AGENDA

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 Board member 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 Special meeting of June 12, 2014 (page 1)
B. Approval of minutes of the Regular meeting of June 18, 2014 (page 5)
C. Approval of Consolidated Application – Spring Release (page 15)
D. During the third quarter of 2014 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 37)
E. Annual Report of School Visitations by County Superintendent of Schools Pursuant to Education Code 1240 and the Williams Settlement (page 38)

IX. Staff Reports

A. Alternative Education, Sanford
B. Educational Services, Johns
C. Business Services, Fitting

X. Superintendent’s Report
A. Penn Valley Superintendent Search
B. Upcoming Events: Scholar Day at the Fair – August 6
C. Grand Jury Report on Grass Valley School District Facilities (page 41)

XI. Action Items 45 min.
A. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education approve the Annual review of Board Policy 2710, Conflict of Interest? (page 58)
B. Schedule special Board Meeting for Interdistrict Transfer Appeal July 16
D. Public Records Request – Superintendent Expense Reports (page 65)

XII. Information/Discussion Items 5 min.
A. Budget Review
   1. NCSOS Program Budget Review (page 66)
B. FY2013-14 Annual Report to the Board of Temporary County Certificates (page 69)

XIII. Board Reports 10 min.
A. SARB, Lapierre
B. Legislative, Meeks
C. NCSBA, Michael
D. Charter Liaison, Altieri
E. Individual Board Reports

XIV. Future Agenda Items
A. Assignment Monitoring for School Year 2013-14

XV. Correspondence
A. Fiscal Reports (page 71)

XVI. Adjournment

Next Meeting Date: August 13, 2014, 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: 7/3/2014
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)]
NEVADA COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION  
Special Meeting  
Thursday, June 12, 2014  
2:00 p.m.  
Nevada County Superintendent of Schools  
Fellersen Conference Room  
112 Nevada City Highway, Nevada City, CA 95959

Minutes

I. Meeting called to order by Board President Michael
II. Established quorum
   Bob Altieri   Present
   Jack Meeks   Present
   Tracy Lapierre   Present
   Marianne Slade-Troutman   Present
   Trevor Michael   Present

III. Salute to the flag
IV. Additions to the Agenda – none.
V. Adoption of the Agenda
   On a motion by Slade-Troutman and seconded by Lapierre the Agenda was adopted as presented. Motion passed unanimously.
VI. Opened public forum – Recognition of members of the audience wishing to address the Board –
   Don Bessee, a District 2 property owner, reported that on June 11, 2014, a budget trailer bill is expected to be passed at the State Senate, capping budget reserves. Bessee encouraged the Board to get money into classrooms.
   Slade-Troutman noted there is $4M which needs allocations.
   Jan Collins, a District 4 resident, had questions regarding LCAP and will ask during the agenda item.

VII. Closed public forum
VIII. Public Hearing – Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) (Action)
   A. Opened public hearing to present the 2014-15 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) (EC § 42127(a)(1).  
      Shar Johns defined the LCAP in detail, noting how the money is spent is determined by the schools staff, parents, and community members in a structure that allows input. Under the LCFF, all LEA’s are required to prepare an LCAP using the State Board of Education’s template. The LCAP plan helps to control and monitor what happens to funds allocated under LCFF.
Michael further explained that the LCAP structure requires each LEA to create a plan that allows the school to set goals in each of (8 areas for districts) 10 areas for COE’s. Within those 10 areas the funding supports the goals.

Jan Collins asked how NCSOS can project a 25% improvement in state and local assessments as the students will not have learned the Common Core methods?

Slade-Troutman questioned using the goals as it states, “All students will improve... how can that be guaranteed? Is there something in place?

Lisa Sanford, Earle Jamieson and Sugarloaf Juvenile Hall Principal, explained the 25% improvement is in actuality a low%; pointing out that this statement indicates 75% of her students could fail and also pointed out that this indicates 25% of students will show improvement. When setting this goal, the majority felt that 25% was a good goal of improvement.

Shar Johns further explained that state testing is only one metric; there are several formative and summative tests built in that are not state testing. This may be a hefty goal; they want to set the standards high; the students will rise to meet them. This is stating that 25% will improve.

Nancy Pierce questioned the survey process and the number of parent stakeholders involved in the meetings listed.

Sanford advised that all parents received the survey; and between 80-100% were returned. Students filled out confidentially; staff, community members, outside community also completed surveys.

Johns thanked the public for questions and advised that input was also solicited at a meeting comprised of mental and behavioral health; probation; law enforcement; and school district superintendents, all of whom are stakeholders within the alternative ed. population. The LCAP is intended to be a three year document; however can be updated annually.

Slade-Troutman noted controversy over CCSS; that states have pulled out. A gradual implementation starting with kindergarten would’ve been nice, as kindergartners do not have prior learning.

Don Bessee asked for clarification in interpreting current API against new test results.

Supt. Hermansen and Johns advised it is unknown at this time; the State Board of Education has not released any information on this. However, NCSOS has local assessments which are critical, enabling a way to see how students are performing.

Slade-Troutman asked if a parent is allowed to reject CCSS. Supt. Hermansen advised that parents have the right to opt out of assessment; not instruction.

B. Closed Public Hearing

IX. Public Hearing – NCSOS Budget  (Action)

A. Opened hearing to receive public comment on the 2014-15 Proposed Consolidated Budget of the 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 County School Facilities Fund (page 22).

Don Bessee questioned why is NCSOS sitting on so much cash; and would like to see a break out of line items. While Bessee understands historical reasoning for not providing a
line item budget, for transparency purposes there should be a report for the public so they can see what is happening with the money that is there.

The Board President Michael responded.

The accrual basis is the standard report for the public. Cash reports aren’t run on a regular basis. The NCBOE has been operating in a prudent manor over an extended period of time since 2007. In doing so, NCSOS had cash on hand to loan to our school districts. Just recently, NCSOS is in a position where they are no longer having to do short term loans. Funding is accrual basis only, no cash. Michael advised we are typically at least 10% behind in funding and was up to 43% at one time per Fitting.

Eddie Garcia asked if a balance sheet was available. The appearance of the budget is one aspect; knowing what funds are needed for is just as important.

Michael advised that he has been working with the business office over the past several months to generate reports from the operational aspects first, and then a balance sheet.

Slade-Troutman asked how much money was loaned to the charters and school districts. Fitting replied approximately $250k total; and those loans were paid back.

Fran Freedle is concerned that the Board is not being informed of what transactions have taken place. Every public body has a monthly statement to be able to monitor fiscally.

Michael advised we operate from a budget……cash on hand of accrual balances. We also review those on a regular quarterly basis.

Fitting responded that NCSOS went through 6 years of fiscal crisis. The state had significant issues with cash flow; which was passed onto our office. School districts were receiving deferrals; but were required to make payroll. The state of finances was tragic and devastating. NCSOS’s fiscal and responsible management has maintained great reserves; and fortunately, did not have to draw on it. Will we have another recession in 3 years? We are not out of this yet and have several years of understanding CCF, LCFF and where the State is going.

Michael noted Fitting’s point, during the height of the storm, we weathered. Now it’s noticed NCSOS has accumulated funds, however we still need to operate in a prudent and conservative manner as this is the history of this Board.

Nancy Pierce would like to see a reasonable amount in reserves for our school districts, noting that $3.9M is a high reserve.

Supt. Hermansen appreciates the public input; noting that Michael has been working hard to bring budget discussion to every board meeting. Board agenda packets are on the NCSOS website. Michael will work with staff to insure that the quarterly financials are on the NCSOS website.

Slade-Troutman advised that she and Meeks have concerns over the very large reserve and no plans; and feels we should assist the school districts, the kids need programs. NCSOS has money, the school districts don’t. Slade-Troutman resubmitted a plan from November 2013 for the following:

1. Mini-Grants for Teachers: $100,000
2. Safe School Grants to Schools: $100,000
3. After-School and Weekend Grant Programs for Students: $100,000
4. Technology Upgrade Grants for our Schools: $200,000
Slade-Troutman does not support the hiring of the NCSOS Director of Curriculum; nor the Safety & School Climate Coordinator.

Bossee suggested increasing mini-grants; Supt. Hermansen agreed and is very supportive hearing from the public. The Board acknowledged Bossee’s suggestion.

Michael noted there is still economic uncertainty and declining enrollment. It seems that the NCSOS budget has peaked this current fiscal year and we may stay where we are. New legislation should be kept in mind. There could be a significant change in expenses for pensions, benefits, STRS and PERS. If these numbers go up, the total budget trends downwards. The only reversal is if California grows significantly.

Eddie Garcia asked why NCSOS was hiring administrators if there was declining enrollment. Michael responded that none of our school districts has a Safety Coordinator; the districts wanted this. Supt. Hermansen reminded all that the two recent positions filled (Curriculum; and Safety) are not administrators, they have no administrative or oversight responsibilities; they support our school districts. Supt. Hermansen met with each District Superintendent for their input on how NCSOS could support district needs. Curriculum and Safety were high priorities.

Noticing the needs have changed for students in Nevada County and California, a Behavior Specialist position was created. Hiring for this position was held off to better define what the position would look like.

Nancy Pierce asked if the Behavior Specialist would interface with the school psychologist. Supt. Hermansen responded that the Behavioral Specialist could work with the school psychologist and provide services at request of the school.

Jan Collins would like to see the positions as independent contractors; not placed on payroll. She appreciates the openness of the NCBOE meetings.

B. Closed public hearing

X. Future Agenda Items

A. Adoption of the FY2013-14 Third Interim Report


C. Adoption of the Annual Workers’ Compensation Certificate regarding self-insured workers’ compensation claims for FY2014/15.

D. Adoption of LCAP (Local Control and Accountability Plan) FY2014-15

XI. Adjournment

Next Meeting Date: June 18, 2014, 112 Nevada City Highway, Nevada City

Approved: ____________________________ Date: July 18, 2014

Trevor Michael, President
NEVADA COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION
Regular Meeting
Wednesday, June 18, 2014
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 by Board President Michael

II. Established quorum
   Trevor Michael present
   Tracy Lapierre present
   Marianne Slade-Troutman present
   Jack Meeks present
   Bob Altieri present

III. Salute to the flag

IV. Additions to the Agenda -- none.

V. Adoption of the Agenda
   On a motion by Slade-Troutman and seconded by Lapierre, the Agenda was adopted as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

VI. Opened public forum -- Recognition of members of the audience wishing to address the Board:
   Debby Sandoval, Superintendent of PVSD, RSSD and PVUESD expressed her gratitude for support in Nevada County. She has lived here 35 years and is impressed with Supt. Hermansen and staff in their support, especially during the consolidation process. Supt. Hermansen spoke with the district Superintendents of how new funding could be best used to support sites. A school safety position aligned with FEMA and coordinating countywide has been a need that supports all school districts. Larger counties provide support for larger enrollment schools; it’s impressive to see this service added in Nevada County.

   Roxanne Gilpatric, NCSD Superintendent, was unable to attend the NCBOE meeting. Supt. Hermansen provided a letter on behalf of Roxanne Gilpatric, NCSD Supt., who was unable to attend. Board President Michael read the letter into record which stated that NCSD requested the services of both Kathleen Kiefer, Curriculum Director, and Chris Espedal, Safety and School Climate Coordinator throughout the 2013/14 school year and found them to be knowledgeable, helpful and concerned about meeting the needs of our students.

   Eric Fredrickson, GVSD Superintendent, appreciates the efforts of NCSOS in the challenges we face. He has been a community member for 20 years; has been an administrator at BRHS, UHSD and previously at Clovis USD. In previous years, Nevada
County school districts were referred to Sacramento County Office of Education for supports. There is not time to travel, it's frustrating and embarrassing in the past; our county did not lead in curriculum and instruction.

When Supt. Hermansen approached the district superintendents, Fredrickson said he expressed the need for coaches, curriculum and instruction experts and safety coordination. Our schools were starving for this. The choices for these positions were exactly what our community needed.

Fredrickson went on to say he's not here to be politically correct, he wants what's best for the kids and to support teachers. The quality of the professional staff development is incredible, cutting edge and appreciated by teachers. We must provide instructional leadership and safety first.

Fredrickson expressed disappointment with strife on the Board. The superintendent needs to be able to do their job and be proud of the community. As he reads the newspaper he's not proud. As community members we need to work in unison. GVSD's 5 Board members support the superintendent and they are able to do great things at GVSD as a result. Continuity is needed with high expectations for the county board to work together.

Scott Lay, CCSD Superintendent, was unable to attend the NCBOE board meeting. A letter of support read into record stated the Curriculum Director and Safety Coordinator positions are valuable for staff and students; and are critical in a small rural county.

Don Bessee would like a line item budget made available to the public; have it made available on-line; and in a consistent format month to month.

Jan Collins reiterates Bessee’s statement - a consistent format for novices so as not to misinterpret.

VII. Closed public forum

VIII. Opened Public Hearing

A public hearing will be conducted for the purpose of receiving public comment and input regarding the initial proposal to the Nevada County Superintendent of Schools from the Nevada County Special Educators Group (NCSEG), and the response and initial proposal from the Nevada County Superintendent of Schools. (page 1)

A. Initial Proposal to the Nevada County Superintendent of Schools from the Nevada County Special Educators Group (NCSEG) for 2014-15 (page 2)

B. Response to the Initial Proposal from NCSEG and Initial Proposal from the Nevada County Superintendent of Schools for 2014-15 (page 3)

Supt. Hermansen offered corrections to pages 1 and 3 of the Public Hearing and the Reopener Proposal, striking Item #2, Article 19, Child Rearing Leave.

No public comments made.

IX. Closed Public Hearing

X. Opened Public Hearing

A public hearing will be conducted for the purpose of receiving public comment and input regarding the initial proposal to the Nevada County Superintendent of Schools from the Nevada County Teaching Assistants (NCTA), and the response and initial proposal from the Nevada County Superintendent of Schools. (page 4)
A. Initial Proposal to the Nevada County Superintendent of Schools from the Nevada County Teaching Assistants (NCTA) for 2014-15 (page 5)

B. Response to the Initial Proposal from NCTA and Initial Proposal from the Nevada County Superintendent of Schools for 2014-15 (page 6)

No public comments made.

XI. **Closed Public Hearing**

XII. **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 Board member 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 May 14, 2014 (page 7)

B. Approval of FY2013-14 Program Self-Evaluation, CSPP (Sierra College Preschool Program) (page 13)

C. Approval of FY2013-14 Program Self-Evaluation, CCTR (Sierra College Toddler Program) (page 21)

On a motion by Slade-Troutman and seconded by Lapierre, the Consent Agenda was adopted as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

XIII. **Staff Reports**

A. Alternative Education, Sanford

Sanford reported current enrollment and attendance data. Our school districts do a great job with kids in 7th & 8th grade given that they have gone through every process possible before getting to EJ. Suspension figures were 119 in the 2012/13 year, as opposed to 50 in the 2013/14 school year. Bad behavior is down due to alternative measures, including non-violent crisis intervention training for staff in how to handle students. The training is therapeutic, gets to the heart of problems; and gets the students to want to come to school. Activities last month included digital storytelling in which students produced personal video projects; and the Wildlife Rehab & Release.

Summer school has started. 7 students enrolled; 5 attending with 2 unable to attend for different reasons. Students are working hard for credit recovery. Snacks and bus passes are provided.

Supt. Hermansen noted the incredible job Sanford and staff is doing. In only 2 years they have created an amazing and successful program.

B. Educational Services, Johns

Johns is wrapping up the school year working with district superintendents. A monthly newsletter was sent to the site principals providing descriptions of summer workshops. 8 coaches will model for teachers who will be able to implement what they’ve learned this year. They are working with site principals, catering to the school sites.

C. Business Services, Fitting

Business office is busy closing out the year; more during budget report.

XIV. **Superintendent’s Report**
A. Penn Valley Superintendent Search
NCSOS is assisting with the new district Superintendent search. The first round of interviews were held and, while there were a couple applicants that they were interested in, the board felt they wanted to solicit more applicants. The second round is scheduled for July 10th as they continue to find the perfect replacement. Debby Sandoval has agreed to stay on as interim Superintendent.

XV. Action Items

A. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education Approve Resolution 14-06, Certification of the FY 2013-14 Third Interim Fiscal Report, referring to column D final approved budget? (page 29) ROLL CALL VOTE

On a motion by Altieri and seconded by Lapierre, the Nevada County Board of Education Approved Resolution 14-06, Certification of the FY 2013-14 Third Interim Fiscal Report, referring to column D final approved budget as presented. On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

B. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education adopt Resolution 14-04, Blanket Transfer Resolution to the FY2013-14 budget? (page 30) ROLL CALL VOTE

Fitting answered questions and noted this is an annual resolution giving authority to close the books.

On a motion by Lapierre and seconded by Altieri, the Nevada County Board of Education adopted Resolution 14-04, Blanket Transfer Resolution to the FY2013-14 budget. On a roll call vote, the motion massed unanimously.

C. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education approve Resolution 14-08, Temporary Transfer Agreement (Short Term Borrowing Agreement) between the County, Districts and Charters? (page 31) ROLL CALL VOTE

On a motion by Slade-Troutman and seconded by Altieri, the Nevada County Board of Education adopted Resolution 14-04, Blanket Transfer Resolution to the FY2013-14 budget. On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

D. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education Approve the 2014-15 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP)? (page 33)

The public hearing held last week brought out a lively discussion with public. No changes were made and staff recommends approval.

On a motion by Slade-Troutman and seconded by Lapierre, the Nevada County Board of Education adopted Resolution 14-04, Blanket Transfer Resolution to the FY2013-14 budget. On a roll call vote, the motion massed unanimously.

E. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education Approve Resolution 14-09, Education Protection Account? (page 62) ROLL CALL VOTE

Fitting advised as a result of the passage of Prop 30 this identifies how funds have been expended and then reports to the State. No new resources were added; the funds prevented further cuts. As noted in the footnote of the document, County Offices record the expenditures of funds differently than school districts as nearly all responsibilities are administrative in nature.
Meeks noted no funds are for instruction, student services or school districts; $253k goes for general administration. You can do a lot with this funding without telling where the money goes. They could stand to have more extracurricular activities. Meeks defined the fund as a slush fund. What about mini-grants, technology and after school activities?

Michael responded that our county office educates only a small number of students, about 40. The school is funded, provisions are made for activities and updates are made monthly by Sanford. The Board has spent hours reviewing how additional funds have been used.

Supt. Hermansen responded that there may be a misunderstanding, this is an accounting function. Services that come under a COE are just this, supporting our school districts is our function; payroll, business services, the administrative designation here refers to county office responsibilities not administrators.

Bessee suggested amending page 65 and put the money into mini-grants.

Slade-Troutman questioned why administration overhead and wants to specify what we will do with it. This is a loophole to put money into the general fund. Tax payers didn’t vote to see money go into general administration.

Altieri noted this is an issue between what a school district is and what a County Office of Ed is; 40 students opposed to 13,000 students.

On a motion by Altieri and seconded by Lapierre, the Nevada County Board of Education Approved Resolution 14-09, Education Protection Account. On a roll call vote, the motion passed (3-2) (Ayes – Altieri, Lapierre and Michael; Nays-Meeks and Slade-Troutman.)

F. Adoption of FY2014-15 budget
   A. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education approve the 2014-15 Proposed Consolidated Budget of the 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 County School Facilities Fund? (EC 1620, EC 1622, EC 33129) (page 66)

Slade-Troutman questioned if salary increases were included in the budget.
Supt. Hermansen replied yes, 4% to staff. Slade-Troutman is opposed to include a salary increase for the Curriculum Director and the Safety Coordinator; but approves of those who have had no raise in the past 7 years.

Fitting led the Board through a powerpoint presentation which included an overview of the State Budget Summary; COE Funding Formula; NCSOS 2014/15 Budget Assumptions; Opportunities/Risks and Closing Remarks.

Slade-Troutman agrees to set aside money for uncertainties, but use other monies for what it was intended for, local funding formula.

Fitting reminded the board of the last 6 years, our school districts suffered at the expense of the state. NCSOS came out of it because of the importance placed on reserves. When the State poses mid-year cuts, we have to have a provision to see our way out of difficult times. When PERS & STRS goes up it will be hard to buffer that. School agencies pulled through the fiscal crisis due to boards and administrators being conservative.
The only change in the draft from the budget presented at the previous board meeting is that charter business services charges were reduced.

Local charters, Forest, YRC, NCSA are stable; growing enrollment, strong fund balance, adequate cash flow and are in a good financial position. YRC is facing a construction project and will have a new director. SMA and Bitney struggle with small size and cash concerns. TRHS has concerns; revenue is over projected; expenses understated; and there is a cash concern update since budget. A serious case of fraud has been reported; charges have been filed; law enforcement is investigating; the business manager was released and we are not at liberty to discuss details as the investigation continues. NCSOS will bring a report to the board at the next meeting.

Jaynie Aiden, TRHS Director, spoke stating that she noticed something was not making sense with the charter school financials. Aiden assured the Board that if ever there was a concern she is confident this is the reason they weren’t flourishing. They are working closely with the board, parents, the school community and teachers. All are working together to get through next year. The school opened 34 years ago and they want it to continue. They ended the year with 103 enrolled. Next year’s enrollment includes a significant increase in kindergartners.

Fitting assured the Board that proper controls would be put into place with a system of checks and balances to ensure this would not happen again. NCSOS Staff will bring a report to the next meeting.

Meeks questioned where the salary increases were listed; Michael attempted to explain; Meeks yelled, "Stop trying to shut me up." Meeks referred to page 67, total Fund column F there is no breakdown in the budget, no line item for indication for anything. The budget is obscure and obfuscated.

Bessiee stated that best practices would include footnotes. For transparency a line item budget is understood; it is impossible to audit the budget without.

Lapierre asked about the formatting. Fitting responded this is the State approved format.

Slade-Troutman stated she could not vote yes for the consolidated budget which is hard to read and hard to understand.

Lapierre asked if the format changed from 2012/13. Fitting responded it did not change.

Ann Driver, asked what was going to happen to the districts that have been prudent and saved money? Fitting replied it is not yet defined. A piece of the trailer bill will be tied to a rainy day fund, going to the voters in November.

Jan Collins also asked if footnotes could be added. Fitting replied yes if it is the will of the Board and the Superintendent.

Bessiee asked if there was a line item budget that matches up with the consolidated budget; and could he have a copy. Fitting replied yes there is; Supt. Hermansen advised Bessiee we will have one available, to come into the office for a copy.

Michael noted the differences from last year and this year. Fitting provided a 2014/15 Proposed Budget for Management Priorities.
Supt. Hermansen clarified that the Board would like full implementation for a Multi-Site County Summer School Program for the 2014/15 school year; noting this is exciting, however challenging. The budget here does not reflect full implementation.

Johns surveyed principals for input on which students to target. A K-5 program at 3 different areas was created. The 4 week program with sites in South County; Nevada Union; and Penn Valley. The focus would be on math and literacy intervention. Staffing would include teachers, counselors and a coordinator.

Currently there is a district interested in opening an outdoor ed program. We may be able to partner with them, having the coordinator oversee both programs.

Grade 6-8 was discussed; it would have a very different look. Supt. Hermansen suggested focusing on the K-5 and looking into a future 6-8 program.

RJ Guess, Muir Charter CEO, doesn’t recommend afterschool programs for above grades 6. They tend to be expensive and no one shows up, they have tried without success.

Slade-Troutman would like to have Saturday night open gym. It would give kids something to do, no learning, just fun. Supt. Hermansen will survey the districts regarding this.

Slade-Troutman would also like to see after school and weekend programs and provided the proposal from November 2013 which includes Mini-Grants; Safe School Grants; After-school Grants and Technology Upgrade Grants.

Michael acknowledged Slade-Troutman’s request noting this would be in addition to what we have now.

Slade-Troutman noted the reserve for economic uncertainty stated; undesignated stated 3M and would like to give some of that to bring back programs that were lost.

RJ Guess cautioned spending down as deferrals are still in place, noting that Muir holds 20% in budget reserves for cash flow, while NCSOS holds 8%. It’s dangerous to not hold high reserves. The COE has helped many districts and we’re not out of the dark yet.

Altieri recommended discussing Slade-Troutman’s ideas at 1st Interim. It’s prudent to do research to see if it’s good use for spending. Slade-Troutman is hearing they want it. School is out for the summer, when schools are in the districts can be surveyed.

Nancy Pierce suggests setting aside the funds and have a school district approach us with a proposal for outdoor ed; open gym; recreation person offering arts and crafts. Contract out, no overhead, no additional staff.

Supt. Hermansen replied in past years conversations, the school districts want the COE to run the programs. This would be a county-wide program to include all districts.

Pierce is opposed to summer school. Her kids were homeschooled. Studies have proven if we get the kids outside, their focus is better; attention span is better; kids do better. Her background is in special ed and is a reading specialist.

Michael noted the Board is thinking of spending more money on supplementary education for kids in several formats for the 2014/15 summer. In the context of
today's budget, there is not a consensus in format or structure; we need to determine the amount of money we want to set aside today.

Debby Sandoval, PVSD/RSSD/PVUESD Supt., met with all the district superintendents yesterday and the general consensus was that they loved the coordination handled by the COE for Curriculum & Arts Programs and summer school. Small school districts are stretched and can't do in-district programs. As far as afterschool programs, several have that right now. Sandoval is excited over the opportunity to apply for mini-grants.

Bessee stated $100K for Mini-Grants is still low. Supt. Hermansen stated the plan implementation will have 3 opportunities throughout the year to apply. If after the 1st submission, more funds are being requested, we can add money at 1st Interim.

Technology support for the school districts was discussed. Supt Hermansen stated there have been discussions about NCSOS providing IT Support to districts. Discussion followed regarding hiring an in-house person or contracting out services. Collins, Bessee & Pierce recommend contractors.

Pierce would like funding offered to school districts for school safety infrastructure. Chris Espedal can come and report on what is being done in the schools; and what their needs are.

Michael summed up the funding amendments as follows: $164K for K-5 Summer School program; $100K for Mini-Grants.

After school Programs were tabled; schools will be surveyed and will revisit at 1st interim as needed.

Slade-Troutman would like to amend the budget to give regular staff raises; not new hires. However, she would be willing to support the budget with the changes if the $100k for afterschool programs can be added even if they don't start until next year. Lapiere replied that sounded like extortion. Slade-Troutman wants to be legal. Michael is opposed to singling out staff members.

On a motion by Altieri and seconded by Lapiere, the Nevada County Board of Education approved the 2014-15 Proposed Consolidated Budget of the Nevada County Superintendent of Schools, Nevada County Special Education Services, Nevada County SELPA, Special Education Pass Thru, Nevada County Charter School Cooperative, Child Reserve Fund, and County School Facilities Fund (EC 1620, EC 1622, EC 33129) as amended, adding an additional $195K for designated programs ($144K Summer School; and $50K Mini-grants) On a roll call vote, the motion passed (3-2) (Ayes – Altieri, Lapiere and Michael; Nays- Meeks and Slade-Troutman.)

B. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education adopt Resolution 14-07, to approve the Final Budget for 2014-15 as presented?

Roll Call Vote

Meeks stated the budget is 39 lines, too much pork.

On a motion by Altieri and seconded by Lapiere, the Nevada County Board of Education adopted Resolution 14-07, to approve the Final Budget for 2014-15 as presented. On a roll call vote, the motion passed (3-2) (Ayes – Altieri, Lapiere and Michael; Nays- Meeks and Slade-Troutman.)
H. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education approve the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) for the Nevada County Superintendent of Schools Combined Alternative Educational Programs? (page 173)

On a motion by Slade-Troutman and seconded by Altieri, the Nevada County Board of Education approved the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) for the Nevada County Superintendent of Schools Combined Alternative Educational Programs. All in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

I. Shall the Nevada County Board of Education Approve the Annual Workers’ Compensation Certificate regarding self-insured workers’ compensation claims for FY2014-15? (page 215)

On a motion by Altieri and seconded by Slade-Troutman, the Nevada County Board of Education Approved the Annual Workers’ Compensation Certificate regarding self-insured workers’ compensation claims for FY2014-15. All in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

XVI. Information/Discussion Items

A. Budget Review
   1. NCSOS Program Budget Review (page 216)

XVII. Board Reports - No Reports

A. SARB, Lapierre
B. Legislative, Meeks
C. NCSBA, Michael
D. Charter Liaison, Altieri
E. Individual Board Reports

XVIII. Future Agenda Items

A. Annual review of Board Policy 2710, Conflict of Interest
B. FY2013-14 Annual Report to the Board of Temporary County Certificates

XIX. Correspondence

A. Fiscal Reports and Ed Source articles (page 219)

XX. Adjournment

Next Meeting Date: July 9, 2014, 112 Nevada City Highway, Nevada City

Approved: ____________________________ Date: July 9, 2014

Trevor Michael, President
Current Submissions and Deadlines

Below are data entry forms with upcoming deadlines or are overdue to be certified. All open data collections can be found under Data Entry Forms.

Certified data that is no longer editable can be viewed in the Reports section.

15 Data Collection(s) found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year 2012-13</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title II, Part A Fiscal Year Expenditure Report, 24 Months</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>Certified sharjohns, 6/18/2014 8:07 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year 2013-14</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title I, Part A School Funded Staff Report</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>Certified sharjohns, 6/18/2014 8:08 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I, Part A Parental Involvement Policies</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>Certified sharjohns, 6/18/2014 8:08 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I, Part D Facilities Report</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>Certified sharjohns, 6/18/2014 8:08 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I, Part D Demographics by Program</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>Certified sharjohns, 6/18/2014 8:08 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I, Part D Outcomes</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>Certified sharjohns, 6/18/2014 8:08 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I, Part D Academics Performance</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>Certified sharjohns, 6/18/2014 8:13 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II, Part A School Class Size Reduction Report</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>Certified sharjohns, 6/18/2014 8:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II, Part A Fiscal Year Expenditure Report, 12 Months</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>Certified sharjohns, 6/18/2014 8:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Education Policy, Requirements and Implementation</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>Certified sharjohns, 6/18/2014 8:09 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year 2014-15</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Prayer Certification</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>Certified sharjohns, 6/18/2014 8:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for Funding</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>Certified sharjohns, 6/18/2014 8:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Student Counts, Projected</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>Certified sharjohns, 6/18/2014 8:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I, Part A Planned School Allocations</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>Certified sharjohns, 6/18/2014 8:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute System for Time Accounting</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>Certified sharjohns, 6/18/2014 8:09 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2014-15 Certification of Assurances

Submission of Certification of Assurances is required every fiscal year. A complete list of legal and program assurances for the fiscal year can be found at http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/co/ca14assstcc.asp

CDE Program Contact:
Anne Daniels, Education Data Office, adaniels@cde.ca.gov, 916-319-0840

LEA Plan

An LEA that receives Title III funds, or any LEA that receives Title I funds and is in Program Improvement corrective action must certify that its LEA Plan, including any Addenda to the Plan, is current and provide the local online web address for their LEA Plan. An LEA that receives Title III funds and is in Title III Improvement status must post their Improvement Plan in the California Accountability and Improvement System (CAIS) at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ca/.

| State Board of Education approval date | 3/11/2004 |
| LEA Plan Web page                      | www.nevco.k12.ca.us |

Consolidated Application Certification Statement

I hereby certify that all of the applicable state and federal rules and regulations will be observed by this applicant; that to the best of my knowledge the information contained in this application is correct and complete; and I agree to have the use of these funds reviewed and/or audited according to the standards and criteria set forth in the California Department of Education's Categorical Program Monitoring (CPM) Manual. Legal assurances for all programs are accepted as the basic legal condition for the operation of selected projects and programs and copies of assurances are retained on site. I certify that we accept all assurances except for those for which a waiver has been obtained or requested. A copy of all waivers or requests is on file. I certify that actual ink signatures for this page are on file.

| Authorized Representative's Full Name | Shar Johns |
| Authorized Representative's Signature | Shar Johns |
| Authorized Representative's Title     | Associate Superintendent |
| Authorized Representative Signature Date | 08/16/2014 |
2014-15 Protected Prayer Certification

ESEA Section 9524(b) specifies federal requirements regarding constitutionally protected prayer in public elementary and secondary schools. This form meets the annual requirement and provides written certification.

CDE Program Contact:
Franco Rozic, Title I Monitoring & Support, frozic@cde.ca.gov, 916-319-0269
Mary Payne, District Improvement Office, MPayne@cde.ca.gov, 916-319-0379

Protected Prayer Certification Statement

The LEA hereby assures and certifies to the California State Board of Education that the LEA has no policy that prevents, or otherwise denies participation in, constitutionally protected prayer in public schools as set forth in the "Guidance on Constitutionally Protected Prayer in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools."

The LEA hereby assures that this page has been printed and contains an ink signature. The ink signature copy shall be made available to the California Department of Education upon request or as part of an audit, a compliance review, or a complaint investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The authorized representative agrees to the above statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorized Representative's Full Name</td>
<td>Shar Johns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorized Representative Title</td>
<td>Associate Superintendent, Educational Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorized Representative Signature Date</td>
<td>06/02/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>If the LEA is not able to certify at this time an explanation must be provided in the Comment field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Date: 6/18/2014
2014-15 Application for Funding

CDE Program Contact:
Anne Daniels, Education Data Office, adaniels@cde.ca.gov, 916-319-0640

Local Governing Board Approval
The LEA is required to review and receive approval of their Application for Funding selections with their local governing board.

| Date of approval by local governing board | 07/09/2014 |

District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) Review
Per Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations Section 11308, if your district has more than 50 English learners the district must establish a District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC) and involve them in the application for funding for programs that serve English learners.

| DELAC representative's full name | 
| DELAC review date | 
| Meeting minutes web address | 
| Please enter the Web address of DELAC review meeting minutes. If a Web address is not available, the LEA must keep the minutes on file which indicates that the application is approved by the committee. |
| DELAC comment | 
| If an advisory committee refused to review the application, or if DELAC review is not applicable, enter a comment. |
| Due to the limited number of EL students this LEA is not required to have a DELAC |

Application for Categorical Programs
To receive specific categorical funds for a school year the LEA must apply for the fund by selecting Yes. Only the categorical funds the LEA is eligible to receive are displayed.

| Title I Part A (Basic Grant) | Yes |
| ESEA Sec. 1111 et seq. SACS 3010 | |
| Title I Part D (Delinquent) | Yes |
| ESEA Sec. 1401 SACS 3025 | |
| Title II Part A (Teacher Quality) | Yes |
| ESEA Sec. 2101 SACS 4035 | |
| Title III Part A Immigrant | No |
| ESEA Sec. 3102 SACS 4201 | |

Report Date: 6/18/2014
2014-15 Application for Funding

CDE Program Contact:
Anne Daniels, Education Data Office, adaniels@cde.ca.gov, 916-319-0640

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title III Part A LEP</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESEA Sec. 3102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACS 4203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2014-15 Substitute System for Time Accounting

This certification may be used by auditors and by CDE oversight personnel when conducting audits and sub-recipient monitoring of the substitute time-and-effort system. Approval is automatically granted when the LEA submits and certifies this data collection.

CDE Program Contact:
Julie Brucklacher, Financial Accountability & Info Srv, jbruckla@cde.ca.gov, 916-327-0858

The LEA certifies that only eligible employees will participate in the substitute system and that the system used to document employee work schedules includes sufficient controls to ensure that the schedules are accurate. Additional information on the predetermined schedule substitute system of time accounting can be found at http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/ac/co/timeaccounting2013.asp. Detailed information on documenting salaries and wages, including both substitute systems of time accounting, are described in Procedure 905 of the California School Accounting Manual posted on the Web at http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/ac/sa/.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-15 Request for authorization</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA certifies that the following is a full disclosure of any known deficiencies with the substitute system or known challenges with implementing the system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Maximum 500 characters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Date: 6/18/2014
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California Department of Education  
Nevada County Office of Education (29 10298 0000000)  

Consolidated Application  
Status: Certified  
Saved by: Shar Johns  
Date: 6/18/2014 8:09 AM

2014-15 Title I, Part A Planned School Allocations

Based on information provided in the School Student Counts data collection, the table below provides eligibility and ranking information. For school allocation planning, the LEA has indicated which schools it intended to allocate Title I Part A funds to by entering a check in the Fund column.

CDE Program Contact:
Nancy Bodenhausen, Title I Policy & Program Guidance, NBodenhausen@cde.ca.gov, 916-445-4904  
Lana Zhou, Title I Policy & Program Guidance, Lzhou@cde.ca.gov, 916-319-0956

If an exception to funding is needed, enter an Exception Reason. Use lower case only.

Allowable Exception Reasons
a - Meets 35% Low Income Requirement  
c - Funded by Other Allowable Sources  
d - Desegregation Waiver on File  
e - Grandfather Provision  
f - Feeder Pattern  
g - Local Funded Charter Opted Out  
h - Local Funded Charter Opt In

Low income measure: FRPM

Group Schools by Grade Span: Yes

District-wide Low Income %: 51.13%
Grade Span 1 Low Income %: 53.01%
Grade Span 2 Low Income %: 0.00%
Grade Span 3 Low Income %: 49.38%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Grade Span Group</th>
<th>Projected Enrollment</th>
<th>Projected Low Income Students</th>
<th>Low Income %</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Funding Required</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Fund Flag</th>
<th>Exception Reason</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yuba River Charter</td>
<td>0114322</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>56.91</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Ridges Home Study Charter</td>
<td>0126227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54.95</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada City School of the Arts</td>
<td>0114330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>48.99</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Academy</td>
<td>0123539</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch</td>
<td>0116681</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2014-15 Title I, Part A Planned School Allocations

Based on information provided in the School Student Counts data collection, the table below provides eligibility and ranking information. For school allocation planning, the LEA has indicated which schools it intended to allocate Title I Part A funds to by entering a check in the Fund column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Grade Span Group</th>
<th>Projected Enrollment</th>
<th>Projected Low Income Students</th>
<th>Low Income %</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Funding Required</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Fund Flag</th>
<th>Exception Reason</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sugarloaf Mountain, Juvenile Hall Program</td>
<td>0116913</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitney College Preparatory High</td>
<td>0114314</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50.98</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada County Special Education</td>
<td>6077226</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Charter</td>
<td>0126219</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>47.34</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire</td>
<td>0123471</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSOLIDATED APPLICATION AND REPORTING SYSTEM (CARS)
Nevada County Office of Education (29 10298 0000000)

2013-14 Title I, Part A School Funded Staff Report

To collect school level data, as required by ESEA, about teachers and instructional paraprofessionals in Title I, Part A programs.

Required fields are denoted with an asterisk (*).

NOTE: Your LEA has previously certified this data collection as official. One or more other data collection(s) may be dependent on this data collection. Please be aware if a change is saved and certified, it may cause a dependent data collection to become obsolete and your LEA may have to revise and resubmit those data collection(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Authorized SWP</th>
<th>New Title I, Part A Funded Teachers Hired Count</th>
<th>Title I, Part A Funded Administrators Count (0.00)</th>
<th>Title I, Part A Funded FTE Paraprofessionals Count (0.00)</th>
<th>ESEA Qualified FTE Paraprofessionals Count (0.00)</th>
<th>ESEA Qualified FTE Paraprofessionals %</th>
<th>Title I, Part A Funded Support Staff Count (0.00)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edge Academy</td>
<td>0123539</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch</td>
<td>0116681</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugarleaf Mountain, Juvenile Hall Program</td>
<td>0116913</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Download Schools Template | Browse | Upload Schools File

Last Saved: Shar Johns (sharjohns), 6/18/2014 8:08 AM, Certified

Save | Return to List

https://www3.cde.ca.gov/CARS/app/DataCollection/TitleIPartA/SchoolStaffReport_V2.aspx

6/18/2014
CONSORTIUM APPLICATION AND REPORTING SYSTEM (CARS)
Nevada County Office of Education (29 10298 000000)

2013-14 Title I, Part A Parental Involvement Policies

To meet federal requirements specified in ESEA Title I, Part A Section 1116(b) to review the LEAs parental involvement policies and practices to determine if the policies and practices meet the requirements of Section 1116.

Required fields are denoted with an asterisk (*).

NOTE: Your LEA has previously certified this data collection as official. One or more other data collection(s) may be dependent on this data collection. Please be aware that a change is saved and certified, it may cause a dependent data collection to become obsolete and your LEA may have to revise and resubmit those data collection(s).

District Parental Involvement Certification

Each LEA shall develop jointly with, agree on with, and distribute to parents of Title I children, a written Title I parental involvement policy (ESEA Section 1116(a)). The policy describes how the LEA will:

a) Involve parents in the joint development of the LEA Plan and the processes of school review and improvement for program improvement schools under ESEA Section 1116;

b) Help schools to plan and implement effective parental involvement activities to improve student academic achievement and school performance;

c) Build the schools' and parents' capacity for strong parental involvement;

d) Coordinate and integrate parental involvement strategies under Part A and under other programs as specified;

e) Conduct, with the involvement of parents, an annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of the parental involvement policy and use the findings of the evaluation to design more effective parental involvement; and

f) Involve parents in the activities of the Title I schools.

* Does the district have a written parental involvement policy:

☐ No ☐ Yes

LEA policy compliance:

☐ No ☐ Yes

Due your current Title I district level parental involvement policy meet the above criteria

Annual evaluation date:

01/15/2014 (0x. 04/30/2012)

Annual Evaluation:

Describe the involvement of parents during the policy evaluation process. If no evaluation occurred or if the evaluation date is not within the allowable range, provide an explanation why. (Maximum 500 chars)

The NCSC Parent Involvement Policy was reviewed and evaluated during the stakeholder engagement process in preparation for the State Local Control Accountability Plan. Parents, staff, students, and community members were representative at the School Site Council.

Parent Involvement Allocation:

Describe parent involvement in decisions on the use of parental involvement set-aside. (Maximum 500 characters)

Based on the size and nature of the Community and Court schools, there have been no funds set aside for parental involvement in the 2013-14 school year.

District Parental Involvement Contact Information

Parental Involvement contact name: Shar Johns

Contact title: Associate Superintendent

Contact email address: sjohns@nevco.k12.ca.us

Contact telephone number: 530-478-6400

School Parental Involvement Policy Compliance Requirements

The Title I, Part A school-level parental involvement policy describes the means to carry out:

a) Involvement of parents in the development of the policy

b) School-parent compacts

c) Building of capacity for involvement of parents

d) Accessibility and opportunities for participation of parents with limited English proficiency, parents with disabilities, and parents of migratory students

024

https://www3.cde.ca.gov/CARS/app/DataCollection/TitleIPartA/ParentInvolvementPolic... 6/18/2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>* Parental Involvement Policy Exists</th>
<th>No Policy Comment (Max 250 char)</th>
<th>Meets Policy Requirements?</th>
<th>Parental Involvement Contact Name</th>
<th>Parental Involvement Contact Title</th>
<th>Parental Involvement Contact Email Address</th>
<th>Parental Involvement Contact Telephone Number (Format 999-999-9999)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Launch</td>
<td>0116681</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shar Johns</td>
<td>Associate Superintendent Education</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sjohns@paso.k12.ca.us">sjohns@paso.k12.ca.us</a></td>
<td>530-478-6401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugarloaf Mountain, Juvenile Hall Program</td>
<td>0116913</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shar Johns</td>
<td>Associate Superintendent Education</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sjohns@nevco.k12.ca.us">sjohns@nevco.k12.ca.us</a></td>
<td>530-478-6401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Academy</td>
<td>0123599</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shar Johns</td>
<td>Associate Superintendent Education</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sjohns@nevco.k12.ca.us">sjohns@nevco.k12.ca.us</a></td>
<td>530-478-6401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last Saved: Shar Johns (sjohns), 6/18/2014 8:08 AM, Certified

Nancy Bodenhausen, Title I Policy & Program Guidance | nbodenhausen@coe.ca.gov | 916-445-4904
General CARS Questions: Consolidated Application Support Desk | consolidatedappdesk@coe.ca.gov | 916-445-4927

California Department of Education
1430 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Web Policy
CONSOLIDATED APPLICATION AND REPORTING SYSTEM (CARS)
Nevada County Office of Education (29 10298 0000000)

2013-14 Title I, Part D Facilities Report

To report the number of Title I, Part D funded facilities, by program, and whether or not they report student data to the LEA, including student outcomes after exit.

Required fields are denoted with an asterisk (*).

NOTE: Your LEA has previously certified this data collection as official. One or more other data collection(s) may be dependent on this data collection. Please be aware if a change is saved and certified, it may cause a dependent data collection to become obsolete and your LEA may have to revise and resubmit those data collection(s).

At-Risk Programs

* Total number of facilities: 

Number of facilities that reported student data: 

Facilities comment:
If all At Risk facilities did not report student data, provide an explanation why. (Maximum 500 characters)

Do all At-Risk facilities collect data on student outcomes after exit: ☐ No ☐ Yes

Neglected Programs

* Total number of facilities: 

Number of facilities that reported student data: 

Facilities comment:
If all Neglected facilities did not report student data, provide an explanation why. (Maximum 500 characters)

Do all Neglected facilities collect data on student outcomes after exit: ☐ No ☐ Yes

Juvenile Detention Programs

* Total number of facilities: 

Number of facilities that reported student data: 

Facilities comment:
If all Juvenile Detention facilities did not report student data, provide an explanation why. (Maximum 500 characters)

☐ No ☐ Yes
2013-14 Title I, Part D Demographics by Program

To report demographic data, by program, of students served with Title I, Part D funds.

Required fields are denoted with an asterisk (*).

NOTE: Your LEA has previously certified this data collection as official. One or more other data collection(s) may be dependent on this data collection. Please be aware if a change is saved and certified, it may cause a dependent data collection to become obsolete and your LEA may have to revise and resubmit those data collection(s).

Students Served in At-Risk Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Counts by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 years old</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years old</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 18 years old</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 years and older</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Counts by Racial/Ethnic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino of any race</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native, not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American, not Hispanic or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial, not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Student Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students Served in Juvenile Detention Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Counts by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 years old</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years old</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 18 years old</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 years and older</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Counts by Racial/Ethnic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino of any race</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native, not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American, not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial, not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Student Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEP students</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with disabilities</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CONSOLIDATED APPLICATION AND REPORTING SYSTEM (CARS)
Nevada County Office of Education (29 10298 0000000)

2013-14 Title I, Part D Outcomes

To report the academic and vocational outcomes of students served with Title I, Part D funds.

Required fields are denoted with an asterisk (*).

NOTE: Your LEA has previously certified this data collection as official. One or more other data collection(s) may be dependent on this data collection. Please be aware if a change is saved and certified, it may cause a dependent data collection to become obsolete and your LEA may have to revise and resubmit those data collection(s).

At-Risk Programs

Total students served: 39

While in the facility, the number of students who:

- Earned high school course credits: 34
- Enrolled in GED program:
- Enrolled in their local district school: 29
- Earned a GED:
- Obtained a high school diploma: 3
- Were accepted or enrolled into postsecondary education:
- Enrolled in job training programs and or courses: 1
- Obtained employment:

General comment (maximum 500 characters):

Within 30 to 50 calendar days after exit, the number of students who:

- Enrolled in their local district school:
- Earned a GED:
- Obtained a high school diploma:
- Were accepted or enrolled into postsecondary education:
- Enrolled in job training programs and or courses:
- Obtained employment:

Juvenile Detention Programs

Total students served: 108

While in the facility, the number of students who:
Earned high school course credits: 105
Enrolled in GED program:
Enrolled in their local district school: 97
Earned a GED:
Obtained a high school diploma: 4
Were accepted or enrolled into postsecondary education:
Enrolled in job training programs and or courses:
Obtained employment:

General comment (maximum 500 characters):

Within 30 to 99 calendar days after exit, the number of students who:
Enrolled in their local district school:
Earned a GED:
Obtained a high school diploma:
Were accepted or enrolled into postsecondary education:
Enrolled in job training programs and or courses:
Obtained employment:

Last Saved: Shari Johns (sharjohns), 6/18/2014 8:08 AM, Certified
### At-Risk Programs

**Total students served:** 39

**Number of long-term students served:** 13

#### Reading

**Completed pre- and post-test results:** 13

**Tested below grade level upon entry:** 11

**Pre- to Post-Test Grade Level Changes**

Enter student counts for each of the ranges below for students who completed pre- and post-testing.

- **Negative grade level change:** 3
- **No change in grade level:** 2
- **Improvement up to one grade level:** 4
- **Improvement more than one grade level:** 4

#### Mathematics

**Completed pre- and post-test results:** 13

**Tested below grade level upon entry:** 10

**Pre- to Post-Test Grade Level Changes**

Enter student counts for each of the ranges below for students who completed pre- and post-testing.

- **Negative grade level change:** 5
- **No change in grade level:** 2
- **Improvement up to one grade level:** 2
- **Improvement more than one grade level:** 4

### Juvenile Detention Programs

**Total students served:** 108

**Number of long-term students served:** 3

---

https://www3.cde.ca.gov/CARS/app/DataCollection/TitleIPartD/Outcomes.aspx

6/18/2014
Reading

Completed pre- and post- test results:  3
Tested below grade level upon entry:  2

Pre-to Post-Test Grade Level Changes
Enter student counts for each of the ranges below for students who completed pre- and post-testing.

Negative grade level change:  
No change in grade level:  
Improvement up to one grade level:  1
Improvement more than one grade level:  1

Mathematics

Completed pre- and post- test results:  2
Tested below grade level upon entry:  2

Pre-to Post-Test Grade Level Changes
Enter student counts for each of the ranges below for students who completed pre- and post-testing.

Negative grade level change:  
No change in grade level:  
Improvement up to one grade level:  1
Improvement more than one grade level:  1

Last Saved: Shar Johns (shajohns), 6/18/2014 8:13 AM, Certified

Save  Return to List
# CONSOLIDATED APPLICATION AND REPORTING SYSTEM (CARS)

**Nevada County Office of Education (2910298 0000000)**

## 2013-14 Title II, Part A School Class Size Reduction Report

The ESEA Act of 2001, Title II, Part A, Section 2123(a)(2)(B) allows LEAs to use ESEA Title II, Part A funds to recruit and hire highly qualified teachers to reduce class size.

Required fields are denoted with an asterisk (*).

**NOTE:** Your LEA has previously certified this data collection as official. One or more other data collection(s) may be dependent on this data collection. Please be aware if a change is saved and certified, it may cause a dependent data collection to become obsolete and your LEA may have to revise and resubmit those data collection(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>* Total Class Size Reduction Teacher Count</th>
<th>* ESEA Title II Part A Funded Class Size Reduction Teacher Count</th>
<th>ESEA/Highly Qualified Teacher Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nevada County Special Education</td>
<td>0677226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blitney College Preparatory High</td>
<td>0114314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba River Charter</td>
<td>0114322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada City School of the Arts</td>
<td>0114330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch</td>
<td>0116681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugarloaf Mountain, Juvenile Hall Programs</td>
<td>0119913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire</td>
<td>0123471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Academy</td>
<td>0129539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Charter</td>
<td>0126219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin RIDGES Home Study Charter</td>
<td>0126227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Download Schools Template  [Browse]  Upload Schools File
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Jackie Rose, Title II Leadership | jrose@ca.de.ed | 916-322-9503
General CARS Questions: Consolidated Application Support Desk | carssupport@ca.de.ed | 916-519-0759

California Department of Education
1430 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Web Policy

https://www3.cde.ca.gov/CARS/app/DataCollection/DataCollection.aspx
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CONSORTIUM APPLICATION AND REPORTING SYSTEM (CARS)
Nevada County Office of Education (29 10298 0000000)

2013-14 Title II, Part A Fiscal Year Expenditure Report, 12 Months


Required fields are denoted with an asterisk (*).

NOTE: Your LEA has previously certified this data collection as official. One or more other data collection(s) may be dependent on this data collection. Please be aware if a change is saved and certified, it may cause a dependent data collection to become obsolete and your LEA may have to revise and resubmit those data collection(s).

2013-14 Title II, Part A entitlement: $5,277

### Professional Development Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional development for teachers</td>
<td>5220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development for administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional development expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exams and Test Preparation Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exam fees, reimbursement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test preparation training and or materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other exam and test preparation expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recruitment, Training, and Retaining Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring incentive and or relocation allotment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Board Certification and or stipend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification process for special settings (VPSS):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University course work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other recruitment training and retaining expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Miscellaneous Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class size reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and indirect costs</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other allowable expenditures or encumbrances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total expenditures and encumbrances: $5,277

General Comment:
(Maximum 500 characters)
CONSOLIDATED APPLICATION AND REPORTING SYSTEM (CARS)
Nevada County Office of Education (29 10298 000000)

2013-14 Homeless Education Policy, Requirements and Implementation

The purpose of this data collection is to meet federal requirements specified in ESEA Section 722. This collection includes 1) monitoring LEAs and their compliance with key provisions of the Education for Homeless Children and Youths Act and 2) collecting contact information for each required designated LEA’s homeless liaison.

Required fields are denoted with an asterisk (*).

NOTE: Your LEA has previously certified this data collection as official. One or more other data collection(s) may be dependent on this data collection. Please be aware if a change is saved and certified, it may cause a dependent data collection to become obsolete and your LEA may have to revise and resubmit those data collection(s).

Homeless Education Certification
The LEA hereby assures and certifies to the California State Board of Education that the LEA has met the following requirements:
1. Designated a staff person as the liaison for homeless children and youths

2. Developed a written policy that supports the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youths in schools of the LEA which:
   a) Includes policies and practices to ensure that homeless children and youths are not stigmatized or segregated on the basis of their status as homeless
   b) Includes a dispute resolution process
   c) Ensures that transportation is provided for a homeless child or youth to and from the school of origin if requested by the parent, guardian or homeless liaison

3. Disseminated public notice of the educational rights of homeless children and youths where such children and youths receive services under the provisions of the Education for Homeless Children and Youths Act.

Homeless Liaison Contact Information

* Contact first name: Holly

* Contact last name: Hermanson

Contact title: Superintendent

* Contact email address: holly@nevco.k12.ca.us

* Contact telephone number: 530-478-6400

Homless Education Policy and Requirements

* Does the LEA have a written homeless education policy: Yes

No policy comment:
Provide an explanation why the LEA does not have a homeless education policy. (Maximum 500 characters)

Date LEA's board approved the homeless education policy: 02/08/2012 (ex. 04/30/2012)

* Does the LEA meet the above federal requirements: Yes

Compliance comment:
Provide an explanation why the LEA does not comply with federal requirements. (Maximum 500 characters)

Title I, Part A Homeless Expenditures

2013-14 Title I, Part A Entitlement: $440,096

2013-14 Title I, Part A direct or indirect services to homeless children reservation: $1,100

Amount of 2013-14 Title I, Part A funds expended or encumbered for direct or indirect services to homeless children: 1100

No expenditures or encumbrances comment:
Provide an explanation why there is no Title I, Part A expenditures or encumbrances for homeless services. (Maximum 500 characters)
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District Name: Nevada County Office of Education

Person completing this form: Holly Hermansen

Title: Superintendent

Quarterly Report Submission Date:

☐ January 2013 (for October-December 2013)
☐ April 2014 (for January-March 2014)
☒ July 2014 (for April-June 2014)
☐ October 2014 (for July-September 2014)

Date for information to be reported publicly at governing board meeting: July 9, 2014

☒ 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>CAHSEE Intensive Instruction and Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Holly Hermansen

Print Name of County Superintendent

Signature of County Superintendent

Revised 3/31/14
June 10, 2014

Nathan Beason
Nevada County Board of Supervisors
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 200
Nevada City, CA 95959

Trevor Michaels
Nevada County Board of Education
112 Nevada City Hwy
Nevada City, CA 95959

Amanda Wilcox
Ready Springs Board of Trustees
14806 Pleasant Valley Rd
Penn Valley, CA 95946

Dear Chairman Beason, President Michaels, and President Wilcox:

California Education Code Section 1240 requires that my office visit schools in our county identified by the criteria described in the Williams Settlement, review information in the areas noted below, and report to you the results of our visits and reviews. I am pleased to provide, for submission to the governing board the annual report for fiscal year 2013-14 as required by Education Code Section 1240(c)(2)(B) pursuant to the Williams Settlement. As required, this report presents the results of our visits and reviews at Ready Springs Elementary School to the Ready Springs School Board, The Nevada County Board of Education and the Nevada County Board of Supervisors

The purpose of my visit as specified in California Education Code 1240 was to:

1. Determine if students have ‘sufficient’ standards-aligned instructional materials in four core subject areas (English language arts, mathematics, history/social science and science (including science laboratory equipment in grades 9-12)) and, as appropriate, in foreign languages and health;

2. Determine if there is any facility condition that ‘poses an emergency or urgent threat to the health or safety of pupils or staff’; and

3. Determine if the school has provided accurate data on the annual school accountability report card related to the sufficiency of instructional materials and the safety, cleanliness, and adequacy of school facilities, including ‘good repair’.
The law further requires that the county superintendent:

1. Annually monitor and review teacher miss-assignments and teacher vacancies in schools ranked in deciles 1-3 (2012 Base API):

2. Receive quarterly reports on complaints filed within the school district concerning insufficient instructional materials, teacher vacancies and miss-assignments, and emergency or urgent facilities issues under the Uniform Complaint Procedure; and

3. Review audit exceptions under expanded authority in the areas of use of instructional materials program funds, teacher miss-assignments, and information reported on the school accountability report card; and determines whether the exceptions are either corrected or an acceptable plan of correction has been developed.

While the Uniform Complaint data and audit findings are not mandated to be a part of this report to you, they are being included so that you and the citizens of our community will have a complete understanding of the environment in which Ready Springs Elementary School is functioning.

Before proceeding with the report, let me define some basic terms:

- **“Sufficient textbooks or instructional materials”** means each pupil, including English language learners, has a standards-aligned textbook or instructional materials, or both, to use in class and to take home.

- **A school facility condition that poses an “emergency or urgent threat”** is defined as a “condition that poses a threat to the health or safety of pupils or staff while at school.” [Note: This definition and quote is drawn from EC 17592.72(c) (1) because it is incorporated by reference in EC 1240(c) (2)(l)(ii)]

- **“Good repair”** means the school facilities are clean, safe and functional as determined pursuant to the school facility inspection and evaluation instrument developed by the Office of Public School Construction or a local evaluation instrument that meets the same criteria. Each school district that receives state funding for facilities maintenance is required to establish a facilities inspection system to ensure that each of its schools is maintained in ‘good repair’.

- **“Teacher vacancy”** is defined by Education Code section 33126(b)(5)(A) as “...a position to which a single-designated certificated employee has not been assigned at the beginning of the year for an entire year or, if the position is for a one-semester course, a position of which a single-designated certificated employee has not been assigned at the beginning of a semester for an entire semester.”

My findings were as follows:

**Instructional Materials and School Facilities:**

In our on-site review, all students at Ready Springs Elementary School were found to have access to California Standards-aligned textbooks and/or materials to use in class and to take home.

In addition, the school facility was thoroughly inspected and determined to be in good repair and well maintained. The FIT (Facilities Inspection Tool) determined that the school was at an overall rating of “EXEMPLARY”.

**School Accountability Report Card:**

School districts are required to publish and post on their websites the annual School Accountability Report Card (SARC) by February 1 of each year. The (SARC) is published each year to provide parents and community members with specific information about each school so they can compare schools.
The SARC was reviewed for accurate data relevant to facilities maintenance and sufficiency of instructional materials, as required by Education Code section 1240(c)(2)(J)(iii). The SARC was determined to be accurate and informative and met all the above mentioned requirements.

**Teacher Misassignments and Teacher Vacancies:**
There were no teacher misassignments or teacher vacancies at this time.

**Uniform Complaint Procedure**
Finally, according to the District’s reports to NCSOS, there were no complaints filed pursuant to the Uniform Complaint Procedure in this District for the 2013-2014 school year.

**Conclusion**
The Nevada County Superintendent of Schools office appreciates the District staff’s assistance in reporting and commends their cooperation with the Williams visitations. As always, we are available to assist in the needs of your district and happy to present this positive report to you.

Sincerely,

[Holly Hermansen]

Holly Hermansen
Nevada County Superintendent of Schools

Cc: Superintendent Sandoval
June 23, 2014

Holly Hermansen  
Nevada County Superintendent of Schools  
112 Nevada City Highway  
Nevada City, California 95959

Dear Superintendent Hermansen;

Herewith is a copy of the report prepared by the Nevada County Grand Jury on the subject of the Grass Valley School District, Unsafe School Facilities. This report will be published on June 30, 2014, at 11:00 A.M. when it will be published on the Grand Jury’s website, www.civilgrandjury.com. To view, please click on the “Reports” link.

Please be aware that the California Penal Code section 933.05 prohibits disclosure of any portion of this report prior to its publication by the Grand Jury.

The California Penal Code requires any responses to Grand Jury reports must be addressed as follows;

The Honorable Thomas M. Anderson  
Presiding Judge of the Grand Jury  
Nevada County Superior Court  
210 Church Street  
Nevada City, California 95945

To assist you in writing your response, we are enclosing a copy of Section 933.05 (a) of the Penal Code and an example of correct format for responding. To assist you with responding, an electronic formattable copy of this report can be obtained by request from the jury at: grandjury@nevadacountycourts.com Please be advised that your response(s) are due on or before September 1, 2014. The Grand Jury appreciates your cooperation.

Sincerely;

[Signature]

Keith Overbey, Foreman  
Nevada County Grand Jury 2013-2014
Section 933.05 (a) For purposes of subdivision (b) of Section 933, as to each grand jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:

1. The respondent agrees with the finding.

2. The respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the finding, in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefor.

(b) For purposes of subdivision (b) of Section 933, as to each grand jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions:

1. The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action.

2. The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future; with a timeframe for implementation.

3. The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.

4. The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefor.

(c) However, if a finding or recommendation of the grand jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a county agency or department headed by an elected officer, both the agency or department head and the board of supervisors shall respond if requested by the grand jury, but the response of the board of supervisors shall address only those budgetary or personnel matters over which it has some decision-making authority. The response of the elected agency or department head shall address all aspects of the findings or recommendations affecting his or her agency or department.
EXAMPLE: CORRECT FORMAT FOR RESPONDING TO A GRAND JURY REPORT
As required by Penal Code Section 933.05

FINDINGS:

1. Even when notification proceeds properly, the foster child’s school records may not arrive at the new school for as long as eight or ten weeks. During this time the child may not be permitted to attend school

Disagree

Children are not denied education and a child’s school record has to be requested by the school of enrollment.

2. Our CPS is on record as demanding that foster parents not home school the foster children in their care. CPS finds it difficult to enforce its own policy.

Partially agree

Nevada County CPS requires that its foster children be mainstreamed in education unless there are exceptional circumstances.

3. There can be a number of possible reasons for the foster child’s relocation to another county, i.e., the availability of foster homes, need for special care, relationships between foster parent and foster child, the location of a desirable member of the child’s extended family.

Agree

RECOMMENDATIONS:

6. The Board of Supervisors should consider taking back from the State the responsibility for the approval and training of foster parents within the County.

The recommendation will not be implemented at the present time

The Board believes the current process for the approval and training of foster parents in Nevada County is sufficient at the present time.

7. The Board of Supervisors should maintain funds and services to continue the County’s model of the transition of 18-year-olds in the foster care system into independent living.

The recommendation has been partially implemented

Additional initiatives to redesign the California Child Welfare System will be implemented in Nevada County in conjunction with changes in State regulations.
GRASS VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT
UNSAFE SCHOOL FACILITIES?

Summary

The Grass Valley School District is a public school district with responsibility for the education and safety of students, teachers, staff, parents and visitors attending school facilities in Grass Valley, California and is governed by a Board of Trustees elected by the district’s voters.

The Grass Valley School District is comprised of local public education traditional school sites and one dependent charter school.

The 2013-2014 Nevada County Grand Jury received a complaint regarding sub-standard conditions at Grass Valley School District facilities described and shown in graphic detail accompanied by photos taken in 2010 and 2011. There is evidence the Grass Valley School District Board of Trustees and Superintendent were made aware of the substandard conditions.

The 2013-2014 Nevada County Grand Jury conducted site visits to Bell Hill Academy and Grass Valley Charter School and observed sub-standard conditions that may have a direct effect on the health and welfare of all students, parents, staff and visitors. Current photos were taken by Jurors showing unchanged conditions from 2010-2011.

A 2000 lawsuit, Eliezer Williams et al v. State of California et al, was settled with regard to sub-standard schools, including education and safety issues.

In 2004, legislation was passed as a result of this case which expands county superintendent duties and requires active involvement by the County Superintendent of Schools in each district.

The Nevada County Superintendent of Schools maintains final jurisdictional responsibility over the Grass Valley School District to provide a safe work environment for employees and safe and clean facilities for the educational environment. This environment includes facilities which are clean and free of defects and unsafe conditions.

The Nevada County Superintendent of Schools is required to:

- inspect all school facilities in Nevada County,
- review each local district’s School Accountability Report Card for accuracy.

The Nevada County Grand Jury interviewed an official of the County Office of Education. The official did not believe the Nevada County Superintendent of Public Schools was required to:
• make required inspections of each school site in the county,
• review the School Accountability Report Card.

The Nevada County Superintendent of Schools was unaware of the important duties imposed on the office to provide for a safe environment at each school facility.

The Grass Valley School District Superintendent and Grass Valley School District Board of Trustees are required to make site inspections to verify that school facilities are clean and free of defects pursuant to Education Code §1240 et seq.

The Nevada County Grand Jury interviewed the Grass Valley School District Superintendent. The Superintendent was aware of the duties imposed on the office to provide for a safe environment at each school facility, but did not implement the provisions of Education Code §1240 et seq.

The Grass Valley School District Superintendent’s office hired a construction consultant to act as a liaison with the California Department of Architecture and a construction consultant to inspect the current facilities and report any deficiencies.

To ensure the health and safety of Nevada County school facilities, the following is recommended:

• The County Superintendent of Schools should make required inspections and conduct report reviews of all school facilities in Nevada County as outlined in the Education Code.
• The Grass Valley School District Board of Trustees should direct the Superintendent to obtain and review all construction and major maintenance projects that have been performed, verify each followed state requirements, and are on file with the state in order to exercise better control over contracts.
• The Grass Valley School District Board of Trustees should direct the Superintendent to reevaluate consultant contracts for the liaison with the State as well as the construction consultant who made site inspections.

Reasons for Investigation

The Nevada County Grand Jury (Jury) received a complaint about the conditions of the facilities of the Grass Valley School District (GVSD) and the manner in which repairs had been made including areas requiring remedial or extensive replacement of structures of the facilities in question. The Jury has the authority to investigate school districts and their boards of trustees, pursuant to California Penal Code.
Background

The Governing Board (Board) of the GVSD is made up of five Trustees. The Board consists of the President, Vice President, Clerk and two Trustees. Each Board member is elected by the voting public within the Area they represent, each serving a four-year term.

The schools within GVSD are Scotten School, Lyman Gilmore School, Grass Valley Charter School, Bell Hill Academy, Grass Valley Little Learners and Our Kids Place.

The Jury was presented documentation of sub-standard conditions in all GVSD facilities.

The Nevada County Superintendent of Schools oversees all school districts in Nevada County.

Procedures Followed

The Jury:

- interviewed the Nevada County Superintendent of Schools and staff,
- conducted interviews with the GVSD superintendent,
- reviewed documents received from the interviewees,
- reviewed documents from the GVSD website,
- reviewed information from the Education Code,
- reviewed information from the Nevada County Superintendent’s office website,
- conducted site visits to observe current conditions at three specific GVSD facilities,
- took 97 photographs at the three sites.

Facts

Fa. 1 Legislation was passed arising out of the 2000 court case of Eliezer Williams et al v State of California et al to “resolve Williams” which included updates to the Education Code, enhanced and expanded the county superintendent’s office and local school district’s responsibilities to provide a safe environment for students, teachers, staff, parents and visitors attending school facilities.

Fa. 2 GVSD is comprised of Scotten School, Lyman Gilmore School, Grass Valley Charter School, Bell Hill Academy, Grass Valley Little Learners and Our Kids Place.

Fa. 3 Complaints had been received by GVSD Superintendent's office concerning dry rot, mold, dangerous playground equipment, exposed live electric wires, unlocked electric boxes and improper repairs at various facilities in GVSD system.

Fa. 4 The Jury received photographs dating from 2010 to 2012 showing substandard conditions at GVSD facilities.

Fa. 5 The 2013-2014 Jury took photographs showing current unsafe conditions at GVSD that appear to have the same issues as the 2010-2012 photographs.
Fa. 6  The HVAC systems in each school are old and are under constant repair. These systems harbor an environment for growing irritants that thrive on damp, dark, and non-maintained spaces.

Fa. 7  The Jury conducted a site visit to Grass Valley Charter School and Bell Hill Academy. The Jury observed and photographed the following (see Appendix):

- dangerous conditions present at the playground including rotted support beams, [#17, #18]
- buildings with soil to wood or concrete contact, [#57]
- siding material compromised by water, [#51, #85]
- holes in siding, allowing water intrusion to interior walls, [#51, #57]
- exposed electrical wires at ground level, [#41]
- non-weatherproof electric box exposed in play areas with live 120 volt electric charge, [#18] trip and fall hazards due to posts cut off, stumps left above ground,
- broken solid conduit exposing 120 volt live wires to elements, [#86]
- improper roofing padding on conduit supports, [#87]
- mold in ceilings of classrooms, [#61, #62, #63]
- continued water intrusion into ceilings of class rooms, [#61, #62, #63]
- roof drains not diverting water away from class rooms at ground level, [#97]
- drains that direct roof runoff water directly into area of high voltage lines, [#97]
- improper storage of flammable chemicals in a non-rated office storage locker without warning signs, [#07, #08]
- Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) book containing unnecessary and inappropriate information rather than a list of the specific chemicals on site for first-responder safety,
- roof flashing missing at drain waste vent. [#61, #67].

Fa. 8  Public schools are required to obtain California Department of General Services (CDGS) approvals for construction projects.

Fa. 9  There were two major construction projects completed, one at Grass Valley Charter School and one at Bell Hill Academy. Both were for removal of mold and reconstruction of damaged areas of classrooms believed completed between 2010 and 2011.

Fa. 10  There is no record on file with the CDGS for the above two construction projects. The construction records on file with CDGS for Grass Valley School District, known as “Certified Projects for Client Id 29-11” revealed 15 total projects. None of these included the concerns listed in this report.
Officials from Nevada County Building Department stated that they were not involved with any school building permits. The California Division of State Architect (CDSA) is the regulating authority for school property projects.

Inquiry to CDSA website refers inquires to CDGS for school projects.

Officials from City of Grass Valley (City) stated that they are not involved in the school construction permit process. However, the City issued a permit for Grass Valley Charter School installation and inspection for a photovoltaic solar system and awning in 2013.

California Department of Education website defines the School Accountability Report Card (SARC) use as: "California public schools annually provide information about themselves to the community allowing the public to evaluate and compare schools for student achievement, environment, resources and demographics."

SARC documents for GVSD were reviewed by the Jury and indicated a "GOOD" rating for facility conditions. However this did not reflect the current, sub-standard conditions observed by the Jury at Grass Valley Charter School and Bell Hill Academy.

Education Code §1240 (J) (iii) requires county superintendents to review all SARC reports for accuracy.

The Nevada County Superintendent of Schools stated:

- that the Education Code and California Code of Regulations are the primary statutes that determine the actions and activities of school superintendents and that of school districts,
- she was not sure of requirements to conduct site visits or to review SARC reports for accuracy, but will look up Education Code §1240 and review the responsibilities placed on the county superintendent of schools,
- she was not aware of Education Code §44110 [Whistler Blower statutes] but will look up Education Code §44110,
- she was not aware of Education Code §35186, a uniform complaint process to report conditions that present a danger to the health and safety of students, teachers, staff, parents and visitors, and the county office's duties concerning reports, but will look up this code section,
- she was not aware of the county office's responsibility concerning the use of the complaint form but will look up this code section,
- she had no knowledge of the Facilities Inspection Tool (F.I.T.) used to assess school buildings and facilities,
- she was not aware of requirements to inspect school facilities within Nevada County,
- she was unaware of MSDS requirements for first responders and staff to know what chemicals are on site in case of an emergency,
she was not responsible for the accuracy of the SARC and believed that there
was no review required by the superintendent's office.

Fa. 18 The GVSD Superintendent was interviewed and stated:

- the authority for school maintenance is being taken care of in the deferred
  maintenance budget account. However, there is no budget money allotted for
  this action,
- the evidence shown in current photos of mold, mildew and water intrusion
  into classrooms is unknown,
- the office is unaware of any unauthorized construction or major repair being
  done. He believed that recent construction had been under a permit issued by
  Nevada County Building Department or City of Grass Valley Building
  Department,
- the district doesn't use the F.I.T. state form because the maintenance crew has
  reported that all maintenance is up to date,
- he is unaware of any notifications of sub-standard conditions in any classroom
  or building within the district,
- there was concern when viewing the photos of current conditions of mold in
  classrooms, faulty and unsafe playground equipment, building siding peeling
  away from the wall studs because of water intrusion into the inner walls,
- consultants had been hired to be liaison between GVSD and CDSA for future
  construction projects. A construction consultant who conducted site
  inspections with GVSD administration and Board of Trustee member(s) stated
  in submitted reports there was no findings of the sub-standard conditions.

Fa.19 The Jury showed the Superintendent current photographs illustrating hazardous
conditions in Nevada County schools.

Findings

Fi. 1 Grass Valley Charter School property conditions expose students, teachers, staff,
parents and visitors attending school facilities to dangerous health and safety issues.

Fi. 2 Bell Hill Academy property conditions expose students, teachers, staff, parents and
visitors attending school facilities to dangerous health and safety issues.

Fi. 3 These hazardous conditions are endangering the health and safety of students,
teachers, staff, parents and visitors because no one has taken responsibility for repair
even though administrators and the Board of Trustees have been notified in writing.

Fi. 4 Mold not properly removed continues to pose an inherent danger to students, teachers,
staff, parents, and visitors.

Fi. 5 Repairs have been done without benefit of required State oversight placing anyone
entering these facilities at risk.
Inadequate inspections have placed students, teachers, staff, parents and visitors attending school facilities in danger. Lack of detail in observing and accurately reporting sub-standard and dangerous conditions are obvious even to a lay person and should have been reported by experts hired by GVSD.

Because GVSD officials created a MSDS book with unnecessary and inappropriate information, this places first responders at risk during emergencies as well as students, teachers, staff, parents, and visitors attending school facilities if immediate first aid is needed to be applied while awaiting medical care.

**Recommendations**

**R. 1** The Nevada County Superintendent of Schools should direct staff to adhere to the requirements of their office including:

- conducting required site visits,
- verifying SARC reports for accuracy,

**R. 2** The GVSD Board of Trustees should direct the Superintendent to review existing contracts with construction consultants to determine if there is a bad-faith clause and demand a refund because hazardous conditions were not repaired.

**R. 3** The GVSD Board of Trustees should direct the Superintendent to review the contracts for work on Grass Valley Charter School and Bell Hill Academy to remove mold, mildew and rot from these sites and verify the work was done according to contract.

**R. 4** The GVSD Board of Trustees should verify all this work performed was state approved, inspected, and complies with codes concerning safe schools.

**R. 5** The Grass Valley School District Board of Trustees should direct the Superintendent to update each MSDS Book to reflect site specific hazards.
Responses

Nevada County Superintendent of Schools:
Findings 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6
Recommendation 1
Due Date: August 30, 2014

Grass Valley School District Board of Trustees:
Findings 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6
Recommendations: 2, 3, 4, and 5
Due Date: September 30, 2014
"MSDS" book. 1 ½ inches thick. Includes all chemical MSDS sheets. The use of this document is for WHAT IS ON SITE for use by emergency responders.

WORK SHOP.

Non-Rated cabinet with flammable chemicals. No CAUTION sign posted on outside. In case of fire, this is in one of the main EXIT routes.
#17 - Rotted support.

#18 Live electric box within play equipment area.

#41 Broken electric conduit at ground level is at risk for high flooding from the adjacent Veteran’s Hall parking lot.
Bell Hill Academy:

#51 - Siding is separating from wall structure. This is evidence of water penetration to interior of wall structure.

#57 Rot at foundation.

#61 Mold repairs were not done correctly.
#62 Mold repairs were not done correctly.

#63 Mold repairs were not done correctly.
#67 Mold repairs were not done correctly. Roof flashing on pipe is absent, allowing water to enter building.

#85 - Siding is separating from wall structure. This is evidence of water penetration to interior of wall structure.

#86 Frayed and broken insulation used to carry 110 volts of electric power. This exposes the live wires to elements. Note also the routing is under the roofing material, no anchors to keep the wires from pulling away.
#87 MAIN BUILDING
Roof – conduit supported by 4x4, untreated blocks.
The blocks rest directly on the roof material. Needed are Roof Pads to absorb movement between the 4x4 and the roof coating.

#97
Rain Gutter drains water; in immediate area of live electric power.
None of the drains routed roof water AWAY from the structures.
2014 LOCAL AGENCY BIENNIAL NOTICE

Name of Agency: Nevada County Board of Education

Mailing Address: 112 Nevada City Highway Nevada City CA 95959

Contact Person: Samie White Phone: (530) 478-6400

E-Mail: __________________________ Fax No: __________________________

This agency has reviewed its conflict of interest code and has determined that:

☐ An Amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:
  (Check all that apply)
  ○ Include new positions (including consultants) which must be designated.
  ○ Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
  ○ Revise disclosure categories.
  ○ Revise the titles of existing positions.
  ○ Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
  ○ Other (describe)______________________________

☐ Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

☐ No amendments are necessary.
  The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income which may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.

________________________________________
Signature of Chief Executive Officer

Date: ________________________________

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended. Please return this report no later than October 1, 2014 to:

Nevada County Board of Supervisors
950 Maidu Avenue
Nevada City CA 95959-8617

Fair Political Practices Commission
428 J Street, Suite 620, Sacramento, CA 95833
For Technical Assistance: (866) ASK-FPPC/www.fppc.ca.gov

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN THIS FORM TO THE FPPC
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 regulations. 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
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,
Adopted as amended by the NCSoS Board of Education 7/10/2013

Reviewed by the NCSoS Board of Education: 7/14/10, 7/11/12, 7/10/13, 8/14/13

Approved by the Nevada County Board of Supervisors 4/24/07, 10/28/08

10/08/13: Approved by the Board of Supervisors
AGENDA ITEM

To: Nevada County Board of Education

From: Donna Somers, Associate Supt - Business


Date: July 9, 2014

In early June we became aware of significant irregularities in the cash flow of Twin Ridges Home Study (TRHS). Around the same time, due to an inability to perform the functions of the job, the director of TRHS released the business Manager.

As we researched the issue further, it became very apparent that funds were being inappropriately used for personal gain by the Business Manager. Upon discovering this, we worked closely with the Director to ascertain the extent of the misuse of funds and began the process of closing accounts and eliminating access to school funds by unauthorized individuals.

The Director has worked closely with local law enforcement to file criminal charges. While allegations are pending, it is not appropriate to discuss details at this time. However, it is important to note the Director and Council have been actively involved in understanding and remedying the issues.

Unfortunately, in small schools and businesses it is difficult to sustain proper internal controls and separation of duties due to limited staff. In these situations, you often see one individual with sole and complete access to mail, bank accounts and credit cards. This is a condition ripe for fraud and abuse. At this time the school as well as our business office continues to put in place practices to prevent this from occurring in the future. The Director, in conjunction with the Charter Council, has made changes to purchasing practices, mail handling and deposits. This process will be ongoing.

Likewise, our business staff has been working diligently on policies and practices to implement or strengthen so that this does not occur at other smaller charters and schools. We plan to have a full review of credit card procedures, purchasing practices, bank account access and money handling. The outcome will be better internal controls and clear policies we can review with employees to set reasonable expectations as well as insure proper documentation of business expenses.

During this process, a full review of the budget of TRHS revealed significant errors and misstatements by the Business Manager in the 2014/15 Budget. It was imperative to redo the TRHS budget to determine if the school was fiscally viable. As you recall, our smaller charters
are greatly impacted by enrollment increases and decreases due to their small size and lack of economies of scale.

I have worked closely with the director to prepare the attached budget and projection to determine if the school can meet its obligations in the upcoming budget year as well as the two subsequent years. The Director has been very open to suggestions for improvement and has actively worked to revise practices to insure this does not occur again. I have met with the Council to support them during this period. The Council and Director have discussed internal controls and already revised policies and practices. The Management of the school is actively addressing the issue to insure their practices maintain or improve the fiscal health of the school.

While the budget projects deficit spending in year one, year two and three result in revenues in excess of expenses due to growth in LCFF revenues, all other things remaining constant. Enrollment and ADA in this projection are consistent with current enrollment of 103 and ADA of 95%. (see attached budget)

In this projection the key elements are enrollment/ADA and donations. Current enrollment supports the enrollment projection. I do believe it is reasonable and could be greater than projected. With respect to donations, $15K in donations has been included in revenue. As part of the director’s three year plan, this third year she was specifically focused on fundraising. I know that approximately $10K was never deposited to the school as it should have been, and the additional $5K is not unreasonable to expect a small charter to raise in this year.

While the projection shows a deficit year one, it is possible that enrollment or donations will be higher to balance the budget. Holding enrollment, donations, staffing and other assumptions constant, the LCFF funding increases eliminate the deficit by year two. If the school follows the budget plan, it is likely the school will meet its obligations over the three year period.

For an interim period, I will be more involved in assisting the school with fiscal items. We will establish protocols for the school and our business staff to shore up the separation of duties that can’t exist in a business office of one. The Director has willingly agreed to work with us to enhance her business knowledge as well as work with the Council to increase their understanding of Charter finances. I will continue to monitor the enrollment and finances of the charter over the next six months. I will prepare regular reports to the Board on the status of the school and business office effort’s to insure this does not occur again. Please see the attached draft of a letter we will send to the charter.

There is still much to be done. We will continue to thoroughly review processes and procedures to insure we are properly safeguarding funds. We will continue to work with schools and charters to insure best practices are being employed. Finally, we will revise our processes where necessary to insure funds are appropriately authorized and expended.
## Twin Ridges Home Study Charter School

### Multi Year Budget Projections

**REVISED 14/15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>$43,45</td>
<td>$49,00</td>
<td>$49,00</td>
<td>$49,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>$31,30</td>
<td>$31,00</td>
<td>$31,00</td>
<td>$31,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>$17,41</td>
<td>$17,00</td>
<td>$17,00</td>
<td>$17,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,00</td>
<td>$9,00</td>
<td>$9,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92,16</td>
<td>97,00</td>
<td>97,00</td>
<td>97,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCFF Revenue</td>
<td>$419,786</td>
<td>$503,609</td>
<td>$554,829</td>
<td>$591,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>$87,093</td>
<td>$91,667</td>
<td>$91,667</td>
<td>$91,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Lieu Taxes</td>
<td>$54,573</td>
<td>$54,573</td>
<td>$54,573</td>
<td>$54,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Revenue - SELPA</td>
<td>$12,233</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Mental Health</td>
<td>$5,726</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Revenue - Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Revenue - SELPA</td>
<td>$32,533</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Mental Health</td>
<td>$5,732</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate Block Grant</td>
<td>$14,14</td>
<td>$3,14</td>
<td>$3,14</td>
<td>$3,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Lottery</td>
<td>$154</td>
<td>$16,921</td>
<td>$14,798</td>
<td>$14,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Prop 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Common Core</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Other-Incl Prior year</td>
<td>$18,170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local - donations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local - other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$722,759</td>
<td>$735,935</td>
<td>$787,156</td>
<td>$813,463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Personnel Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificated Salaries</td>
<td>$218,049</td>
<td>$201,394</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td>$213,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified inc/(dec)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Stipends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Total</td>
<td>$218,049</td>
<td>$222,694</td>
<td>$228,500</td>
<td>$234,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Salaries</td>
<td>$166,546</td>
<td>$129,487</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Enrich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Stipends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Benefits</strong></td>
<td>$166,546</td>
<td>$133,987</td>
<td>$136,500</td>
<td>$139,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books and Supplies</td>
<td>$66,832</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (less facility lease)</td>
<td>$235,190</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Lease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSoS Oversight</td>
<td>$6,133</td>
<td>$6,659</td>
<td>$7,172</td>
<td>$7,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSoS Business Services</td>
<td>$31,159</td>
<td>$26,637</td>
<td>$28,686</td>
<td>$29,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSoS Bus Mgr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Costs</strong></td>
<td>$339,314</td>
<td>$328,297</td>
<td>$340,858</td>
<td>$347,173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>$216,522</td>
<td>$146,818</td>
<td>$130,705</td>
<td>$142,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
<td>$148,818</td>
<td>$130,705</td>
<td>$142,002</td>
<td>$162,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving/Clearing</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Reserve</td>
<td>$21,083</td>
<td>$22,078</td>
<td>$23,615</td>
<td>$24,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Reserve</td>
<td>$14,456</td>
<td>$14,719</td>
<td>$15,743</td>
<td>$16,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/TTUSD Cash Flow Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappropriated Fund Balance</td>
<td>$109,580</td>
<td>$92,809</td>
<td>$101,545</td>
<td>$120,510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Narrative/Comments:

- Year 2
- Year 3
July 2, 2014

Twin Ridges Home Study Charter Council
Jaynie Aydin, Director
Twin Ridges Home Study Charter
111 New Mohawk Road
Nevada City, CA 95959

Honorable Council Members;

I am seriously concerned about the recent fraud and fiscal mismanagement which has occurred at your school. While I recognize and appreciate your immediate response to address deficiencies, it is imperative that a thorough review of policies and practices occurs to insure this does not occur again.

My Board has been informed of the events and will receive updates on TRHS status. They are equally concerned about the operation of the school.

I request you submit a plan in writing to me by August 15 to address the following:

Updated 2014/15 Budget to demonstrate you can meet our commitments in the current year plus two
Additional training for the Director and Council in Charter Budget and Finance
Revised procedures employing best practices for purchasing, deposits, mail and credit card usage

In closing, I understand the unique needs of small schools and the difficulty in maintaining good internal controls with a small staff. If you need assistance, please do not hesitate to ask.

Sincerely,

Holly A. Hermansen
Superintendent of Schools
July 3, 2014

To: Nevada County Board of Education

From: Holly Hermansen

Re: Public Records Request for Superintendent Credit Card Statements

On May 19th we received a public records request from Marianne Slade Troutman for all writings in connection with my credit card for the seven years that I have been in this position.

Our office only keeps these types of records for 5 years, and they are stored off site. A business office staff member spent 20 hours collecting the requested records at a cost of $550.00.

Attached to this board packet you will find five years of these records. I have put this on as an agenda item in the event that you have any questions or would like to have a discussion.

There are a couple of things that I would like to bring to your attention that will not be readily apparent by reading through the records.

1. You will see quarterly receipts for dinners labeled “CSR”. I am the chair of the 10 county Capitol Service Region and part of my responsibility in this role is to schedule business dinners for the 10 county superintendents at our quarterly meetings. The dinners are paid for by me at the time, then reimbursed through Capitol Service Region dues, and any guests meals are paid for by personal check. Any alcohol purchased is always on a separate check and paid for personally by the individual. The only cost to our office for these dinners comes as part of our annual CSR dues.

2. When I came into this position it had been a long-standing tradition for the county superintendent to host the district superintendents for a two-day summer retreat for planning for the upcoming year and team-building. This meeting typically took place in Sierra City. Due to the fiscal crisis, we have only held the meeting out of town a couple of times since I have been in office. Otherwise, we have held one-day summer meetings locally to plan for the upcoming year. Any costs covered by the county office were for the district superintendents only. If guests were included, they were billed for their meals and any alcohol purchased was always on a separate check and paid for by the individual.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>AC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nevada County Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Budget Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data thru 6/30/14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EJ / SUGARLOAF COMBINED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2013/14 Actuals</td>
<td>% Actual vs Budget</td>
<td>2013/14 Budget</td>
<td>2012/13 Actuals</td>
<td>2011/12 Actuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>BEGINNING BALANCE</td>
<td>49,955</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,955</td>
<td>48,682</td>
<td>56,518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Revenues - Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LCFF/REVENUE LIMIT/EIA</td>
<td>269,980</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>296,296</td>
<td>360,875</td>
<td>508,731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Title I, Part A</td>
<td>303,648</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>308,924</td>
<td>231,279</td>
<td>396,988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Title I, Part D</td>
<td>68,426</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>62,696</td>
<td>57,213</td>
<td>74,725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Child Nutrition</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>4,830</td>
<td>6,380</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>5,885</td>
<td>201%</td>
<td>2,931</td>
<td>6,517</td>
<td>7,068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>$650,088</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>$675,677</td>
<td>$662,264</td>
<td>$991,490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>EXPENDITURES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>348,644</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>347,798</td>
<td>375,597</td>
<td>117,351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>104,299</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>100,461</td>
<td>112,149</td>
<td>31,190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>STPS @ 8.25%</td>
<td>23,276</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>25,081</td>
<td>27,198</td>
<td>3,739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>PERS @ 11.442%</td>
<td>7,087</td>
<td>139%</td>
<td>5,111</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>6,983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Health &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>59,420</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>33,591</td>
<td>58,272</td>
<td>12,233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>14,516</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>16,678</td>
<td>21,579</td>
<td>8,215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>20,775</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>39,659</td>
<td>15,657</td>
<td>4,896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>27,005</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>28,146</td>
<td>19,067</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Travel &amp; Conferences</td>
<td>8,601</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>3,859</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Dues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>8,554</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>15,950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Rent/Repairs</td>
<td>32,935</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>32,931</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>14,431</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>14,330</td>
<td>7,311</td>
<td>4,078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21,534</td>
<td>24,669</td>
<td>11,196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Copies/Faxes/Classes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21,534</td>
<td>24,669</td>
<td>11,196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Professional Services/Postage</td>
<td>26,859</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>35,008</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>795,196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>48,157</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>57,346</td>
<td>56,323</td>
<td>21,917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>TOTAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>$641,494</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>$706,563</td>
<td>$660,991</td>
<td>$999,326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</td>
<td>$8,594</td>
<td>($30,886)</td>
<td>$1,273</td>
<td>($7,836)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>PROJECTED ENDING FUND BALANCE</td>
<td>$19,069</td>
<td>$49,955</td>
<td>$48,682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>NOTES:</td>
<td>The FY13/14 Ending Balance also includes the CDS Waiver funding carryover from FY12/13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nevada County Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Program Budget Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Data thru 6/30/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>EJ EDUCATIONAL OPTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>BEGINNING BALANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Revenues - Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LCFF/REVENUE LIMIT/EIA</td>
<td>170,199</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>187,447</td>
<td>200,412</td>
<td>314,540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Title I, Part A</td>
<td>159,846</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>168,639</td>
<td>141,770</td>
<td>207,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Title I, Part D</td>
<td>68,426</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>62,696</td>
<td>57,213</td>
<td>74,725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Child Nutrition</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>4,830</td>
<td>6,380</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>3,476</td>
<td>252%</td>
<td>1,379</td>
<td>3,616</td>
<td>3,629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>$404,096</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>$424,991</td>
<td>$409,391</td>
<td>$604,539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>EXPENDITURES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>202,405</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>200,642</td>
<td>206,684</td>
<td>93,244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>63,568</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>60,207</td>
<td>65,931</td>
<td>23,264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>STRS@ 8.25%</td>
<td>13,238</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>14,709</td>
<td>15,101</td>
<td>3,759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>PERS@ 11.442%</td>
<td>4,531</td>
<td>177%</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Health &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>37,861</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>33,518</td>
<td>36,477</td>
<td>8,523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>7,937</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>9,425</td>
<td>11,803</td>
<td>6,632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>13,824</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>22,591</td>
<td>8,996</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>19,090</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>19,696</td>
<td>17,384</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Travel &amp; Conferences</td>
<td>52xx</td>
<td>1,683</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Dues</td>
<td>53xx</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>55xx</td>
<td>8,554</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>15,950</td>
<td>8,076</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Rent/Repairs</td>
<td>56xx</td>
<td>31,270</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>31,331</td>
<td>28,595</td>
<td>9,817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>58xx</td>
<td>14,431</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>14,330</td>
<td>7,311</td>
<td>4,078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td>57xx</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14,581</td>
<td>13,264</td>
<td>11,196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Copies/Faxes/Classes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14,581</td>
<td>13,264</td>
<td>11,196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Professional Services/Postage</td>
<td>58xx</td>
<td>16,069</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>21,323</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>448,432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>59xx</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>29,781</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>35,606</td>
<td>34,098</td>
<td>11,793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>TOTAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>$401,497</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>$439,657</td>
<td>$399,750</td>
<td>$609,783</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</td>
<td>$2,599</td>
<td></td>
<td>($14,666)</td>
<td>$9,641</td>
<td>($5,244)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>PROJECTED ENDING FUND BALANCE</td>
<td>$19,069</td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,735</td>
<td>$24,094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>NOTES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>The FY13/14 Ending Balance also includes the CDS Waiver funding carryover from FY12/13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Nevada County Superintendent of Schools
## Program Budget Review
### 2013/14

Data thru 6/30/14 100%

### SUGARLOAF MOUNTAIN JUVENILE HALL PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013/14 Actuals</th>
<th>% Actual vs Budget</th>
<th>2013/14 Budget</th>
<th>2012/13 Actuals</th>
<th>2011/12 Actuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Balance</strong></td>
<td>16,220</td>
<td>16,220</td>
<td>24,588</td>
<td>27,180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues - Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCFF/REVENUE LIMIT/EIA</td>
<td>99,781</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>108,849</td>
<td>160,463</td>
<td>194,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I, Part A</td>
<td>143,802</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>140,285</td>
<td>89,509</td>
<td>189,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I, Part D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Nutrition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>2,409</td>
<td>155%</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>2,901</td>
<td>3,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$245,992</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>$250,686</td>
<td>$252,873</td>
<td>$386,951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013/14 Actuals</th>
<th>% Actual vs Budget</th>
<th>2013/14 Budget</th>
<th>2012/13 Actuals</th>
<th>2011/12 Actuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries</strong></td>
<td>146,239</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>147,156</td>
<td>168,913</td>
<td>24,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>40,731</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>40,254</td>
<td>46,218</td>
<td>7,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRS @ 8.25%</td>
<td>10,038</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>10,372</td>
<td>12,097</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERS @ 11.442%</td>
<td>2,556</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,556</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>2,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>21,559</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>20,073</td>
<td>21,795</td>
<td>3,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>6,379</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>7,235</td>
<td>9,776</td>
<td>1,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplies</strong></td>
<td>6,951</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17,068</td>
<td>6,661</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td>7,915</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>8,450</td>
<td>1,683</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Conferences</td>
<td>52xx</td>
<td>6,918</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues</td>
<td>53xx</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>55xx</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent/Repairs</td>
<td>56xx</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food</strong></td>
<td>58xx</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Service</strong></td>
<td>57xx</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6,953</td>
<td>11,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copies/Faxes/Classes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6,953</td>
<td>11,405</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services/Postage</td>
<td>58xx</td>
<td>10,790</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>13,685</td>
<td>1,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>59xx</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>138%</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>18,376</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>21,740</td>
<td>22,225</td>
<td>10,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>239,998</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$266,906</td>
<td>$261,241</td>
<td>$389,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>$5,995</td>
<td>(16,220)</td>
<td>($8,368)</td>
<td>($2,592)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$16,220</td>
<td>$24,588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Memorandum

TO: President Trevor Michael and Nevada County Board of Education Members
FROM: Regina Reno, Personnel Manager

BOARD MEETING DATE: July 9, 2014
DATE PREPARED: July 1, 2014
AGENDA: Informational Item
TITLE: Temporary County Certificates issued for 2013/2014

RECOMMENDED MOTION: Informational item only, no motion needed.

BACKGROUND:

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) authorizes the County office to issue Temporary County Certificates (TCC) to qualified educators that have the proper qualifications whose applications are being processed by the CTC to obtain a valid credential or permit. The purpose of the TCC is to authorize salary payments during this timeframe. (EC 44332)

Attached is a list of individuals who were issued Temporary County Certificates during the 2013/2014 school year.

IMPACT:
The Temporary County Certificate authorizes salary payments to working educators while they obtain a valid credential or permit from the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. There is no fiscal impact.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>NCSOS</th>
<th>Sub Ed</th>
<th>Mail</th>
<th>NCSOS Charter</th>
<th>Other District</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huland</td>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Clear SS - English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Clear SS - Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck</td>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Clear SS - Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosson</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Clear SS - English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairchild</td>
<td>Debi</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Clear SS - Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lofisi</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Clear Admin Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td>PVSD</td>
<td>Prelim Admin Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montoro</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td>NCSD</td>
<td>Prelim CTE - Info Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looney</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td>NCSD</td>
<td>Prelim Admin Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daugherty</td>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>7/22/2013</td>
<td>NCSD</td>
<td>Prelim Admin Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugly</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>7/22/2013</td>
<td>NCSD</td>
<td>Prelim Admin Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riden</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>7/22/2013</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Prelim Admin Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cappellan</td>
<td>Marisa</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Out of State Prepared - MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGovern</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>8/1/2013</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>CLAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>8/5/2013</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>MS Internship Credential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>8/13/2013</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Emergency CLAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiFilippo</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>6/19/2013</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Admin Services Credential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagwell</td>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Child Develop. Program Director Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Clear SS - Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Clear SS - English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simas</td>
<td>Paulette</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Clear SS - Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Biletey - PPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roggenbhi</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Prelim SS - Social Science extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>10/1/2013</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Extension of Prelim SS English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawall</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>10/1/2013</td>
<td>GVSD</td>
<td>Clear SS - English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovelton</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>10/1/2013</td>
<td>PVSD</td>
<td>Clear Multiple Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koster</td>
<td>Kristi</td>
<td>10/23/2013</td>
<td>UHSD</td>
<td>Emergency RSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>11/1/2013</td>
<td>UHSD</td>
<td>Forest, Clear Multiple Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demeter</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>1/1/2014</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Extension of Prelim Multiple Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foss</td>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>1/1/2014</td>
<td>UHSD</td>
<td>Extension of Prelim SS - English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisella</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>1/1/2014</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Ed Specialist &amp; Admin Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harter</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>1/1/2014</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Clear Single Subject - Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Amara</td>
<td>1/1/2014</td>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td>Clear Clinical or Rehabilitative Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machado</td>
<td>Vanessa</td>
<td>1/20/2014</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>30 day sub permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>2/1/2014</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Clear SS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saio</td>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>3/1/2014</td>
<td>GVSD</td>
<td>Clear Multiple Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolk</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>5/1/2014</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Clear Single Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>3/20/2014</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Prospective 30 Day Sub Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callouette</td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>4/7/2014</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Prospective 30 Day Sub Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koenko</td>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>4/22/2014</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>30 day sub permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chidley</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>5/1/2014</td>
<td>GVSD</td>
<td>MS extension - 2 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>5/1/2014</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>SS - Soc Sci extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prado</td>
<td>Gabriela</td>
<td>5/22/2014</td>
<td>GVSD</td>
<td>Multiple Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berardi</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>5/22/2014</td>
<td>TRSOSD</td>
<td>Admin Services/Single Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homan</td>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>5/22/2014</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Single Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>Shawn</td>
<td>5/22/2014</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>Single Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>6/1/2014</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Single Subject extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Tammie</td>
<td>6/1/2014</td>
<td>NUUHSD</td>
<td>PPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 49
How Do the New Limitations on District Reserves Work . . . and What Should Districts Do Now?

We have had many questions regarding the details of the recently enacted budget trailer bill which places a cap on district reserves, Senate Bill (SB) 858, and its effect on school district policies and operations. The most frequent question is "What should I do now as a result of this bill?" We think the answer to that is clear: "Nothing."

As a precursor to the discussion of the new requirements, we want to make it clear that we at School Services of California, Inc., stand strongly with the other statewide management groups that have opposed the concept of the state dictating maximum reserve levels to local school districts. We believe this legislation is totally unnecessary and will greatly increase the exposure of district budgets to the volatility of state revenues during the next downturn. We believe that student programs and employment security for the members of the unions that supported the bill will be adversely affected. Nonetheless, SB 858 is now current law. We therefore need to be fully informed of its provisions and actions that are required of school districts as a result of the new law.

We want to explain two major elements of the bill and how they would affect local school districts. First, SB 858 requires more detailed public disclosure of district ending balances and in some cases requires explanation of why they are needed. This is not significantly different than what districts have been required to do prior to SB 858. In the past, districts have been required to provide full information on the budget to the public in advance of a formal public hearing before adoption of the budget. The reserves and ending balances have always been subject to public review and discussion. The new process merely makes that review more formal.

However, with regard to the cap on reserves, we see no need for a school district to be concerned about the level of its reserves in the immediate future. Local school boards are still responsible for the solvency of the school district and our advice on the calculation of adequate reserves will not change as a result of passage of the SB 858. We continue to recommend the state minimum reserve level be considered just that—the minimum. Layered above that, we recommend that districts establish prudent reserves for known purposes such as declining enrollment, opening or closing a school, a basic aid reserve, volatility in state funding or general economic conditions.

Assuming voter enactment of the "Rainy Day Fund" in November, proponents of the cap on school district reserves have asserted that the newly created Proposition 98 Reserve will serve as a sufficient reserve for local school districts. We disagree with that assertion.

Provisions of SB 858 specify that in the year following a contribution to the Proposition 98 Reserve—a contribution triggered by the volatile capital gains tax—school districts are prohibited from maintaining reserves in excess of twice the minimum required by state regulations (three times the minimum for the Los Angeles Unified School District, or 3%). Thus, school districts statewide would have reserves cut to a maximum ranging from 3% to 10%, depending upon the size of the district, if any contribution, regardless of the amount, is made to the Proposition 98 Reserve.
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We would note that economic recessions are often preceded by a run-up in stock prices, as a rising Dow Jones industrial average entices speculators to pour greater sums into more risky stocks. This condition could result in capital gains revenues reaching the 8% threshold specified in the November ballot measure and thus trigger a contribution to the state “Rainy Day Fund” and the Proposition 98 Reserve. In the following year school districts would be required to cut their reserves to the SB 858 maximum. (We acknowledge that the new law provides for county offices of education to grant exemptions to the cap under specified circumstances.)

Unfortunately, a major market sell-off can also be the precursor to a prolonged economic recession. Thus, school districts could find themselves exposed to sustained cuts in state funding, an inadequate amount in its local reserve, and no certainty that the state’s Proposition 98 Reserve will be sufficient to protect their educational programs. How big would the state’s Proposition 98 Reserve have to be to protect districts from having to make significant program cuts?

Recent history provides an example. In 2008-09, the first year of the Great Recession, the state cut general purpose revenue limits about $150 per ADA, or about $900 million statewide. The following year, the revenue limit was cut an additional $690 per ADA, or an additional $4 billion. Thus, in just the first two years of the last economic downturn, had SB 858 been in place, the state’s Proposition 98 Reserve would have to have been close to $6 billion in order to avert the cuts to the revenue limit that districts suffered. As we know, the state also imposed cuts of 20% to the Tier III categorical programs and both of these reductions continued well beyond two years. And reserves are one-time money. A healthy Proposition 98 Reserve, had it existed at the time, would at best cushion, but not eliminate, cuts in funding for education.

We are including an extensive discussion of this change in law in our upcoming School Finance and Management Conference. We will detail what is known, and what remains fluid in the translation of the law. We believe this topic is likely to continue to evolve. We urge readers to follow our continuing discussions and not to immediately change district policies toward reserves. Current law and good judgment by local boards have served us well during bad times; we should not give up those proven principles easily.

—John Gray, Ron Bennett, and Robert Miyashiro

posted 06/25/2014
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