up, apologized for getting emotional, and cut his mic.

**A concerning picture of child and youth mental health**

During the hearing, senators and experts discussed how schools can do more to support students’ mental health, and disturbing trends in child well-being.
Several senators expressed grave concerns about the impact of COVID-19 on child well-being. These worries were backed up by medical professionals who told the panel about sharp increases in reports of children struggling with mental health.

But they also said that with new resources, personnel, guidance from their communities, and classroom materials for students, schools can take a big step forward when it comes to helping their students.

Educators, researchers, and others are still coming to grips with all of the pandemic’s effects in the short and long term. But many working in schools have said that nearly two years of COVID disruptions and restrictions have affected students’ mental health and will continue to do so for years to come.

A recent study of children in several countries found that between 18 to 60 percent of students experienced strong “distress” and especially symptoms of anxiety and depression. While the study found no significant link between school closures and suicide among young people early in the pandemic, the research found other concerning results about a decline in referrals to child-protection services and children’s screen time.

And many teachers are simultaneously going through their own struggles with skyrocketing stress.

Felecia Evans, a principal in Mayfield Heights, Ohio, for example, told Education Week last year that collaborating with her school’s psychologist, counselor, and other staff to identify at-risk students and see what can be done to help with their anxiety about pandemic-driven challenges has “kind of changed the nature of my work.”

Concern is also growing that the pandemic is behind a possible rise in student misbehavior—including violence—this school year, although it is unclear to what extent this sentiment will ultimately be backed up by data.

**Mental health professionals can be key partners to schools**

Lawmakers as well as the witnesses discussed alarming statistics involving children’s mental well-being.

Dr. Mitch Prinstein, the chief science officer of the American Psychological Association, said there had been a 42 percent increase in self-injury and suicide cases reported by children’s hospitals in the first three quarters of 2021, compared to the same period of 2019.

Yet Prinstein also said the nation’s mental health professionals can provide crucial support and information to educators even if they are not working full-time in schools. Helping teachers and administrators connect with students “before they reach a moment of trauma” is essential, he said.

“School staff are currently overwhelmed,” said Prinstein. “Please do think about ways that psychologists and other care providers can help teach schools about what’s needed. … We have many prevention programs ready to deploy.”

He also expressed support for the Mental Health Services Student Act, which was introduced in Congress last year that would authorize grants to support school-based mental health services like screening and treatment. (Companion House and Senate bills were introduced by Rep. Grace F. Napolitano, D-Calif., and Sen. Tina Smith, D-Minn.)
Echoing this argument, Sen. Chris Murphy, D-Conn., said more should be done to ensure that people working directly with children, including adults in schools, receive more education about mental health and children, given all the money already spent on training professionals like teachers and pediatricians.

Citing recent work by David Leonhardt in the New York Times about the harm done to children by pandemic policy choices, Sen. Susan Collins, R-Maine, asked witnesses about comparing the negative effects of COVID-19 itself with the fallout from COVID-19 restrictions, including school closures, for children.

Prinstein responded by saying that a host of reasons are behind children’s rising mental health problems, from delays in receiving special education services to a divisive political culture.

“They have tremendous disruptions in their rules and routines,” he said. “They see polarization in leaders.”

Meanwhile, Rep. Lisa Murkowski, R-Alaska, who served as the ranking member for the hearing, said she’d seen evidence of a troubling divide separating young people struggling with suicidal ideation and despair, and adults who are reluctant to hear about and respond to such challenges.

“They were afraid that if they spoke about it, it might be encouraged,” Murkowski said.

Note: Governor Newsom’s State Budget proposal includes $10 million for dyslexia research at the University of California San Francisco, which follows $15.2 million in the current budget and $3.5 million the previous year, for a total of $28.7 million.

After Setbacks, Dyslexia Screening for Young Students Moves Forward in California Schools

By Carolyn Jones
EdSource
February 3, 2022

With a major push from Gov. Gavin Newsom, California is moving closer toward screening all kindergartners and first graders for dyslexia — a reading disability that affects up to 15% of the U.S. population, including Newsom himself.

Newsom’s proposed budget, unveiled earlier this month, includes $10 million for dyslexia research at the University of California San Francisco, where scientists are studying the neuroscience behind the condition and creating a free screening test that would signal if a child is at risk for the disability.

The $10 million follows $15.2 million in the current budget and $3.5 million the previous year, for a total of $28.7 million. Also in the pipeline is a Senate bill that would require the state to start screening all kindergartners, first graders and second graders for dyslexia starting in the 2022-23 school year. These efforts are joined by a $4 million pilot program at the Sacramento County Office of Education meant to improve the way schools across the state identify and help children with dyslexia.

Dyslexia assessments vary by district, but usually schools don’t test students for reading disabilities until third or fourth grade when they’re already lagging well behind their peers in literacy skills. Typically, if a school identifies a student with dyslexia, they’ll either get a 504 plan (legal accommodation that allows them
extra time on tests) or a special education plan that provides anything from an hour or two a week with a reading specialist in a small group, to several hours a day in a special education classroom.

But identifying dyslexia early, advocates say, can dramatically improve students’ outcomes. Students who receive services at a young age can avert a slew of problems associated with reading difficulties, such as low self-esteem and disengagement from school. And the sooner they start, the easier it is for them to learn.

For children with dyslexia who don’t get help, the hurdles can be daunting and reach far beyond the classroom. They’re less likely to succeed in school and more likely to engage in risky behavior, research shows. Only 70% of students with learning disabilities graduate from high school, compared with about 80% of their nondisabled peers, according to the National Center on Learning Disabilities. A 2000 study of Texas inmates found that 48% had dyslexia, more than twice the rate of the population at large.

Among those championing the new screening tool is Linda Darling-Hammond, chair of the State Board of Education, whose two children have dyslexia.

“Screening can make a huge difference in the well-being of children,” Darling-Hammond said. “We’re looking at an approach that’s unique and based on the new neuroscience of dyslexia. … This kind of research will have effects that go beyond California and benefit children nationally.”

By getting the extra help they needed, Darling-Hammond’s children were both able to thrive in school and even graduated from Ivy League colleges, she said.

California’s screening tool is a 20-minute digital test, called Multitudes, that measures how well a student can recognize letters and sounds. It won’t diagnose dyslexia, but it will signal that the child needs extra help learning to read, often with an approach based on phonics and sounding out words instead of guessing words based on pictures or context.

Dozens of other states already test kindergartners for dyslexia, but California’s efforts have hit a few roadblocks. In 2015, Assembly Bill 1369 would have mandated dyslexia screening for all third graders, but the bill failed after the California School Boards Association, California Teachers Association and Special Education Local Plan Area Administrators voiced their opposition.

Their argument is that the screening test would over-identify English learners, who might be able to recognize sounds and letters in their native language but not in English. Those children would be funneled to special education whether they need it or not, they said, creating an unnecessary stigma and costing school districts extra money.

Those groups do not appear to have changed their stance. The school boards association is opposed to the current bill, as well, arguing that it’s unfair to English learners. Even though UCSF scientists are creating dyslexia screening tests in multiple languages, tuned to the cultural and phonetic nuances of each language, it still won’t be enough to ensure English learners get the same benefits as children who speak English fluently, the association said. Almost 60 languages are spoken in California schools, according to the Public Policy Institute of California, far too many for researchers to address.

“California’s schools serve students from many language backgrounds. It is impossible to provide assessments in every language,” the organization wrote in June to the bill’s author, state Sen. Anthony...
Portantino, D-Glendale. “If only the language(s) mostly common at a school site are provided, students could be left behind.”

But for parents like Renee Webster-Hawkins, not pushing forward with dyslexia screening is a greater equity concern. Her son struggled to read in elementary school, but the teachers and specialists at his school in Sacramento never identified him as dyslexic. By sixth grade, he was still reading at a kindergarten level and deeply despondent about school.

Webster-Hawkins eventually hired a private educational consultant who identified her son as dyslexic, and she sent him to a private school that specialized in learning disabilities. Her son learned how to read and quickly caught up to his peers academically, she said. Now an 11th-grader in a traditional public school, he’s taking Advanced Placement classes and gets mostly A’s, she said.

“He used to feel like a failure. He was afraid he’d end up in juvenile hall, that he wasn’t worth anything,” she said. “Now we’re talking about colleges. Getting help for dyslexia was life-changing for him, but it shouldn’t have gotten to that point. He should have been screened in kindergarten.”

For families who can’t afford private consultants, tutors and schools, it’s crucial that California’s public schools offer high-quality dyslexia screening and assistance for children who need it, said Lori DePole, co-state director of Decoding Dyslexia California, which pushes for improved dyslexia interventions in schools.

For too long, California’s approach to learning disabilities has been inconsistent and, for most students, inadequate, she said. The result is that thousands of students, particularly those who are low-income, have fallen behind or dropped out because they didn’t receive the help they need.

“More than 70% of kids who need help don’t get it,” she said, citing California Department of Education special education data. “Unless a parent raises a red flag, we’re missing those kids. They fall through the cracks, and that’s not acceptable.”

Screening should begin as soon as possible, she said, even if the assessments aren’t perfect. The tests can be refined and improved over time, but waiting another year or two will only endanger more students’ academic outcomes.

At UCSF, researchers are taking a comprehensive approach to the study of dyslexia, using MRI scans, genetic tests and other tools to learn how the brain processes language. The research is not limited to reading: They’re studying auditory processing, visual perception, executive functioning, memory and other cognitive skills related to communication, language and learning.

Equity is a focus of the research. Scientists are testing the assessment on students from a wide array of racial, ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds to ensure it’s effective for all students.

“It’s a social justice issue. Literacy is a huge predictor of one’s outcome in life,” said Dr. Marilu Gorno Tempini, co-director of the UCSF Dyslexia Center. This funding, she said, “is such an opportunity. It’s a field that has been underfunded too long, with consequences that can be catastrophic for low-income communities. To get to where we are now, it’s an exciting moment.”
Fresno Unified School District  
Board Communication  

From the Office of the Superintendent  
To the Members of the Board of Education  
Prepared by: Kim Kelstrom, Executive Officer  
Cabinet Approval:  

Regarding: February Legislative Committee Meeting  

The purpose of this communication is to provide the Board information shared at the February 04, 2022 Legislative Committee Meeting.  

Economic and Budget Update – Ms. Leilani Aguinaldo provided an economic and budget update.  

Trailer bill language was released and lays out the investments for the 2022/23 proposed budget. Legislative meetings have begun and will continue until the Governor updates the January proposal with the May Revise.  

The Legislative Analyst’s Office presented a revised Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) from the January proposal of 5.33% to 6.17%. At the time the Governor released the COLA in January, only six of the eight factors were available. A seventh factor is now available, and the final factor is expected in April and will contain the COLA amount to be included in the May Revise.  

The Universal Transitional Kindergarten program will require an adult to student ratio of 12:1. The 2022/23 proposed budget includes funding to support the lower ratio as an add on to the Local Control Funding Formula of $2,813 per TK Average Daily Attendance (ADA).  

The Extended Learning Opportunities Program provides increased funding in 2022/23 of $2,500 per K-6 ADA which is an increase from 2021/22 of $1,170 per K-6 ADA. The program requires 30 additional days of 9 hours of instruction annually. If a district is unable to fully implement, an audit finding will be applied at a prorated rate.  

The Governor’s proposed one-time investments for 2022/23 and updates are provided below:  

- Inclusive Early Learning will be a competitive grant  
- Early literacy coaches will be allocated based on demographics and will require $0.50 match for every $1.00  
- Multi-lingual libraries for grades P-3, with at least 80% Unduplicated Pupil Percentage (UPP), and have 15% English learners will provide an allocation of $100,000 per school site  
- The Green bus fleet proposal will prioritize districts with a high UPP or high proportion of older busses  

The Senate approved AB 854 which extends paid COVID-19 sick leave retroactive to January 01, 2022, through September 30, 2022, up to 40 hours. This also provides up to 3 days leave for vaccination symptoms in addition to caring for family members.  

The School Services Legislative Committee February 2022 report is attached. The next Legislative Committee meeting is scheduled for March 04, 2022. If you have any questions or require further information, please contact either Kim Kelstrom at 457-3907 or Santino Danisi at 457-6226.  

Approved by Superintendent  
Robert G. Nelson Ed.D.  

Date: 02/11/2022
Fresno Unified School District

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
FEBRUARY 4, 2022

2022–2023 Legislative Session

Prepared By:

Leilani Aguinaldo
Director, Governmental Relations
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LAO Expects Higher COLA in May

By Patti F. Herrera and John Gray
February 2, 2022

Less than a month ago, Governor Gavin Newsom released his 2022-23 State Budget proposal, which includes a critical planning component for K-12 and community college agencies across the state—the estimated cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) for 2022-23. It is not traditional for School Services of California Inc. to provide updated estimates between the January Governor’s Budget proposal and the May Revision; however, given the extraordinary moment we are in with historically high inflation, we felt it judicious to depart from tradition this year.

As you know, the state is required to compute the annual COLA for K-12 and community colleges using the federal implicit price deflator for state and local governments—an annual inflationary percentage reflecting the cost of doing business for public agencies—which relies on eight economic factors. When Governor Newsom released his 2022-23 State Budget proposal on January 10, 2022, he and his fiscal advisors only had six of the eight factors. Since then, an additional factor has been released, allowing for revised estimates leading to May.

On February 1, 2022, the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) presented a revised COLA estimate for 2022-23 of 6.17% (from 5.33% included in the Governor’s Budget) to the Assembly Budget Subcommittee on Education, taking the additional inflation factor into account (see page 3 of the LAO budget handout).

The LAO estimates that the Proposition 98 cost of a 6.17% revised COLA would be an additional $500 million for the Local Control Funding Formula alone. This does not include the cost of a higher COLA for other categorical programs such as special education. Thus, assuming the minimum guarantee does not increase in May above the Governor’s January estimate of $102 billion for the 2022-23 fiscal year, COLA will consume more of Proposition 98’s new revenue, leaving fewer dollars for other education priorities.

There are three important things to remember about the estimated COLA:

- Current estimates rely on seven of the eight data points necessary to compute the annual COLA. The last factor will not be available until April, just weeks before Governor Newsom is expected to release the May Revision, and will most certainly require the COLA to be further revised.

- Many things can happen between now and April that will influence the final data point, the most important of which would be changes to federal monetary policy such as quantitative
tightening and increased interest rates by the Federal Reserve, the latter of which is expected to occur in March. These policies are designed to mitigate rising inflation

- Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, the purpose of annual COLAs is designed to maintain the purchasing power of public school and college agencies, not increase it. Upward revisions to the COLA reflect the larger reality that the costs of goods and services are rising.

Finally, recognizing the fluidity of the estimated COLA, we continue to counsel local school business leaders to use the Governor’s 5.33% COLA for their Second Interim budget reports.
Major Ongoing Investments

- LCFF COLA $2.1 billion
- ADA three-year average proposal $1.2 billion
- Additional universal transitional kindergarten (UTK) ADA $639 million
- UTK 12:1 ratio $383 million
- Expanded Learning Opportunities Program $3.4 billion
- After School Education and Safety Program $149 million
- Special education funding formula $500 million
- Universal meals $596 million

Major One-Time Investments

- Inclusive Early Education Expansion Program $500 million
- Early literacy coaches $500 million (over 5 years)
- Multilingual school libraries $200 million
- Expanded Learning Opportunities Program infrastructure $937 million (over 4 years)
- Critical sector college and career pathways $1.5 billion (over 4 years)
- Dual enrollment expansion $500 million (over 4 years)
- Green buses $1.5 billion (over 3 years)
- Kitchen infrastructure upgrades $450 million (over 3 years)
- School Breakfast and Summer Meal Start-up and Expansion Grant Program $3 million
Historical Contribution Rates for CalSTRS and CalPERS

By Charlene Quailo and Dave Heckler
January 31, 2022

Q. Do you know where I can find historical employer and employee contribution rate sheets for the California State Teachers’ Retirement System (CalSTRS) and the California Public Employees’ Retirement System (CalPERS)?

A. Employers have numerous payroll tax withholding and payment obligations, so it’s important to have an understanding as to what an employer is required to contribute as well as what is required by the employee. Below are the historical contribution rates for both CalSTRS and CalPERS.

Contribution Rates to CalSTRS

Employer contribution rate increases for CalSTRS were phased in over a seven-year period. The CalSTRS employer contribution rate is set in statute through 2020-21. After that, the CalSTRS Board has limited employer contribution rate-setting authority through 2045-46. Table 1 details the historical employer contribution rate increases for CalSTRS as follows:

**Table 1: CalSTRS Employer Contribution Rate Increases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>8.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>10.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>12.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>14.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are two different groups of CalSTRS members. Each group pays different rates based on whether individual members became members of CalSTRS before or after the California Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act of 2012 (PEPRA), which became effective on January 1, 2013. Table 2 details, for each group, an increase of their contribution rate as follows:

**Table 2: CalSTRS Member Contribution Rate Increases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pre-PEPRA Members</th>
<th>Post-PEPRA Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>8.15%</td>
<td>8.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td>8.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>10.25%</td>
<td>9.205%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>10.25%</td>
<td>9.205%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>10.25%</td>
<td>10.205%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>10.25%</td>
<td>10.205%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>10.25%</td>
<td>10.205%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>10.25%</td>
<td>10.205%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalSTRS Funding Plan Fact Sheet (11/20)

Contribution Rates to CalPERS

The unfunded liability has been rising significantly, which in turn increases the total employer contribution. In fact, the unfunded liability contribution surpassed the employer’s normal cost percentage in 2018-19, 2019-20, and 2020-21. However, in 2021-22, the unfunded liability contribution percentage decreased by 0.54%. Table 3 includes historical employer contribution rate increases to CalPERS:
Table 3: CalPERS Employer Contribution Rate History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employer Normal Cost</th>
<th>Unfunded Liability Contribution</th>
<th>Total Employer Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>7.410%</td>
<td>2.299%</td>
<td>9.709%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>7.173%</td>
<td>3.534%</td>
<td>10.707%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>7.132%</td>
<td>3.791%</td>
<td>10.923%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>7.415%</td>
<td>4.002%</td>
<td>11.417%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>7.313%</td>
<td>4.129%</td>
<td>11.442%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>7.814%</td>
<td>3.957%</td>
<td>11.771%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>7.621%</td>
<td>4.226%</td>
<td>11.847%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>8.242%</td>
<td>5.646%</td>
<td>13.888%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>8.103%</td>
<td>7.428%</td>
<td>15.531%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>8.739%</td>
<td>9.323%</td>
<td>18.062%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>8.992%</td>
<td>11.741%</td>
<td>20.733%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>9.47%</td>
<td>14.13%</td>
<td>23.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>9.32%</td>
<td>13.59%</td>
<td>22.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Actual employer rates for 2019-20 and 2020-21 were impacted by the $3.15 billion investment made from the State of California in 2018-19. Actual employer contribution rates for the two-year period were 19.721% and 20.70%, respectively.

Source: CalPERS School Pool Actuarial Valuation (June 30, 2020)

The contribution rates for the pre- and post-PEPRA CalPERS members are as follows:

Table 4: CalPERS Member Contribution Rate Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CalPERS Member Contribution Rate Increases</th>
<th>Post-PEPRA Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-PEPRA Classic Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Pre-PEPRA Classic Members</td>
<td>Post-PEPRA Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalPERS School Pool Actuarial Valuation (June 30, 2020)
New COVID-19 Paid Sick Leave Expected

By Leilani Aguinaldo and Danyel Conolley
February 3, 2022

As anticipated through a recent announcement by Governor Gavin Newsom, Senate President pro Tempore Toni Atkins, and Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon, COVID-19 supplemental paid sick leave is poised to be resurrected in 2022. On February 2, 2022, details of the new supplemental paid sick leave were released in Assembly Bill (AB) 84.

When enacted, AB 84 will reinstate COVID-19 leave as a provision of state law and is applicable to all public and private employers with 26 or more employees, including local educational agencies (LEAs). AB 84 is retroactive to January 1, 2022, and would expire September 30, 2022.

Unlike previous mandated COVID-19 leave, AB 84 initially provides only 40 hours of supplemental paid sick leave. An employee who is considered full-time or who worked, or was scheduled to work, an average of at least 40 hours per week in the two weeks before the leave is taken is entitled to 40 hours of COVID-19 supplemental paid sick leave. Employees who don’t meet this criteria are entitled to a prorated amount of leave according to the number of hours the employee works as defined by AB 84.

The qualifying reasons for the new leave are similar, but not identical, to prior iterations (see “Legislation Expands COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave” in the March 2021 Fiscal Report). To qualify for the leave, an employee must be unable to work due to one of the following reasons:

- The employee is subject to a federal, state, or local quarantine or isolation order related to COVID-19
- The employee is advised by a health care provider to quarantine or isolate due to COVID-19
- The employee is attending an appointment for themselves or a family member to receive a COVID-19 vaccine
- The employee is experiencing symptoms, or caring for a family member experiencing symptoms, related to a COVID-19 vaccine that prevents the employee from being able to work
- The employee is experiencing symptoms of COVID-19 and seeking a medical diagnosis
• The employee is caring for a family member who is subject to a COVID-19 quarantine or isolation order, or has been advised by a health care provider to quarantine or isolate.

• The employee is caring for a child whose school or place of care is closed or otherwise unavailable for reasons related to COVID-19 on the premises.

In addition, for leave taken due to symptoms related to a COVID-19 vaccine, an employer may limit the total supplemental paid sick leave to three days or 24 hours unless the employee provides verification from a health care provider that the employee or family member is continuing to experience symptoms from the vaccine.

In the biggest change from previous COVID-19 leaves, employees are entitled to an additional 40 hours of supplemental paid sick leave (or lesser amount if the employee receives a prorated amount of supplemental paid sick leave) only if the employee tests positive for COVID-19. This additional leave also is provided for employees who must care for a family member that tests positive for COVID-19. The total maximum amount of COVID-19 supplemental paid sick leave mandated by AB 84 shall not exceed 80 hours, and this leave shall be in addition to any paid sick leave that may be available to employees.

If your LEA extended leave entitlements for COVID-related reasons beyond the expiration of previous mandated leaves, we recommend that you work closely with legal counsel to ensure the application of leave is legally compliant (see “FAQs: Expansion of COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave” in the April 2021 Fiscal Report).

AB 84 must still be passed by the Legislature and signed into law by Governor Newsom. These steps are expected to occur in the next week or so and will be shared in a future article.
Bill Update
**Newly introduced since last report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill No./Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 102 Holden</td>
<td>Pupil Attendance at Community Colleges: College and Career Access Pathways Partnerships: County Offices of Education</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 408 Quirk-Silva</td>
<td>Homeless Children and Youths: Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1607 Muratsuchi</td>
<td>Education Finance: Local Control Funding Formula</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly Education Committee</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1609 Muratsuchi</td>
<td>Education Finance: Local Control Funding Formula</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly Education Committee</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1614 Muratsuchi</td>
<td>Education Finance: Local Control Funding Formula: Base Grants: Aspirational Funding Level: Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly Education Committee</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 579 Allen</td>
<td>Education Finance: Local Control Funding Formula</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 830 Portantino</td>
<td>Education Finance: Supplemental Education Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Education Committee</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SB 871 Pan</td>
<td>Public Health: Immunizations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SB 878 Skinner</td>
<td>School Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AB 102 (Holden)
**Amended:** 1/3/2022  
**Title:** Pupil Attendance at Community Colleges: College and Career Access Pathways Partnerships: County Offices of Education  
**Status:** Senate Rules Committee  
**Position:** Support  

**Summary:**
Removes the January 1, 2027, sunset date for the CCAP program. Also expands the program to allow county offices of education to enter into CCAP partnerships with community colleges.

### AB 408 (Quirk-Silva)
**Amended:** 1/3/2022  
**Title:** Homeless Children and Youths: Reporting  
**Status:** Senate Rules Committee  
**Position:**

**Summary:**
This bill does the following:

- Requires local educational agencies (LEAs) to establish homeless education program policies and to update these policies at least every three years
- Requires homeless education liaisons to offer annual training to staff who work with students on the homeless education program policies and recognizing signs that students are experiencing homelessness
- Requires the California Department of Education (CDE) to develop a risk-based monitoring plan for homeless education requirements.

### AB 1607 (Muratsuchi)
**Title:** Education Finance: Local Control Funding Formula  
**Status:** Assembly Education Committee  
**Position:**

**Summary:**
Starting with 2022-23 and for LCFF purposes, calculates ADA using a three year average of ADA based on current fiscal year and previous two fiscal years.

### AB 1609 (Muratsuchi)
**Title:** Education Finance: Local Control Funding Formula  
**Status:** Assembly Education Committee  
**Position:**

**Summary:**
For the 2022-23 fiscal year, requires apportionments to local educational agencies (LEAs) under the Local Control Funding Formula to be calculated based on the greater of each LEA’s 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22, or 2022-23 average daily attendance.

*Newly introduced since last report*
**AB 1614 (Muratsuchi)**
Title: Education Finance: Local Control Funding Formula: Base Grants: Aspirational Funding Level: Reports
Status: Assembly Education Committee
Position:

Summary:

Expresses the intent of the Legislature that the state aspire to increase the Local Control Funding Formula base grants to amounts equal to the national average per-pupil funding level. Commencing with the 2022–23 fiscal year, this bill would increase the base grants to specified amounts.

**SB 579 (Allen)**
Amended: 1/20/2022
Title: Education Finance: Local Control Funding Formula
Status: Assembly Desk
Position:

Summary:

For the 2022-23 fiscal year, requires apportionments to local educational agencies (LEAs) under the Local Control Funding Formula to be calculated based on the greater of each LEA’s 2019-20, 2021-22, or 2022-23 average daily attendance.

**SB 830 (Portantino)**
Title: Education Finance: Supplemental Education Funding
Status: Senate Education Committee
Position:

Summary:

Establishes a process for school districts and county offices of education to apply for “supplemental education funding” using “average daily membership” data which relies on enrollment. In order to be eligible for the supplemental funds, a local educational agency (LEA) must maintain at least the same per-pupil spending level on staff who address chronic absenteeism and habitual truancy as in the 2019-20 school year. LEAs would be required to use at least 50% of the supplemental education funds on efforts focused on chronic absenteeism and habitual truancy.

**SB 871 (Pan)**
Title: Public Health: Immunizations
Status: Senate Rules Committee
Position:

Summary:

Adds the COVID-19 vaccine to the list of vaccinations required by statute for admission to private or public schools and childcare centers.

*Newly introduced since last report*
**SB 878 (Skinner)**

**Title:** School Transportation  
**Status:** Senate Rules Committee  
**Position:**

**Summary:**

Requires local educational agencies (LEAs) to provide free transportation to all students to and from their neighborhood school. Transportation would be required for students in transitional kindergarten through grade 6 who live more than half a mile from their neighborhood school, and more than one mile for students in grades 7-12. Establishes the Transportation Access to Public Schools Fund to provide funds to LEAs for this purpose.
Regarding: 2021/22 General Fund Budget Category

The purpose of this communication is to provide the Board additional information on the 2021/22 General Fund categories presented at the February 02, 2022 Board meeting.

For reference, attached as backup are two slides from the presentation where discussion centered on a better understanding of the categories other than ‘School Sites’, shown on the right-hand side of slide five. As mentioned, the first two categories ‘Direct Site Support’ and ‘Other Support’ were presented with additional detail as shown on slide seven. Summarized below is additional detail of what is included in the remaining categories:

- Maintenance – Routine Restricted Maintenance which includes all trades staff, supplies, and custodial and maintenance staff not directly assigned to school sites
- Transportation – Transportation staff (including bus drivers and clerical support), contract with First Student for transportation of Special Education students, fuel, and supplies
- Utilities – Gas, electricity, water, garbage, pest control, and monitoring services
- Transfers Out – Annual contribution to the district's Health Fund for the Other Post-Employment Benefit Reserve, deferred maintenance support, Special Education tuition for students in private school placement, and the joint partnership agreement for CART
- One-time COVID-19 and Capital Projects – Expanded learning opportunities, targeted student supports, training and resource supports, health, social-emotional and mental health supports, ventilation, classroom telecommunication upgrades, student desk replacements, support for virtual learning which includes expanded services at eLearn and simultaneous/independent study stipends to support students on quarantine. Also included are one-time capital projects for Design Science, Fresno High Career Tech Ed and secondary restroom projects
- Central Administration – General administrative activities such as the Board Office, Superintendent’s Office, School Leadership, Business and Financial Services, Human Resources, Equity and Access, Information Technology, and Purchasing

If you have any questions or require further information, please contact Kim Kelstrom at 457-3907.

Approved by Superintendent
Robert G. Nelson Ed.D. Date: 02/11/2022
2021/22 General Fund Budget – $1.35 billion

School Sites: $977 million

- Direct Site Support $20 million
- Other Support $38 million
- Maintenance $47 million
- Transportation $21 million
- Utilities $24 million
- Transfers Out $11 million
- One-Time Covid-19 & Capital Projects $169 million
- Central Admin $44 million
2021/22 School Site Support – $58 million

Total Direct Site Supports – $20 million

- Student Engagement Admin $1.0
- Teacher Quality Partnership $4.5
- Department of Prevention and Intervention $12.3
- Teacher Support $1.2
- CART $1.3

Total Other Supports – $38 million

- Curriculum and Professional Learning $2.2
- Student Support $28.9
- School Grants $2.0
- School Site Technology $4.7
- Teacher Support $1.2
- Department of Prevention and Intervention $12.3
Regarding: One-time School Site Funding

The purpose of this communication is to provide the Board information regarding school site spending of the one-time Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) funds as requested during the February 02, 2022 Board of Education meeting. As a reminder, for the 2021/22 school year, $2.0 million was provided to schools. The intent of these funds is to address the impact COVID-19 had and continues to have on elementary and secondary schools and to assist schools in developing plans for the return to normal operations.

To date, schools have spent funds on supplemental supplies, equipment, supplemental contracts, and contracted services. This includes additional books, instructional supplies, technology, tutoring contracts, and site licenses. These funds were allocated to each site, factoring counts of student enrollment and percentages of students living in disadvantaged circumstances. Specific allocations for the current school year are noted on the attached.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please call Tammy Townsend at 457-3934.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addams Elementary</td>
<td>$33,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addicott</td>
<td>$1,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahwahnee Middle School</td>
<td>$12,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Elementary</td>
<td>$18,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayer Elementary</td>
<td>$28,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aynesworth Elementary</td>
<td>$24,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird Middle</td>
<td>$5,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakman Elementary</td>
<td>$30,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balderas Elementary</td>
<td>$25,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birney Elementary</td>
<td>$31,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullard High School</td>
<td>$29,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullard Talent K-8</td>
<td>$17,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burroughs Elementary</td>
<td>$30,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calwa Elementary</td>
<td>$24,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Elementary</td>
<td>$29,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Elementary</td>
<td>$22,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm-Phoenix Elementary</td>
<td>$1,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computech</td>
<td>$11,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper Middle School</td>
<td>$9,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar Elementary</td>
<td>$22,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Science High School</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewolf High School</td>
<td>$3,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Polytechnical</td>
<td>$22,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easterby Elementary</td>
<td>$27,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaton Elementary</td>
<td>$14,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison High School</td>
<td>$42,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ericson Elementary</td>
<td>$29,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewing Elementary</td>
<td>$29,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figarden Elementary</td>
<td>$18,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forkner Elementary</td>
<td>$10,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Miller Middle</td>
<td>$13,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Elementary</td>
<td>$16,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno High School</td>
<td>$39,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>$360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaston B Rutherford Middle</td>
<td>$15,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson Elementary</td>
<td>$11,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenberg Elementary</td>
<td>$22,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>$30,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaton Elementary</td>
<td>$21,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo Elementary</td>
<td>$26,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland Elementary</td>
<td>$16,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homan Elementary</td>
<td>$24,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover High School</td>
<td>$35,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Elementary</td>
<td>$15,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE Young eLearn Academy</td>
<td>$3,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE Young Independent Study</td>
<td>$6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Elementary</td>
<td>$17,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Elementary</td>
<td>$23,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Canyon Middle School</td>
<td>$16,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total $2,003,908</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding: Legal Services by Category

The purpose of this communication is to provide the Board an update on legal services by category for the 2021/22 fiscal year.

### General Fund Legal Services by Category
**July 01, 2021 – December 31, 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Education</td>
<td>70,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter School</td>
<td>5,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Management &amp; Planning</td>
<td>50,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Legal Services</td>
<td>65,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources/Labor Relations</td>
<td>155,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention &amp; Intervention</td>
<td>11,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>16,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>376,246</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Funds Legal Services by Category
**July 01, 2021 – December 31, 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liability</td>
<td>174,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Compensation</td>
<td>243,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>417,264</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any questions or require further information, please contact Kim Kelstrom at 457-3907.

Approved by Superintendent
Robert G. Nelson Ed.D.  Date: 02/11/2022
Regarding: Update on Food Waste Diversion Pilot Program

The purpose of this communication is to provide the Board an update regarding planning for a food waste diversion program for district schools and support facilities. In a December 17, 2021 Board Communication, it was reported that a pilot program to capture and separately dispose of food waste was targeted to commence in February 2022. However, implementation of the pilot program is delayed until the 2022/23 school year, as explained below:

- The surge in pandemic-related staff absences has impacted school site custodial staffing and all available custodians are needed to focus on high priority school needs (daily cleaning/disinfection), which does not allow for additional duties related to food waste collection and disposal.

- School site administrators are similarly impacted by staffing uncertainties, and therefore the timing is not ideal to start a new program requiring training and oversight.

- A vendor has not been identified to provide the food waste composting service on a pilot scale at an economical cost to the district.

As conditions evolve, staff will continue to plan for implementation of a food waste composting program.

If you have questions or need further information, please contact Karin Temple at 457-3134.
From the Office of the Superintendent
To the Members of the Board of Education
Prepared by: Sean Virnig, PhD, Executive Director
Cabinet Approval: 

Regarding: Parent University Supports for Families of Students with Disabilities

The purpose of this communication is to provide the Board information related to the request made by the Board regarding the supports for families of students with disabilities currently available through Parent University.

The mission of Parent University is to empower, engage, and connect families to support student achievement including all students with disabilities. The University continues its longstanding collaboration with the Department of Special Education in support of the Family Learning Workshops series. This collaboration involves both the development and the periodic review of training modules on various topics and subtopics as follows:

- **Special Education Overview and Law**: Fresno Unified Department of Special Education mission and vision, Child Find process, the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, an overview of Special Education services throughout the district, and the assessment process.

- **Individualized Education Program (IEP), Section 504 Plan, and Behavior Support**: The IEP, parent/guardian participation in an IEP meeting, a 504 Plan, and the tiers of Positive Behavior.

- **District Profile of Special Education Services**: Student academic needs and support services, programs offered, and the importance of building a partnership with the school team.

- **Participating in the IEP Process**: The purpose and function of an IEP and important tips for parents/guardians before, during, and after the IEP meeting.

- **Student Success**: Self-awareness, accommodations, and modifications to support student academic success.

- **Question and Answer with Special Education Staff**: An opportunity to meet with Special Education experts to explain their children’s legal documents and strategies to support student achievement.

- **Virtual Question and Answer with Adult Transition Program Staff**: A virtual version of the Question and Answer with Special Education staff.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Dr. Virnig at 457-3227.

Approved by Superintendent
Robert G. Nelson Ed.D.  

Date: ____________________