



## MEETING MINUTES

---

### Voting Members

Paul Bokota, Board Clerk  
Lauren Brooks, Board Member  
Jeff Kim, Board Member  
Katie McEwen, Board Member  
Cyril Yu, Board President

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER - 3:00 PM

President Yu called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

### 2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Minutes:

Debra Kamm and Geneva Bailey addressed the Board Regarding the Closed Session Anticipated Litigation matter.

### 3. CLOSED SESSION

The Board adjourned to closed session at 3:11 p.m.

Minutes:

Prior to adjourning to Closed Session, President Yu announced that the Board would be conferencing with legal counsel regarding one anticipated litigation case pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9, in response to eight Brown Act Cure and Correct demands submitted by Debra Kamm to the Board under Government Code section 54960.1.

#### a. Conference with Legal Counsel - Anticipated Litigation [Government Code Section 54956.9]

The Board met with legal counsel to discuss the anticipated litigation matter.

### 4. RECONVENE SPECIAL MEETING

President Yu reconvened the meeting at 3:29 p.m.

### 5. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/ROLL CALL

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Member Yu.

#### Members Present:

Paul Bokota  
Lauren Brooks  
Jeff Kim  
Katie McEwen  
Cyril Yu

Staff Present:

Terry L. Walker, Superintendent of Schools  
John Fogarty, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services  
Eamonn O'Donovan, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources  
Cassie Parham, Assistant Superintendent, Education Services  
Brienne Ford, Assistant Superintendent, Information Technology  
Raianna Chavez, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent

**6. REPORT OF CLOSED SESSION DISCUSSION / ACTION**

Minutes:

President Yu reported on the discussion in Closed Session including the motion by Member Bokota and second by Member Brooks, carried 5-0 with Members Bokota, Brooks, Kim, McEwen, and Yu voting to authorize legal counsel to respond to the complainant in writing.

**7. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Adopt agenda, as presented.

Motion made by: Katie McEwen

Motion seconded by: Lauren Brooks

Voting:

Paul Bokota - Yes  
Lauren Brooks - Yes  
Jeff Kim - Yes  
Katie McEwen - Yes  
Cyril Yu - Yes

**8. \*BUDGET STUDY SESSION**

Minutes:

Tammy Blakely, Executive Director of Student Support Services, commenced the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) and Budget Study Session by reviewing the meeting's goals and outcomes. These include a review of the 2024-25 LCAP development process and the district budget as it relates to the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). The 2024-25 school year marks the first year of a three-year cycle for the new LCAP document. The purpose of the LCAP is to align planning and budgeting efforts, monitor the implementation of actions and progress by student subgroups, engage educational partners including students, parents, and staff, and ensure oversight by the Board of Education.

The LCAP consists of 10 sections: Budget Overview for Parents; Annual Update; Plan Summary; Educational Partner Engagement; Goals, Actions, and Progress Indicators; Increase or Improved Services; Expenditure Tables; Federal Addendum; and attachments including the Local Indicator Self-Reflection Report. The Annual Update and the Local Indicator Self-Reflection Report are new sections for this LCAP cycle.

The District obtained feedback on the LCAP through the Annual Survey in January 2024, resulting in responses from 26,704 participants, including 19,641 students, 5,522 parents, and 1,541 staff members. Additionally, the District utilized a ThoughtExchange LCAP activity in spring 2024, with nearly 1,700 participants from educational partner groups such as IUCPTA, ITA, CSEA, Special Education CAC, DELAC, and district office staff. This activity generated over 2,000 individual thoughts in multiple languages, which were then reviewed and ranked. Tammy noted the moderate increase in participation from site staff and parents and thanked the District's educational partners, including IUCPTA, for their support. From these exercises,

high-priority themes emerged: Class Size Reduction/Staff Support, Mental Health Support, Special Education/English Learner Support, and Equitable Resources.

Eamonn O'Donovan, Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources, provided an overview of employee stakeholder input into the LCAP, noting that while the LCAP process is not subject to collective bargaining, it is typically discussed as informational items in bargaining meetings. This is because some of the goal areas in the LCAP process relate to curriculum content, selection of instructional materials, and the use of technology, requiring separate consultation with bargaining units. Additionally, decisions resulting from the LCAP process can have implications for collective bargaining, especially regarding class size, salary, benefits, and working conditions.

Next, Tammy reviewed the eight state priorities, the three LCAP goals, and the required action item changes within the three Districtwide goals. The California Dashboard serves as a primary source and plays a significant role in determining changes to the action items that will inform the progress indicators.

Required Action Items were outlined, noting if a school district has 30 or more English Learners and 15 or more Long Term English Learners, as IUSD does, there are required action items to address language acquisition and development. Districts eligible for Technical Assistance or Differentiated Assistance must include specific actions related to implementation and the work needed to address that assistance. The District is in Differentiated Assistance for the Foster Youth subgroup in chronic absenteeism and mathematics, and six district sites are in year two of Additional Targeted Support and Intervention. Therefore, these sites and student groups will be identified in the progress indicators and action items. Districts must include one or more specific actions if they have red indicators on the 2023 Dashboard for any student group or school. These actions are in place for three years. Consequently, the LCAP has shifted from using one-time funds to how funds are used to support student groups.

Tammy reviewed the California Dashboard, noting the high academic performance for the district is predominantly in the blue tier. She also reviewed the College and Career indicator, which shows very high performance, and noted the variation in student groups' levels. This indicator will be color-coded next year. For Academic Engagement and School Climate, the Graduation Rate remained unchanged at 94.5%, with no student groups in the red or orange categories. The Suspension Rate also remained stable as 'very good' districtwide, with student groups indicated in each of the performance levels. Chronic Absenteeism remained unchanged districtwide. A table displayed various Dashboard categories by student subgroups, showing each color category was shared. She also highlighted the multi-tiered systems of support in place to support students with diverse needs, focusing on school or district-level supports and teacher or classroom-level supports.

For Goal 1: Create a positive school climate and system of support for student personal and academic growth, Tammy noted there are eight Progress Indicators, 58 Action Items, and two Action Items with one-time funding. The Goal 1 Progress Indicators include attendance, chronic absenteeism, middle and high school dropout rates, graduation rates, suspension rates, expulsion rates, and local indicators, including education partner engagement tools. Proposed Action Items for Goal 1 were shared, broken down by support level for students.

For Goal 2: Ensure all students attain proficiency in state standards with access to rigorous and relevant learning tools, resources, and skills for staff and students, Tammy noted there are nine Progress Indicators, 27 Action Items, and five one-time funding action items. The Goal 2 Progress Indicators include CAASPP ELA/Math Performance, Graduation Rates, EL Progress toward Proficiency, EL Reclassification Rates, Summative ELPAC Rates, ELPAC Participation

Rates, UC/CSU Requirements, and local indicators, including education partner engagement tools. Proposed Action Items for Goal 2 were shown by student support level.

Lastly, for Goal 3: Address barriers limiting student participation in programs and provide equity in the allocation of resources, Tammy noted nine Progress Indicators, 18 Action Items, and five one-time funding action items. The Goal 3 Progress Indicators include Teachers Appropriately Assigned/Credentialed, Access to Standards Aligned Materials, School Facilities FIT Report, Students Taking one or two or more College Prep Courses, College and Career Indicator, CTE Pathway Completers, A-G Requirements and CTE Courses, and local indicators. Proposed Action Items for Goal 3 were shared by student support level.

Tammy concluded by stating the draft LCAP document is still being refined, and the final document will be presented for the June Public Hearing. Member Kim inquired about the interest in a dual immersion language program within the District. Ms. Blakely responded that community feedback had not indicated such an interest, and it would depend on space availability.

John Fogarty, Assistant Superintendent of Business Services, presented the 2024-25 LCAP Budget overview, which is based on the January Governor's Budget. He noted that the May Revise Budget, which is due May 15th, will be used to build the District's budget. He began with a state fiscal outlook for 2024-25, highlighting that the postponement of the 2022 Personal Income Tax and Corporate Tax filings until November 2023 resulted in a revenue shortfall of approximately \$26 billion, as projected revenues didn't materialize. In response to this shortfall, the Governor's January 2024-25 Budget proposal acknowledged a deficit of about \$38 billion, although the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) identified a deficit of approximately \$58 billion. The variation in the deficits is primarily related to the projected tax revenues for the current and subsequent years. Given the volatility of state revenues, the projected deficits are expected to evolve.

Proposition 98 operates under Test 1, meaning that reductions in state revenue directly impact K-12 and community college funding. To address the deficit, the Governor and Legislative leaders reached an agreement in early April to cover \$17 billion of the impending deficit, which includes using approximately half of the state's reserves, reductions, deferrals, fund shifts, and borrowings. This agreement appears to largely spare PK-14 operational programs but does reduce the allocation for the School Facility Aid Program by \$500 million and delays previously planned allocations of \$550 million for the Preschool, PK, and Full-Day Kindergarten Facilities Grant program.

A three-year graph was shared depicting the budget projections for Personal Income Tax collections of the enacted budget, Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) projections, and the Governor's budget, showing a discrepancy of \$9.1 billion between the enacted budget and the LAO's projections for 2023-24. Similar projections were shared for Corporate Income Tax and Sales and Use Tax Collections. Unfortunately, state revenue collections are not aligning with the Governor's projections. The Department of Finance recently reported that tax collections through March 2024 were down approximately \$5.8 billion from what was included in the Governor's January Budget Proposal, potentially negatively impacting Proposition 98 funding. The LAO projects a current year shortfall of \$15.3 billion and an additional shortfall of \$8.4 billion for 2024-25, but revenues received in April, when taxes are due, will heavily influence the final projections.

John highlighted the 2024-25 Governor's January Budget Proposal for K-12 education, noting its focus on protecting K-12 from the projected deficits. There are no new ongoing or one-time categorical programs, just a Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) for the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and most of the previously established categorical programs. The COLA

included in the January budget was 0.76%, which would yield \$5 million for IUSD. However, the current calculated COLA is now set at 1.07% for 2024-25, which is quite low compared to previous years and insufficient to cover the annual increases in expenditures related to step and column, pension costs, and special education for many, if not all, school districts in the state. It remains unclear what COLA the Governor will adopt for the May Revised Budget. Assuming a 0.76% COLA yielding \$5 million to IUSD in 2024-25, a shortfall of \$5.3 million is anticipated; we await the Governor's May Revised budget.

In 2023-24, the 8.22% COLA provided ongoing funding of \$47.4 million to the District. After accounting for annual increases in expenditures related to step and column, pension costs, and special education, approximately \$32.2 million in ongoing funding remained available for allocation. The 2024-25 LCAP Budget by Goal was shared, noting \$5.1 million in one-time funding for all three Goals. However, some actions totaling \$600,000 were covered by other State funded resources, lowering the total allocation to \$4.5 million of the nearly \$5.5 million available, leaving nearly \$1 million for future LCAPs.

John outlined the ongoing challenges related to school district funding, primarily that the LCFF represents over 90% of unrestricted revenue. For IUSD, it represents 94%, yet funding disproportionately benefits districts with high concentrations of disadvantaged students. Other challenges include district and statewide enrollment issues, one-time categorical funding, volatile state revenues, and ongoing pension increases. Inflation remains a concern, at least in the short-term, potentially causing stock market volatility and impacting State Capital Gains in 2023-24.

John reviewed the District's Locally Funded/Basic Aid status, noting three main factors that impact when a district transitions from LCFF funding to locally funded (Basic Aid): annual assessed property valuations and corresponding property tax collections, district-wide enrollment/Average Daily Attendance (ADA) growth, and statewide LCFF appointment increases. IUSD is currently an LCFF funded district, receiving LCFF funding of \$429 million, of which \$347 million or 81% comes from local property taxes, and the rest, \$82 million, is made up in State aid. Locally funded districts receive nearly all funding from local property taxes, with a small amount from state categorical funding. Based on current projections, IUSD will not be locally funded through at least 2027-28.

Enrollment and attendance trends are another factor affecting K-12 funding. From 2013-14 to 2019-20, prior to the pandemic, the District's Average Daily Attendance (ADA) was 97.19%. Since the pandemic, the average ADA for years 2021-22 to 2023-24 has been 95.6%. Each 1% of ADA equates to approximately \$3.9 million in funding. Statewide, in the first year out of the pandemic, 2021-22, ADA was 90.5%, followed by 92% and 93.9% in the current year. IUSD's ADA is better than the statewide average, but still not back to pre-pandemic levels.

He reviewed the use of one-time stimulus funds and allowable uses for 2022-23 one-time funding grants, including the three-year plan for Learning Recovery Emergency Block Grant funds of \$22.1 million, and broke down the distribution of the one-time grant funds by area of impact and expenditures by year. Of the combined approximately \$53 million in one-time grant funding, around \$37.2 million remains unspent. He shared the two-year plan to spend the remaining one-time funds, noting the total amount exceeds available funds by approximately \$6.4 million; however, additional funds have been earmarked elsewhere to cover the expense through 2025-26.

In closing, John reviewed the ongoing increases to CalSTRS and CalPERS pension costs, noting that prior to 2013-14, STRS rates were capped at 8.25% and are currently 16.92%. PERS rates were capped at 13.02% and are now 26.68%, with a projection to be 30.30% in 2027-28. He

provided the next steps in the LCAP and Budget process, stating that the LCAP plan will be shared with stakeholder groups in May, with public hearings and adoptions in June.

Board members expressed their concern regarding the lower, but improving, average daily attendance of students following the pandemic and inquired about the possible reasons. John communicated that all districts are experiencing the same occurrence, with many having even lower numbers. The reason is believed to be that parents are heeding the warnings by health experts not to send their students to school if they aren't feeling well and with more parents working from home, they can more easily keep their students' home with them.

The Board extended their appreciation to staff for the information and the presentation.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Motion made by: Lauren Brooks

Motion seconded by: Jeff Kim

Voting:

Paul Bokota - Yes

Lauren Brooks - Yes

Jeff Kim - Yes

Katie McEwen - Yes

Cyril Yu - Yes