Rutledge, Mary

Subject:

FW: Reallocation requests 3.2.17

------Forwarded message ------From: **Taylor, Martha** <<u>Martha.Taylor@tusd1.org</u>> Date: Thu, Mar 2, 2017 at 5:41 PM Subject: Reallocation requests 3.2.17 To: "wdh@umd.edu" <wdh@umd.edu>, "Thompson, Lois D." <<u>Ithompson@proskauer.com</u>>, "Juan Rodriguez (jrodriguez@MALDEF.org)" <jrodriguez@maldef.org>, "rsjr3@aol.com" <rsjr3@aol.com>, "Eichner, James (CRT)" <<u>James.Eichner@usdoj.gov</u>>, Shaheena Simons <<u>shaheena.simons@usdoj.gov</u>>, Alexander Chanock <<u>Alexander.Chanock@usdoj.gov</u>> Cc: Desegregation <<u>deseg@tusd1.org</u>>, "Converse, Bruce" <<u>BConverse@steptoe.com</u>>, Timothy Overton <<u>toverton@steptoe.com</u>>, "Soto, Karla" <<u>KARLA.SOTO@tusd1.org</u>>, "Weatherless, Renee"

Dr. Hawley and counsel:

At the start of the 2016-17 school year the District developed a Priority Reallocation List, indicating that the following items could be implemented in any order:

- Reducing the negative contingency (the adopted budget includes -\$1.2M)
- Implementation of approved consultant recommendations for the following items:
 - o Outreach, Recruitment, and Retention
 - o Dual-Language Access Plan
 - Coordinated Student Assignment (including magnets and/or integration initiatives)
 - o African American Academic Achievement Task Force
 - o CRC Plan
- PD for schools that received additional technology to move to 1:1 or 2:1

After reviewing the Q2 Expenditure Report and assessing the existing needs of the areas listed above, the District is proposing the following eight reallocations over \$50,000. Also, provided below, is a chart showing the projected FCI score changes if items 4-8 are implemented. As indicated, the four identified RC schools are currently below 2.5 on the FCI but would all be well above 2.5 on the FCI if these projects are approved. **Please respond with any objections within five business days, no later than next Thursday, March 9, 2017.**

1. \$1,435,000: Reducing negative contingency (top priority)

2. \$1,500,000: Summer PD

Summer PD is designed to improve the effectiveness of instruction and teacher skills to improve the achievement of all of our students. Summer PD centers specifically around effective instruction in the areas of ELA and Math. To support the proposed comprehensive Early Literacy Plan TUSD is proposing a 5-day Teaching Reading Effectively PD for all K-3 teachers. We are planning to provide continued support with Engage NY Math. In addition to ELA and Math we are providing continued PD in PLCs (building teacher leader capacity and understanding curriculum 4.0).

3. \$155,000: Facility upgrades (security systems) @ Hollinger

This upgrade includes repairing or replacing components of Hollinger's antiquated security system. As parents and families often equate school safety to campus security, this item is a high priority not only for the FCI score, but for the attractiveness of the school that affect recruitment.

4. \$150,000: EMCS upgrades @ Manzo

EMCS stands for "Electronic Management/Maintenance Computer Systems" (aka "Energy Management Controls Systems" or, in layman's terms, "electronic remote access to HVAC systems"). These systems manage cooling and heating centrally; and there are a many automated systems involved. They have been in operation for many years, and the District maintains a three-person staff that repair the systems and the mechanical systems connected to them for Chillers and Boilers.

5. \$1.625M Roof upgrades @ Safford (\$420k); @ Hollinger (\$575k); and @ Manzo and Carrillo (\$315k each)

FCI is a measurement of the life cycle and coordinated improvements to improve life cycles of a structure. Age is the first item looked at by National Programs. As a system ages it either does better than expected or worse. The closer a system gets to its replacement age, the lower the FCI score (in our system). If a system is doing better than expected, then it slows the process (FCI getting lower,) as facility management constantly reviews such systems. If the system is doing worse (for example, a roof is leaking), then the system gets to a lower FCI score quicker than expected. Low scores are priorities in deciding which projects to seek to address for the MYFP.

Case 4:74-cv-00090-DCB Document 2008-1 Filed 04/06/17 Page 3 of 3

The typical funds that would be used for such projects include the Building Improvement Fund (defunded by the State in 2009) and Capital Funding (also provided by the State, but essentially non-existent at this point). In their place is the State Facilities Board grant application process which only funds specific projects for systems that are already in collapse (it does not fund preventative maintenance). Thus, relying only on existing non-910G sources, the District is severely hampered in addressing facilities conditions at racially concentrated schools that score under 2.5 (any existing, available funds are directed towards facility improvements that are necessary for safety reasons – or, in exceptional cases, for improvements that support integration initiatives like the expansion of Drachman K-8).

RC Schools Under 2.5	Projects Needed to Move Towards (or to pass) 2.5	Cost	FCI Element Score		FCI Category Score			Overall FCI		Anticipated FCI score post-project
			Before	After	Before		After	Before	After	
Safford	Roof	420,000	1.00	4.00	Roof	1.00	4.00	2.13	2.73	2.73
Hollinger	Roof	575,000	1.00	4.00	Roof	1.00	4.00	2.29	2.89	3.02
	Security (alarm)	80,000	1.25	5.00	Sp Sys	2.08	3.33	2.29	2.42	
Manzo	Roof	315,000	1.50	4.00	Roof	1.50	4.00	2.33	2.83	
	Security (fire, alarm, intercom)	75,000	1.00	5.00	Sp Sys	1.00	5.00	2.33	2.73	3.23
	EMCS	150,000	1.75	3.00	Bld Sys	2.69	4.00	2.33	2.39	
Carrillo	Roof	315,000	1.00	4.00	Roof	1.00	4.00	2.33	2.93	3.10

Willis D. Hawley Professor Emeritus of Education and Public Policy University of Maryland, College Park Senior Adviser, Southern Poverty Law Center