

EXHIBIT J

TUSD RFI #(s): 2407-2424
Estimated TUSD Staff Time:
Attachment(s):

-----Information above this line is to be completed by District Staff -----

TUSD Request for Information Form

RFI Instructions

1. TUSD will then assign each request its TUSD RFI number.
2. Present the RFI in the form of a question(s) or a discrete request for information.
3. For every question/request on the form, include the reason(s) why the information being requested is needed.
4. Indicate the relevant section of the USP, court order, district report or other document (i.e., reference) that relates to RFI. Page numbers may be more appropriate in some instances).
5. Use a separate form for each specific request unless the answers to the questions posed are interdependent.
6. Copy the TUSD email group "Deseg."

Request for Information

Submitted by:	Lois Thompson for the Mendoza Plaintiffs.
Submission Date:	May 20, 2019
Subject:	Draft # 3 Proposed 2019-20 910(G) Budget
USP or Reference	Sections X, B

RFI #2407: Are there integration initiatives that are proposed to be funded in 2019-20 that would not otherwise have been included in the proposed budget if approximately \$ 2 million additional dollars were included in the magnet school/transition school budgets?

Response: It is impossible to answer this question. First, there are no specific or single items that are identified as "integration initiatives" in the budget. Second, any time a major funding decision is made to increase one category of expenditures, it involves a complex rebalancing of all other expenditure categories to triage and determine what areas can least problematically be cut to offset the increase. This rebalancing process involves discussions with all departments across the district, approval of leadership, and secondary rebalancing to offset the impact of the initial rebalancing in an iterative process.

RFI #2408: If so, what are those initiatives and what is the amount proposed to be allocated to each such initiative (and where can they be found in the draft budget)?

Response: NA.

With respect to the Reading Recovery program:

RFI #2409: In 2018-19 what was the total budget allocation was for this program (and where can those allocations be found in the 2018-19 budget documents)?

Response: On Form 4 teachers are labeled Reading Recovery. In addition, there is a Reading Recovery coordinator in Language Acquisition in activity code 80511 (Targeted Academic Interventions). Other costs (materials, etc.) are not significant and are not identifiable in the budget.

With respect to the dual language program (Activity Code 504):

RFI #2410: Is the District proposing to decrease the number of dual language teachers at Hollinger in 2019-20 below the number in 2018-19?

Response: No, in fact, we have increased their FTE for Dual Language by 1 at the middle school level.

RFI #2411: If so, what is the basis for doing so?

Response: We did not decrease.

RFI #2412: If not, what is the explanation for the apparent reduction in funded FTEs in the 2019-20 budget as compared to the 2018-19 budget?

Response: The recommendation from LAD called for an additional DL FTE at the middle school. We checked their budget and it was not decreased.

RFI #2413: To what “formula” was the District referring in the Draft Budget # 3 Cover Letter when it explained a change in the draft budget for funding for the dual language program at Bloom from 8 to 6 when it wrote “Bloom needs 6 not 8 based on formula”?

Response: This refers to the standard staffing formula used to allocate teachers based on projected enrollment for all classroom teachers in the district. All teacher allocations are adjusted to match actual enrollment in the Fall Equalization process once school begins.

RFI #2414: Is the District proposing to decrease the number of dual language teachers at Mission View in 2019-20 below the number in 2018-19?

Response: No. This is merely a funding source change. All teacher allocations are adjusted to match actual enrollment in the Fall Equalization process once school begins.

RFI #2415: If so, what is the basis for doing so?

Response: NA

RFI #2416: If not, what is the explanation for the apparent reduction in funded FTEs in the 2019-20 budget as compared to the 2018-19 budget?

Response: See response to 2414.

RFI #2417: How many dual language classes and at what grade levels is Mission View expected to have TWDL classes in 2019-20?

Response: Mission View will have a DL classroom at every grade level K-5. This is a total of 6 DL classes.

RFI #2418: How many dual language classes and at what grade levels is Van Buskirk expected to have TWDL classes in 2019-20?

Response: Van Buskirk will have a DL classroom at every grade level K-5. This a total of 6 DL classes.

With respect to discipline: restorative practices and PBIS (Activity Code 601):

RFI #2419: What is the District's rationale or basis for decreasing one FTE in the "classified salary" under this Activity Code and adding two "ESI Classified" positions?

Response: This year the district has budgeted for both a director and a coordinator in this department. Last year the district budgeted only for a director. The two employees are paid through the district's contract with ESI. This is merely a coding issue and has nothing to do with roles and responsibilities.

RFI #2420: What is the role/responsibility of the "classified salary" position that is proposed to be eliminated?

Response: See response to 2419.

RFI #2421: What is the role/responsibility of the "ESI Classified" positions that are proposed to be added?

Response: See response to 2419.

RFI #2422: Please explain the process that the District has or will put in place to regularly assess that teachers have an understanding of District disciplinary practices, the code of conduct/GSRR, PBIS, and restorative practices? (As noted in the accompanying statement of comments and objections, what Mendoza Plaintiffs seek here is not the description of a fully developed process, but some explanation of the District's plan that would help provide them with an understanding of why the District believes "existing resources" can be used to adequately implement this Court directive.

Response: The District ensures that twice a year (once per semester) disciplinary policies and procedures are reviewed with all teachers in a professional development setting. At this time, they are given the opportunity to ask questions and receive further clarification. Copies of the district Code of Conduct are at hand and the principals or designees review guidelines for Student Rights and Responsibilities, Restorative Practices, and PBIS. Additionally, the Department of Student Relations has developed two mandatory on-line trainings for teachers and administrators on the Student Code of Conduct and PBIS. After completing the on-line training, an assessment is given and if the teacher achieves an 80% score or better they receive professional development credit. The Department of Student Relations is also available to visit campuses and present professional development on any aspect of Student Code of Conduct, PBIS, or Restorative Practices.

With respect to family and community engagement (Activity Codes 701-04)

RFI #2423: How many FTEs has the District allocated in budget Draft #3 to the individuals that are to “support school level teams and principals” per the Special Master’s recommendation?

Response: Three.

RFI #2424: What positions that are included in the approved 2018-2019 school year budget have been eliminated from budget Draft # 3 and why?

Response: The draft 3 budget does not change the overall number of FTEs for the Family Engagement and Outreach Department.