NEVADA COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION
Regular Meeting
Wednesday, July 11, 2012
2:00 p.m.

Nevada County Superintendent of Schools
Houser Conference Room
112 Nevada City Highway, Nevada City, CA 95959

AGENDA

All times approximate

I. Meeting called to order
II. Establish quorum
III. Salute to the flag
IV. Additions to the Agenda
V. Adoption of the Agenda
VI. Open public forum – Recognition of members of the audience wishing to address an agenda item may do so at this time or at the time the agenda item is heard. After being recognized by the Board president, please identify yourself. A member of the public may at this time make brief comments regarding items not on the agenda, although no action may be taken.

VII. Close public forum
VIII. Approval of the Consent Agenda
These items are expected to be routine and non-controversial. They will be acted upon by the Board at one time without discussion, unless a trustee or citizen requests that an item be removed for discussion and separate consideration. In that case the designated item(s) will be considered following approval of the remaining items.

A. Approval of minutes of the Regular meeting of June 20, 2012 (page 1)
B. Approval of FY2011-12 Program Self-Evaluation, CSPP (Sierra College Preschool Program) (page 8)
C. Approval of FY2011-12 Program Self-Evaluation, CCTR (Sierra College Toddler Program) (page 12)
D. During the third quarter of 2012 April-June, there were no complaints filed to be reported, pursuant to Williams Uniform Complaint Procedures (E.C. 1240(H): Board policy 1010 – Uniform Complaint Procedures) (page 16)

IX. Action Items

A. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education approve the Annual review of Board Policy 2710, Conflict of Interest? (page 17)
B. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education approve the reconfiguration of Earle Jamieson, Nevada County Academy of Learning (NCAL) and 3-R into the following Alternative Education Program:
Earle Jamieson Educational Options

**Inspire:** a Community Day School serving students grades 7-12 (formerly 3-R)

**Launch:** a County Community School serving students grades 7-12 (formerly E.J.)

**Edge Academy:** a County Community School serving students grades 7-12 in an independent study program (formerly NCSOS County Community School)

X. Discussion/Information Items 10 min.

A. Yuba River Charter School Request for Exemption from Local Zoning Regulations.

XI. Reports 10 min.

A. Board member reports
   1. SARB – Meeks
   2. Budget Review Committee – Meeks/Slade-Troutman
   3. Legislative – Voss
   4. NCSBA – Michael
   5. Individual Board Member Reports

B. Superintendent’s Report 15 min.
   1. School Readiness Project
   2. Superintendent’s Expenditure Report
   3. Upcoming Events: Scholar Day at the Fair – August 8

C. Staff Reports
   1. Ed Services – Miller 5 min.
   2. Business Services – Fitting 5 min.

E. Future agenda items
   1. Approval of the 2012-13 Consolidated Application for funding Categorical Aid Programs, Part I

XIII. Correspondence

A. California County Boards of Education 2012 Fall Conference *(page 19)*

B. Fiscal Report *(page 20)*

Adjournment

Next Meeting Date: WEDNESDAY, August 8, 2012, 4:00 p.m., 112 Nevada City Highway, Nevada City

This agenda was posted at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting at the Nevada County Superintendent of Schools office, 112 Nevada City Highway.

Posted: 7-6-12

Date

Notice: The agenda packet and supporting materials, including materials distributed less than 72 hours prior to the scheduled meeting, can be viewed at the Nevada County Superintendent of Schools office – reception desk, located at 112 Nevada City Highway, Nevada City, CA. For more information please call 530.478.6400 ext. 203.

Notice: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to access the Board meeting room or to otherwise participate at this meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, contact the Nevada County Superintendent of Schools office at 530.478.6400 ext. 203 at least 48 hours before the scheduled Board meeting so that we may make every reasonable effort to accommodate your needs. {G.C. §54953.2, §54954.2(a) (1); Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, §202 (42 U.S.C. §12132)}
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NEVADA COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION  
Regular Meeting  
Wednesday, June 20, 2012  
2:00 p.m.  

Nevada County Superintendent of Schools  
Houser Conference Room  
112 Nevada City Highway, Nevada City, CA 95959  

Minutes

I. Meeting called to order

II. Establish quorum

III. Salute to the flag was led by Caleb Buckley.

IV. Additions to the Agenda

   A. Supt. Hermansen requested removal of Agenda Item XI. Information/Discussion C, Alternative Education Program Discussion; as it will be incorporated with Agenda Item X. Action G, Redesignation from TAP to SWP for Earle Jamieson, Sugarloaf and Nevada County Academy of Learning.

   B. Slade-Troutman requested the Budget Committee report be moved prior to Agenda Item X. Action Items, D. Adoption of FY2012-13 budget.

V. Adoption of the Agenda

   On a motion by Slade-Troutman and seconded by Altieri, the agenda was adopted as amended, removing Agenda Item XI. Information/Discussion C, Alternative Education Program Discussion as it will be incorporated with Agenda Item X. Action G, Redesignation from TAP to SWP for EJ, Sugarloaf and NCAL; and moving the Budget Committee Report to be heard prior to Agenda Item X. Action Items, D. Adoption of FY2012-13 budget. The motion carries unanimously.

VI. Opened public forum

   Recognition of members of the audience wishing to address an agenda item may do so at this time or at the time the agenda item is heard.

   Caleb Buckley, Director of Yuba River Charter requested the board hold a public hearing to exempt the charter school from local zoning regulations. In order to receive the $8.5 million dollar funding they were required to become a nonprofit. Their site is zoned commercial, they went to the planning commission; held a public meeting declaring they are a state public agency. County of Nevada County Counsel claims they are not a state public agency, even though it was pointed out that the building money is from State Bonds; and they are members of Cal-PERS.

   The Board of Education can exempt the Charter School as the authorizer. Buckley states a public exemption is in order; Ed Code dictates YRC is a public agency and he would like an open public hearing to allow for public comment.

VII. Closed public forum

VIII. Presentations

   A. Presentation of Proclamation to Doug Carver, recently Retired Chief Probation Officer
As Supt. Hermansen presented Chief Carver the Proclamation, he very humbly accepted the award, crediting the opportunities he was provided with were successful thanks to the staff he is surrounded by, including NCSOS Staff.

B. Sierra College Child Development Center, Morgan Best, Site Supervisor

Assoc. Supt. Miller introduced Morgan Best. Morgan provided a power point presentation detailing the collaborative partnerships with Sierra College, Head Start, Early Head Start and NCSOS; each partner provides an integral part to the success of the CDC. Sierra College students; Ghidotti Early College HS; Volunteers; and other agencies also provide support. The CDC serves children ages 18 months to Kindergarten entrance who meet income eligibility requirements and reside in Nevada/Placer Counties.

IX. Approval of the Consent Agenda

A. Approval of minutes of the Regular meeting of May 9, 2012

B. Approval of 2011-12 Consolidated Application Part II – Meeks requested the item be removed for discussion.

On a motion by Altieri and seconded by Michael, the consent agenda was approved as amended removing Agenda Item B. Approval of 2011-12 Consolidated Application Part II. The motion carries unanimously.

A. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education Approve the 2011-12 Consolidated Application Part II?

Meeks questioned what the determining factors were to qualify as low income students. Assoc. Supt. Miller explained eligibility is based on the Federal Poverty Level which is available in chart form. Fitting will obtain and send to Meeks.

On a motion by Meeks and seconded by Michael, the Nevada County Board of Education approved the 2011-12 Consolidated Application Part II. The motion carries unanimously.

X. Action Items

A. FY2011-12 Third Interim
   1. Review FY2011-12 Third Interim Fiscal Report
   2. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education approve Resolution 12-09, Certification of the Third Interim Fiscal Report, referring to column D final approved budget?

On a motion by Slade-Troutman and seconded by Altieri, the Nevada County Board of Education approved Resolution 12-09, Certification of the Third Interim Fiscal Report, referring to Column D final approved budget. Roll call vote taken. The motion carries unanimously.

B. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education adopt Resolution 12-10, Blanket Transfer Resolution to the FY2011-12 budget?

On a motion by Altieri and seconded by Slade-Troutman, the Nevada County Board of Education approved Resolution 12-10, Blanket Transfer Resolution to the FY2011-12 budget. Roll call vote taken. The motion carries unanimously.

C. Disposal of Equipment
   1. List A – No longer in use
   2. List B – Erroneously Capitalized
   3. List C – Sale of Donated Assets – MOU attached
Shall the Nevada County Board of Education approve the disposal of equipment as described in List A; List B and List C?

On a motion by Slade-Troutman and seconded by Michael, the Nevada County Board of Education approved the disposal of equipment as described in List A; List B; and List C. The motion carries unanimously.

C.1. Budget Review Committee, Slade-Troutman/Meeks

The Budget Review Committee's report is hereby incorporated by reference, per Slade-Troutman's request.

D. Adoption of FY2012-13 budget

1. Open public hearing to view the FY2012-13 consolidated budget of Nevada County Superintendent of Schools, Nevada County Special Education Services, Nevada County SELPA, Special Education Pass Thru, Nevada County Charter School Cooperative, Child Development, Forest Reserve Fund, and School Facilities Fund (E.C. 1620, E.C. 1622, E.C. 33129)

2. Closed public hearing

3. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education adopt the FY2012-13 consolidated budget of Nevada County Superintendent of Schools, Nevada County Special Education Services, Nevada County SELPA, Special Education Pass Thru, Nevada County Charter School Cooperative, Child Development, Forest Reserve Fund, and School Facilities Fund? Michael questioned if changes in the high school program will fit into our budget. Fitting explained for the FY2012-13 there is carry over; next FY2013-14 may be precarious.

On a motion by Slade-Troutman and seconded by Michael, the Nevada County Board of Education adopted the FY2012-13 consolidated budget of Nevada County Superintendent of Schools, Nevada County Special Education Services, Nevada County SELPA, Special Education Pass Thru, Nevada County Charter School Cooperative, Child Development, Forest Reserve Fund, and School Facilities Fund. The motion carries unanimously.

4. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education adopt Resolution 12-11, to approve the Final Budget for 2012-13 as presented?

On a motion by Altieri and seconded by Slade-Troutman, the Nevada County Board of Education approved the Final Budget for 2012-13 as presented. Roll call vote taken. The motion carries unanimously.

E. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education adopt the annual Workers' Compensation Certification regarding self-insured workers' compensation claims for FY2012-13?

On a motion by Slade-Troutman and seconded by Michael, the Nevada County Board of Education adopted the annual Workers' Compensation Certification regarding self-insured workers' compensation claims for FY2012-13. The motion carries unanimously.

F. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education approve Resolution 12-08, Temporary Transfer Agreement (Short Term Borrowing Agreement) between the County, Districts and Charters? ROLL CALL VOTE

Fitting provided a memo summarizing the short term financing. Michael expressed the need for a good quantitative risk assessment and to set limits. Fitting explained this will not put our budget in jeopardy FY2012-13. Fitting will create a policy, defining criteria and parameters FY2013-14.

On a motion by Altieri; amended and seconded by Slade-Troutman, Nevada County Board of Education approved Resolution 12-08, Temporary Transfer Agreement (Short Term
Borrowing Agreement) between the County, Districts and Charters setting a limit of $350K. Roll call vote taken. The motion carries unanimously.

G. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education approve the redesignation from Targeted Assistance Program (TAP) to School Wide Program (SWP) for Title I Basic Part A for Earle Jamieson, Sugarloaf and Nevada County Academy of Learning?

On a motion by Michael and seconded by Altieri, the Nevada County Board of Education approved the redesignation from Targeted Assistance Program (TAP) to School Wide Program (SWP) for Title I Basic Part A for Earle Jamieson, Sugarloaf and Nevada County Academy of Learning. The motion carries unanimously.

Supt. Hermansen provided a drawing and handout which described previous programs and proposed programs for Alternative Ed. School districts will be responsible for offering a program for 6th graders as they will no longer be served under this program. Currently we have 23 students and 3 teachers planned for FY2012-13.

Not all expelled students are required to attend our program. Districts have options, they must offer something to expelled students. NJUHSD is planning to expand their independent study program.

The Countywide Plan for providing services to expelled students further discusses options.

TAP Title I funding is for specific students with academic challenges. SWP can use Title I funding for all students.

H. Second reading and Approval of Board Policy 1330 and Administrative Regulations 1330, Community Relations, Relationships With Community Resources

Shall the Nevada County Board of Education approve Board Policy 1330 and Administrative Regulations 1330, Community Relations, Relationships with Community Resources?

On a motion by Slade-Troutman and seconded by Michael, the Nevada County Board of Education approved the Board Policy 1330 and Administrative Regulations 1330, Community Relations, Relationships With Community Resources. The motion carries (4-0-1).

I. Second reading and Approval of Board Policy 3513.3 and Administrative Regulations 3513.3, Business and Non-Instructional Operations, Tobacco Free Schools

Shall the Nevada County Board of Education approve Board Policy 3513.3 and Administrative Regulations 3513.3, Business and Non-Instructional Operations, tobacco Free Schools?

On a motion by Slade-Troutman and seconded by Michael, the Nevada County Board of Education Approved Board Policy 3513.3 and Administrative Regulations 3513.3, Business and Non-Instructional Operations, Tobacco Free Schools. The motion carries unanimously.

J. Second reading and Approval of Board Policy 5131.62 and Administrative Regulations 5131.62, Students, Tobacco

Shall the Nevada County Board of Education approve Board Policy 5131.62 and Administrative Regulations 5131.62, Students, Tobacco?

On a motion by Altieri and seconded by Michael, the Nevada County Board of Education Approved Board Policy 5131.62 and Administrative Regulations 5131.62, Students, Tobacco. The motion carries unanimously.

K. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education approve the Nevada County Plan for Providing Educational Services to Expelled Students?
Supt. Hermansen explained every three years the plan must be revised, approved and submitted to the State by June 30. The district superintendents participated in revisions to the Nevada County Plan.

On a motion by Slade-Troutman and seconded by Altieri, the Nevada County Board of Education approved the Nevada County Plan for Providing Educational Services to Expelled Students. The motion carries unanimously.

XI. Information/Discussion Items

A. FY2011-12 Annual Report to the Board of Temporary County Certificates

Regina Reno provided the annual required report. This allows teachers, for up to one year, to continue in their position if they are in the process of obtaining their credential, but have not yet received it. We verify they meet certain criteria before issuing the temporary certificate, most are renewals.

B. Preschool Special Day Class Discussion

Supt. Hermansen stated we were in the beginning discussions of moving the TKM Special Day Class to Sierra College CDC. Concerns were raised after talking to TKM staff. All concerns were heard and responded to. TKM staff was taken to the CDC on a visit. Great program ideas have been brought up as a result of these discussions. Having an integrated site is a continuous struggle. We have visited several counties who offer inclusion programs. Staff believe an inclusion program is the best for the students and would like to continue moving forward.

C. Alternative Education Programs Discussion

Item addressed in earlier discussion.

D. CCSESA/CalPERS Lawsuit Update

A written summary was provided. For now, there will likely be no fiscal impact on counties as there is a reserve set aside.

E. Grand Jury Report on Schools Efficiency

Supt. Hermansen stated the Grand Jury Report seems to be fair and reasonable. Every school district has placed consolidation on their board agenda. Three large meetings have been held. Each school district will respond to the report as required, NCSOS has one item to respond to.

GVSD and NCSD recently met and decided they wanted to have a conversation on consolidation. A meeting was scheduled; publically posted; advertised with over 20 people in attendance; all spoke in favor, there was no contention. The meeting focused on what would be best for the kids. Both Boards agreed to the possibility of students being better served as one district and took action to look into it further. The CCOSDO will have a role in this and will meet soon as well.

XII. Reports

A. Board member reports

1. SARB, Meeks – no report

2. Budget Review Committee, Slade-Troutman/Meeks – Item addressed earlier

3. Legislative, Voss – no report

4. NCSBA, Michael – TOY Dinner Speaker has been chosen; Personal Learning Communities and Implementation of Common Core Standards are the two topics being considered.

5. Individual Board member reports

Slade-Troutman and Meeks toured Juvenile Hall Program and were very impressed. They attended the ILP Graduation and visited TKM FRC.
Slade-Troutman questioned if the TKM Special Ed concerns had been addressed. Supt. Hermansen assured the Board that concerns had been addressed. If further concerns arise, the Board will be kept apprised.

B. Superintendent’s Report
   1. School Readiness Project – tabled to next meeting
   2. District Updates – covered in earlier discussion
   3. Upcoming events - none
   4. Supt. Expense report provided to the Board

C. Staff Reports
   1. Business Services, Fitting – no report
   2. Ed Services, Miller – Miller will report on Common Core Standards at an upcoming meeting

D. Future agenda items
   a. Approval of FY2011-12 Program Self-Evaluation, CSPP (Sierra College Preschool Program)
   b. Approval of FY2011-12 Program Self-Evaluation, CCTR (Sierra College Toddler Program)

XIII. Correspondence

A. Fiscal Reports

B. Letter, NJUHSD – Mason’s Scholarship Awards Dinner

C. Letter, Captain John Oldham Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, Donation of books to schools in Nevada County


XIV. Closed Session

A. Pending litigation, Conference with Legal Counsel (Govt. Code §54956.9 (b) )

XV. Open Session

B. Announcement from closed session – No action taken.

Adjournment

Next Meeting Date: WEDNESDAY, July 11, 2012, 2:00 p.m., 112 Nevada City Highway, Nevada City

Approved: ___________________________ Date: July 11, 2012

James Voss, President
Budget Committee—attached to minutes (June 20, 2012)

The Budget Committee met with Superintendent Hermansen on May 14th and again on June 7th to gain clarifications on some specific budget details. Following the budget discussions, Superintendent Hermansen agreed with the Budget Committee that she will begin providing a monthly detailed accounting of her job related expenses to the Board during her Superintendent’s report. Superintendent Hermansen also noted that she has “no interest” in pursuing another location for business and administrative services.

The next steps for the Committee will begin to review and compare budgeted expenses to actual expenses which will be completed in a few months.

On June 12th, the Budget Committee toured with Monty Martin and Shelly Sexton the TKM Center, Juvenile Hall and Sierra College. It was noted by Superintendent Hermansen that she would be providing the Board a drawing showing the many locations of many County Office programs.

The Committee also attended two youth functions. On May 22nd the County Office’s Foster Youth Program held a round table discussion with ten recently emancipated foster youth. It was an informative discussion detailing the challenges of being 18 without a “real” home and without parents in their lives. On June 1st, we attended the graduation ceremony for these youth which was held at Seven Hill School with a dinner provided by the local Soroptimist Club.
Program Self-Evaluation Annual Report

Contractor’s Legal Name  Nevada County Superintendent of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Number</th>
<th>CDS Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contract and Age
- ☑ CSPP
- □ CCTR – (Infant/Toddler)
- □ CCTR – (School Age)
- □ Education Network (Infant/Toddler)
- □ Education Network (Preschool)
- □ CHAN
- □ CMIG - (Infant/Toddler)
- □ CMIG - (Preschool)

Date Program Self-Evaluation Completed  May 30, 2012
Number of Classrooms  1
Number of Family Child Care Homes  

Describe the Program Self-Evaluation Process (Note: This area expands as necessary.)

As a campus-based child development center that partners with PCAC (Head Start) and Nevada County Superintendent of Schools, collaboration is a key component to our successful program. But collaboration doesn’t end at the programmatic level. Our staff collaborates with parents regularly on an informal basis, as well as during our Parent Meetings. We also use parent surveys to help us understand what parent’s needs are, and how our program can best meet their needs. Our staff also spends time with parents learning how they can support each child’s individual needs. The following is a calendar showing staff trainings, staff meetings, parent meetings, programmatic meetings, and timelines for assessments that were done by our program during the 2011/2012 school year:

- 8/11 Staff Development Meetings (including ECERS training and DRDP review) for preschool teaching team
- 8/22/11 Preschool begins for students
- 8/11 Collaborative Leadership Council meeting with representatives from Sierra College (Darlene Jackson, Dean of Human Development), Nevada County Superintendent of Schools (Stanton Miller, Associate Superintendent and Morgan Best, Site Supervisor) and Placer Community Action Council (Vickie Treadway, Child Development Specialist) These meetings take place once per month.
- 9/11 First Parent Meeting-These meetings happen once per month.
- 9/11 Preschool staff meets with Sierra College Faculty to plan for Student Teacher projects
- 10/11 DRDPs are collected and reviewed by Site Supervisor and Preschool Teachers
- 11/10 Parent Conferences
- 11/11 Staff Evaluation process begins
- 2/9/12 Parent Surveys are distributed at Parent Meeting, then they are analyzed by the Site Supervisor and the Preschool Staff
- 3/12 Staff Evaluations are completed
• 3/12 Staff attends Child Development Conference through PCOE
• 5/12 Center participates in a Quality Rating process through the Nevada County Local Planning Council. Two professional raters complete the ECERS tool. Then Staff meets with raters to analyze results.
• 4/12 Staff meeting to review the results of the ECERS
• 4/12 DRDPs are collected and reviewed by Site Supervisor and Preschool Teachers. Summary of findings is completed and plans are made for program improvement for the FY12-13
• 5/12 Parent Conferences are held
• 6/12 Summer Celebration with families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A copy of the Program Self-Evaluation will be/has been presented to the Governing Board.</th>
<th>Date June 13 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A copy of the Program Self-Evaluation will be/has been presented to teaching/program staff.</td>
<td>Date June 1 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A copy of the Program Self-Evaluation will be/has been presented to parents.</td>
<td>Date June 1 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Completion I certify that a Program Self-Evaluation was completed.</td>
<td>Signature Holly Hermansen County Superintendent (530) 478-6400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The form can be expanded and is not limited to a single page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings from Developmental Profiles And Educational Goal (What will be accomplished for children?)</th>
<th>Action Steps (Including materials and training needed, schedule, space and supervision changes)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date and Persons Responsible</th>
<th>Follow-Up and Reflection (Changes made, date completed, time extended)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35% of students are at or below the “building” level for Classification. We would like 65% of our students to be at or above this level</td>
<td>• Find or purchase materials that will be highly engaging for students as they develop classification skills</td>
<td>Morgan, Preschool Staff June 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plan staff development to train teachers how to support the development of this skill</td>
<td>Morgan June 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% of students are at or below the “building” level for Phonemic Awareness. We would like 75% of our students to be at or above</td>
<td>• Plan Staff Development to train teachers how to support children’s emerging Phonemic Awareness</td>
<td>Morgan June 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Compile a library of songs, chants, finger</td>
<td>Morgan, Preschool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this level.</td>
<td>plays and stories that will support Phonemic Awareness development, that teachers can easily access during their curriculum planning.</td>
<td>Staff, Mary Anne Kreshka June 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Contractor's Legal Name**: Nevada County Superintendent of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Number</th>
<th>1029</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract and Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ CSPP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ CCTR – (Infant/Toddler)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ CCTR – (School Age)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Education Network (Infant/Toddler)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Education Network (Preschool)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ CHAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ CMIG - (Infant/Toddler)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ CMIG - (Preschool)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Program Self-Evaluation Completed</th>
<th>May 30 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Classrooms</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Family Child Care Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Describe the Program Self-Evaluation Process**: (Note: This area expands as necessary.)

As a campus-based child development center that partners with PCAC (Head Start/Early HeadStart) and Nevada County Superintendent of Schools, collaboration is a key component to our successful program. But collaboration doesn’t end at the programmatic level. Our staff collaborates with parents regularly on an informal basis, as well as during our Parent Meetings. We also use parent surveys to help us understand what parent’s needs are, and how our program can best meet their needs. Our staff also spends time with parents learning how they can support each child's individual needs. The following is a calendar showing staff trainings, staff meetings, parent meetings, programmatic meetings, and timelines for assessments that were done by our program during the 2011/2012 school year.

- **3/11-4/11** Site Supervisor holds individual parent orientation meetings as families enroll.
- **8/11** Collaborative Leadership Council meeting with representatives from Sierra College (Darlene Jackson, Dean of Human Development), Nevada County Superintendent of Schools (Stanton Miller, Associate Superintendent and Morgan Best, Site Supervisor) and Placer Community Action Council (Annie White, Child Development Specialist). These meetings happen each month.
- **8/11** Staff meets to review our previous annual report and to plan for further development of the environment and curriculum.
- **9/11** Parent meetings begin and are held each month.
- **10/11** Sixty day DRDPs are completed, parent conferences are held.
- **10/11** Staff attends Program for Infant Toddler Care (PITC) training.
- **12/11** Staff attends Program for Infant Toddler Care (PITC) training.
- **1/12** Staff attends Program for Infant Toddler Care (PITC) training.
- **3/12** Staff attends Program for Infant Toddler Care (PITC) training.
- **3/12** Second round of DRDPs are complete and parent conferences are scheduled.
- **4/12** Parent surveys are distributed, analyzed by staff and plans are made for program improvements based on the results.
- 4/12 Enrollment for new toddlers begins, and individual parent enrollment meetings are held with the Site Supervisor
- 5/12 Staff attends Program for Infant Toddler Care (PITC) training
- 5/12 ITERs (environment rating scale) is completed and reviewed by staff. Plans are made for improvements to the program based on the results
- 6/12 End of the year events are planned

| A copy of the Program Self-Evaluation will be has been presented to the Governing Board. | Date June 13 2012 |
| A copy of the Program Self-Evaluation will be has been presented to teaching/program staff. | Date June 1 2012 |
| A copy of the Program Self-Evaluation will be has been presented to parents. | Date June 1 2012 |

Statement of Completion
I certify that a Program Self-Evaluation was completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holly Hermansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(530) 478-6400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date  June 1 2012
## Desired Results Developmental Profile Summary of Findings
### And Program Action Plan – Program or Network Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor Name</th>
<th>Nevada County Superintendent of School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Type, Education Network, and/or Cal-SAFE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Age Group (Infant/Toddler, Preschool, School-Age)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTR</td>
<td>Toddler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Date</strong></td>
<td>August 26 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Planner's Name and Position</strong></td>
<td>Shelly Cruddas, Kirsten Pressel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-up Date(s)</strong></td>
<td>January 28 2012, May 18 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Planner's Name and Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This form can be expanded and is not limited to a single page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Key Findings from Developmental Profiles and Educational Goal</strong></th>
<th><strong>(What will be accomplished for children?)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Action Steps (Including materials and training needed, schedule, space and supervision changes)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Expected Completion Date and Persons Responsible</strong></th>
<th><strong>Follow-Up and Reflection (Changes made, date completed, time extended)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45% of students are at or below the &quot;acting with purpose&quot; level for Classification and matching. We would like 75% of our students to be at or above this level</td>
<td>Find or purchase materials that will be highly engaging for students as they develop classification skills</td>
<td>Morgan, Toddler Staff</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan staff development to train teachers how to support the development of this skill</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% of students are at or below the &quot;acting with purpose&quot; level. We would like 75% of our students to be at or above this</td>
<td>Plan home visits and parent conferences earlier in the year, and as needed throughout the year so that parents and teachers can work together to help</td>
<td>Morgan, Toddler Staff</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level</td>
<td>students gain impulse control skills</td>
<td>Morgan, Toddler Staff, Gail Sullivan (Second Step Coordinator)</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduce &quot;Second Step&quot; curriculum to support students as they develop skills in the social/emotional area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nevada County Superintendent of Schools  
112 Nevada City Highway  
Nevada City, CA 95959

Quarterly Report on Williams Uniform Complaints  
(Education Code 35186(d))

Person completing this form: Holly Hermansen

Title: Superintendent

Quarterly Report Submission Date:
- [ ] January 2012 (for October-December 2011)
- [ ] April 2012 (for January-March 2012)
- [x] July 2012 (for April-June 2012)
- [ ] October 2012 (for July-September 2012)

Date for information to be reported publicly at governing board meeting: July 11, 2012

[ ] No Complaints were filed with any school in the county programs during the quarter indicated above.

[ ] Complaints were filed with schools in the county programs during the quarter indicated above. The following chart summarizes the nature and resolution of these complaints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Subject Area</th>
<th>Total # of Complaints</th>
<th># Resolved</th>
<th># Unresolved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks and Instructional Materials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Vacancy or Misassignment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Conditions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Holly Hermansen

Print Name of County Superintendent

Signature of County Superintendent
ADMINISTRATION

Conflict of Interest

The Superintendent and the County Board shall adopt and promulgate Conflict of Interest Codes in compliance with the Political Reform Act, Government Code section 81000, et seq. The Fair Political Practices Commission has adopted a standard set of regulations which contains the terms of the Conflict of Interest Code. (CCR, Title 2, Sec. 18730)

The standard regulations, enumerated in California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Sec. 18730, are hereby incorporated by reference. The County Board, Superintendent, and designated employees shall abide by the terms of the standard regulation. Statements of economic interests shall be filed with the Nevada County Board of Supervisors and County Board, pursuant to Section 4 of the standard regulations. Copies of the standard regulations can be obtained from the Office of the Superintendent.

DESIGNATED POSITIONS:
Members, County Board of Education
County Superintendent
County Associate Superintendent of Business Services
Los Angeles Educational Corp Charter Schools Executive Director
Members, Los Angeles Educational Corp Charter Schools Board of Trustees
Muir Charter Schools Executive Director
Members, Muir Charter Schools Board of Trustees
Consultant(s)

All employees described in the section above, DESIGNATED POSITIONS, shall file with the Nevada County Superintendent of Schools Office.

REQUIRED DISCLOSURE Government Code §§ 87100, et seq.
Governing Board members and designated employees assigned to this category must report:

a. Interests in real property which are located in whole or in part:
   1. within the boundaries of the District
   2. within two miles of the boundaries of the District, or
   3. within two miles of any land owned or used by the District, including any leasehold, beneficial or ownership interest or option to acquire such interest in real property.

b. Investments in business entities or income from sources which engage in the acquisition of real property within the jurisdiction.

c. Investments in business entities or income from sources which:
   1. are contractors or subcontractors engaged in the performance of work or services of the type utilized by the District, or
2. which manufacture or sell supplies, books, machinery or equipment of
the type utilized by the employee’s department. For the purposes of this
category a principal’s department is the entire school.

CONSULTANTS
Consultants shall be included in the list of designated employees and shall disclose pursuant to
the broadest disclosure category in the code subject to the following limitation: The
Superintendent may determine in writing that a particular consultant, although a “designated
position”, is hired to perform a range of duties that is limited in scope and thus is not required to
fully comply with the disclosure requirements in this section. Such written determination shall
include a description of the consultant’s duties and, based upon that description, a statement of
the extent of disclosure requirements. The Superintendent’s determination is a public record and
shall be retained for public inspection in the same manner and location as this conflict of interest
code.

California Code of Regulations Sections - 18701(a) and 18701(a)(2)
FPPC Regulation - 18730

Adopted by the NCSoS Board of Education: 12/10/03, 4/5/06, 7/12/06, 10/11/06, 11/8/06, 3/14/07, 9/10/08
Reviewed by the NCSoS Board of Education: 7/14/10
Approved by the Nevada County Board of Supervisors 4/24/07, 10/28/08
Save on Fall Conference - register now

Samie White

From: ctuter@csba.org
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2012 3:55 PM
To: Samie White
Subject: Save on Fall Conference - register now

Having trouble viewing this mailing? Click here to view the web version.
To ensure receipt of this mailing, please add csba@csba.org to your address book.

June 29, 2012

This email is being sent to all CCBE board members and executive assistants.

Register for the CCBE Fall Conference
Save $50 before July 13

Save $50 when you register for the 2012 CCBE Fall Conference by July 13. Save an additional $40 when register for both the conference and pre-conference governance workshop by entering the promotional code CCBEDISC. Register online, or download a registration form on our website.

The CCBE Fall Conference, held this Sept. 14-16, provides valuable resources and information specific to board members' unique role and responsibilities. County board members and superintendents are encouraged to attend CCBE's annual Fall Conference for a learning opportunity specifically focused on unique issues at the population level pertinent to counties. Join fellow members and get immersed in interesting and relevant topics like school safety and current gang trends, charter school issues relevant to county boards, and trends in education.

You won't want to miss out on the exciting workshops, keynote session speakers, and ample networking opportunities we've lined up for you this year. For a detailed conference schedule, please visit our website.

CCBE provides advocacy, information and support services for county offices of education and ROCS/Ps.

California County Boards of Education
3100 Beacon Blvd, West Sacramento, CA 95691
Phone - 800.266.3382 ext. 3281 | Fax - 916.371.3407
Web Site | Privacy Policy | Send to a friend | Unsubscribe

If you would prefer not to receive emails from us, go here.
Please send any comments about this email to csba@csba.org

7/5/2012
Down But Not Out, Three Pupil Discipline Bills Resurrected in Senate Education

Today, July 3, 2012, the Senate Education Committee performed the rarest of hat tricks by approving three Assembly Bills on the subject of pupil discipline that had, in a previous hearing, failed to garner enough votes for passage.

At the Committee's June 27 hearing, the failed bills—Assembly Bill (AB) 1729 (Ammiano, D-San Francisco), AB 2242 (Dickinson, D-Sacramento) and AB 2537 (V. Manuel Pérez, D-Coachella)—were extended a traditional courtesy of the Committee, an opportunity for reconsideration. Reconsideration means that the bills may be brought before the committee again for a second vote. While most failed bills are routinely granted reconsideration, few actually are brought back to the committee and fewer still are brought back and passed. In this case, though, all three bills were breathed new life as the committee members provided more than enough votes the second time around for the bills to continue on their journey through the legislative process. The bills make the following changes:

- AB 1729 (Ammiano, D-San Francisco) would relax and recast some existing requirements related to pupil suspension and expulsion, providing greater flexibility in responding to disciplinary issues, and would require schools to document the kinds of responses taken
- AB 2242 (Dickinson, D-Sacramento) would prohibit pupils who are found to have disrupted school activities or otherwise willfully defied the authority of school officials from being subject to extended suspension, or recommended for expulsion
- AB 2537 (V. Manuel Pérez, D-Coachella) would grant discretion to school principals to make a determination of the appropriateness of the expulsion of a pupil who has unlawful possession of certain medications or of an imitation firearm, and makes other changes relative to mandatory expulsion provisions. Author's amendments deleted the inclusion of drug possession among the list of discretionary actions that had caused the Committee concern in its initial hearing.

Legislators have introduced a flurry of bills related to pupil suspension and expulsion in response to recent reports on the use of these disciplinary measures among different racial and ethnic groups. This marks both increased interest in monitoring decisions to suspend or expel pupils and a relaxation of the mandatory requirements put into place during the 1990's in response to on-campus violence.

—Michael Ricketts and Michelle McKay Underwood

posted 07/03/2012
Court Battle Ensues For Ballot Positioning

The battle between the two competing education funding initiatives took an interesting turn last week. Attorneys for the Our Children, Our Future (OCOF) personal income tax increase initiative filed a lawsuit in Sacramento Superior Court to prevent Secretary of State Debra Bowen from numbering the propositions that have qualified for the November 2012 General Election ballot.

The Secretary of State had intended to number the qualified initiatives and set the order in which they would appear on the November ballot on Monday, July 2. At a hearing on Friday, June 29, 2012, the judge prohibited the Secretary of State from taking any further action until after a hearing on the issue. That hearing is set for Monday, July 9.

As a matter of practice, initiative measures appear on the ballot in the order in which they qualified. However, the Legislature passed as one of the Budget Trailer Bills, Assembly Bill (AB) 1499 (Chapter 30/2012), which would place initiative constitutional amendments at the top of the ballot, ahead of the nearly dozen other measures. As a Budget Trailer Bill, AB 1499 went into effect immediately upon being signed by Governor Jerry Brown.

Benefiting from AB 1499 would be Governor Brown's temporary sales and personal income tax increase initiative, which would move to the top of the ballot (assuming the Legislature removes the $11 billion water bond as expected). The constitutional amendment would also lock in place the public safety sales tax realignment enacted in the 2011-12 Budget.

At stake is a provision of Proposition 25 that allows legislators to make policy changes that go into effect immediately without the two-thirds vote required for emergency votes. Proposition 25 allows the Legislature to pass the budget bill and any budget trailer bills by a simple majority vote. The lawsuit alleges that AB 1499 is not a trailer bill, and, as a majority-vote bill, should not go into effect until January 1, 2013.

The OCOF lawsuit suggests that the OCOF initiative should have qualified before Governor Brown's initiative. Typically, election officials begin validating initiative petition signatures on a first in, first out basis. However, while the OCOF petitions were turned in a few days before Governor Brown's initiative petitions, the validation of signatures for Governor Brown's measure was completed before those for the OCOF petition. The lawsuit highlights procedural inconsistencies in Alameda and Los Angeles counties in support of their contention.

Ballot order placement is seen as critical for the success of many initiatives as initiative proponents work to stand out from the crowd. This is especially critical when a ballot is crowded and complex, which November's ballot is going to be as a dozen measures (including the initiatives by Governor Brown and OCOF) are slated to be considered by voters.

—Dave Heckler

posted 07/03/2012

State Controller to Appeal Proposition 25 Court Decision

State Controller John Chiang (D) has decided to appeal the controversial court ruling from March stemming from his decision to withhold legislators pay for their failure to pass a balanced Budget by the June 15 constitutional deadline.

The majority-vote spending plan passed by legislators last year had been passed by June 15, 2011. However, Governor Jerry Brown subsequently vetoed the spending plan. In response to Governor Brown's action, Controller Chiang implemented a key provision of Proposition 25, the 2010 initiative that gave legislators the ability to pass a Budget (and the bills necessary to implement it) by a majority vote, and withheld legislators’ pay and per diem until the 2011-12 Budget was adopted, at a cost of about $4,900 per legislator.

Senate pro Tempore Darrell Steinberg (D-Sacramento) and Speaker of the Assembly John Pérez (D-Los Angeles) filed a lawsuit at the beginning of the year to challenge this action and to seek clarification of the law.

In the April court decision, the judge ruled that Controller Chiang did not have the authority to determine whether a Budget plan passed by the Legislature was balanced, and that the role of estimating revenues resides with the Legislature (see "Judge Denies State Controller Authority to Determine if the Legislature Passes a "Real" Budget Pursuant to Proposition 25," in the April 27, 2012, Fiscal Report).

—Dave Heckler

posted 07/03/2012
By the Way . . . State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson Issues Statement on the 2012-13 State Budget

Superintendent Torlakson released the following statement after Governor Jerry Brown signed the 2012-13 State Budget:

Preparing California's young people for the future—all the way from early childhood through high school—will be more difficult under our state's continuing budget problems. As Superintendent, I can sympathize with the difficult decisions faced by the Governor and the Legislature—but, as an educator, I am saddened today. The simple truth is that schools need more revenue if they are going to begin restoring some of what billions of dollars of cuts have already taken from them and from their students.

In the budget passed by the Legislature, early child care funding was cut significantly—and then cut even more with the Governor's line item veto. Two other vetoes that disturbed me were the elimination of both AVID funding and the Early Mental Health Initiative. These are programs that aid our students, prepare them to succeed in school, and then help them graduate ready for careers and college. The final budget also allows districts to cut as many as 30 days of instructional time over the next two years—which amounts to a combined potential loss of the equivalent of one million years of schooling for California's 6.3 million public school kids.

And still, our schools—even in the face of this continuing do-more-with-less approach—have found a way to raise graduation rates this year. To me, that shows they not only need and deserve our support—they have earned it.

posted 07/03/2012
The Second Layoff Window is Now Open

Education Code Section (E.C.) 44955.5 specifies that in any year when the enacted State Budget provides less than a 2% funded cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) for revenue limits, school agencies shall be allowed a second chance to lay off certificated employees, if necessary. The period begins five days after the enactment of the State Budget and extends until August 15. For this year, the Budget was signed on June 27, so the second layoff period begins on July 2 and runs through August 15.

In most years when the funded COLA has been less than 2%, and there have been many, either the Budget is passed after August 15 or the Legislature closes the layoff window through a provision in the Budget Act. This year, the Budget was passed on time, and there was no provision to set aside E.C. 44955.5, so the window is indeed open.

Those who have followed our commentary on this topic know that we never advise districts to rely on the second window to lay off certificated staff. We have consistently recommended that you use the normal March-May window to make any staffing adjustments that might be necessary. But the fact that the window is indeed open will allow districts to make further layoffs if necessary to balance tight budgets.

If your district plans to avail itself of this second opportunity, keep in mind that all of the provisions of law regarding certificated layoffs must be followed, albeit in a much more compressed timeframe. We have written extensively on this topic in the past and the links below are to articles referencing the detailed procedures to be followed.


As a commentary, 2012-13 will be the fifth year in a row that Budget cuts from the state have forced local educational agencies to reduce staffing. Five years ago, California had more than 300,000 teachers; we now have fewer than 260,000 and are still moving lower. This is occurring at a time when student achievement in California lags the nation by a wide margin. We cannot compete with states that spend up to twice as much per student, particularly when we continue to have the highest class sizes in the nation.

The fact that we are putting energy into reducing the number of professional teachers at a time when our students need more support than ever is, in our view, counter-productive. The future of our state depends on our ability to restore our reputation as a state with a highly educated population that in turn attracts the business and cultural opportunities that follow education. There are some things that are legal, and even necessary in the short term, but that absolutely kill our competitive potential for the future. In our view, the necessity of laying off our professional teachers certainly fits that description.

—Ron Bennett and Suzanne Speck
Ask SSC . . . What is the Status of Transitional Kindergarten in the Final Budget?

Q. Now that the State Budget has been signed by the Governor, what is the status of Transitional Kindergarten (TK)? Is the program required, and will it be funded in 2012-13?

A. The Governor had proposed eliminating the current requirement that TK be offered by school districts. Instead of TK, the Governor proposed trailer bill language that would have authorized school districts, on a case-by-case basis, to admit a student to kindergarten at the beginning of the school year, rather than waiting until the child is five years old, provided the student will turn five at some point during that respective school year. The Governor continued to push for adoption of his proposal through the May Revision, albeit with some modifications. However, in the end, the proposal to eliminate TK was rejected in both houses of the Legislature.

As such, current law, enacted by Senate Bill 1381 (Chapter 705/2010), requires that TK be implemented in the upcoming 2012-13 school year, beginning with the cohort of students that will turn five years old between November 2 and December 2. School districts can include students who have birthdays between September 2 and December 2 if they choose to implement the program for all the students identified in the enabling statute at once, recognizing that there may be districts where this is the best option for reaching a critical mass of students for district needs. The program is not required at every campus. Rather, it is required in every district, and districts have the flexibility to offer it in a way that best meets the circumstances and needs of the district. TK students will be fully funded from the beginning of the school year just like traditional kindergarten students; in the eyes of the state, a kindergarten unit of average daily attendance (ADA) and a TK ADA is the same thing, provided the district has enrolled a student that is age eligible.

—Jeff Bell and Michael Ricketts

posted 06/29/2012

http://www.sscal.com/fiscal_print.cfm?contentID=18027

7/5/2012
State Revenues in May Fall $176 Million Short

The Department of Finance (DOF) reports that state General Fund revenues for the month of May 2012 fell $176 million, or 3.2% short of the revised forecast released with the May Revision. Year-to-date revenues are now running $93 million below forecast, with one month remaining in the 2011-12 fiscal year.

The DOF Finance Bulletin contrasts with the State Controller's Office (SCO) report, which concluded that May revenues were $84 million above the May Revision forecast, a swing of $260 million. We have pointed out that the State Budget is based on the DOF revenue and expenditure forecasts, and that the SCO's method of counting state revenues is not consistent with the DOF's; therefore, the SCO's monthly revenue reports should be read with a grain of salt.

The Finance Bulletin notes that of the three major taxes, the personal income tax was ahead of the forecast, bringing in an additional $53 million and the other minor taxes provided $180 million in unexpected revenues. However, these gains were offset by shortfalls in the sales and use tax (-$109 million) and the corporation tax (-$300 million).

However, much of the May shortfall in the corporation tax was related to higher-than-expected one-time refunds, rather than an ongoing shortfall in collections.

On the economic front, the Finance Bulletin highlighted a positive jobs report for May, with the state adding 33,900 payroll jobs. In addition, the April jobs report was revised upward from a loss of 4,200 jobs to a gain of 1,300 jobs. Over the last five months, private sector employment has grown 1.9% from the same period in 2011, compared to losses in government employment of 1.8%.

The state's unemployment rate dropped slightly in May to 10.8%, but still remains the third highest rate in the nation.

Finally, the DOF reports that California's real estate market may be turning the corner, with May showing the third consecutive month of rising home prices. The median price for an existing home rose above $300,000 for the first time since October 2010.

---Robert Miyashiro

posted 06/28/2012
California Forward Budget Reform Proposal Qualifies for November Ballot

Just two days ahead of the June 28, 2012, deadline, the final proposal qualified for the November 2012 general election ballot. Sponsored by California Forward, the Government Performance Accountability Act (GPAA) would amend the State Constitution to provide for greater accountability and transparency, as well as amend the State Budget development process to allow for a more long-term approach to managing the state’s finances.

Specifically, the GPAA would change the State Budget process in the following ways:

- Create a two-year Budget cycle, with three- and five-year forecasts
- Require any new or increased expenditures greater than $25 million to be offset by spending reductions or an identified revenue source
- Establish performance-based reviews for all state agencies

Additionally, to prevent the infamous last minute “Cuts and Amends,” where legislation is amended with little notice or opportunity for public input (such as last year’s Assembly Bill 114 or most of this year’s Budget trailer bills), the GPAA would prohibit the Legislature from voting on any bills unless they have been in print for at least three days.

California Forward is a nonpartisan group of former elected officials and business leaders who are dedicated to bringing reforms to many of the structural problems facing California.

— Dave Heckler

posted 06/28/2012
Teacher Dismissal Reform Bill Held in Committee, Finance Reform Commission Bill Moves Forward

After a long day passing nearly two dozen State Budget trailer bills, both Senate and Assembly Education Committees held hearings into the evening, with more than 50 bills between the two agendas. Policy committees have until Friday, July 6, 2012, to act on bills that are in their second house.

The hottest topic in the Assembly Education Committee was Senate Bill (SB) 1530 (Padilla, D-Pacoima), which would modify certificated employee suspension and dismissal procedures for certain offenses, including sexual misconduct, controlled substance offenses, and specified penal code offenses, including child abuse and neglect. Led by the Los Angeles Unified School District and supported by other districts and several statewide management associations, the proponents of SB 1530 argued that the bill struck a balance of expediting the dismissal process in the most serious cases while maintaining due process for certificated employees. Opponents, led by the California Teachers Association and joined by several other labor associations, argued that the bill erodes due process, creates a duplicative process for a small number of cases, and that current law works when applied correctly.

SB 1530 failed to get sufficient votes to pass out of the Assembly Education Committee, with Committee Chair Julia Brownley and Republicans in support and the remaining Democrats voting against the bill or abstaining.

In the Senate, four bills introduced this year that would change how pupil suspensions and expulsions are handled took center stage. Only one of the four bills was approved by the Senate Education Committee, Assembly Bill (AB) 2145 (Alejo, D-Salinas). AB 2145 requires expulsion and suspension data to be disaggregated by certain pupil subgroups and made available on the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS). Three related bills—AB 1729 (Ammiano, D-San Francisco), AB 2242 (Dickinson, D-Sacramento), and AB 2537 (V. Manuel Pérez, D-Coachella)—failed passage. The Assembly Education Committee passed SB 1235 (Steinberg, D-Sacramento), which would establish district targets and specific interventions to reduce pupil suspensions.

The Senate Committee also passed AB 18 (Brownley, D-Santa Monica), with support from a variety of statewide education organizations. The bill was recently amended to call for a California School Finance Commission, which would review and analyze alternative formulas for allocating funds to public schools in California. The new Commission would be tasked with recommending a school finance formula or formulas that best meet the needs of California's public school system and students.

In presenting her bill, Assembly Education Chair Julia Brownley acknowledged the leadership of Governor Jerry Brown in bringing forward his weighted student funding proposal, and emphasized that her bill is meant to carry the momentum for school finance reform forward so substantive changes to the way the state funds schools can be made next year. The Commission established by the bill would be required to report its findings to the Legislature by February 1, 2013.

Following are other Senate and Assembly Bills from our Critical Bills report that were passed by the Education Committees (for further information on these bills, see the latest edition of Critical Bills):

Senate Bills
• SB 1088 (Price, D-Los Angeles): Student Readmission—would require, if requested, a second review for a student who has been expelled and denied readmission
• SB 1290 (Alquist, D-Santa Clara): Charter School Establishment, Renewal, and Revocation—would require that charter school petitions include outcomes that address pupil academic achievement schoolwide as well as groups served by the charter school
• SB 1404 (Hancock, D-Berkeley): Civic Center Act—would expand the definition of direct costs that can be charged to an organization that uses school facilities
• SB 1458 (Steinberg, D-Sacramento): School Accountability—would make several changes to the state’s Academic Performance Index
• SB 1509 (Simitian, D-Palo Alto): School Facility Design-Build Contracts—would delete the sunset data authorizing school districts or community colleges to enter into design-build contracts

Assembly Bills

• AB 644 (Blumenfield, D-Van Nuys): Online Education—would allow school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools that offer synchronous online courses to claim attendance toward average daily attendance
• AB 1246 (Brownley, D-Santa Monica): Instructional Materials—would streamline and broaden the state adoption process for K-8 instructional materials by providing for State Board of Education (SBE) review and approval of instructional materials submitted by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI), publishers, and school districts
• AB 1565 (Fuentes, D-Los Angeles): Public Contract Bidding Requirements—would require that the standardized questionnaire and the uniform rating system used to evaluate bidders meet specific guidelines as developed by the Department of Industrial Relations
• AB 1575 (Lara, D-South Gate): Pupil Fees—would prohibit a pupil enrolled in a public school from being required to pay a pupil fee for participation in any educational activity, and would require school districts to use the uniform complaint process to identify and refund illegally charged fees
• AB 1594 (Eng, D-Monterey Park): Charter Schools Pupil Nutrition—would require that a charter school provide at least one nutritionally adequate free and reduced-price meal during the school day
• AB 2001 (Bonilla, D-Martinez): Pupil Assessment—would require the SPI to develop and present to the SBE recommendations to reform the statewide pupil assessment program for grades 7 through 12, and requires the SBE to adopt reforms by September 30, 2013
• AB 2362 (Conway, R-Visalia): Necessary Small High School Funding—would extend the provisions of current law that allow counts of grade 7 and 8 instructors and pupils to be included in the necessary small high school calculation, and would state the intent of the Legislature that the SPI recommend revisions to the formula for funding necessary small schools

—Michelle McKay Underwood and Michael Ricketts

posted 06/28/2012
Reduction in Instructional Days Expands if Trigger is Pulled

The new Education Budget Bill, Assembly Bill 1476 (Assembly Budget Committee), will allow school districts to reduce the number of instructional days by 15 days in each of the next two fiscal years if voters reject Governor Jerry Brown's tax initiative on the November 2012 election. In his May Revision, Governor Brown proposed allowing districts to cut a maximum of 15 instructional days total across the next two fiscal years if the tax initiative fails. This latest change in the Education Budget Bill would allow districts to reduce the instructional days down to 160 days in both 2012-13 and 2013-14. That is 20 days below the once standard 180 days, which fell to 175 days in post-recession budget cuts.

The school-day reduction would still be subject to collective bargaining between school districts and labor unions.

—John Gray and Sheila Vickers

posted 06/25/2012
Midyear Trigger Cut Grows as Part of Budget Deal

The Governor and Democratic leadership in the Legislature announced agreement on a final framework for the 2012-13 State Budget last week as the work of drafting trailer bills to implement that framework shifted into high gear. Those bills were heard by the Senate Budget Committee last night (June 25, 2012), and the Education Trailer Bill—Assembly Bill (AB) 1476—including imposition of a midyear "trigger" cut totaling $2.74 billion to school revenue limits, in the event that the tax increases in the Governor's November Budget initiative are not approved by voters.

This contingent cut translates into an average of $457.47 per unit of average daily attendance (ADA), or more than a $16 per-ADA increase over the $441 per-ADA reduction by the Department of Finance as part of the Governor's May Revision. Education advocates are working today to clarify the Budget adjustments that have caused the midyear contingency cut to grow. Although we don't have final data on the companion reduction for community colleges, they have typically shared in changes to both cross-year deferral buybacks and trigger cuts.

The amount of the proposed midyear trigger for K-14 education has varied since the introduction of the Governor's Budget in January, beginning at $370 per ADA and growing to an estimated high of $455 per ADA during the spring. The trigger cut has been viewed as the balancer among changes in the cost of program spending tagged as Proposition 98, deferral buybacks, and the estimated proceeds from the Governor's tax initiative.

AB 1476 includes other provisions that affect education programs, and we will provide additional information on those changes in subsequent Fiscal Report articles. The trailer bills for the 2012-13 State Budget will next be heard on the floor of the Senate and then transmitted to the Assembly for concurrence. Action on the State Budget is expected to be completed this week.

—Michael Ricketts

posted 06/26/2012

http://www.sscal.com/fiscal_print.cfm?contentID=18006