

ITEM 10
INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIM
PROPOSED DECISION

Education Code Section 49079, Statutes 1993, Chapter 1257

Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion

05-4452-I-01

Fiscal Years: 2001-2002 and 2002-2003

San Diego Unified School District, Claimant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Exhibit A

Incorrect Reduction Claim (IRC) filed June 26, 2006.....1

Exhibit B

State Controller’s Office, Comments on the IRC filed November 21, 2007.....106

Exhibit C

Draft Proposed Decision issued May 16, 2014.....246

Exhibit D

State Controller’s Office, Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision filed June 4, 2014.....266

Exhibit E

Supporting Documents.....271

Parameters and Guidelines adopted July 20, 1995

Statement of Decision on the *Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion* test claim adopted January 19, 1995.

State of California
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES
980 Ninth Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 323-3562

Appendix E

For Official Use Only
RECEIVED
JUN 26 2006
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES
Claim No. 05-4452-I-01

INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIM FORM

Local Agency or School District Submitting Claim

San Diego Unified School District

Contact Person

Telephone Number

Arthur M. Palkowitz

(619) 725-7785

Address

4100 Normal Street, Room 3160, San Diego, CA 92103-2682

Representative Organization to be Notified

Mandated Cost Unit

This claim alleges an incorrect reduction of a reimbursement claim filed with the State Controller's Office pursuant to section 17561 of the Government Code. This incorrect reduction claim is filed pursuant to section 17551(b) of the Government Code.

CLAIM IDENTIFICATION: Specify Statute or Executive Order

Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Chapter 1306/89 and 1257/93

Fiscal Year*	Amount of the Incorrect Reduction
2001-2002	\$166,791
2002-2003	\$187,255

*More than one fiscal year may be claimed

IMPORTANT: PLEASE SEE INSTRUCTIONS AND FILING REQUIREMENTS FOR COMPLETING AN INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIM ON THE REVERSE SIDE.

Name and Title of Authorized Representative


Telephone No.

Arthur M. Palkowitz

(619) 725-7785

Signature of Authorized Representative

Date



6-22-06

INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIM OF SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989 and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993
Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion

Table of Contents

Narrative of the Incorrect Reduction Claim..... 1

I. Statement of the Dispute 1

II. The District Used a Reasonable Method to Determine Unsupported Costs 4

Conclusion..... 5

Certification..... 6

Exhibits

- Exhibit A: Original Parameters and Guidelines
- Exhibit B: Government Code Section 17518.5
- Exhibit C: Notice from California State Controller re 2001-2002 Claim (2/22/2002)
- Exhibit D: Claim for Payment for Fiscal Year 2001-2002
- Exhibit E: California State Controller’s Claiming Instructions
- Exhibit F: Notice from California State Controller re 2001-2002 Claim Adjustment
- Exhibit G: Claim for Payment for Fiscal Year 2002-2003
- Exhibit H: Notice from California State Controller re 2002-2003 Claim Adjustment
- Exhibit I: California State Controller’s Audit Report
- Exhibit J: District’s Response to State Controller’s Draft Audit Report

attached as Exhibit A. The Parameters and Guidelines describe the reimbursable activities in Section V(B) as follows:

- A. Identifying pupils from records received from law enforcement agencies or otherwise maintained in the ordinary course of business, who have during the past three years engaged in or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in acts described in any subdivision, except (h) of §48900.
- B. Maintaining the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years, and a onetime cost for adopting a cost effective method of assembling and disseminating the information to teachers.
- C. Notifying teachers on a regular and timely basis of the pupils whose behavior makes them subject to suspension and expulsion and maintaining the confidentiality of the dissemination of this information.

Section VI(B)(1) of the Parameters and Guidelines states the following regarding Employee Salaries and Benefits:

“The average number of hours devoted to each function may be claimed if supported by a documented time study.”

C. Government Code Section 17518.5 “Reasonable Reimbursement Methodology”

Government Code Section 17518.5 (Exhibit B) includes the following pertinent statements regarding a “reasonable reimbursement methodology” for purposes of reimbursement of state mandates.

1. The amount reimbursed should be estimated to fully offset at least half of eligible school districts’ projected costs to implement the mandate in a cost-efficient manner.
2. Whenever possible, a reasonable reimbursement methodology shall be based on general allocation formulas, uniform cost allowance, and other approximations of local costs mandated by the state, rather than detailed documentation of the actual local costs.
3. A reasonable reimbursement methodology may be developed by, among other entities, a claimant.

D. The District’s Claim

Fiscal Year 2001-2002

On December 18, 2001, the District estimated its costs for 2001-2002 at \$375,000. On February 22, 2002, the SCO made a \$178,217 payment, which was offset to the Emergency Procedures program, to the District with a balance due of \$196,783 (Exhibit C). The SCO did not make any adjustments at this time.

On December 10, 2002, the District filed its claim for reimbursement of the costs that the District incurred during Fiscal Year 2001-2002. A copy of the District’s

reimbursement claim is attached as Exhibit D. The District's actual costs for Fiscal Year 2001-2002 were \$406,224. The District's claim is complete and contains all information required by the claiming instructions (Exhibit E).

On July 21, 2005, the SCO notified the District that the claimed amount had been adjusted down by \$166,791 (Exhibit F). The adjustment comprised of \$161,713 in "unsupported costs" and \$5,078 in related indirect costs. The District challenges the entire \$166,791 adjustment.

Fiscal Year 2002-2003

On December 10, 2002, the District estimated its costs for 2002-2003 at \$375,000. The SCO did not make an estimated payment to the District in 2003.

On December 22, 2003, the District filed its claim for reimbursement of the costs that the District incurred during Fiscal Year 2002-2003. A copy of the District's reimbursement claim is attached as Exhibit G. The District's actual costs for Fiscal Year 2002-2003 were \$414,685. The District's claim is complete and contains all information required by the Claiming Instructions (Exhibit E).

On July 21, 2005, the SCO notified the District that the claimed amount had been adjusted down by \$192,740 (Exhibit H). The adjustment comprised of \$183,045 in "unsupported costs", \$5,362 in costs funded by restricted funds, and \$4,333 in related indirect costs. The Districts challenges the \$183,045 in "unsupported costs" and \$4,210 in indirect costs related to it.

E. The SCO's Notice of Claim Reduction

On June 30, 2005, the SCO issued its final audit report (Exhibit I), which reduced the Districts claims for Fiscal Years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 from \$820,909 to \$461,378. The SCO stated the following four reasons for the disallowed costs:

1. The district's methodology was inconsistent between fiscal years.
2. The district's methodologies for both fiscal years do not constitute valid statistical analyses.
3. The time logs (contemporaneous activity reports) employees did submit indicate that time studies are not appropriate for these activities because time reported for each student varied significantly.
4. The district's procedures do not lend themselves to time studies performed at the district level.

II. THE DISTRICT USED A REASONABLE METHOD TO DETERMINE UNSUPPORTED COSTS

Section 17518.5 of the Government Code allows and even encourages the use of a reasonable reimbursement methodology. The Parameters and Guidelines state that the District may use “the average number of hours devoted to each function” as long as it is “supported by a documented time study”. The district used an average derived from contemporaneous activity reports submitted by school site staff members who performed the activities to calculate an average rate per mandated activity, per student suspended. The District contends its averages are conservative and not excessive for the following reasons:

1. The total hours submitted by each school is divided by the total number of qualifying students suspended at that school regardless of whether the staff turned in time for all students. In cases where school site employees did not turn in all of their contemporaneous activity logs for the year, the average time per student is driven down below the actual average time.
2. To be conservative, data with the highest hours reported was eliminated when calculating the average time per student. As noted in the District’s response to the SCO’s draft audit, the “longest time reported per student” in fiscal year 2001-02 for “Identifying Students” was due to an error that incorrectly credited a middle school with 7 suspensions instead of the 449 actual suspensions reported (Exhibit J). Using the correct figure the average for that school is less than 17 minutes per student. This error did not affect the District’s average per student for “Identifying Students” because it was not included in the calculation of the average. None of the high-end extremes shown in SCO’s chart on page 5 of the Audit Report (Exhibit I) were included in the calculation of the averages used by the District. The District made this adjustment to the average so that it would be more representative of the typical reimbursable situation.
3. The per student cost for extrapolated schools was less than the per student audited costs supported by contemporaneous activity reports for both fiscal years.

Fiscal Year 2001-2002

For fiscal year 2001-2002, the District has time logs from 66 schools totaling \$236,587. These schools reported a total of 6,451 suspensions that qualified for the teacher notification program, which breaks down to \$36.67 per student. In their audit, the SCO accepted these activity reports as reasonable reimbursement. The District extrapolated costs for 37 additional schools totaling \$157,270. The additional 37 schools had a total of 4,681 suspensions that qualified for the teacher notification program, which breaks down to \$33.60 per student, approximately \$3.00

less than the supported costs accepted by the SCO. The District argues that this is a reasonable estimate of the actual costs for these 37 schools.

Fiscal Year 2002-2003

For fiscal year 2002-2003, the District has time logs from 83 schools totaling \$224,356. These schools reported a total of 6,327 suspensions that qualified for the teacher notification program, which breaks down to \$35.46 per student. In their audit, the SCO accepted these time logs as reasonable reimbursement. The District extrapolated costs for 57 additional schools totaling \$181,006. The additional 57 schools had a total of 5,307 suspensions that qualified for the teacher notification program, which breaks down to \$34.11 per student, \$1.35 less than the supported costs accepted by the SCO. The District contends this is a reasonable estimate of the actual costs for these 57 schools.

A unit rate for *Pupil Health Screenings* was approved by the Commission despite concerns by the SCO that the “variance was too great” on the basis that the net result created a cost savings to the state (Final Staff Analysis, 12/9/04). In both years, the District’s average time per student was less than audited claim amounts.

CONCLUSION

The SCO is require by law to pay the claims submitted by the District (Government Code Section 17561, subdivision [d]). It is clear in Government Code Section 17518.5 that the legislature’s intent was to reimburse schools for reasonable costs of complying with state mandates without burdening them with the need for “detailed documentation of actual local costs” whenever possible. The District has gone to great effort to comply with the SCO’s desire for contemporaneous logs and has provided these logs for 60 percent of the schools claimed. Many of the District’s school sites are understaffed and overburdened. Denying reasonable funding for these schools whose staff are performing the mandated duties instituted by the state simply because they do not have the time to document their work is unfair and contrary to the intent of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution. The District is entitled to fair compensation for the cost of complying with this mandate and argues that the method used was reasonable, conservative, and consistent with the manner in which uniform cost rates have been developed for other mandates.

The Commission should find that:

- (1) The SCO incorrectly reduced the District’s Fiscal Year 2001-2002 claim by \$161,713
- (2) The SCO incorrectly reduced the District’s Fiscal Year 2002-2003 claim by \$192,740.

CERTIFICATION

I certify by my signature below that the statements made in this document are true and correct of my own knowledge, or as to all other matters, I believe them to be true and correct based upon information and belief.

Executed on June 22, 2006, in San Diego, California, by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of stylized cursive letters, positioned above a horizontal line.

Arthur M. Palkowitz
Director, Office of Resource Development

Exhibit A

Proposed Parameters and Guidelines

Education Code Section 49079
Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989
Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993

Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion

I. Summary of the Source of the Mandate

Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, added Education Code section 49079 to require school districts to report to each teacher the names of every student who has caused, or who has attempted to cause, serious bodily injury or injury to another person. The notification was to be based upon any written records the district maintained or received from a law enforcement agency. No district would be liable for failure to comply as long as a good faith effort was made to notify the teacher. Notifications were to commence in the 1990-91 school year utilizing data from the previous year, with a progression to three prior-years of data to be reported by fiscal year 1992-93.

Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993, amended Education Code section 49079 to specify for the first time the particular pupil behavior that warrants a teacher notification by including the specific reference to Education Code section 48900. The Section was also amended to immunize school personnel from civil or criminal liability unless the information they provide to the teacher was knowingly false.

II. Commission on State Mandates' Decision

The Commission on State Mandates, in the Statement of Decision adopted at the January 19, 1995 hearing found that Education Code section 49079 as added by Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989 and amended by Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993 imposes a new program or higher level of service within the meaning of Section 6, Article XIII B of the California Constitution, for school districts and county offices of education.

The Commission determined that the following provisions of Education Code Section 49079 established costs mandated by the state pursuant to Government Code section 17514, by requiring school districts to:

- (1) From records maintained in the ordinary course of business or received from law enforcement agencies, identify pupils who have, during the previous three years, engaged in, or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in any of the subdivisions of Education Code section 48900, except subdivision (h).
- (2) Provide this information to teachers on a routine and timely basis.
- (3) Maintain the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years, and adopt a cost effective method to assemble, maintain and disseminate the information to teachers.

III. Eligible Claimants

Any "school district", as defined in Government Code section 175 19, except for community colleges, which incurs increased costs as a result of this mandate is eligible to claim reimbursement.

IV. Period of Reimbursement

Section 17557 of the Government Code states that a test claim must be submitted on or before December 31 following a given fiscal year to establish eligibility for that fiscal year. The test claim for this mandate was filed on February 18, 1994, therefore all mandated costs incurred on or after July 1, 1993, for implementation of Education Code Section 49079 are reimbursable.

Actual costs for one fiscal year should be included in each claim. Estimated costs for the subsequent year may be included on the same claim, if applicable. Pursuant to Section 17561 (d) (3) of the Government Code, all claims for reimbursement of initial years' costs shall be submitted within 120 days from the date on which the State Controller's Office issues claiming instructions on funded mandates contained in the claims bill.

If the total costs for a given fiscal year do not exceed \$200, no reimbursement shall be allowed, except as otherwise allowed by Government Code section 17564.

V. Reimbursable Costs

A. Scope of the Mandate

School districts and county offices of education shall be reimbursed for the costs incurred to: identify pupils, from records maintained in the ordinary course of business or received from law enforcement agencies who have, during the previous three years engaged in, or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in any of the subdivisions of Education Code section 48900, except subdivision (h); and provide this information to teachers on a routine and timely basis.

B. Reimbursable Activities

For each eligible school district or county office of education, the direct and indirect costs of labor, supplies and services incurred for the following mandate components are reimbursable:

1. Identifying Pupils

For identifying pupils, from records received from law enforcement agencies or otherwise maintained in the ordinary course of business, who have during the previous three years engaged in or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in any of the acts described in any of the subdivisions, except (h), of section 48900.

2. Information Maintenance

For maintaining the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years, and a one-time cost for adopting a cost effective method of assembling, maintaining and disseminating the information to teachers.

3. Notifying Teachers

For notifying teachers on a regular and timely basis of the pupils whose behavior makes them subject to suspension and expulsion and such notification shall be made in a manner designed to maintain confidentiality of this information.

VI. Claim Preparation

Each claim for reimbursement pursuant to this mandate must be timely filed and set forth a listing of each item for which reimbursement is claimed under this mandate.

A. Reporting by Components

Claimed costs must be allocated according to the three components of reimbursable activity described in Section V. B.

B. Supporting Documentation

Claimed costs should be supported by the following information:

1. Employee Salaries and Benefits

Identify the employee(s) and their job classification, describe the mandated functions performed, and specify the actual number of hours devoted to each function, the productive hourly rate, and the related benefits. The average number of hours devoted to each function may be claimed if supported by a documented time study.

2. Materials and Supplies

Only the expenditures which can be identified as a direct cost of the mandate can be claimed. List cost of materials which have been consumed or expended specifically for the purpose of this mandate.

3. Contracted Services

Give the name(s) of the contractor(s) who performed the service(s). Describe the activities performed by each named contractor, and give the number of actual hours spent on the activities. Show the inclusive dates when services were performed and itemize all costs for those services.

4. Allowable Overhead Cost

- a. School districts must use the J-380 (or subsequent replacement) non-restrictive indirect cost rate provisionally approved by the California Department of Education.
- b. County offices of education must use the J-580 (or subsequent replacement) non-restrictive indirect cost rate provisionally approved by the State Department of Education.

C. Cost Accounting Statistics

The State Controller is directed to include in its claiming instructions each year the requirement that claimants report to the State Controller the following statistics for the

purpose of establishing a database for potential future reimbursement based on prospective rates:

- a. The average number of pupils for which this information is being maintained (i.e., number of pupils identified) for each year.
- b. The average daily attendance for the district for each year.
- c. The number times each year the notification is routinely made to teachers (e.g., quarterly, each semester, or annually).

VII. Supporting Data

For auditing purposes, all costs claimed must be traceable to source documents and/or worksheets that show evidence of the validity of such costs. Pursuant to Government Code section 17558.5, these documents must be kept on file by the agency submitting the claim for a period of no less than four years after the end of the calendar year in which the reimbursement claim is filed, and made available on the request of the State Controller.

VIII. Offsetting Savings and Other Reimbursements

Any offsetting savings claimant experiences as a direct result of this statute must be deducted from the costs claimed. In addition, reimbursement for this mandate received from any source, e.g., service fees collected, federal funds, other state funds etc., shall be identified and deducted from this claim. While not specifically researched, the Commission has not identified any specific offsetting savings from state or federal sources applicable to this mandate.

IX. State Controller's Office Required Certification

An authorized representative of the claimant will be required to provide a certification of claim, as specified in the State Controller's claiming instructions, for those cost mandated by the state contained herein.

Exhibit B

CALIFORNIA CODES
GOVERNMENT CODE
SECTION 17518.5

17518.5. (a) "Reasonable reimbursement methodology" means a formula for reimbursing local agency and school district costs mandated by the state that meets the following conditions:

(1) The total amount to be reimbursed statewide is equivalent to total estimated local agency and school district costs to implement the mandate in a cost-efficient manner.

(2) For 50 percent or more of eligible local agency and school district claimants, the amount reimbursed is estimated to fully offset their projected costs to implement the mandate in a cost-efficient manner.

(b) Whenever possible, a reasonable reimbursement methodology shall be based on general allocation formulas, uniform cost allowances, and other approximations of local costs mandated by the state, rather than detailed documentation of actual local costs. In cases when local agencies and school districts are projected to incur costs to implement a mandate over a period of more than one fiscal year, the determination of a reasonable reimbursement methodology may consider local costs and state reimbursements over a period of greater than one fiscal year, but not exceeding 10 years.

(c) A reasonable reimbursement methodology may be developed by any of the following:

- (1) The Department of Finance.
- (2) The Controller.
- (3) An affected state agency.
- (4) A claimant.
- (5) An interested party.

Exhibit C

CONTROLLER OF CALIFORNIA
P.O. BOX 942850, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 94250

THIS NOTICE IS FOR INFORMATION PURPOSE ONLY.
NO WARRANT WILL BE MAILED.
THE NET PAYMENT AMOUNT WAS ZERO.

*****.00

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SAN DIEGO CITY UN SCH DIST
SAN DIEGO COUNTY
4100 NORMAL STREET
SAN DIEGO CA 92103

PAYEE: TREASURER, SAN DIEGO CITY UN SCH DIST
FUND NAME: GENERAL FUND

ISSUE DATE: 02/22/2002

CLAIM SCHEDULE NBR: MA13311E

REIMBURSEMENT OF STATE MANDATED COSTS
ANY QUESTIONS PLEASE CALL KIM NGUYEN AT (916) 324-7876
ACL : 6110-295-0001 PROG : NOTICE TO TEACH SUS CH 1306/89
2001/2002 ESTIMATED PAYMENT CLAIMED AMT: 375,000.00
TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS: .00
TOTAL APPROVED CLAIMED AMT: 375,000.00
LESS PRIOR PAYMENTS: .00
PRORATA PERCENT: 47.524629
PRORATA BALANCE DUE: 196,783.00-
APPROVED PAYMENT AMOUNT: 178,217.00
PAYMENT OFFSETS (ACL NBR, NAME, FY, AMT.):
6100-295-0001-1996 EMERGENCY PROCEDURE CH 1 96/97 178,217-
NET PAYMENT AMOUNT: .00

Exhibit D

<p>CLAIM FOR PAYMENT Pursuant to Government Code Section 17561 NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION</p>	<p>For State Controller Use Only (19) Program Number 00150 (20) Date File __/__/__ (21) LRS Input __/__/__</p>	<p>Program 150</p>
---	--	-------------------------------

L A B E L H E R E	(01) Claimant Identification Number: S37165	Reimbursement Claim Data	
	(02) San Diego Unified School District	(22) NTT-1, (03)(a)	13,766
	San Diego County	(23) NTT-1, (03)(b)	125,915
	4100 Normal Street	(24) NTT-1, (03)(c)	Daily
	San Diego California 92103	(25) NTT-1, (04)(1)(d)	230,778


Type of Claim	Estimated Claim	Reimbursement Claim		
	(03) Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(09) Reimbursement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(26) NTT-1, (04)(2)(d)	85,211
	(04) Combined <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) Combined <input type="checkbox"/>	(27) NTT-1, (04)(3)(d)	77,868
	(05) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(28)	
			(29)	
Fiscal Year of Cost	(06) 2002/2003	(12) 2001/2002	(30)	
Total Claimed Amount	(07) \$ 375,000	(13) \$ 406,224	(31)	
Less: 10% Late Penalty, not to exceed \$1000		(14)	(32)	
Less: Estimated Claim Payment Received		(15) \$ 178,217	(33)	
Net Claimed Amount		(16) \$ 228,007	(34)	
Due from State	(08) \$ 375,000	(17) \$ 228,007	(35)	
Due to State		(18)	(36)	

(37) CERTIFICATION OF CLAIM

In accordance with the provisions of Government Code 17561, I certify that I am the officer authorized by the local agency to file claims with the State of California for costs mandated by Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993; and certify under penalty of perjury that I have not violated any of the provisions of Government Code Sections 1090 to 1096, inclusive.

I further certify that there was no application other than from the claimant, nor any grant or payment received, for reimbursement of costs claimed herein; and such costs are for a new program or increased level of services of an existing program mandated by Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989 and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993.

The amounts for Estimated Claim and/or Reimbursement Claim are hereby claimed from the State for payment of estimated and/or actual costs for the mandated program of Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989 and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993, set forth on the attached statements.

Signature of Authorized Officer 	Date 12-10-02
Gamy Rayburn	Accounting Director
Type or Print Name	Title

(39) Name of Contact Person for Claim <u>Camille Y. Chacon</u>	Telephone Number (619) 725-7566	E-mail Address cchacon@mail.sandi.net
---	------------------------------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION CLAIM SUMMARY				FORM NTT-1
(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District		(02) Type of Claim: Reimbursement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>		Fiscal Year 2001/2002
Claim Statistics				
(03) (a) Number of pupils identified for the fiscal year (Refer to instructions)				13,766
(b) Average daily attendance for the fiscal year				125,915
(c) Number of times teachers were notified in the fiscal year (Refer to instructions)				Daily
Direct Costs		Object Accounts		
(04) Reimbursable Components:		(a) Salaries and Benefits	(b) Materials and Supplies	(c) Contracted Services
		(d) Total		
1. Identifying Pupils		\$ 230,777.92		\$ 230,777.92
2. Information Maintenance		\$ 85,210.51		\$ 85,210.51
3. Notifying Teachers		\$ 77,868.45		\$ 77,868.45
(05) Total Direct Cost		\$ 393,856.88		\$ 393,856.88
Indirect Costs				
(06) Indirect Cost Rate		[From J-380 or J-580]		3.14%
(07) Total Indirect Costs		[Line (06) x (line (05)(d) - line (05)(c))]		\$ 12,367.11
(08) Total Direct and Indirect Costs		[Line (05)(d) + line (07)]		\$ 406,223.99
Cost Reduction				
(09) Less: Offsetting Savings, if applicable				0
(10) Less: Other Reimbursements, if applicable				0
(11) Total Claimed Amount:		[Line (08) - (Line (09) + Line (10))]		\$ 406,223.99

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

- Identifying Pupils
- Information Maintenance
- Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Identifying pupils who have engaged in or are reasonably suspected of engaging in acts described in any subdivision, except (h), of Ed. Code 48900 from records from law enforcement agencies or otherwise maintained in the ordinary course of business.					
Alcantar Cesar, Vice Principal	\$ 62.13	44	\$ 2,733.72		
Alexander Julia, Vice Principal	\$ 62.13	15.4	\$ 956.80		
Alfstad Dennis, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	138.6	\$ 8,820.50		
Andrews Virginia, Vice Principal	\$ 52.35	46	\$ 2,408.10		
Baca Laura, Guidance Assist.	\$ 18.76	59.5	\$ 1,116.22		
Baird Thomas, Vice Principal	\$ 47.80	69.08	\$ 3,302.02		
Bandiola Francisca, School Clerk I	\$ 23.92	2.5	\$ 59.80		
Barnes Julie, School Secretary II	\$ 24.24	1.66	\$ 40.24		
Beraud Beatriz, School Clerk I	\$ 24.98	29.75	\$ 743.16		
Beraud Michael, Vice Principal	\$ 62.13	6.6	\$ 410.06		
Berman Jo, Vice Principal	\$ 60.66	54.56	\$ 3,309.61		
Bishop-Irwin Michelle, Vice Principal	\$ 47.01	23.83	\$ 1,120.25		
Blackman Kristin, District Counselor	\$ 37.07	2.42	\$ 89.71		
Blair Leslie, School Clerk I	\$ 20.44	1.88	\$ 38.43		
Brings Judith, Principal	\$ 67.78	35.64	\$ 2,415.68		
Brower Chester, District Counselor	\$ 38.60	6	\$ 231.60		
Campbell Donna, Vice Principal	\$ 65.06	54.56	\$ 3,549.67		
Candage Beverly, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	10.56	\$ 566.12		
Caporale Leslie, School Secretary	\$ 30.42	15.84	\$ 481.85		
Carrillo Cecilia, Principal	\$ 66.04	13.64	\$ 900.79		
Casey Kathleen, Vice Principal	\$ 56.10	73.48	\$ 4,122.23		
Chappell Lois, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	26	\$ 1,732.38		
Coffey Douglas, Vice Principal	\$ 56.10	124.5	\$ 6,984.45		
Coleman Barbara, Vice Principal	\$ 59.37	7	\$ 415.59		
Conaway Colleen, Principal	\$ 64.60	1.75	\$ 113.05		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 1 of 5 \$ 46,662.03

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

- Identifying Pupils
- Information Maintenance
- Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Connolly Renee, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	147.25	\$ 9,811.27		
Coody Kimberly, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	134.2	\$ 8,941.75		
Cook Arlene, Teacher	\$ 47.19	0.25	\$ 11.80		
Cross Evvalenora, Vice Principal	\$ 65.06	15	\$ 975.90		
Dalal Anisha, Vice Principal	\$ 38.99	74.36	\$ 2,899.30		
Ernst Judith, Principal	\$ 66.04	0.25	\$ 16.51		
Esparza Ruth, Clerk Typist I	\$ 17.47	1.08	\$ 18.87		
Estrada Alma, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	38.72	\$ 2,075.78		
Fink Dianne, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	146.96	\$ 9,791.94		
Fischer-Garza Jerrilee, Principal	\$ 66.04	22.75	\$ 1,502.41		
Garcia Marina, Vice Principal	\$ 47.80	46.2	\$ 2,208.36		
Garcia Moreno George, Teacher	\$ 41.92	1.17	\$ 49.05		
Gardner Laura, School Clerk I	\$ 21.33	3.91	\$ 83.40		
George Michael, Vice Principal	\$ 56.10	161.92	\$ 9,083.71		
Gibson Gail, Guidance Asst.	\$ 22.16	8	\$ 177.28		
Gingery Trudy, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	0.17	\$ 4.84		
Graham Marthe, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	46.5	\$ 2,492.87		
Gray Patricia, School Clerk I	\$ 21.97	26.18	\$ 575.17		
Grimes Marilyn, Vice Principal	\$ 60.66	19.36	\$ 1,174.38		
Guido Laurie, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	55.88	\$ 3,723.28		
Halfpenny Ruth, District Counselor	\$ 36.04	18.75	\$ 675.75		
Harper, Yvonne	\$ 64.60	18.48	\$ 1,193.81		
Hernandez Joseph, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	28.6	\$ 1,820.10		
Hernandez Sergio, District Counselor	\$ 44.99	12.08	\$ 543.48		
Higgins Joann, Vice Principal	\$ 50.05	25.52	\$ 1,277.28		
Hoerr Rita, School Clerk I	\$ 23.92	56	\$ 1,339.52		
Huggins Deborah, Vice Principal	\$ 54.79	22.44	\$ 1,229.49		
Hunold DeAnne, School Secretary	\$ 23.42	14	\$ 327.88		
Iglesias Marilyn, District Counselor	\$ 37.17	16.49	\$ 612.93		
Jacobs Marian, Vice Principal	\$ 50.05	6.5	\$ 325.33		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 2 of 5 \$ 64,963.44

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Jeffers Melissa, Vice Principal	\$ 55.13	3.75	\$ 206.74		
Jennings Elizabeth, Vice Principal	\$ 51.12	19.5	\$ 996.84		
Jimenez James, Vice Principal	\$ 38.99	158.84	\$ 6,193.17		
Johnson Minerva, Vice Principal	\$ 54.22	24.5	\$ 1,328.39		
Jordan Claudia, Principal	\$ 46.52	36.08	\$ 1,678.44		
Juarez Christopher, Vice Principal	\$ 46.09	69.52	\$ 3,204.18		
Karpowich Linda, Principal	\$ 64.60	4.5	\$ 290.70		
Kheo, Phinga-Evelyn, Counselor	\$ 48.43	12	\$ 581.16		
Kotnik David, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	92.4	\$ 6,156.61		
Laine William, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	165	\$ 10,500.60		
Lewis Yolanda, Vice Principal	\$ 44.50	1.5	\$ 66.75		
Little Linda, Vice Principal	\$ 65.09	31.43	\$ 2,045.78		
Longo Mary Jo, Vice Principal	\$ 53.05	4.25	\$ 225.46		
Madden Jean, Principal	\$ 57.54	32	\$ 1,841.28		
Malcom Keith, Vice Principal	\$ 59.37	12.75	\$ 756.97		
Malone Sandra, Guidance Asst.	\$ 14.01	14	\$ 196.14		
Marra Christine, School Assistant	\$ 22.46	1.5	\$ 33.69		
Mc Fee Linda, School Secretary	\$ 20.11	0.67	\$ 13.47		
McCann Michael, Attendance Assist.	\$ 23.92	25	\$ 598.00		
McGee Stephen, District Counselor	\$ 43.53	4.75	\$ 206.77		
McGee Stephen, District Counselor	\$ 43.53	16.05	\$ 698.66		
Medina Mary, School Clerk	\$ 23.92	0.33	\$ 7.89		
Mendez Jovita, Attendance Assit.	\$ 18.76	7.66	\$ 143.70		
Mills Floyd, Dean of Students	\$ 55.78	73.5	\$ 4,099.83		
Mooney Karen, Principal	\$ 58.94	0.03	\$ 1.77		
Moran Sheelagh, Vice Principal	\$ 62.13	37.4	\$ 2,323.66		
Morrill Greg, District Counselor	\$ 55.78	0.25	\$ 13.95		
Mrachek Rebecca, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	67.76	\$ 4,312.25		
Nimtz Joan, Sub-Teacher	\$ 18.74	0.08	\$ 1.50		
Nydam Julie, Vice Principal	\$ 56.67	158	\$ 8,953.86		

(05)	Total <input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page: 3 of 5	\$ 57,678.21	
------	--------------------------------	--	--------------	--------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred:	2001/2002
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Olivero Jeff, Vice Principal	\$ 65.06	290	\$ 18,867.40		
Omogbehin Arinola, Vice Principal	\$ 44.50	37.84	\$ 1,683.88		
Ontiveros Darrio, Guidance Asst	\$ 15.62	39.25	\$ 613.09		
Passanisi Laura, Vice Principal	\$ 45.54	9.5	\$ 432.63		
Penn Marilyn, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	22	\$ 1,179.42		
Perez Concepcion, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	15	\$ 426.90		
Piper Theresa, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	14	\$ 398.44		
Ramirez Alyson, District Counselor	\$ 26.28	59.25	\$ 1,557.09		
Rapp-McCreary Jessica, Principal	\$ 54.90	34	\$ 1,866.60		
Rayburn Rachel, School Clerk	\$ 23.92	0.42	\$ 10.05		
Remillard Bryan, Vice Principal	\$ 56.67	28.75	\$ 1,629.26		
Rich Vivian, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	37.5	\$ 2,386.50		
Richard Jean, Principal	\$ 64.60	27.5	\$ 1,776.50		
Rizzo Courtney, Vice Principal	\$ 42.08	2.5	\$ 105.20		
Robinson Dana, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	88.88	\$ 5,922.07		
Santiago Mercedes, District Counselor	\$ 47.06	1	\$ 47.06		
Sawyers Roberta, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	20.68	\$ 1,316.08		
Sell Patricia, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	70.4	\$ 4,690.75		
Serritella Matthew, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	66.88	\$ 4,456.21		
Sexton Judith, School Clerk	\$ 22.26	4.83	\$ 107.52		
Smith Arlene, Teacher	\$ 41.92	0.42	\$ 17.61		
Smith-Rios Christina, School Clerk	\$ 23.92	0.5	\$ 11.96		
Soderberg Loni, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	5	\$ 268.05		
Stern Robin, Principal	\$ 64.60	1.5	\$ 96.90		
Stevenson James Jr., Comm Serv Offcer	\$ 27.45	22.5	\$ 617.63		
Sullivan Mary, School Clerk II	\$ 26.09	116.5	\$ 3,039.49		
Sund Deborah, Peer Coach	\$ 53.19	2	\$ 106.38		
Taggart Linda, Principal	\$ 60.36	17	\$ 1,026.12		
Tavasci Magdalena, Vice Principal	\$ 52.35	15.84	\$ 829.22		
Taylor Sheari, Vice Principal	\$ 44.50	32.56	\$ 1,448.92		

(05)	Total <input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page: 4 of 5	\$ 56,934.93
------	--------------------------------	--	--------------	--------------

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Thibeault Sharon, Teacher	\$ 47.19	0.55	\$ 25.95		
Van Zant Robert, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	32.76	\$ 2,182.80		
Vidana-Cross Martha, Vice Principal	\$ 48.79	9.68	\$ 472.29		
Vine Edna, School Clerk	\$ 23.92	58.32	\$ 1,395.01		
Watry Mary, Principal	\$ 67.07	1.5	\$ 100.61		
White Lydia, Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.01	9	\$ 162.09		
Williams Molly, District Counselor	\$ 28.32	0.5	\$ 14.16		
Wraith Josephine, Principal	\$ 67.78	2.75	\$ 186.40		
Total Page 1 of 5			\$ 46,662.03		
Total Page 2 of 5			\$ 64,963.44		
Total Page 3 of 5			\$ 57,678.21		
Total Page 4 of 5			\$ 56,934.93		

(05) **Total** **Subtotal** Page: 5 of 5 \$230,777.92

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Maintaining the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years.					
Acuna Amalia, Schl Clerk I	\$ 18.05	7.56	\$ 136.46		
Andrews Virginia, Vice Principal	\$ 52.35	9	\$ 471.15		
Arzaga Beatriz, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 19.61	9	\$ 176.49		
Baca Laura, Guidance Assist.	\$ 18.76	36.5	\$ 684.74		
Bandiola Francisca, School Clerk I	\$ 23.92	2.5	\$ 59.80		
Barnes Julie, School Secretary II	\$ 24.24	1.44	\$ 34.91		
Bas Frances, Instructional Assistant	\$ 19.13	56.5	\$ 1,080.85		
Beraud Beatriz, School Clerk I	\$ 24.98	44.17	\$ 1,103.37		
Bishop-Irwin Michelle, Vice Principal	\$ 47.01	23.5	\$ 1,104.74		
Blackman Kristin, District Counselor	\$ 37.07	3.5	\$ 129.75		
Blair Leslie, School Clerk I	\$ 20.44	4.25	\$ 86.87		
Boyd Rupinder, Vice Principal	\$ 39.75	5	\$ 198.75		
Bravo Sylvia, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	15.84	\$ 337.87		
Brower Chester, District Counselor	\$ 38.60	1.75	\$ 67.55		
Caporale Leslie, School Secretary	\$ 30.42	15.91	\$ 483.98		
Chambers Ana, Schl Clerk I	\$ 21.97	15.3	\$ 336.14		
Chappell Lois, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	0.74	\$ 49.31		
Coffey Douglas, Vice Principal	\$ 56.10	75.5	\$ 4,235.55		
Coleman Barbara, Vice Principal	\$ 59.37	3	\$ 178.11		
Connolly Renee, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	34.42	\$ 2,293.40		
Cook Arlene, Teacher	\$ 47.19	1	\$ 47.19		
Cross Evvalenora, Vice Principal	\$ 65.06	15.25	\$ 992.17		
Cucinotta Patricia, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.44	6.48	\$ 132.45		
Davies Charlotte, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	54.9	\$ 1,313.21		
Ernst Judith, Principal	\$ 66.04	0.25	\$ 16.51		
Esparza Ruth, Clerk Typist I	\$ 17.47	4.58	\$ 80.01		
Fierro Frances, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	4.32	\$ 92.15		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 1 of 5 \$ 15,923.48

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL					FORM NTT-2
(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District			(02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002		
(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.					
<input type="checkbox"/> Identifying Pupils <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Maintenance <input type="checkbox"/> Notifying Teachers					
(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).				Object Accounts	
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Fischer-Garza Jerrilee, Principal	\$ 66.04	9.25	\$ 610.87		
Garcia Moreno George, Teacher	\$ 41.92	0.83	\$ 34.79		
Gardner Laura, School Clerk I	\$ 21.33	3.17	\$ 67.62		
Gibson Gail, Guidance Asst.	\$ 22.16	3.25	\$ 72.02		
Gingery Trudy, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	0.33	\$ 9.39		
Gonzalez Maria, Schl Clerk I	\$ 21.06	18	\$ 379.08		
Graham Marthe, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	18	\$ 964.98		
Gray Patricia, School Clerk I	\$ 21.97	14.01	\$ 307.80		
Griffith Linda, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	14.58	\$ 348.75		
Guevara Ana, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.06	11.7	\$ 246.40		
Halfpenny Ruth, District Counselor	\$ 36.04	13	\$ 468.52		
Heartel Mary, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	56.7	\$ 1,356.26		
Hernandez Sergio, District Counselor	\$ 44.99	5	\$ 224.95		
Huezo Laura, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 22.92	28.8	\$ 660.10		
Hunold DeAnne, School Secretary	\$ 23.42	4.84	\$ 113.35		
Hurlburt Carol, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	27.36	\$ 654.45		
Iglesias Marilyn, District Counselor	\$ 37.17	16.49	\$ 612.93		
Island Carmen, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 24.98	7.92	\$ 197.84		
Jacobs Marian, Vice Principal	\$ 50.05	2.33	\$ 116.62		
Jeffers Melissa, Vice Principal	\$ 55.13	3	\$ 165.39		
Jennings Elizabeth, Vice Principal	\$ 51.12	5.7	\$ 291.38		
Jimenez Margarita, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 24.98	8.46	\$ 211.33		
Jones Idabelle, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.44	9.18	\$ 187.64		
Kheo, Phinga-Evelyn, Counselor	\$ 48.43	46	\$ 2,227.78		
King Brenda, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	6.3	\$ 150.70		
Kramer Linda, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.44	10.44	\$ 213.39		
Lackman Sharen, School Secretary	\$ 26.67	6.67	\$ 177.89		
Laine William, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	1.5	\$ 95.46		
Lakin Karen, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	0.25	\$ 7.12		
Lancey-Jewell Carol, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.44	66.24	\$ 1,353.95		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page: 2 of 5		\$ 12,528.75	

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Lewis Yolanda, Vice Principal	\$ 44.50	0.5	\$ 22.25		
Little Linda, Vice Principal	\$ 65.09	22.85	\$ 1,487.31		
Longo Mary Jo, Vice Principal	\$ 53.05	21	\$ 1,114.05		
Loya Blanca, School Clerk	\$ 22.92	1	\$ 22.92		
Madden Jean, Principal	\$ 57.54	15.5	\$ 891.87		
Maiorano Karla, School Clerk	\$ 17.33	12.5	\$ 216.63		
Malcom Keith, Vice Principal	\$ 59.37	4.58	\$ 271.91		
Malone Sandra, Guidance Asst.	\$ 14.01	7	\$ 98.07		
Marquez Guadalupe, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	14.76	\$ 314.83		
Marquez Marie, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 23.20	30.42	\$ 705.74		
Marra Christine, School Assistant	\$ 22.46	3	\$ 67.38		
Mc Fee Linda, School Secretary	\$ 20.11	0.83	\$ 16.69		
McCann Michael, Attendance Assist.	\$ 23.92	18.75	\$ 448.50		
Mcdonald Joyce, Schl Clerk I	\$ 22.92	64.98	\$ 1,489.34		
Mcdougall Linda, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	2.7	\$ 64.58		
McGee Stephen, District Counselor	\$ 43.53	0.7	\$ 30.47		
McGee Stephen, District Counselor	\$ 43.53	15.15	\$ 659.48		
Medina Mary, School Clerk	\$ 23.92	1.33	\$ 31.81		
Medrano Rita, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	13.32	\$ 284.12		
Mendez Jovita, Attendance Assit.	\$ 18.76	8.34	\$ 156.46		
Mills Floyd, Dean of Students	\$ 55.78	85	\$ 4,741.30		
Montano Crusita, School Clerk II	\$ 26.09	36.36	\$ 948.63		
Morrill Greg, District Counselor	\$ 55.78	0.25	\$ 13.95		
Moya Josephina, Systems Tech II	\$ 28.46	59.75	\$ 1,700.49		
Nimtz Joan, Sub-Teacher	\$ 18.74	0.08	\$ 1.50		
Norris Katrina, Clerk Typist I	\$ 18.21	0.5	\$ 9.11		
Nydam Julie, Vice Principal	\$ 56.67	29.75	\$ 1,685.93		
Olivero Jeff, Vice Principal	\$ 65.06	119	\$ 7,742.14		
Ontiveros Darrio, Guidance Asst	\$ 15.62	17.6	\$ 274.91		
Palreiro Jo Ellen, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	22.32	\$ 533.89		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 3 of 5 \$ 26,046.26

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Passanisi Laura, Vice Principal	\$ 45.54	5.5	\$ 250.47		
Peck Barbara, Attendance Assistant	\$ 20.79	4.66	\$ 96.88		
Pena-Aguilar Ana, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	18.9	\$ 403.14		
Perez Concepcion, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	9.33	\$ 265.53		
Piper Theresa, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	43.17	\$ 1,228.62		
Prince Barbara, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.19	30.06	\$ 606.91		
Ramirez Alyson, District Counselor	\$ 26.28	22	\$ 578.16		
Remillard Bryan, Vice Principal	\$ 56.67	14.5	\$ 821.72		
Rich Vivian, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	28	\$ 1,781.92		
Rieger Annette, Vice Principal	\$ 50.32	91	\$ 4,579.12		
Riley Patricia, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	37.8	\$ 904.18		
Rodriguez Cecilia, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 18.05	5.58	\$ 100.72		
Rodriguez Christopher, Schl Clerk I	\$ 21.31	28.26	\$ 602.22		
Rodriguez Irene, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	3.96	\$ 84.47		
Rohm Aumi, School Clerk II	\$ 24.98	27.72	\$ 692.45		
Rowley Linda, School Clerk	\$ 26.09	19.58	\$ 510.84		
Rutherford Dolores, School Secretary	\$ 18.32	2.25	\$ 41.22		
Salom Sandra, School Secretary	\$ 26.09	40.8	\$ 1,064.47		
Santiago Mercedes, District Counselor	\$ 47.06	0.15	\$ 7.06		
Serrano Gualberto, Guidance Asst.	\$ 19.94	36.5	\$ 727.81		
Sexton Judith, School Clerk	\$ 22.26	6.5	\$ 144.69		
Shuffler Paulette, School Clerk I	\$ 24.98	106	\$ 2,647.88		
Skinner Susan, Head Counselor	\$ 52.60	12	\$ 631.20		
Smith Arlene, Teacher	\$ 41.92	0.16	\$ 6.71		
Smith-Rios Christina, School Clerk	\$ 23.92	1.67	\$ 39.95		
Soderberg Loni, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	1	\$ 53.61		
Spire Patricia, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	28.44	\$ 680.28		
Stem Joann, School Clerk II	\$ 26.09	25.33	\$ 660.86		
Stevenson James Jr., Comm Serv Offer	\$ 27.45	17	\$ 466.65		
Sullivan Mary, School Clerk II	\$ 26.09	171	\$ 4,461.39		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 4 of 5 \$ 25,141.13

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Maintaining the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years.					
Acuna Amalia, Schl Clerk I	\$ 18.05	7.98	\$ 144.04		
Andrews Virginia, Vice Principal	\$ 52.35	5	\$ 261.75		
Arzaga Beatriz, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 19.61	9.5	\$ 186.30		
Baca Laura, Guidance Assist.	\$ 18.76	34	\$ 637.84		
Bandiola Francisca, School Clerk I	\$ 23.92	2.5	\$ 59.80		
Barnes Julie, School Secretary II	\$ 24.24	3.08	\$ 74.66		
Beraud Beatriz, School Clerk I	\$ 24.98	28.66	\$ 715.93		
Berlin Janet, School Clerk II	\$ 26.09	146	\$ 3,809.14		
Bishop-Irwin Michelle, Vice Principal	\$ 47.01	3.91	\$ 183.81		
Blackman Kristin, District Counselor	\$ 37.07	2.67	\$ 98.98		
Blair Leslie, School Clerk I	\$ 20.44	2.02	\$ 41.29		
Bravo Sylvia, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	16.72	\$ 356.64		
Brower Chester, District Counselor	\$ 38.60	2	\$ 77.20		
Caporale Leslie, School Secretary	\$ 30.42	19.08	\$ 580.41		
Chambers Ana, Schl Clerk I	\$ 21.97	16.15	\$ 354.82		
Coffey Douglas, Vice Principal	\$ 56.10	50.33	\$ 2,823.51		
Conaway Colleen, Principal	\$ 64.60	2.5	\$ 161.50		
Connolly Renee, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	29.08	\$ 1,937.60		
Cross Evvalenora, Vice Principal	\$ 65.06	5.63	\$ 366.29		
Cucinotta Patricia, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.44	6.84	\$ 139.81		
Davies Charlotte, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	57.95	\$ 1,386.16		
Ernst Judith, Principal	\$ 66.04	0.5	\$ 33.02		
Esparza Ruth, Clerk Typist I	\$ 17.47	4.58	\$ 80.01		
Fierro Frances, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	4.56	\$ 97.26		
Fischer-Garza Jerrilee, Principal	\$ 66.04	6	\$ 396.24		
Gardner Laura, School Clerk I	\$ 21.33	1.67	\$ 35.62		
Gibson Gail, Guidance Asst.	\$ 22.16	2.5	\$ 55.40		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 1 of 5 \$ 15,095.03

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

- Identifying Pupils
- Information Maintenance
- Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).

Object Accounts

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Gloria Marietta, School Clerk I	\$ 21.33	11	\$ 234.63		
Gonzalez Maria, Schl Clerk I	\$ 21.06	19	\$ 400.14		
Graham Marthe, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	35	\$ 1,876.35		
Griffith Linda, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	15.39	\$ 368.13		
Guevara Ana, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.06	12.35	\$ 260.09		
Halfpenny Ruth, District Counselor	\$ 36.04	9.25	\$ 333.37		
Heartel Mary, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	59.85	\$ 1,431.61		
Hernandez Sergio, District Counselor	\$ 44.99	5	\$ 224.95		
Huezo Laura, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 22.92	30.4	\$ 696.77		
Hunold DeAnne, School Secretary	\$ 23.42	4.84	\$ 113.35		
Hurlburt Carol, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	28.88	\$ 690.81		
Iglesias Marilyn, District Counselor	\$ 37.17	16.49	\$ 612.93		
Island Carmen, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 24.98	8.36	\$ 208.83		
Jacobs Marian, Vice Principal	\$ 50.05	0.75	\$ 37.54		
Jeffers Melissa, Vice Principal	\$ 55.13	4.25	\$ 234.30		
Jennings Elizabeth, Vice Principal	\$ 51.12	2.6	\$ 132.91		
Jimenez Margarita, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 24.98	8.93	\$ 223.07		
Johnson Minerva, Vice Principal	\$ 54.22	11.5	\$ 623.53		
Jones Idabelle, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.44	9.69	\$ 198.06		
Karpowich Linda, Principal	\$ 64.60	2.25	\$ 145.35		
Kheo, Phinga-Evelyn, Counselor	\$ 48.43	30	\$ 1,452.90		
King Brenda, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	6.65	\$ 159.07		
Kramer Linda, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.44	11.02	\$ 225.25		
Lackman Sharen, School Secretary	\$ 26.67	1	\$ 26.67		
Laine William, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	102	\$ 6,491.28		
Lancey-Jewell Carol, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.44	69.92	\$ 1,429.16		
Lee-Farley Wendy, District Counselor	\$ 30.76	0.83	\$ 25.53		
Lewis Yolanda, Vice Principal	\$ 44.50	0.5	\$ 22.25		
Little Linda, Vice Principal	\$ 65.09	17.86	\$ 1,162.51		
Longo Mary Jo, Vice Principal	\$ 53.05	6.75	\$ 358.09		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 2 of 5 \$ 20,399.43

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Loya Blanca, School Clerk	\$ 22.92	0.67	\$ 15.36		
Madden Jean, Principal	\$ 57.54	42	\$ 2,416.68		
Malone Sandra, Guidance Asst.	\$ 14.01	0.9	\$ 12.61		
Marquez Guadalupe, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	15.58	\$ 332.32		
Marquez Marie, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 23.20	32.11	\$ 744.95		
Marra Christine, School Assistant	\$ 22.46	0.25	\$ 5.62		
Mc Fee Linda, School Secretary	\$ 20.11	0.25	\$ 5.03		
McCann Michael, Attendance Assist.	\$ 23.92	7	\$ 167.44		
McDonald Joyce, Schl Clerk I	\$ 22.92	68.59	\$ 1,572.08		
Mcdougall Linda, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	2.85	\$ 68.17		
McGee Stephen, District Counselor	\$ 43.53	0.35	\$ 15.24		
McGee Stephen, District Counselor	\$ 43.53	10	\$ 435.30		
Medina Mary, School Clerk	\$ 23.92	0.14	\$ 3.35		
Medrano Rita, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	14.06	\$ 299.90		
Mendez Jovita, Attendance Assit.	\$ 18.76	7.32	\$ 137.32		
Mills Floyd, Dean of Students	\$ 55.78	74.67	\$ 4,165.09		
Montano Crusita, School Clerk Ii	\$ 26.09	38.38	\$ 1,001.33		
Mooney Karen, Principal	\$ 58.94	0.5	\$ 29.47		
Nimtz Joan, Sub-Teacher	\$ 18.74	0.17	\$ 3.19		
Norris Katrina, Clerk Typist I	\$ 18.21	5	\$ 91.05		
Nydam Julie, Vice Principal	\$ 56.67	15.25	\$ 864.22		
Olivero Jeff, Vice Principal	\$ 65.06	65.25	\$ 4,245.17		
Ontiveros Darrío, Guidance Asst	\$ 15.62	7.5	\$ 117.15		
Palreiro Jo Ellen, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	23.56	\$ 563.56		
Parks Patricia, Principal	\$ 64.60	0.25	\$ 16.15		
Passanisi Laura, Vice Principal	\$ 45.54	5.5	\$ 250.47		
Pena-Aguilar Ana, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	19.95	\$ 425.53		
Perez Concepcion, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	8.5	\$ 241.91		
Piper Theresa, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	7	\$ 199.22		
Prince Barbara, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.19	31.73	\$ 640.63		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 3 of 5 \$ 19,085.51

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).	Object Accounts
--	------------------------

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Ramirez Alyson, District Counselor	\$ 26.28	43.75	\$ 1,149.75		
Rayburn Rachel, School Clerk	\$ 23.92	0.25	\$ 5.98		
Remillard Bryan, Vice Principal	\$ 56.67	14.5	\$ 821.72		
Richard Jean, Principal	\$ 64.60	0.17	\$ 10.98		
Riley Patricia, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	39.9	\$ 954.41		
Rodriguez Cecilia, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 18.05	5.89	\$ 106.31		
Rodriguez Christopher, Schl Clerk I	\$ 21.31	29.83	\$ 635.68		
Rodriguez Irene, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	4.18	\$ 89.16		
Rohm Aumi, School Clerk II	\$ 24.98	29.26	\$ 730.91		
Rowley Linda, School Clerk	\$ 26.09	19.17	\$ 500.15		
Santiago Mercedes, District Counselor	\$ 47.06	0.15	\$ 7.06		
Serrano Gualberto, Guidance Asst.	\$ 19.94	126.95	\$ 2,531.38		
Sexton Judith, School Clerk	\$ 22.26	13.43	\$ 298.95		
Skinner Susan, Head Counselor	\$ 52.60	11	\$ 578.60		
Smith Arlene, Teacher	\$ 41.92	0.34	\$ 14.25		
Soderberg Loni, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	1	\$ 53.61		
Spire Patricia, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	30.02	\$ 718.08		
Stem Joann, School Clerk II	\$ 26.09	25	\$ 652.25		
Stern Robin, Principal	\$ 64.60	1	\$ 64.60		
Stevenson James Jr., Comm Serv Offcr	\$ 27.45	3	\$ 82.35		
Sullivan Mary, School Clerk II	\$ 26.09	314	\$ 8,192.26		
Sund Deborah, Peer Coach	\$ 53.19	0.58	\$ 30.85		
Taggart Linda, Principal	\$ 60.36	3.75	\$ 226.35		
Thibeault Sharon, Teacher	\$ 47.19	0.55	\$ 25.95		
Trombley Mary, School Clerk II	\$ 24.98	10.25	\$ 256.05		
Van Zant Robert, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	22.33	\$ 1,487.85		
Vanella Laura, Schl Clerk I	\$ 22.92	63.46	\$ 1,454.50		
Vindel Any, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.06	16.34	\$ 344.12		
Watry Mary, Principal	\$ 67.07	1.5	\$ 100.61		
Wesch Patricia, School Clerk	\$ 22.92	22.25	\$ 509.97		

(05)	Total <input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page: 4 of 5	\$ 22,634.69
------	--------------------------------	--	--------------	--------------

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL					FORM NTT-2
(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District			(02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred:		2001/2002
(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.					
<input type="checkbox"/> Identifying Pupils <input type="checkbox"/> Information Maintenance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notifying Teachers					
(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).				Object Accounts	
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
White Lydia, Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.01	5.01	\$ 90.23		
Williams Margaret, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	23.56	\$ 563.56		
Total Page 1 of 5			\$ 15,095.03		
Total Page 2 of 5			\$ 20,399.43		
Total Page 3 of 5			\$ 19,085.51		
Total Page 4 of 5			\$ 22,634.69		
(05) Total <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Subtotal	\$ 77,868.45	
			Page: 5 of 5		

Exhibit E

NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION

1. Summary of Chapters 1306/89 and 1257/93

Education Code § 49079, as added and amended by Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993, requires that school districts report to each teacher the names of every student who has caused, or attempted to cause, serious bodily injury or injury to another person. The notification is to be based on any written records the district maintained or received from a law enforcement agency. No district would be liable for failure to comply as long as a good faith effort was made to notify the teacher. School personnel are immune from civil or criminal liability unless the information they provided was knowingly false. Notifications were to commence in the 1990/91 school year utilizing data from the previous year, with a progression to three prior years of data to be reported by fiscal year 1992/93.

On January 19, 1995, the Commission on State Mandates determined that Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989 and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993, resulted in state mandated costs that are reimbursable pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Government Code § 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2.

2. Eligible Claimants

Any school district (K-12) or county office of education that incurs increased costs as a result of this mandate is eligible to claim reimbursement of these costs.

3. Appropriations

Funding in the amount of \$6,876,000 for payment of initial claims covering fiscal years 1993/94, 1994/95, 1995/96, and 1996/97, is provided by the local government claims bill SB 91, enacted as Chapter 748, Statutes of 1996.

To determine if this program is funded in subsequent fiscal years, refer to the schedule "Appropriation for State Mandated Cost Programs" in the "Annual Claiming Instructions for State Mandated Costs" issued in September of each year to county superintendents of schools and superintendents of schools.

4. Types of Claims

A. Reimbursement and Estimated Claims

A claimant may file a reimbursement and/or an estimated claim. A reimbursement claim detail the costs actually incurred for a prior fiscal year. An estimated claim shows the costs to be incurred for the current fiscal year.

B. Minimum Claim

Government Code § 17564(a) provides that no claim shall be filed pursuant to Government Code § 17561 unless such a claim exceeds \$200 per program per fiscal year. However, any county superintendent of schools, as fiscal agent for the school district, may submit a combined claim in excess of \$200 on behalf of one or more districts within the county even if the individual district's claim does not exceed \$200.

A combined claim must show the individual costs for each district. Once a combined claim is filed, all subsequent years relating to the same mandate must be filed in a combined form. The county receives the reimbursement payment and is responsible for disbursing funds to each participating district. A district may withdraw from the combined claim form by providing a written notice to the county superintendent of schools and the State Controller's Office of its intent to file a separate claim, at least 180 days prior to the deadline for filing the claim.

5. Filing Deadline

A. Initial Claims

Initial claims must be filed within 120 days from the issuance of claiming instructions. Accordingly:

Reimbursement claims detailing the actual costs incurred for the 1993/94, 1994/95, and 1995/96 fiscal years must be filed with the State Controller's Office and postmarked by July 28, 1997. If the reimbursement claim is filed after the deadline of July 28, 1997, the approved claim must be reduced by a late penalty of 10%, not to exceed \$1,000. Claims filed more than one year after the deadline will not be accepted.

Estimated claims for costs to be incurred during the 1996/97 fiscal year must be filed with the State Controller's Office and postmarked by July 28, 1997. Timely filed estimated claims are paid before late claims. If a payment is received for the estimated claim, a 1996/97 reimbursement claim must be filed by November 30, 1997.

B. Annually Thereafter

Refer to the item, "Reimbursable State Mandated Cost Programs", contained in the annual cover letter for mandated cost programs issued annually in September, which identifies the fiscal years for which claims may be filed. If an "x" is shown for the program listed under "19__/19__ Reimbursement Claim", and/or "19__/19__ Estimated Claim", claims may be filed as follows:

An estimated claim must be filed with the State Controller's Office and postmarked by November 30 of the fiscal year in which costs are to be incurred. Timely filed estimated claims will be paid before late claims.

After having received payment for an estimated claim, the claimant must file a reimbursement claim by November 30 of the following fiscal year. If the district fails to file a reimbursement claim, monies received must be returned to the State. If no estimated claim was filed, the agency may file a reimbursement claim detailing the actual costs incurred for the fiscal year, provided there was an appropriation for the program for that fiscal year. For information regarding appropriations for reimbursement claims, refer to the "Appropriation for State Mandated Cost Programs", in the previous fiscal year's annual claiming instructions.

A reimbursement claim detailing the actual costs must be filed with the State Controller's Office and postmarked by November 30 following the fiscal year in which costs were incurred. If the claim is filed after the deadline but by November 30 of the succeeding fiscal year, the approved claim must be reduced by a late penalty of 10%, not to exceed \$1,000. Claims filed more than one year after the deadline will not be accepted.

6. Reimbursable Components

Eligible claimants will be reimbursed for the direct and indirect cost of labor, supplies, and services incurred for the following mandated activities:

A. Identifying Pupils

Identifying pupils from records received from law enforcement agencies or otherwise maintained in the ordinary course of business, who have during the past three years engaged in or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in acts described in any subdivision, except (h) of § 48900.

B. Information Maintenance

Maintaining the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years, and a one-time cost for adopting a cost effective method of assembling and disseminating the information to teachers.

C. Notifying Teachers

Notifying teachers on a regular and timely basis of the pupils whose behavior makes them subject to suspension and expulsion and maintaining the confidentiality of the dissemination of this information.

7. Reimbursement Limitations

Any offsetting savings or reimbursement the claimant received from any source (e.g. service fees collected, federal funds, other state funds, etc.) as a result of this mandate shall be identified and deducted so only net local costs are claimed.

8. Claiming Forms and Instructions

The diagram "Illustration of Claim Forms" provides a graphical presentation of forms required to be filed with a claim. A claimant may submit a computer generated report in substitution for forms NTT-1 and NTT-2 provided the format of the report and data fields contained within the report are identical to the claim forms included in these instructions. The claim forms provided with these instructions should be duplicated and used by the claimant to file estimated or reimbursement claims. The State Controller's Office will revise the manual and claim forms as necessary. In such instances, new replacement forms will be mailed to claimants.

A. Form NTT-2, Component/Activity Cost Detail

This form is used to segregate the detailed costs by claim component. A separate form NTT-2 must be completed for each cost component being claimed. Costs reported on this form must be supported as follows:

1) Salaries and Benefits

Identify the employee(s), and/or show the classification of the employee(s) involved. Describe the mandated functions performed and specify the actual time devoted to each function by each employee, the productive hourly rates and related fringe benefits.

Source documents required to be maintained by the claimant may include, but are not limited to, employee time records that show the employee's actual time spent on this mandate.

2) Materials and Supplies

Only expenditures that can be identified as a direct cost of this mandate may be claimed. List the cost of materials consumed or expended specifically for the purpose of this mandate.

Source documents required to be maintained by the claimant may include, but are not limited to, invoices, receipts, purchase orders and other documents evidencing the validity of the expenditures.

3) Contracted Services

Contracting costs are reimbursable to the extent that the function to be performed requires special skill or knowledge that is not readily available from the claimant's staff or the service to be provided by the contractor is cost effective. Use of contract services must be justified by the claimant. Give the name(s) of contractor(s) who performed the service(s). Describe the activities performed by each named contractor, actual time spent on this mandate, inclusive dates when services were performed, and itemize all costs for services performed. Attach consultant invoices with the claim.

Source documents required to be maintained by the claimant may include, but are not limited to, contracts, invoices, and other documents evidencing the validity of the expenditures.

For audit purposes, all supporting documents must be retained for a period of two years after the end of the calendar year in which the reimbursement claim was filed or last amended, whichever is later. Such documents shall be made available to the State Controller's Office on request.

B. Form NTT-1, Claim Summary

This form is used to summarize direct costs by claim component and compute allowable indirect costs for the mandate. Claim statistics shall identify the work performed for costs claimed. The claimant must give the number of pupils identified for each year, the average daily attendance for each year, the number of times teachers were notified in the fiscal year.

School districts and local offices of education may compute the amount of indirect costs utilizing the State Department of Education's Annual Program Cost Data Report J-380 or J-580 rate, as applicable. The cost data on this form are carried forward to Form FAM-27.

C. Form FAM-27, Claim for Payment

Form FAM-27 contains a certification that must be signed by an authorized representative of the district. All applicable information that from form NTT-1 must be carried forward to this form for the State Controller's Office to process the claim for payment.

CLAIM FOR PAYMENT Pursuant to Government Code Section 17561 NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION	For State Controller Use Only (19) Program Number 00150 (20) Date Filed ___/___/___ (21) LRS Input ___/___/___	Program 150
---	---	-----------------------

L A B E L H E R E	(01) Claimant Identification Number		Reimbursement Claim Data	
	(02) Claimant Name		(22) NTT-1, (03)(a)	
	County of Location		(23) NTT-1, (03)(b)	
	Street Address or P.O. Box		(24) NTT-1, (03)(c)	
	City		(25) NTT-1, (04)(1)(d)	
	State			

Type of Claim	Estimated Claim	Reimbursement Claim	
	(03) Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>	(09) Reimbursement <input type="checkbox"/>	(26) NTT-1, (04)(2)(d)
	(04) Combined <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) Combined <input type="checkbox"/>	(27) NTT-1, (04)(3)(d)
	(05) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(28) NTT-1, (06)
Fiscal Year of Cost	(06) 20___/20___	(12) 20___/20___	(29) NTT-1, (07)
Total Claimed Amount	(07)	(13)	(30) NTT-1, (09)
Less: 10% Late Penalty, not to exceed \$1,000		(14)	(31) NTT-1, (10)
Less: Prior Claim Payment Received		(15)	(32)
Net Claimed Amount		(16)	(33)
Due from State	(08)	(17)	(34)
Due to State		(18)	(35)

(37) CERTIFICATION OF CLAIM

In accordance with the provisions of Government Code Section 17561, I certify that I am the officer authorized by the school district to file mandated cost claims with the State of California for this program, and certify under penalty of perjury that I have not violated any of the provisions of Government Code Sections 1090 to 1098, inclusive.

I further certify that there was no application other than from the claimant, nor any grant or payment received, for reimbursement of costs claimed herein, and such costs are for a new program or increased level of services of an existing program. All offsetting savings and reimbursements set forth in the Parameters and Guidelines are identified, and all costs claimed are supported by source documentation currently maintained by the claimant.

The amounts for this Estimated Claim and/or Reimbursement Claim are hereby claimed from the State for payment of estimated and/or actual costs set forth on the attached statements. I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature of Authorized Officer _____ Date _____

 Type or Print Name _____ Title _____

(38) Name of Contact Person for Claim _____ Telephone Number () - _____ Ext. _____

 E-Mail Address _____

Program 150	NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION Certification Claim Form Instructions	FORM FAM-27
-----------------------	---	---------------------------------

- (01) Enter the payee number assigned by the State Controller's Office.
- (02) Enter your Official Name, County of Location, Street or P. O. Box address, City, State, and Zip Code.
- (03) If filing an estimated claim, enter an "X" in the box on line (03) Estimated.
- (04) If filing a combined estimated claim on behalf of districts within the county, enter an "X" in the box on line (04) Combined.
- (05) If filing an amended estimated claim, enter an "X" in the box on line (05) Amended.
- (06) Enter the fiscal year in which costs are to be incurred.
- (07) Enter the amount of the estimated claim. If the estimate exceeds the previous year's actual costs by more than 10%, complete form NTT-1 and enter the amount from line (11).
- (08) Enter the same amount as shown on line (07).
- (09) If filing a reimbursement claim, enter an "X" in the box on line (09) Reimbursement.
- (10) If filing a combined reimbursement claim on behalf of districts within the county, enter an "X" in the box on line (10) Combined.
- (11) If filing an amended reimbursement claim, enter an "X" in the box on line (11) Amended.
- (12) Enter the fiscal year for which actual costs are being claimed. If actual costs for more than one fiscal year are being claimed, complete a separate form FAM-27 for each fiscal year.
- (13) Enter the amount of the reimbursement claim from form NTT-1, line (11). The total claimed amount must exceed \$1,000.
- (14) Reimbursement claims must be filed by January 15 of the following fiscal year in which costs are incurred or the claims shall be reduced by a late penalty. Enter zero if the claim was timely filed, otherwise, enter the product of multiplying line (13) by the factor 0.10 (10% penalty), not to exceed \$1,000.
- (15) If filing a reimbursement claim or a claim was previously filed for the same fiscal year, enter the amount received for the claim. Otherwise, enter a zero.
- (16) Enter the result of subtracting line (14) and line (15) from line (13).
- (17) If line (16), Net Claimed Amount, is positive, enter that amount on line (17), Due from State.
- (18) If line (16), Net Claimed Amount, is negative, enter that amount on line (18), Due to State.
- (19) to (21) Leave blank.
- (22) to (36) Reimbursement Claim Data. Bring forward the cost information as specified on the left-hand column of lines (22) through (36) for the reimbursement claim, e.g., NTT-1, (03)(a), means the information is located on form NTT-1, block (03), line (a). Enter the information on the same line but in the right-hand column. Cost information should be rounded to the nearest dollar, i.e., no cents. Indirect costs percentage should be shown as a whole number and without the percent symbol, i.e., 7.548% should be shown as 8. **Completion of this data block will expedite the payment process.**
- (37) Read the statement "Certification of Claim." If it is true, the claim must be dated, signed by the agency's authorized officer, and must include the person's name and title, typed or printed. **Claims cannot be paid unless accompanied by an original signed certification. (To expedite the payment process, please sign the form FAM-27 with blue ink, and attach a copy of the form FAM-27 to the top of the claim package.)**
- (38) Enter the name, telephone number, and e-mail address of the person to contact if additional information is required.

SUBMIT A SIGNED ORIGINAL, AND A COPY OF FORM FAM-27, WITH ALL OTHER FORMS AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS TO:

Address, if delivered by U.S. Postal Service:

OFFICE OF THE STATE CONTROLLER
 ATTN: Local Reimbursements Section
 Division of Accounting and Reporting
 P.O. Box 942850
 Sacramento, CA 94250

Address, if delivered by other delivery service:

OFFICE OF THE STATE CONTROLLER
 ATTN: Local Reimbursements Section
 Division of Accounting and Reporting
 3301 C Street, Suite 500
 Sacramento, CA 95816

Program 150	MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION CLAIM SUMMARY	FORM NTT-1
------------------------------	---	-----------------------

(01) Claimant	(02) Type of Claim Reimbursement <input type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>	Fiscal Year 20__/20__
---------------	--	--------------------------

Claim Statistics

(03) (a) Number of pupils identified for the fiscal year (Refer to instructions)	
(b) Average daily attendance for the fiscal year	
(c) Number of times teachers were notified in the fiscal year (Refer to instructions)	



Direct Costs	Object Accounts			
(04) Reimbursable Components	(a) Salaries and Benefits	(b) Materials and Supplies	(c) Contracted Services	(d) Total
1. Identifying Pupils				
2. Information Maintenance				
3. Notifying Teachers				
(05) Total Direct Costs				

Indirect Costs

(06) Indirect Cost Rate	[From J-380 or J-580]	%
(07) Total Indirect Costs	[Line (05)(a) x line (06)]	
(08) Total Direct and Indirect Costs	[Line (05)(d) + line (07)]	

Cost Reduction

(09) Less: Offsetting Savings	
(10) Less: Other Reimbursements	
(11) Total Claimed Amount	[Line (08) - (line (09) + line (10))]

Program 150	NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION CLAIM SUMMARY INSTRUCTIONS	FORM NTT-1
------------------------------	--	------------------------

- (01) Enter the name of the claimant.
- (02) Type of Claim. Check a box, Reimbursement or Estimated, to identify the type of claim being filed. Enter the fiscal year of costs. Form NTT-1 must be filed for a reimbursement claim. Do not complete form NTT-1 if you are filing an estimated claim and the estimate does not exceed the previous fiscal year's actual costs by 10%, do not complete form NTT-1. Simply enter the amount of the estimated claim on form FAM-27, line (07), Estimated. However, if the estimated claim exceeds the previous fiscal year's actual costs by more than 10%, form NTT-1 must be completed and a statement attached explaining the increased costs. Without this information the estimated claim will automatically be reduced to 110% of the previous fiscal year's actual costs.
- (03)
- (a) Enter the number of pupils for whom information is being maintained for the fiscal year. For the period 7/1/93 to 12/31/93, report only the number of students who have attempted to cause bodily injury or injury to another person. After 1/1/94, report the number of students who have engaged in offenses listed in Education Code § 48900, except subdivision (h).
- (b) Enter the average daily attendance for the fiscal year.
- (c) Enter the number of times during the fiscal year in which teachers were notified of students described in Education Code § 49079 (e.g., quarterly, each semester, or annually).
- (04) Reimbursable Components. For each reimbursable component, enter the totals from form NTT-2, line (05) columns (d), (e) and (f) to form NTT-1, block (04) columns (a), (b) and (c) in the appropriate row. Total each row.
- (05) Total Direct Costs. Total columns (a) through (d).
- (06) Indirect Cost Rate. Enter the indirect cost rate from the Department of Education form J-380 or J-580, as applicable, for the fiscal year of costs.
- (07) Total Indirect Costs. Enter the result of multiplying Total Salaries and Benefits, line (05)(a), by the Indirect Cost Rate, line (06).
- (08) Total Direct and Indirect Costs. Enter the sum of Total Direct Costs, line (05)(d) and Total indirect Costs line (07)
- (09) Less: Offsetting Savings, if applicable. Enter the total savings experienced by the claimant as direct result of this mandate. Submit a detail schedule of savings with the claim.
- (10) Less: Other Reimbursements. If applicable, enter the amount of other reimbursements received from any source, (i.e., service fees collected, federal funds, and other state funds, etc.) which reimbursed any portion of the mandated cost program. Submit a schedule detailing the reimbursement sources and amounts.
- (11) Total Claimed Amount. Subtract the sum of Offsetting Savings, line (09), and Other Reimbursements, line (10), from Total Direct and Indirect Costs, line (08). Enter the remainder on this line and carry the amount forward to form FAM-27, line (07) for the Estimated Claim or line (13) for the Reimbursement Claim.

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
---	--

(01) Claimant	(02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred
---------------	--------------------------------------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check **only** one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils

Information Maintenance

Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services

(05) Total <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/>	Subtotal <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/>	Page: _____ of _____
--	--	----------------------

NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL Instructions	FORM NTT-2
--	--

- (01) Enter the name of the claimant.
- (02) Enter the fiscal year for which costs were incurred.
- (03) Reimbursable Components. Check the box which indicates the cost component being claimed. Check only one box per form. A separate form NTT-2 shall be prepared for each component which applies.
- (04) Description of Expenses. The following table identifies the type of information required to support reimbursable costs. To detail costs for the component activity box "checked" in block (03), enter the employee names, position titles, a brief description of their activities performed, actual time spent by each employee, productive hourly rates, fringe benefits, supplies used, contracted services, etc. Describe the method used for assembling and disseminating information to teachers and for information maintenance. **The descriptions required in column (4)(a) must be of sufficient detail to explain the cost of activities or items being claimed. If the descriptions are incomplete, the claim cannot be processed for payment.** For audit purposes, all supporting documents must be retained by the claimant for a period of not less than two years after the end of the calendar year in which the reimbursement claim was filed or last amended, whichever is later. Such documents shall be made available to the State Controller's Office on request.

Object/ Subobject Accounts	Columns						Submit these supporting documents with the claim
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	
Salaries	Employee Name	Hourly Rate	Hours Worked	Salaries = Hourly Rate x Hours Worked			
Benefits	Title Activities Performed	Benefit Rate		Benefits = Benefit Rate x Salaries			
Materials and Supplies	Description of Supplies Used	Unit Cost	Quantity Used		Cost = Unit Cost x Quantity Consumed		
Contracted Services	Name of Contractor Specific Tasks Performed	Hourly Rate	Hours Worked Inclusive Dates of Service			Itemized Cost of Services Performed	Invoice

- (05) Total line (04), columns (d), (e), and (f) and enter the sum on this line. Check the appropriate box to indicate if the amount is a total or subtotal. If more than one form is needed for the component/activity, number each page. Enter totals from line (05), columns (d), (e), and (f) to form NTT-1, block (04) columns (a), (b), and (c) in the appropriate row.

Exhibit F



STEVE WESTLY
 California State Controller
 Division of Accounting and Reporting
 JULY 21, 2005

S37165
 00150
 2005/07/21

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
 SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCH DIST
 SAN DIEGO COUNTY
 4100 NORMAL STREET ROOM 3159
 SAN DIEGO CA 92103

DEAR CLAIMANT:

RE: NOTICE TO TEACH SUS CH 1306/89

WE HAVE REVIEWED YOUR 2001/2002 FISCAL YEAR REIMBURSEMENT CLAIM FOR THE MANDATED COST PROGRAM REFERENCED ABOVE. THE RESULTS OF OUR REVIEW ARE AS FOLLOWS:

AMOUNT CLAIMED		406,224.00
ADJUSTMENT TO CLAIM:		
FIELD AUDIT FINDINGS	-	166,791.00
TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS	-	<u>166,791.00</u>
LESS PRIOR PAYMENT: SCHEDULE NO. MA13311E PAID 02-22-2002		<u>178,217.00</u>
AMOUNT DUE CLAIMANT		<u><u>\$ 61,216.00</u></u>

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, PLEASE CONTACT KIM NGUYEN AT (916) 324-7876 OR IN WRITING AT THE STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE, DIVISION OF ACCOUNTING AND REPORTING, P.O. BOX 942850, SACRAMENTO, CA 94250-5875. DUE TO INSUFFICIENT APPROPRIATION, THE BALANCE DUE WILL BE FORTHCOMING WHEN ADDITIONAL FUNDS ARE MADE AVAILABLE.

SINCERELY,

Ginny Brummels
 GINNY BRUMMELS, MANAGER


Exhibit G

CLAIM FOR PAYMENT			(19) Program Number 00150	150
Pursuant to Government Code Section 17561			(20) Date File ___/___/___	
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:			(21) LRS Input ___/___/___	
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION				
(01) Claimant Identification Number: S37165			Reimbursement Claim Data	
(02) San Diego Unified School District			(22) NTT-1, (03)(a)	12,935
San Diego County			(23) NTT-1, (03)(b)	124,373
4100 Normal Street			(24) NTT-1, (03)(c)	Daily
San Diego California 92103			(25) NTT-1, (04)(1)(d)	250,900
Type of Claim	Estimated Claim	Reimbursement Claim	(26) NTT-1, (04)(2)(d)	88,573
	(03) Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(09) Reimbursement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(27) NTT-1, (04)(3)(d)	65,889
	(04) Combined <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) Combined <input type="checkbox"/>	(28) NTT-1, (06)	2
	(05) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(29) NTT-1, (07)	9,323
Fiscal Year of Cost	(06) 2003/2004	(12) 2002/2003	(30) NTT-1, (09)	0
Total Claimed Amount	(07) \$ 425,000	(13) \$ 414,685	(31) NTT-1, (10)	0
Less: 10% Late Penalty, not to exceed \$1000		(14)	(32)	
Less: Prior Claim Payment Received		(15)	(33)	
Net Claimed Amount		(16) \$ 414,685	(34)	
Due from State	(08) \$ 425,000	(17) \$ 414,685	(35)	
Due to State		(18)	(36)	
(37) CERTIFICATION OF CLAIM				
<p>In accordance with the provisions of Government Code Section 17561, I certify that I am the officer authorized by the school district to file mandated cost claims with the State of California for this program, and certify under penalty of perjury that I have not violated any of the provisions of Government Code Sections 1090 to 1098, inclusive.</p> <p>I further certify that there was no application other than from the claimant, nor any grant or payment received, for reimbursement of costs claimed herein; and such costs are for a new program or increased level of services of an existing program. All offsetting savings and reimbursements set forth in the Parameters and Guidelines are identified, and all costs claimed are supported by source documentation currently maintained by the claimant.</p> <p>The amounts for this Estimated Claim and/or Reimbursement Claim are hereby claimed from the State for payment of estimated and/or actual costs set forth on the attached statements. I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.</p>				
 Scott Patterson Type or Print Name		12/22/03 Chief Financial Officer Title		
(39) Name of Contact Person for Claim Camille Y. Hom		Telephone Number (619) 725-7566	E-mail Address chom1@sandi.net	

Program 150	MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION CLAIM SUMMARY	FORM NTT-1
-----------------------	---	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Type of Claim: Reimbursement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>	Fiscal Year 2002/2003
---	--	--------------------------

Claim Statistics	
(03) (a) Number of pupils identified for the fiscal year (Refer to instructions)	12,935
(b) Average daily attendance for the fiscal year	124,373
(c) Number of times teachers were notified in the fiscal year (Refer to instructions)	Daily



Direct Costs	Object Accounts			
(04) Reimbursable Components:	(a) Salaries and Benefits	(b) Materials and Supplies	(c) Contracted Services	(d) Total
1. Identifying Pupils	\$ 250,900.21			\$ 250,900.21
2. Information Maintenance	\$ 88,572.74			\$ 88,572.74
3. Notifying Teachers	\$ 65,888.91			\$ 65,888.91
(05) Total Direct Cost	\$ 405,361.86			\$ 405,361.86

Indirect Costs	
(06) Indirect Cost Rate	[From J-380 or J-580] 2.30%
(07) Total Indirect Costs	[Line (05)(a) x line (06)] \$ 9,323.32
(08) Total Direct and Indirect Costs	[Line (05)(d) + line (07)] \$ 414,685.18

Cost Reduction	
(09) Less: Offsetting Savings	0
(10) Less: Other Reimbursements	0
(11) Total Claimed Amount:	[Line (08) - {Line (09) + Line (10)}] \$ 414,685.18

Revised 09/03

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Identifying pupils who have engaged in or are reasonably suspected of engaging in acts described in any subdivision, except (h), of Ed. Code 48900 from records from law enforcement agencies or otherwise maintained in the ordinary course of business.					
ALANIS, ROSA/Secretary	\$ 28.69	3.50	\$ 100.42		
ALCANTAR, CESAR/Vice Principal	\$ 65.64	61.60	\$ 4,043.42		
ALTOMARE, PETER/Vice Principal	\$ 65.64	137.36	\$ 9,016.31		
ALVAREZ, ANA/Vice Principal	\$ 59.91	19.50	\$ 1,168.25		
ANDREWS, VIRGINIA/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	21.00	\$ 1,109.64		
ANKERS, LETICIA/Administrative Assistant	\$ 35.20	0.75	\$ 26.40		
ANKERS, LETICIA/Secretary	\$ 20.85	2.00	\$ 41.70		
APPLEMAN, SHELAGH/Vice Principal	\$ 62.69	2.80	\$ 175.53		
BACA, LAURA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 19.70	13.42	\$ 264.37		
BAILEY, J/Vice Principal	\$ 48.26	12.00	\$ 579.12		
BAIN MURPHY, TYRA/Counselor	\$ 33.92	4.00	\$ 135.68		
BALLINGER, DAVID/Teacher	\$ 47.52	1.50	\$ 71.28		
BARNES, LESLIE/Principal	\$ 62.27	2.80	\$ 174.36		
BELKNAP, MARY/Counselor	\$ 41.13	6.50	\$ 267.35		
BENECCHI, MICHAEL/Counselor	\$ 29.49	2.09	\$ 61.63		
BERAUD, MICHAEL/Principal	\$ 62.27	14.40	\$ 896.69		
BERMAN, JO/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	24.00	\$ 1,541.04		
BLACKMAN, KRISTIN/Counselor	\$ 37.46	0.50	\$ 18.73		
BLACKMAN, SANDRA/Principal	\$ 65.18	7.60	\$ 495.37		
BLAIR, LESLIE/School Clerk	\$ 24.98	9.00	\$ 224.82		
BLUMENSHEIN, STEPHAN/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	94.40	\$ 6,061.42		

(05)	Total <input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 1 of 9	\$ 26,473.53		
------	--------------------------------	--	-------------	--------------	--	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils

2. Information Maintenance

3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
BRADY, ANNETTE/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	18.00	\$ 951.12		
BRANDI, BARBARA/Secretary	\$ 23.06	31.00	\$ 714.86		
BRAUN, DAVID/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	27.00	\$ 1,733.67		
BUSBY, E/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	48.40	\$ 3,253.45		
BUSTAMANTE, RUTH/School Assistant	\$ 22.81	2.25	\$ 51.32		
BUSTANI, TAVGA/Vice Principal	\$ 42.93	5.20	\$ 223.24		
BUTLER, CARLA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 22.22	109.50	\$ 2,433.09		
CAHILL, DENISE/Guidance Assistant	\$ 10.99	3.75	\$ 41.21		
CARLIN, DONNA/Attendance Assistant	\$ 23.15	4.67	\$ 108.11		
CARRILLO, CECILIA/Principal	\$ 66.63	1.25	\$ 83.29		
CASEY, KATHLEEN/Principal	\$ 67.22	17.00	\$ 1,142.74		
CASHMAN, CHRISTINE/Principal	\$ 56.85	5.00	\$ 284.25		
CASTILLO-DUVALL, ELIZABETH/Res. Tchr.	\$ 44.83	1.67	\$ 74.87		
CHAPPELL, LOIS/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	27.50	\$ 1,848.55		
COFFEY, DOUGLAS/Vice Principal	\$ 56.62	188.50	\$ 10,672.87		
COLANDREA, RICHARD/Counselor	\$ 31.01	40.00	\$ 1,240.40		
COLLINS, COURTNEE/Teacher	\$ 41.41	0.67	\$ 27.74		
CONAWAY, COLLEEN/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	17.50	\$ 967.75		
CONNER, BEVERLEY/Attendance Assistant	\$ 18.94	4.00	\$ 75.76		
CONTRERAS, JOE/Attendance Assistant	\$ 23.15	38.00	\$ 879.70		
COODY, KIMBERLY/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	109.20	\$ 7,340.42		
CRAWFORD, CHARLES/Counselor	\$ 56.30	1.67	\$ 94.02		
CURTIS, JAMES/Vice Principal	\$ 62.69	38.40	\$ 2,407.30		

(05) Total	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 2 of 2	\$ 36,649.73	
------------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------------	--------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
DALAL, ANISHA/Vice Principal	\$ 42.93	50.80	\$ 2,180.84		
DALE, TIMOTHY/Vice Principal	\$ 52.01	3.60	\$ 187.24		
DALTON, TERESA/Teacher	\$ 35.56	17.59	\$ 625.50		
DAVIS, JANE/Principal	\$ 66.63	2.00	\$ 133.26		
DAVIS, YVETTE/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	148.20	\$ 9,962.00		
DECK, PATRICIA/School Clerk	\$ 24.77	2.08	\$ 51.52		
DEERING, ANNETTE/Attendance Assistant	\$ 18.94	26.00	\$ 492.44		
DELEON, ELSITA/School Clerk	\$ 20.43	17.00	\$ 347.31		
DERWAE, E./Principal	\$ 65.18	2.00	\$ 130.36		
DEVOE, SYLVIA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	5.83	\$ 134.96		
DIAZ, ALMA/School Clerk	\$ 23.97	5.25	\$ 125.84		
DIME, ROBIN/Vice Principal	\$ 61.21	24.40	\$ 1,493.52		
DOWLEN, NANCY/School Clerk	\$ 26.95	16.84	\$ 453.84		
DYSON JR, LLOYD/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	35.00	\$ 2,352.70		
EARLSTON, LINDA/Secretary	\$ 25.31	1.12	\$ 28.35		
ECKLES, GAIL/School Assistant	\$ 22.07	1.75	\$ 38.62		
ENGBLOM, MOLLY/Counselor	\$ 36.82	0.50	\$ 18.41		
ESTILL, MARY/Principal	\$ 65.18	3.20	\$ 208.58		
ESTRADA, ALMA/Vice Principal	\$ 54.11	28.80	\$ 1,558.37		
ESTRADA, EDUARDO/Counselor	\$ 28.64	5.24	\$ 150.07		
EVERETT, JOHN/Community Serv. Off.	\$ 25.28	4.00	\$ 101.12		
FOSTER, SHELLEY/Teacher	\$ 40.02	0.33	\$ 13.21		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 3 of 9		\$ 20,788.06		

**MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL**

**FORM
NTT-2**

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District

(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:

2002/2003

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

- 1. Identifying Pupils
- 2. Information Maintenance
- 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).

Object Accounts

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
FREEMAN, KEITH/Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.94	19.00	\$ 359.86		
GALLARDO, ROBERT/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	8.25	\$ 456.23		
GARDNER, LAURA/School Clerk	\$ 22.34	15.66	\$ 349.84		
GARZA, ADOLFO/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	38.50	\$ 2,129.05		
GENNARO, STEVEN/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	100.00	\$ 6,421.00		
GEORGE, MICHAEL/Vice Principal	\$ 56.62	148.40	\$ 8,402.41		
GIBSON, GAIL/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	8.73	\$ 202.10		
GILWEE, HARRIET/Principal	\$ 65.18	7.60	\$ 495.37		
GINGERY, TRUDY/Secretary	\$ 29.34	5.50	\$ 161.37		
GONZALEZ, NIDIA/Counselor.	\$ 33.08	31.50	\$ 1,042.02		
GONZALEZ, SYLVIA/Principal	\$ 72.79	2.25	\$ 163.78		
GRAY, PATRICIA/School Clerk	\$ 23.77	64.66	\$ 1,536.97		
GREENFELD, SALLY/Vice Principal	\$ 54.11	4.00	\$ 216.44		
GRIMES, MARILYN/Vice Principal	\$ 62.69	12.00	\$ 752.28		
GUTIERREZ, FRANCES/Vice Principal	\$ 46.97	24.25	\$ 1,139.02		
HALFPENNY, RUTH/Counselor.	\$ 37.57	6.00	\$ 225.42		
HAMMOND-WILLIAMS, AMANDA/Principal	\$ 62.27	33.00	\$ 2,054.91		
HERNANDEZ, JOSEPH/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	4.00	\$ 256.84		
HERNANDEZ, SERGIO/Counselor	\$ 45.31	13.00	\$ 589.03		
HILGERS, FREDERICK/Vice Principal	\$ 48.62	85.60	\$ 4,161.87		
HILLIER, SCOTT/Vice Principal	\$ 61.21	115.60	\$ 7,075.88		
HUNT, MARLENE/Teacher	\$ 33.08	0.50	\$ 16.54		
IGLESIAS, MARILYN/Counselor	\$ 37.46	4.91	\$ 183.93		

(05) Total

Subtotal

Page 4 of 9

\$38,392.16

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

- 1. Identifying Pupils
- 2. Information Maintenance
- 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
IZU, SUSAN/Principal	\$ 65.18	4.00	\$ 260.72		
JAIME, TERESA/Vice Principal	\$ 45.99	4.33	\$ 199.14		
JEFFERS, MELISSA/Vice Principal	\$ 58.39	13.00	\$ 759.07		
JIMENEZ, JAMES/Vice Principal	\$ 46.25	14.50	\$ 670.63		
JOHNSON, JOHN/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	60.00	\$ 4,033.20		
JUAREZ, CHRISTOPHER/Vice Principal	\$ 48.62	8.00	\$ 388.96		
KARPOWICH, LINDA/Principal	\$ 65.18	2.00	\$ 130.36		
KBIFETZ, SHEILA/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	106.00	\$ 7,125.32		
KELLY, MELINDA/Teacher	\$ 34.87	0.50	\$ 17.44		
KERR, PATRICIA/Counselor	\$ 53.65	10.50	\$ 563.33		
KING, CAROLINE/Vice Principal	\$ 47.46	30.40	\$ 1,442.78		
LAINE, WILLIAM/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	47.20	\$ 3,030.71		
LASWELL, ROBIN/Counselor	\$ 26.52	32.50	\$ 861.90		
LEON-MAAS, THERON/Counselor	\$ 53.65	13.13	\$ 704.42		
LEWIS, YOLANDA/Vice Principal	\$ 46.97	6.00	\$ 281.82		
LOCHTEFELD, KIMIE/Principal	\$ 54.28	2.00	\$ 108.56		
LONGO, MARY JO/Principal	\$ 63.76	7.50	\$ 478.20		
MADDEN, JEAN/Principal	\$ 60.91	17.00	\$ 1,035.47		
MALONE, SANDRA/School Assistant	\$ 16.22	2.00	\$ 32.44		
MARTIN JR, MILTON/Vice Principal	\$ 39.38	13.60	\$ 535.57		
MASON, EMMA/Principal	\$ 66.63	4.80	\$ 319.82		
MCCLURE-LOTT, DIANE/Teacher	\$ 57.66	37.25	\$ 2,147.84		
MCDADE, JONATHAN/Vice Principal	\$ 49.63	8.80	\$ 436.74		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 5 of 9		\$ 25,564.44		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
MCFEE, LINDA/School Clerk	\$ 21.26	1.17	\$ 24.87		
MCGEE, STEPHEN/Counselor	\$ 45.31	2.75	\$ 124.60		
MCGEE-BOLDEN, GLENDA/Secretary	\$ 23.48	0.91	\$ 21.37		
MCMILLAN, LILLIE/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	1.00	\$ 55.30		
MEDINA, DIANA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.57	31.00	\$ 575.67		
MELEO, KRISTINA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 15.91	2.25	\$ 35.80		
MENDEZ, JOVITA/School Assistant	\$ 19.70	0.83	\$ 16.35		
MERCIER, RITA/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	71.00	\$ 3,926.30		
MIHALKA, BRIAN/Vice Principal	\$ 61.21	104.00	\$ 6,365.84		
MITCHELL RICKS, DIANETTE/Principal	\$ 70.14	16.00	\$ 1,122.24		
MORAN, SHEELAGH/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	5.50	\$ 353.16		
MORGENSTEIN, ROBERT/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	2.00	\$ 128.42		
MORRIS, MICHELLE/Counselor	\$ 28.17	6.75	\$ 190.15		
MORRIS, VINCENT/Vice Principal	\$ 55.64	36.40	\$ 2,025.30		
MRACHEK, REBECCA/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	54.80	\$ 3,518.71		
MUNOZ, VIOLA/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	23.20	\$ 1,225.89		
NYDAM, JULIE/Vice Principal	\$ 59.91	76.50	\$ 4,583.12		
OCHS, GINA/Attendance Assistant	\$ 20.08	2.00	\$ 40.16		
OLIVERO, JEFF/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	106.92	\$ 7,187.16		
OMAHONEY, M/School Clerk	\$ 24.77	2.00	\$ 49.54		
ORTIZ, TANIA/School Clerk	\$ 18.87	21.50	\$ 405.71		
PACIS, DINA/Vice Principal	\$ 58.39	12.50	\$ 729.88		
PARRA, RAQUEL/Counselor	\$ 38.77	2.00	\$ 77.54		

(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 6 of 9	\$32,783.08		
--	-------------	-------------	--	--

**MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL**

**FORM
NTT-2**

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

- 1. Identifying Pupils
- 2. Information Maintenance
- 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).

Object Accounts

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
PENFOLD, DEBORAH/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	14.60	\$ 937.47		
PENN, MARILYN/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	2.00	\$ 105.68		
PETERSEN, VICTORIA/Vice Principal	\$ 54.11	2.00	\$ 108.22		
PICKETT, JOLIE/Principal	\$ 64.65	83.60	\$ 5,404.74		
PIPER, ELIZABETH/School Clerk	\$ 19.17	9.41	\$ 180.39		
PORTER, SUSAN/School Clerk	\$ 27.18	1.00	\$ 27.18		
PRISE, SUSAN/Counselor	\$ 31.10	7.33	\$ 227.96		
RAMIREZ, ALYSON/Counselor	\$ 27.33	23.50	\$ 642.26		
RAPP-MCCREARY, JESSICA/Principal	\$ 58.07	4.80	\$ 278.74		
RAWLINGS, CLAUDETTE/Counselor	\$ 47.52	32.26	\$ 1,533.00		
REMILLARD, BRYAN/Vice Principal	\$ 59.91	114.80	\$ 6,877.67		
REYES, KARINA/Vice Principal	\$ 65.64	129.90	\$ 8,526.64		
RICHMOND, ALAN/Principal	\$ 65.18	6.40	\$ 417.15		
RICHMOND, JEAN/Principal	\$ 65.18	4.00	\$ 260.72		
RIOS, ARNOLD/Counselor	\$ 36.56	75.00	\$ 2,742.00		
ROBINSON, DANA/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	36.80	\$ 2,473.70		
ROMO, JUAN/Vice Principal	\$ 56.62	5.33	\$ 301.78		
ROWAN, RENEE/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	220.50	\$ 14,822.01		
ROWLEY, LINDA/School Clerk	\$ 26.95	8.25	\$ 222.34		
ROY, GREGORY/Teacher	\$ 35.85	1.00	\$ 35.85		
RUCKER, ELVIA/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	16.80	\$ 929.04		
RYAN, DIANE/Principal	\$ 66.59	38.40	\$ 2,557.06		
RYAN, LYNN/Vice Principal	\$ 42.93	6.40	\$ 274.75		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Page 7 of 9	\$ 49,886.35		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
SAMOLES, KAREN/Secretary	\$ 29.60	4.76	\$ 140.90		
SANCHEZ, ELIZABETH/Guidance Assistant	\$ 20.08	2.50	\$ 50.20		
SANTOS, ANTHONY/Comm. Serv. Officer	\$ 29.58	5.83	\$ 172.45		
SANTOS, FRANCISCO/Counselor	\$ 35.85	6.50	\$ 233.03		
SARDINA, TERESA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	11.17	\$ 258.59		
SEXTON, JUDITH/School Clerk	\$ 23.09	18.24	\$ 421.16		
SILVA, PAMELA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	38.50	\$ 891.28		
SLOAN, ELIZABETH/Vice Principal	\$ 59.91	241.00	\$ 14,438.31		
SMITH-RIOS, CHRISTINA/School Clerk	\$ 25.83	4.50	\$ 116.24		
TAGGART, LINDA/Principal	\$ 63.76	6.00	\$ 382.56		
THOMAS, SHANNA/Teacher	\$ 47.52	20.00	\$ 950.40		
TOYOHARA, KAREN/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	6.40	\$ 338.18		
TRAKAS, ANDY/Vice Principal	\$ 48.62	11.25	\$ 546.98		
TROMBLEY, MARY/School Clerk	\$ 25.83	3.66	\$ 94.54		
VIDANA-CROSS, MARTHA/Vice Principal	\$ 51.62	3.83	\$ 197.70		
VIENNA, KATHLEEN/Counselor	\$ 47.31	7.75	\$ 366.65		
WALTER, TERESA/Vice Principal	\$ 65.64	2.00	\$ 131.28		
WEHAGE, CHERIE/Counselor	\$ 35.23	3.00	\$ 105.69		
WHITE, LYDIA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.94	12.33	\$ 233.53		
WILLIAMS, LINDA/Vice Principal	\$ 62.69	2.40	\$ 150.46		
WOLFE, KATHRYN/Principal	\$ 59.47	2.40	\$ 142.73		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 8 of 9		\$ 20,362.86		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Total Page 1 of 9 Total Page 2 of 9 Total Page 3 of 9 Total Page 4 of 9 Total Page 5 of 9 Total Page 6 of 9 Total Page 7 of 9 Total Page 8 of 9			\$ 26,473.53 \$ 36,649.73 \$ 20,788.06 \$ 38,392.16 \$ 25,564.44 \$ 32,783.08 \$ 49,886.35 \$ 20,362.86		

(05) Total	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input type="checkbox"/>	Page 9 of 9	\$ 250,900.21	
------------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	-------------	---------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f). Object Accounts					
Maintaining the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years.					
ABAGAT, KIM/ELEM Counselor	\$ 37.30	45.98	\$ 1,715.05		
AGUIRRE, NORA/School Clerk I	\$ 18.14	6.60	\$ 119.72		
ALANIS, ROSA/Secretary	\$ 28.69	3.50	\$ 100.42		
ALVAREZ, ANA/Vice Principal	\$ 59.91	8.50	\$ 509.24		
ANDREWS, VIRGINIA/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	25.00	\$ 1,321.00		
ANKERS, LETICIA/Administrative Assistant	\$ 35.20	5.67	\$ 199.58		
ANKERS, LETICIA/Secretary	\$ 20.85	6.75	\$ 140.74		
BACA, LAURA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 19.70	10.24	\$ 201.73		
BAIN MURPHY, TYRA/Counselor	\$ 33.92	1.75	\$ 59.36		
BARANSKI, JANICE/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	3.52	\$ 74.84		
BARNES, JULIE/Secretary	\$ 27.26	5.00	\$ 136.30		
BELKNAP, MARY/Counselor	\$ 41.13	4.00	\$ 164.52		
BENECCHI, MICHAEL/Counselor	\$ 29.49	0.75	\$ 22.12		
BERAUD, BEATRIZ/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	58.30	\$ 1,505.89		
BLACKMAN, KRISTIN/Counselor	\$ 37.46	0.17	\$ 6.37		
BLAIR, LESLIE/School Clerk	\$ 24.98	9.00	\$ 224.82		
BLAKLEY, TERRI/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	57.20	\$ 1,416.84		
BOOTH-FRANKEL, JOYCE/DIST Counselor	\$ 44.23	4.18	\$ 184.88		
BRADY, ANNETTE/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	3.25	\$ 171.73		
BRANDI, BARBARA/Secretary	\$ 23.06	15.50	\$ 357.43		
BRAVO, SYLVIA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 22.16	15.84	\$ 351.01		

(05) Total	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 1 of 9	\$ 8,983.59
------------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------------	-------------

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
BROWN, VERONNA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.98	\$ 49.04		
BURTON, MELINDA/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	1.10	\$ 23.39		
BUSTAMANTE, RUTH/School Assistant	\$ 22.81	0.82	\$ 18.70		
BUTLER, CARLA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 22.22	70.00	\$ 1,555.40		
BUTTERWORTH, TRAVES/School Clerk I	\$ 21.02	85.80	\$ 1,803.52		
CAHILL, DENISE/Guidance Assistant	\$ 10.99	2.00	\$ 21.98		
CANTON, JOYLYN/School Clerk I	\$ 21.02	33.88	\$ 712.16		
CARLIN, DONNA/Attendance Assistant	\$ 23.15	4.67	\$ 108.11		
CARRILLO, CECILIA/Principal	\$ 66.63	1.25	\$ 83.29		
CASHMAN, CHRISTINE/Principal	\$ 56.85	1.25	\$ 71.06		
CASTILLO-DUVAL, ELIZABETH/Res. Teach	\$ 44.83	1.83	\$ 82.04		
CASTRO, DANIEL/School Clerk	\$ 22.07	6.50	\$ 143.46		
CASTRO, IVAN/School Assistant	\$ 19.70	0.75	\$ 14.78		
CHAPPELL, LOIS/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	5.00	\$ 336.10		
CHISM, MARGARET/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	12.76	\$ 271.28		
CLARK-CORBETT, BARBARA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	47.08	\$ 1,166.17		
COFFEY, DOUGLAS/Vice Principal	\$ 56.62	111.84	\$ 6,332.38		
COLANDREA, RICHARD/Counselor	\$ 31.01	2.34	\$ 72.56		
COMAN, TERRIE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	13.20	\$ 326.96		
CONAWAY, COLLEEN/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	7.50	\$ 414.75		
CONNER, BEVERLEY/Attendance Assistant	\$ 18.94	2.20	\$ 41.67		
CONTRERAS, JOE/Attendance Assistant	\$ 23.15	19.00	\$ 439.85		
CRANE, ALEXIS/DIST Counselor	\$ 31.10	21.12	\$ 656.83		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 2 of 9		\$14,745.48		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
CRAWFORD, CHARLES/Counselor	\$ 56.30	1.25	\$ 70.38		
DALTON, TERESA/Teacher	\$ 35.56	7.50	\$ 266.70		
DAVID, JACKIE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.32	\$ 32.70		
DAVIES, CHARLOTTE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	60.06	\$ 1,487.69		
DECK, PATRICIA/School Clerk	\$ 24.77	0.17	\$ 4.21		
DEERING, ANNETTE/Attendance Assistant	\$ 18.94	8.60	\$ 162.88		
DEVOE, SYLVIA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	1.50	\$ 34.73		
DEVOE-BROWN, DYELENE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	26.62	\$ 659.38		
DIAZ, ALMA/School Clerk	\$ 23.97	10.00	\$ 239.70		
DOWLEN, NANCY/School Clerk	\$ 26.95	16.83	\$ 453.57		
DUERFELDT, MARTHA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 21.26	2.86	\$ 60.80		
DYSON JR, LLOYD/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	35.00	\$ 2,352.70		
EARLSTON, LINDA/Secretary	\$ 25.31	2.25	\$ 56.95		
ECKLES, GAIL/School Assistant	\$ 22.07	3.75	\$ 82.76		
EGGERT, NANCY/Site Tech	\$ 28.11	9.50	\$ 267.05		
ESPARZA, RUTH/School Clerk	\$ 19.17	14.00	\$ 268.38		
ESPINOZA, ANA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 23.77	21.12	\$ 502.02		
FAIRCHILD, JANET/School Clerk I	\$ 19.63	1.10	\$ 21.59		
FLORES, BREE/School Clerk I	\$ 21.02	13.42	\$ 282.09		
FREEMAN, KEITH/Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.94	7.00	\$ 132.58		
GABUYA, CAROLINE/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	3.30	\$ 70.16		
GALLARDO, ROBERT/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	6.63	\$ 366.64		
GARDNER, LAURA/School Clerk	\$ 22.16	18.42	\$ 408.19		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 3 of 9		\$ 8,283.85		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
GARZA, ADOLFO/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	10.00	\$ 553.00		
GIBSON, GAIL/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	5.00	\$ 115.75		
GILLASPIE, NATALIE/School Clerk	\$ 21.89	46.25	\$ 1,012.41		
GLORIA, MARIETTA/School Clerk	\$ 22.16	7.00	\$ 155.12		
GONZALEZ, NIDIA/Counselor	\$ 33.08	7.50	\$ 248.10		
GRAY, PATRICIA/School Clerk	\$ 23.77	24.91	\$ 592.11		
GRIFFITH, LINDA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	4.84	\$ 119.89		
GRIFFITH, SALLY/School Clerk	\$ 21.44	2.75	\$ 58.96		
GROH, MAXINE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	4.18	\$ 103.54		
GUEVARA, ANA/School Clerk	\$ 22.81	8.51	\$ 194.11		
GUTIERREZ, FRANCES/Vice Principal	\$ 46.97	12.25	\$ 575.38		
HALFPENNY, RUTH/Counselor	\$ 37.57	4.25	\$ 159.67		
HAMMOND-WILLIAMS, AMANDA/Principal	\$ 62.27	11.00	\$ 684.97		
HATLEY, MARIA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 18.87	27.94	\$ 527.23		
HEARTEL, MARY/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	63.58	\$ 1,574.88		
HERNANDEZ, JOSEPH/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	3.25	\$ 208.68		
HERNANDEZ, SERGIO/Counselor	\$ 45.31	11.50	\$ 521.07		
HERSCHE-HOWARD, ALISON/DIST Counselor	\$ 56.30	2.64	\$ 148.63		
HINZE, KAREN/School Clerk I	\$ 23.77	1.10	\$ 26.15		
HOBSON, CHRISTINE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.54	\$ 38.15		
HUEZO, LAURA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 23.77	20.02	\$ 475.88		
HUNT, MARLENE/Teacher	\$ 33.08	0.50	\$ 16.54		
HYDE, PATRICIA/HEAD Counselor I	\$ 56.30	20.24	\$ 1,139.51		

(05) Total	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 4 of 9	\$ 9,249.73	
------------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------------	-------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
IGLESIAS, J./School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 22.16	2.64	\$ 58.50		
IGLESIAS, MARILYN/Counselor	\$ 37.46	2.25	\$ 84.29		
ISLAND, CARMEN/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	6.60	\$ 170.48		
IZU, SUSAN/Principal	\$ 65.18	0.91	\$ 59.31		
JAIME, TERESA/Vice Principal	\$ 45.99	1.02	\$ 46.91		
JAMES, JULIA/School Clerk	\$ 22.07	1.25	\$ 27.59		
JIMENEZ, JAMES/Vice Principal	\$ 46.25	6.50	\$ 300.63		
JOHNSON BLAKE, LULA/DIST Counselor	\$ 54.98	1.76	\$ 96.76		
JOHNSON, JOHN/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	60.00	\$ 4,033.20		
JOHNSON, MINERVA/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	1.50	\$ 82.95		
JUAREZ, CHRISTOPHER/Vice Principal	\$ 48.62	1.60	\$ 77.79		
KEITH, HEATHER/SEC Counselor	\$ 54.98	51.92	\$ 2,854.56		
KERR, PATRICIA/Counselor	\$ 53.65	4.75	\$ 254.84		
LACKMAN, E/Secretary	\$ 27.53	0.67	\$ 18.45		
LANCEY-JEWELL, CAROL/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	81.62	\$ 1,735.24		
LANE, KIM/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	63.14	\$ 1,563.98		
LASWELL, ROBIN/Counselor	\$ 26.52	37.75	\$ 1,001.13		
LEON-MAAS, THERON/Counselor	\$ 53.65	10.09	\$ 541.33		
LITTLETON, ERICKA/School Clerk I	\$ 18.87	7.48	\$ 141.15		
LONG, DIANE/Secretary	\$ 29.60	7.50	\$ 222.00		
LOYA, BLANCA/School Clerk	\$ 24.98	1.16	\$ 28.98		
LUNA, JEFFREY/Vice Principal	\$ 53.20	1.75	\$ 93.10		
MADDEN, JEAN/Principal	\$ 60.91	8.50	\$ 517.74		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Page 5 of 9			\$14,010.91		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
MAIORANO, KARLA/School Assistant	\$ 18.87	2.50	\$ 47.18		
MALONE, SANDRA/School Assistant	\$ 16.22	1.50	\$ 24.33		
MANCILLA, HORTENCIA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 18.87	9.24	\$ 174.36		
MARRA, CHRISTINE/School Assistant	\$ 22.22	0.75	\$ 16.67		
MASON, DEBORA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	7.92	\$ 204.57		
MCCAULEY, SANDRA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.54	\$ 38.15		
MCCLURE-LOTT, DIANE/Teacher	\$ 57.66	29.00	\$ 1,672.14		
MCDOUGALL, LINDA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	8.80	\$ 217.98		
MCFEE, LINDA/School Clerk	\$ 21.26	2.34	\$ 49.75		
MCGEE, BARBARA/Counselor	\$ 41.41	3.00	\$ 124.23		
MCGEE, STEPHEN/Counselor	\$ 45.31	0.75	\$ 33.98		
MCGEE-BOLDEN, GLENDA/Secretary	\$ 23.48	0.67	\$ 15.73		
MCGIRR, BRUCE/Principal	\$ 66.63	5.34	\$ 355.80		
MCMILLAN, LILLIE/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	1.00	\$ 55.30		
MEDINA, DIANA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.57	12.00	\$ 222.84		
MEDINA, MARY/School Clerk	\$ 24.98	4.33	\$ 108.16		
MELEO, KRISTINA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 15.91	20.25	\$ 322.18		
MENDEZ, JOVITA/School Assistant	\$ 19.70	0.92	\$ 18.12		
MERCIER, RITA/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	22.83	\$ 1,262.50		
MORAN, SHEBLAGH/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	1.75	\$ 112.37		
MORRIS, MICHELLE/Counselor	\$ 28.17	2.50	\$ 70.43		
MOYA, JOSEFINA/Site Tech	\$ 29.34	96.00	\$ 2,816.64		
NARCISSE, DEBORAH/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	3.52	\$ 74.84		

(05) Total	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 6 of 9	\$ 8,038.25	
------------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------------	-------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
NGUYEN, DAO/Site Tech	\$ 26.13	23.75	\$ 620.59		
NYDAM, JULIE/Vice Principal	\$ 59.91	18.00	\$ 1,078.38		
OCHS, GINA/Attendance Assistant	\$ 20.08	2.66	\$ 53.41		
OLIVERO, JEFF/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	33.32	\$ 2,239.77		
OMAHONEY, M/School Clerk	\$ 24.77	1.36	\$ 33.69		
ORTIZ, TANIA/School Clerk	\$ 18.87	43.00	\$ 811.41		
PACIS, DINA/Vice Principal	\$ 58.39	11.50	\$ 671.49		
PARRA, RAQUEL/Counselor	\$ 38.77	3.00	\$ 116.31		
PECK, BARBARA/Attendance Assistant	\$ 22.22	3.50	\$ 77.77		
PENFOLD, DEBORAH/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	11.75	\$ 754.47		
PEREZ, CHERYL/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	25.96	\$ 643.03		
PERRINE, MADGE/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	8.80	\$ 187.09		
PIPER, ELIZABETH/School Clerk	\$ 19.17	12.50	\$ 239.63		
PORTER, SUSAN/School Clerk	\$ 27.18	3.50	\$ 95.13		
PRISE, SUSAN/Counselor	\$ 31.10	4.00	\$ 124.40		
RADDEN, ROSA/School Clerk	\$ 25.83	0.15	\$ 3.87		
RAMIREZ, ALYSON/Counselor	\$ 27.33	6.75	\$ 184.48		
RATTAN, KARINA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 20.43	2.20	\$ 44.95		
RAWLINGS, CLAUDETTE/Counselor	\$ 47.52	3.75	\$ 178.20		
REED, MARQUALENE/SEC Counselor	\$ 40.72	30.14	\$ 1,227.30		
RILEY, PATRICIA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	55.00	\$ 1,362.35		
RIOS, ARNOLD/Counselor	\$ 36.56	21.25	\$ 776.90		
RODRIGUEZ, IRENE/School Clerk	\$ 22.34	3.83	\$ 85.56		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Page 7 of 9	\$11,610.18		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
ROMERO, DUREZA/School Clerk	\$ 21.19	3.16	\$ 66.96		
ROMO, JUAN/Vice Principal	\$ 56.62	3.83	\$ 216.85		
ROWAN, RENEE/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	51.50	\$ 3,461.83		
ROWLEY, LINDA/School Clerk	\$ 26.95	41.70	\$ 1,123.82		
SAMOLES, KAREN/Secretary	\$ 29.60	4.51	\$ 133.50		
SANCHEZ, ELIZABETH/Guidance Assistant	\$ 20.08	1.25	\$ 25.10		
SANTOS, ANTHONY/Comm. Serv. Officer	\$ 29.58	1.50	\$ 44.37		
SANTOS, FRANCISCO/Counselor	\$ 35.85	13.50	\$ 483.98		
SARDINA, TERESA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	17.16	\$ 397.25		
SCHREIBER, GAVINA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	1.10	\$ 28.41		
SEXTON, JUDITH/School Clerk	\$ 23.09	36.24	\$ 836.78		
SHUFFLER, PAULETTE/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	88.88	\$ 2,295.77		
SILVA, PAMELA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	76.00	\$ 1,759.40		
SMITH-RIOS, CHRISTINA/School Clerk	\$ 25.83	5.00	\$ 129.15		
SOCIE, MARTHA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	3.52	\$ 87.19		
STAPA, SUSAN/School Clerk I	\$ 22.81	1.10	\$ 25.09		
TEMPLIN, DONNA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.32	\$ 32.70		
THOMAS, SHANNA/Teacher	\$ 47.52	5.50	\$ 261.36		
TRAKAS, ANDY/Vice Principal	\$ 48.62	7.25	\$ 352.50		
TROMBLEY, MARY/School Clerk	\$ 25.83	3.66	\$ 94.54		
TROWBRIDGE, ADELE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.10	\$ 27.25		
VALDEZ, LINDA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	1.10	\$ 28.41		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 8 of 9	\$11,912.21		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

- 1. Identifying Pupils
- 2. Information Maintenance
- 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
VAZQUEZ, MARTHA/School Clerk I-BIL.	\$ 23.77	16.72	\$ 397.43		
VIENNA, KATHLEEN/Counselor	\$ 47.31	2.00	\$ 94.62		
VINE, EDNA/School Clerk	\$ 24.77	30.99	\$ 767.62		
WALTER, TERESA/Vice Principal	\$ 65.64	3.83	\$ 251.40		
WEHAGE, CHERIE/Counselor	\$ 35.23	1.00	\$ 35.23		
WHITE, LYDIA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.94	10.15	\$ 192.24		
Total Page 1 of 9			\$ 8,983.59		
Total Page 2 of 9			\$ 14,745.48		
Total Page 3 of 9			\$ 8,283.85		
Total Page 4 of 9			\$ 9,249.73		
Total Page 5 of 9			\$ 14,010.91		
Total Page 6 of 9			\$ 8,038.25		
Total Page 7 of 9			\$ 11,610.18		
Total Page 8 of 9			\$ 11,912.21		
(05) Total <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input type="checkbox"/>		Page 9 of 9	\$ 88,572.74		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Maintaining the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years.					
ABAGAT, KIM/ELEM Counselor	\$ 37.30	35.53	\$ 1,325.27		
AGUIRRE, NORA/School Clerk I	\$ 18.14	5.10	\$ 92.51		
ALANIS, ROSA/Secretary	\$ 28.69	3.50	\$ 100.42		
ALVAREZ, ANA/Vice Principal	\$ 59.91	8.50	\$ 509.24		
ANDREWS, VIRGINIA/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	16.50	\$ 871.86		
ANKERS, LETICIA/Secretary	\$ 20.85	0.25	\$ 5.21		
AVERY, APRIL/School Clerk	\$ 27.18	17.50	\$ 475.65		
BACA, LAURA/Guidance Assistnat	\$ 19.70	5.57	\$ 109.73		
BAIN MURPHY, TYRA/Counselor	\$ 33.92	1.75	\$ 59.36		
BARANSKI, JANICE/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	2.72	\$ 57.83		
BARNES, JULIE/Secretary	\$ 27.26	1.00	\$ 27.26		
BELKNAP, MARY/Counselor	\$ 41.13	2.50	\$ 102.83		
BENECCHI, MICHAEL/Counselor	\$ 29.49	0.83	\$ 24.48		
BERAUD, BEATRIZ/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	45.05	\$ 1,163.64		
BERLIN, JANET/School Clerk	\$ 26.95	39.50	\$ 1,064.53		
BLACKMAN, KRISTIN/Counselor	\$ 37.46	0.17	\$ 6.37		
BLAIR, LESLIE/School Clerk	\$ 24.98	4.50	\$ 112.41		
BLAKLEY, TERRI/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	44.20	\$ 1,094.83		
BOOTH-FRANKEL, JOYCE/DIST Counselor	\$ 44.23	3.23	\$ 142.86		
BRADY, ANNETTE/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	4.50	\$ 237.78		
BRANDI, BARBARA/Secretary	\$ 23.06	15.50	\$ 357.43		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Page 1 of 8	\$ 7,941.50		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
BRAVO, SYLVIA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 22.16	12.24	\$ 271.24		
BROWN, VERONNA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.53	\$ 37.90		
BURTON, MELINDA/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	0.85	\$ 18.07		
BUTTERWORTH, TRAVES/School Clerk I	\$ 21.02	66.30	\$ 1,393.63		
CAHILL, DENISE/Guidance Assistant	\$ 10.99	3.25	\$ 35.72		
CANTON, JOYLYN/School Clerk I	\$ 21.02	26.18	\$ 550.30		
CARLIN, DONNA/Attendance Assistant	\$ 23.15	4.66	\$ 107.88		
CARRILLO, CECILIA/Principal	\$ 66.63	1.25	\$ 83.29		
CASHMAN, CHRISTINE/Principal	\$ 56.85	1.25	\$ 71.06		
CASTILLO-DUVALL, ELIZABETH/Resource T	\$ 44.83	3.83	\$ 171.70		
CHISM, MARGARET/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	9.86	\$ 209.62		
CLARK-CORBETT, BARBARA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	36.38	\$ 901.13		
COFFEY, DOUGLAS/Vice Principal	\$ 56.62	48.33	\$ 2,736.44		
COLANDREA, RICHARD/Counselor	\$ 31.01	0.34	\$ 10.54		
COMAN, TERRIE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	10.20	\$ 252.65		
CONAWAY, COLLEEN/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	15.50	\$ 857.15		
CONNER, BEVERLEY/Attendance Assistant	\$ 18.94	0.50	\$ 9.47		
CONTRERAS, JOE/Attendance Assistant	\$ 23.15	19.00	\$ 439.85		
CRANE, ALEXIS/DIST Counselor	\$ 31.10	16.32	\$ 507.55		
CRAWFORD, CHARLES/Counselor	\$ 56.30	1.08	\$ 60.80		
DAVID, JACKIE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.02	\$ 25.27		
DAVIES, CHARLOTTE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	46.41	\$ 1,149.58		
DECK, PATRICIA/School Clerk	\$ 24.77	0.50	\$ 12.39		

(05) Total	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 2 of 8	\$ 9,913.23	
------------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------------	-------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
DEERING, ANNETTE/Attendance Assistant	\$ 18.94	2.10	\$ 39.77		
DEVOE, SYLVIA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	5.83	\$ 134.96		
DEVOE-BROWN, DYELENE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	20.57	\$ 509.52		
DIAZ, ALMA/School Clerk	\$ 23.97	5.00	\$ 119.85		
DOWLEN, NANCY/School Clerk	\$ 26.95	16.83	\$ 453.57		
DUERFELDT, MARTHA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 21.26	2.21	\$ 46.98		
DYSON, YVONNE/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	83.00	\$ 5,579.26		
EARLSTON, LINDA/Secretary	\$ 25.31	0.68	\$ 17.21		
ECKLES, GAIL/School Assistant	\$ 22.07	1.75	\$ 38.62		
EGGERT, NANCY/Site Tech	\$ 28.11	22.83	\$ 641.75		
ESPARZA, RUTH/School Clerk	\$ 19.17	5.24	\$ 100.45		
ESPINOZA, ANA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 23.77	16.32	\$ 387.93		
ESTRADA, EDUARDO/Counselor	\$ 28.64	2.42	\$ 69.31		
FAIRCHILD, JANET/School Clerk I	\$ 19.63	0.85	\$ 16.69		
FINK, DIANNE/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	28.75	\$ 1,932.58		
FLORES, BREE/School Clerk I	\$ 21.02	10.37	\$ 217.98		
GABUYA, CAROLINE/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	2.55	\$ 54.21		
GALLARDO, ROBERT/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	0.50	\$ 27.65		
GARDNER, LAURA/School Clerk	\$ 22.16	13.67	\$ 302.93		
GARZA, ADOLFO/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	8.75	\$ 483.88		
GIBSON, GAIL/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	4.25	\$ 98.39		
GILLASPIE, NATALIE/School Clerk	\$ 21.89	1.75	\$ 38.31		
GLORIA, MARIETTA/School Clerk	\$ 22.16	7.00	\$ 155.12		

(05)	Total	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 3 of 8	\$11,466.92	
------	-------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------------	-------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
GONZALEZ, NIDIA/Counselor	\$ 33.08	7.50	\$ 248.10		
GONZALEZ, SYLVIA/Principal	\$ 72.79	1.75	\$ 127.38		
GRIFFITH, LINDA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	3.74	\$ 92.64		
GROH, MAXINE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	3.23	\$ 80.01		
GUEVARA, ANA/School Clerk	\$ 22.81	4.07	\$ 92.84		
GUTIERREZ, FRANCES/Vice Principal	\$ 46.97	22.75	\$ 1,068.57		
HALFPENNY, RUTH/Counselor	\$ 37.57	4.50	\$ 169.07		
HAMMOND-WILLIAMS, AMANDA/Principal	\$ 62.27	2.75	\$ 171.24		
HATLEY, MARIA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 18.87	21.59	\$ 407.40		
HEARTEL, MARY/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	49.13	\$ 1,216.95		
HERNANDEZ, SERGIO/Counselor	\$ 45.31	17.00	\$ 770.27		
HERSCHE-HOWARD, ALISON/DIST Counselor	\$ 56.30	2.04	\$ 114.85		
HINZE, KAREN/School Clerk I	\$ 23.77	0.85	\$ 20.20		
HOBSON, CHRISTINE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.19	\$ 29.48		
HOERR, RITA/School Clerk	\$ 24.98	94.50	\$ 2,360.61		
HUEZO, LAURA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 23.77	15.47	\$ 367.72		
HYDE, PATRICIA/HEAD Counselor I	\$ 56.30	15.64	\$ 880.53		
IGLESIAS, J/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 22.16	2.04	\$ 45.21		
IGLESIAS, MARILYN/Counselor	\$ 37.46	2.33	\$ 87.28		
ISLAND, CARMEN/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	5.10	\$ 131.73		
IZU, SUSAN/Principal	\$ 65.18	0.75	\$ 48.89		
JAIME, TERESA/Vice Principal	\$ 45.99	1.51	\$ 69.44		
JIMENEZ, JAMES/Vice Principal	\$ 46.25	4.75	\$ 219.69		

(05) Total	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 4 of 8	\$ 8,820.10
------------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------------	-------------

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
JOHNSON BLAKE, LULA/DIST Counselor	\$ 54.98	1.36	\$ 74.77		
JUAREZ, CHRISTOPHER/Vice Principal	\$ 48.62	1.60	\$ 77.79		
KEITH, HEATHER/SEC Counselor	\$ 54.98	40.12	\$ 2,205.80		
KERR, PATRICIA/Counselor	\$ 53.65	11.50	\$ 616.98		
LANCEY-JEWELL, CAROL/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	63.07	\$ 1,340.87		
LANE, KIM/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	48.79	\$ 1,208.53		
LASWELL, ROBIN/Counselor	\$ 26.52	18.00	\$ 477.36		
LEON-MAAS, THERON/Counselor	\$ 53.65	9.44	\$ 506.46		
LITTLETON, ERICKA/School Clerk I	\$ 18.87	5.78	\$ 109.07		
LONGO, MARY JO/Principal	\$ 63.76	0.80	\$ 51.01		
LUNA, JEFFREY/Vice Principal	\$ 53.20	13.50	\$ 718.20		
MADDEN, JEAN/Principal	\$ 60.91	25.00	\$ 1,522.75		
MALONE, SANDRA/School Assistant	\$ 16.22	0.50	\$ 8.11		
MANCILLA, HORTENCIA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 18.87	7.14	\$ 134.73		
MASON, DEBORA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	6.12	\$ 158.08		
MCCAULEY, SANDRA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.19	\$ 29.48		
MCCLURE-LOTT, DIANE/Teacher	\$ 57.66	26.75	\$ 1,542.41		
MCDOUGALL, LINDA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	6.80	\$ 168.44		
MCGEE, BARBARA/Counselor	\$ 41.41	0.50	\$ 20.71		
MCGEE, STEPHEN/Counselor	\$ 45.31	0.75	\$ 33.98		
MCGEE-BOLDEN, GLENDA/Secretary	\$ 23.48	0.59	\$ 13.85		
MCMILLAN, LILLIE/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	1.00	\$ 55.30		
MEDINA, DIANA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.57	12.00	\$ 222.84		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 5 of 8		\$11,297.52		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
MELEO, KRISTINA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 15.91	2.25	\$ 35.80		
MERCIER, RITA/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	67.00	\$ 3,705.10		
MORAN, SHEELAGH/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	1.75	\$ 112.37		
MORRIS, MICHELLE/Counselor	\$ 28.17	3.00	\$ 84.51		
NARCISSE, DEBORAH/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	2.72	\$ 57.83		
OCHS, GINA/Attendance Assistant	\$ 20.08	2.00	\$ 40.16		
OLIVERO, JEFF/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	18.73	\$ 1,259.03		
OMAHONEY, M/School Clerk	\$ 24.77	0.64	\$ 15.85		
ORTIZ, TANIA/School Clerk	\$ 18.87	21.50	\$ 405.71		
PACIS, DINA/Vice Principal	\$ 58.39	5.50	\$ 321.15		
PARRA, RAQUEL/Counselor	\$ 38.77	3.00	\$ 116.31		
PENFOLD, DEBORAH/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	3.75	\$ 240.79		
PEREZ, CHERYL/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	20.06	\$ 496.89		
PERRINE, MADGE/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	6.80	\$ 144.57		
PIPER, ELIZABETH/School Clerk	\$ 19.17	9.25	\$ 177.32		
PORTER, SUSAN/School Clerk	\$ 27.18	5.50	\$ 149.49		
PRISE, SUSAN/Counselor	\$ 31.10	6.66	\$ 207.13		
RAMIREZ, ALYSON/Counselor	\$ 27.33	6.25	\$ 170.81		
RATTAN, KARINA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 20.43	1.70	\$ 34.73		
RAWLINGS, CLAUDETTE/Counselor	\$ 47.52	4.00	\$ 190.08		
REED, MARQUALENE/SEC Counselor	\$ 40.72	23.29	\$ 948.37		
RICHMOND, JEAN/Principal	\$ 65.18	0.33	\$ 21.51		
RILEY, PATRICIA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	42.50	\$ 1,052.73		

(05) Total	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 6 of 8	\$ 9,988.24	
------------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------------	-------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
ROMO, JUAN/Vice Principal	\$ 56.62	3.33	\$ 188.54		
ROWLEY, LINDA/School Clerk	\$ 26.95	32.35	\$ 871.83		
SAMOLES, KAREN/Secretary	\$ 29.60	2.55	\$ 75.48		
SANCHEZ, ELIZABETH/Guidance Assistant	\$ 20.08	1.25	\$ 25.10		
SANTOS, ANTHONY/Comm. Serv. Officer	\$ 29.58	5.83	\$ 172.45		
SARDINA, TERESA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	39.17	\$ 906.79		
SCHREIBER, GAVINA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	0.85	\$ 21.96		
SEXTON, JUDITH/School Clerk	\$ 23.09	2.17	\$ 50.11		
SHUFFLER, PAULETTE/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	68.68	\$ 1,774.00		
SMITH-RIOS, CHRISTINA/School Clerk	\$ 25.83	2.50	\$ 64.58		
SOCIE, MARTHA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	2.72	\$ 67.37		
STAPA, SUSAN/School Clerk I	\$ 22.81	0.85	\$ 19.39		
TAGGART, LINDA/Principal	\$ 63.76	1.50	\$ 95.64		
TEMPLIN, DONNA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.02	\$ 25.27		
TRAKAS, ANDY/Vice Principal	\$ 48.62	5.25	\$ 255.26		
TROMBLEY, MARY/School Clerk	\$ 25.83	3.66	\$ 94.54		
TROWBRIDGE, ADELE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	0.85	\$ 21.05		
TUSSEY, LEAH/Principal	\$ 66.63	10.75	\$ 716.27		
VALDEZ, LINDA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	0.85	\$ 21.96		
VAZQUEZ, MARTHA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 23.77	12.92	\$ 307.11		
VIDANA-CROSS, MARTHA/Vice Principal	\$ 51.62	1.25	\$ 64.53		
VIENNA, KATHLEEN/Counselor	\$ 47.31	1.50	\$ 70.97		

(05) Total	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 7 of 8	\$ 5,910.20	
------------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------------	-------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
WALTER, TERESA/Vice Principal	\$ 65.64	4.17	\$ 273.72		
WEHAGE, CHERIE/Counselor	\$ 35.23	3.00	\$ 105.69		
WHITE, LYDIA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.94	9.07	\$ 171.79		
Total Page 1 of 8			\$ 7,941.50		
Total Page 2 of 8			\$ 9,913.23		
Total Page 3 of 8			\$11,466.92		
Total Page 4 of 8			\$ 8,820.10		
Total Page 5 of 8			\$11,297.52		
Total Page 6 of 8			\$ 9,988.24		
Total Page 7 of 8			\$ 5,910.20		

(05) Total	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input type="checkbox"/>	Page 8 of 8	\$65,888.91	
------------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	-------------	-------------	--

Exhibit H



STEVE WESTLY
 California State Controller
 Division of Accounting and Reporting
 JULY 21, 2005

S37165
 00150
 2005/07/21

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
 SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCH DIST
 SAN DIEGO COUNTY
 4100 NORMAL STREET ROOM 3159
 SAN DIEGO CA 92103

DEAR CLAIMANT:

RE: NOTICE TO TEACH SUS CH 1306/89

WE HAVE REVIEWED YOUR 2002/2003 FISCAL YEAR REIMBURSEMENT CLAIM FOR THE MANDATED COST PROGRAM REFERENCED ABOVE. THE RESULTS OF OUR REVIEW ARE AS FOLLOWS:

AMOUNT CLAIMED 414,685.00

ADJUSTMENT TO CLAIM:

FIELD AUDIT FINDINGS - 192,740.00

TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS - 192,740.00

AMOUNT DUE CLAIMANT \$ 221,945.00

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, PLEASE CONTACT KIM NGUYEN AT (916) 324-7876 OR IN WRITING AT THE STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE, DIVISION OF ACCOUNTING AND REPORTING, P.O. BOX 942850, SACRAMENTO, CA 94250-5875. DUE TO INSUFFICIENT APPROPRIATION, THE BALANCE DUE WILL BE FORTHCOMING WHEN ADDITIONAL FUNDS ARE MADE AVAILABLE.

SINCERELY,

Ginny Brummels
 GINNY BRUMMELS, MANAGER

Exhibit I

SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Audit Report

NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION PROGRAM

Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, and
Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993

July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2003



STEVE WESTLY
California State Controller

June 2005



STEVE WESTLY
California State Controller

June 30, 2005

Alan D. Bersin
Superintendent of Public Instruction
San Diego Unified School District
4100 Normal Street
San Diego, CA 92103-2682

Dear Mr. Bersin:

The State Controller's Office audited the costs claimed by the San Diego Unified School District for the legislatively mandated Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Program (Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993) for the period of July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2003.

The district claimed \$820,909 for the mandated program. Our audit disclosed that \$461,378 is allowable and \$359,531 is unallowable. The unallowable costs occurred because the district claimed unallowable salary, benefit, and related indirect costs. The State paid the district \$178,217. The State will pay allowable costs claimed that exceed the amount paid, totaling \$283,161, contingent upon available appropriations.

If you disagree with the audit finding, you may file an Incorrect Reduction Claim (IRC) with the Commission on State Mandates (COSM). The IRC must be filed within three years following the date that we notify you of a claim reduction. You may obtain IRC information at COSM's Web site at www.csm.ca.gov (Guidebook link), and obtain IRC forms by telephone at (916) 323-3562 or by e-mail at csminfo@csm.ca.gov.

If you have any questions, please contact Jim L. Spano, Chief, Compliance Audits Bureau, at (916) 323-5849.

Sincerely,

VINCENT P. BROWN
Chief Operating Officer

VPB:JVB/ams

cc: (See page 2)

cc: Scott Patterson,
Chief Financial Officer
San Diego Unified School District
Arthur M. Palkowitz, Manager
Office of Resource Development
Financial Division
San Diego Unified School District
Jennifer Thompson
Legislative Financial Accountant
Mandated Cost Unit
San Diego Unified School District
Rudy Castruita, County Superintendent of Schools
San Diego County Office of Education
Scott Hannan, Director
School Fiscal Services Division
California Department of Education
Arlene Matsuura, Education Fiscal Services Consultant
School Fiscal Services Division
California Department of Education
Gerry Shelton, Director
Fiscal and Administrative Services Division
California Department of Education
Jeannie Oropeza, Program Budget Manager
Education Systems Unit
Department of Finance

Contents

Audit Report	
Summary	1
Background	1
Objective, Scope, and Methodology	1
Conclusion	2
Views of Responsible Official	2
Restricted Use	3
Schedule 1—Summary of Program Costs	4
Finding and Recommendation	5
Attachment—District’s Response to Draft Audit Report	

Audit Report

Summary

The State Controller's Office (SCO) audited the costs claimed by the San Diego Unified School District for the legislatively mandated Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Program (Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993) for the period of July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2003. The last day of fieldwork was March 29, 2005.

The district claimed \$820,909 for the mandated program. Our audit disclosed that \$461,378 is allowable and \$359,531 is unallowable. The unallowable costs occurred because the district claimed unallowable salary, benefit, and related indirect costs. The State paid the district \$178,217. The State will pay allowable costs claimed that exceed the amount paid, totaling \$283,161, contingent upon available appropriations.

Background

Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993 added and amended *Education Code* Section 49079. The law requires that school districts identify to their teachers those students who have engaged in, or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts specified in *Education Code* Sections 48900 (excluding subdivision (h)), 48900.2, 48900.3, 48900.4, and 48900.7. The notification is to be based on any written records the district maintains or receives from a law enforcement agency. No district is liable for failure to comply if the district makes a good faith effort to notify the teacher. Districts were to commence notifications in the 1990-91 school year, using data from the previous year. By fiscal year (FY) 1992-93, districts were to include three years of prior data in their teacher notifications.

On January 19, 1995, the Commission on State Mandates (COSM) determined that the legislation imposed a state mandate reimbursable under *Government Code* Section 17561.

Parameters and Guidelines establishes the state mandate and defines reimbursement criteria. COSM adopted *Parameters and Guidelines* on July 20, 1995. In compliance with *Government Code* Section 17558, the SCO issues claiming instructions for mandated programs, to assist local agencies and school districts in claiming reimbursable costs.

Objective, Scope, and Methodology

We conducted the audit to determine whether costs claimed represent increased costs resulting from the Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Program for the period of July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2003.

Our audit scope included, but was not limited to, determining whether costs claimed were supported by appropriate source documents, not funded by another source, and not unreasonable and/or excessive.

We conducted the audit according to *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, and under the authority of *Government Code* Section 17558.5. We did not audit the district's financial statements. We limited our audit scope to planning and performing audit procedures necessary to obtain reasonable assurance that costs claimed were allowable for reimbursement. Accordingly, we examined transactions, on a test basis, to determine whether the costs claimed were supported.

We limited our review of the district's internal controls to gaining an understanding of the transaction flow and claim preparation process as necessary to develop appropriate auditing procedures.

We asked the district's representative to submit a written representation letter regarding the district's accounting procedures, financial records, and mandated cost claiming procedures as recommended by *Government Auditing Standards*. However, the district did not submit a representation letter.

Conclusion

Our audit disclosed an instance of noncompliance with the requirements outlined above. This instance is described in the accompanying Summary of Program Costs (Schedule 1) and in the Finding and Recommendation section of this report.

For the audit period, the San Diego Unified School District claimed \$820,909 for Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Program costs. Our audit disclosed that \$461,378 is allowable and \$359,531 is unallowable.

For FY 2001-02, the State paid the district \$178,217. Our audit disclosed that \$239,433 is allowable. The State will pay allowable costs claimed that exceed the amount paid, totaling \$61,216, contingent upon available appropriations.

For FY 2002-03, the State made no payment to the district. Our audit disclosed that \$221,945 is allowable, which the State will pay contingent upon available appropriations.

Views of Responsible Official

We issued a draft audit report on May 6, 2005. Art M. Palkowitz, Manager, Office of Resource Development, responded by letter dated May 31, 2005 (Attachment), disagreeing with the audit results. This final audit report includes the district's response.

Restricted Use

This report is solely for the information and use of the San Diego Unified School District, the San Diego County Office of Education, the California Department of Education, the California Department of Finance, and the SCO; it is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties. This restriction is not intended to limit distribution of this report, which is a matter of public record.


JEFFREY V. BROWNFIELD
Chief, Division of Audits

**Schedule 1—
Summary of Program Costs
July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2003**

<u>Cost Elements</u>	<u>Actual Costs Claimed</u>	<u>Allowable per Audit</u>	<u>Audit Adjustment</u> ¹
<u>July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2002</u>			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 393,857	\$ 232,144	\$ (161,713)
Indirect costs	12,367	7,289	(5,078)
Total program costs	<u>\$ 406,224</u>	239,433	<u>\$ (166,791)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		(178,217)	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ 61,216</u>	
<u>July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003</u>			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 405,362	\$ 216,955	\$ (188,407)
Indirect costs	9,323	4,990	(4,333)
Total program costs	<u>\$ 414,685</u>	221,945	<u>\$ (192,740)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		—	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ 221,945</u>	
<u>Summary: July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2003</u>			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 799,219	\$ 449,099	\$ (350,120)
Indirect costs	21,690	12,279	(9,411)
Total program costs	<u>\$ 820,909</u>	461,378	<u>\$ (359,531)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		(178,217)	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ 283,161</u>	

¹ See the Finding and Recommendation section.

Finding and Recommendation

**FINDING—
Unallowable salary,
benefit, and related
indirect costs**

The district claimed unallowable salary and benefit costs totaling \$350,120 for the audit period. The district claimed employee time that was not supported by actual time records and costs for one employee who was funded by restricted funds.

The district claimed \$344,758 in unallowable salary and benefit costs for school-site employees. Various school-site employees submitted time logs that identified actual time spent on mandate-related activities. The district used these time logs to generate a time study and to calculate the average time spent for each reimbursable activity. The district used the average times calculated to claim costs for school-site employees who did not submit actual time logs. However, the district's time studies and additional costs claimed are unallowable for the following reasons.

1. The district's methodology was inconsistent between fiscal years. For fiscal year (FY) 2001-02, the district calculated average times based on time logs completed by employees in certain positions, rather than on all employees who performed each mandated activity. For the activity of identifying students, the district used only time reported by principals and vice principals to calculate an average time. For the activities of information maintenance and notifying teachers, the district used only time reported by school clerks, school secretaries, and similar positions to calculate average times.

For each mandated activity in FY 2002-03, the district calculated average times based on all employees who submitted time logs. However, the district excluded four school sites that submitted time logs and excluded the "max school" from each calculation. The "max school" was the school that reported the highest number of hours for each activity (but not the highest hours per student).

2. The district's methodologies for both fiscal years do not constitute valid statistical analyses. The projections are based on employees who submitted time logs rather than on randomly selected employees. In calculating average times for each mandated activity, the district provided no documentation that shows the employees used were representative of the population.
3. The time logs employees did submit indicate that time studies are not appropriate for these activities because time reported per student varied significantly. For employees whom the district used to calculate average times, the actual time reported ranged as follows.

	Fiscal Year			
	2001-02		2002-03	
	Shortest time reported per student	Longest time reported per student	Shortest time reported per student	Longest time reported per student
Identifying students	1 minute	18 hours	1 minute	299 minutes
Information maintenance	1 minute	144 minutes	1 minute	191 minutes
Notifying teachers	1 minute	64 minutes	1 minute	125 minutes

4. The district's procedures do not lend themselves to time studies performed at the district level. A district representative advised us that there is no district procedure that specifies which employees will identify students and maintain information at the school sites. In addition, the district has no procedure that specifies how frequently school sites will perform the mandated activities.

The district also claimed unallowable salary and benefit costs totaling \$5,362 for one employee whose costs were funded by a restricted fund source. The following table summarizes the audit adjustment.

	Fiscal Year		Total
	2001-02	2002-03	
Unsupported costs	\$ (161,713)	\$ (183,045)	\$ (344,758)
Costs funded by restricted funds	—	(5,362)	(5,362)
Total salary and benefit costs	(161,713)	(188,407)	(350,120)
Related indirect costs	(5,078)	(4,333)	(9,411)
Audit adjustment	\$ (166,791)	\$ (192,740)	\$ (359,531)

Parameters and Guidelines states that the district must identify the employees and their job classification, describe the mandated functions performed, and specify the actual number of hours devoted to each function to support salary and benefit costs claimed. Districts may claim the average number of hours devoted to each function if supported by a documented time study. *Parameters and Guidelines* also states that all costs claimed must be traceable to source documents and/or worksheets that show evidence of the validity of such costs. In addition, *Parameters and Guidelines* states that reimbursement for this mandate received from any source—e.g., service fees, federal funds, other State funds, etc.—must be identified and deducted from claimed costs.

Recommendation

We recommend the district maintain actual time records to support salary and benefit costs claimed. In addition, the district should deduct from costs claimed any reimbursement received from other sources.

District's Response

[1.] We do not deny the fact that our methodology for calculating costs changed in 2002/2003. We believe the revised method is a more realistic representation of actual school site activities.

In 2000-2001 we differentiated the time spent completing the mandate by job description and associated responsibilities. . . . In 2002-2003 we reevaluated the above 'division of labor' premise. In doing so, we discovered the defining lines between school sites job responsibilities are often blurred. While front office personnel may not take the lead in identifying pupils reasonably suspected to have engaged in suspendable or expulsionable offenses, their support function cannot be entirely dismissed. Conversely, while the school site's front office will usually carry out the notification of teacher requirement, school site administrators will occasionally perform that function. . . .

- [2.] Unfilled and eliminated support positions are 'covered' by existing front office personnel. Each school site allocates the mandate requirements according to their contemporaneous staffing levels. This dynamic staffing precludes a Notification to Teachers district-wide time study. As such, we are unable to define specific 'representatives of the population'. We maintain that the high submission percentages, when viewed as a representative sample of the entire school site population, is a very accurate reflection of actual school site mandate activity and performance.

Job descriptions of school secretaries, school front-office clerks and similar school site staff "support" positions do not vary by school site. Additionally, job descriptions of school site administrators are not established by school sites. As such, there is no "representative of the population" variable. . . .

In regards to the statistical validity of our sample, forty-nine percent of our elementary schools submitted 'Notification to Teachers' time logs. The submissions of our middle schools and high schools were even higher (fifty-two percent and fifty-six percent, respectively). The average times were derived from these large samples, thereby providing us a very high statistical level of confidence.

Notification to Teachers mandate responsibilities vary from school to school and are not strictly defined by district procedures. With their ever changing front-office landscape, schools have become very adept at modifying job duties and responsibilities. Front-office mandate responsibilities are certainly not comparable between school levels (elementary vs. high schools) and only marginally similar with peer schools. For this multi-task mandate, a district-wide time study would be inconclusive.

- [3.] The outliers cited in the chart are easily identified as extremes. We are confident that the average times spent per activity/per student are representative of school site performances.

2001/2002:

. . . In the [table included in the audit finding], the 'longest time reported identifying students' cell is an aberration. In calculating average times, a middle school with 449 suspensions was incorrectly credited with only 7 suspensions. The aggregate time calculations for this middle school are correct but the average time spent per student / per activity are skewed. The next highest 'per student identification' submission was 1.85 hours (111 minutes). The average times spent on identifying students, information maintenance and notifying teachers was 22 minutes, 16 minutes and 15 minutes, respectively. The extremes noted in the table are uncommon.

2002/2003:

The average times spent on identifying students, information maintenance and notifying teachers was 27 minutes, 15 minutes and 11 minutes, respectively. As with the 2001/2002 table, the extremes noted are uncommon. . . .

- [4.] School site job responsibilities are not static. As noted in our response to finding 2, each school site allocates the mandate requirements according to their contemporaneous staffing levels. This dynamic staffing precludes a Notification to Teachers district-wide time study.

District Administrative Procedure 6290 specifies that "the principal or designee shall inform the teacher of each student who has engaged in, or is reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in C.4." (causes of suspension). The parameters and guidelines does not require a district procedure that specifies who is to identify pupils or maintain the information.

The district's procedure is reasonable and may be used as a basis for time studies.


SCO's Comment

Our finding remains unchanged. Based on the district's response, we revised our recommendation to exclude the alternative of performing a time study to support costs claimed.

1. The district concurs that the methodology it used to calculate mandate-related costs changed between FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03. However, the district's methodology is not appropriate for either fiscal year, because of the remaining issues identified in the finding. In addition, the district did not provide any explanation for excluding four school sites and the "max school" from its calculations for FY 2002-03. Furthermore, in FY 2002-03, the district calculated an average time to identify students from time logs submitted by various employee classifications, such as school clerk, attendance clerk, secretary, and teacher. However, to calculate claimed costs, the district applied the time study results only to the higher wage rates of school vice principals.
2. The district states that the dynamic staffing used to perform mandate-related activities precludes a district-wide time study. The district further states that mandate-related responsibilities vary from school to school, and are not comparable between school levels and are only marginally similar between peer schools. The district concludes that a district-wide time study would be inconclusive. We concur with the district's assessment and conclude that the district must maintain actual time records for employees who perform mandate-related activities. Consistent with this conclusion, we allowed salary and benefit costs claimed that were supported by actual time records and disallowed costs claimed that the district calculated from its time study.

The district believes it achieved a very high statistical level of confidence from the number of time logs that employees submitted. However, the district provided no analysis to support this conclusion, and we disagree with the conclusion. The district's methodology did not provide for a random sample of all employees who performed mandate-related activities. Instead, the district calculated average times from those school sites that submitted employee time logs. In addition, the district did not address how its time study was affected by the lack of uniform mandate-related procedures. Furthermore, the district concedes that a district-wide time study would be inconclusive.

3. The district states that the table shown in the finding identifies an inaccurate datum. The table shows data based on documentation that the district provided. The district did not submit any additional documentation to support the information provided in its response. Regardless of the purportedly erroneous datum, we still conclude that employees reported significant time variations that preclude the district from using time studies to calculate mandate-related costs. For example, 68 school sites reported time spent identifying mandated-related pupils in FY 2002-03. The following chart shows a distribution of information that school sites reported.




The district states that the finding identifies uncommon data extremes; however, the chart shows that 14 school sites reported from 1 to 10 minutes per student, while 18 school sites reported 41 minutes or more per student. The district claimed 24 minutes per student. The chart shows that the district's time study results do not result in a normal distribution; thus, we disagree that the district's time study provides a very high statistical level of confidence. We believe the time variations indicate that school employees use significantly differing procedures to perform mandate-related activities and/or school employees report time spent performing activities outside the scope of mandate-related activities. As discussed in item 4, the district does not have uniform procedures for performing mandate-related activities.

Furthermore, the district's response identifies average times that do not agree with the average times the district used to calculate claimed costs. For FY 2001-02, the district calculated claimed costs based on average times of 26 minutes, 11 minutes, and 11 minutes, respectively, to identify students, maintain information, and notify teachers. For FY 2002-03, the district calculated claimed costs based on average times of 24 minutes, 13 minutes, and 10 minutes, respectively. The district did not provide documentation to support the average times identified in its response.

4. The district did not address how its time study is affected by the lack of uniform district-wide procedures that specify how frequently schools should perform mandated activities. We agree that *Parameters and Guidelines* does not require a district procedure that specifies who will identify pupils or maintain information. However, the district cannot perform a valid district-wide time study without standardized procedures to perform mandate-related activities.

**Attachment—
District's Response to
Draft Audit Report**



SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EUGENE BRUCKER EDUCATION CENTER
4100 Normal Street, San Diego, CA 92103-8363

(619) 726-7785
Fax: (619) 726-7664

FINANCIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Office of Resource Development

May 31, 2005

Jim L. Spano, Chief
Compliance Audits Bureau
State Controller's Office
Division of Audits
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 518
Sacramento, California 95814

RE: NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS 1306/89 & 1257/93

Dear Mr. Spano:

This letter is in response to the May 2005 Draft Audit Report. The State Controller's Office performed an audit of San Diego Unified School District's (district) Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension/Expulsion Program claims for fiscal years 2001/2002 and 2002/2003. The district respectfully disputes findings 1, 2, 3 & 4 as noted below.

Response to Finding 1:

We do not deny the fact that our methodology for calculating costs changed in 2002/2003. We believe the revised method is a more realistic representation of actual school site activities.

In 2000-2001 we differentiated the time spent completing the mandate by job description and associated responsibilities. At that time, our rationale was that it was not reasonable to assume that school secretaries, school front office clerks and similar school site staff 'support' positions would be involved in the identification of pupils reasonably suspected to have engaged in suspendable or expulsionable offenses and that the identification procedure would be handled by upper-echelon school site administrators (vice principal level and above). Per direction of school site administrators, the subsequent notification of teachers and the ongoing information maintenance activities would be carried out by school site support personnel. In 2002-2003 we reevaluated the above 'division of labor' premise. In doing so, we discovered the defining lines between school sites job responsibilities are often blurred. While front office personnel may not take the lead in

"The mission of the San Diego City Schools is to improve student achievement by supporting teaching and learning in the classroom."

identifying pupils reasonably suspected to have engaged in suspendable or expulsionable offenses, their support function cannot be entirely dismissed. Conversely, while the school site's front office will usually carry out the notification of teacher requirement, school site administrators will occasionally perform that function.

Response to Finding 2:

Unfilled and eliminated support positions are 'covered' by existing front office personnel. Each school site allocates the mandate requirements according to their contemporaneous staffing levels. This dynamic staffing precludes a Notification to Teachers district-wide time study. As such, we are unable to define specific 'representatives of the population'. We maintain that the high submission percentages, when viewed as a representative sample of the entire school site population, is a very accurate reflection of actual school site mandate activity and performance.

Job descriptions of school secretaries, school front-office clerks and similar school site staff 'support' positions do not vary by school site. Additionally, job descriptions of school site administrators are not established by school sites. As such, there is no "representative of the population" variable.

The suspended students listed in the district's claims have all been suspended for the reasons listed in section 48900 of the Ed Code excluding subdivision "h" (tobacco offenses). This information is supported by a discipline report from the district's student information system which is entered at the school site level per component B (information maintenance). Component 3 (notifying teachers) is a function of the overall number of suspensions. State law and district procedures require principals or their designees to notify the teachers of the students who have been suspended for the acts mentioned above.

In regards to the statistical validity of our sample, forty-nine percent of our elementary schools submitted 'Notification to Teachers' time logs. The submissions of our middle schools and high schools were even higher (fifty-two percent and fifty-six percent, respectively). The average times were derived from these large samples, thereby providing us a very high statistical level of confidence.

Response to Finding 3:

Activity	Fiscal Year			
	2001-02		2002-03	
	Shortest time reported per student	Longest time reported per student	Shortest time reported per student	Longest time reported per student
Identifying students	1 minute	18 hours	1 minute	299 minutes
Information Maintenance	1 minute	144 minutes	1 minute	191 minutes
Notifying teachers	1 minute	64 minutes	1 minute	125 minutes

The outliers cited in the chart are easily identified as extremes. We are confident that the average times spent per activity per student are representative of school site performances.

2001/2002:

In the previous table, the 'longest time reported identifying students' cell is an aberration. In calculating average times, a middle school with 449 suspensions was incorrectly credited with only 7 suspensions. The aggregate time calculations for this middle school are correct but the average time spent per student / per activity are skewed. The next highest 'per student identification' submission was 1.85 hours (111 minutes). The average times spent on identifying students, information maintenance and notifying teachers was 22 minutes, 16 minutes and 15 minutes, respectively. The extremes noted in the table are uncommon.

2002/2003:

The average times spent on identifying students, information maintenance and notifying teachers was 27 minutes, 15 minutes and 17 minutes, respectively. As with the 2001/2002 table, the extremes noted are uncommon.

Response to Finding 4:

School site job responsibilities are not static. As noted in our response to finding 2, each school site allocates the mandate requirements according to their contemporaneous staffing levels. This dynamic staffing precludes a Notification to Teachers district-wide time study.

District Administrative Procedure 6290 specifies that "the principal or designee shall inform the teacher of each student who has engaged in, or is reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in C.4. (causes of suspension). The parameters and guidelines does not require a district procedure that specifies who is to identify pupils or maintain the information.

Conclusion

Finding 1:

For 2002-2003 we reevaluated the previous year's 'division of labor' premise. In doing so, we discovered the dividing lines between school site job activities were not clearly defined. We are confident that our change in methodology resulted in a more accurate representation of actual school-site job performance. This change in methodology would seem 'inconsistent' when looking at a brief two-year snapshot but was clearly an improvement over prior year procedures.

Finding 2:

Notification to Teachers mandate responsibilities vary from school to school and are not strictly defined by district procedures. With their ever changing front-office landscape,

Letter to Jim L. Spano

Page 4

May 31, 2005

schools have become very adept at modifying job duties and responsibilities. Front-office mandate responsibilities are certainly not comparable between school levels (elementary vs. high schools) and only marginally similar with peer schools. For this multi-task mandate, a district-wide time study would be inconclusive.

Finding 3:

Though mandate responsibilities vary from school to school, the outliers noted in finding #3 are clearly exceptions. The inferential means from 2001/2002 are consistent with 2002/2003 means. We are confident that these large-sample averages are representative of district-wide activity.

Finding 4:


The district's procedure is reasonable and may be used as a basis for time studies.

In a district of 170 individual schools, time allotted to mandate activities will certainly vary site-by-site but the district-wide inferential mean smoothes out these fluctuations and allows us to apply the averages to ALL traditional and alternative San Diego Unified School District schools.

We respectfully ask you to reevaluate our 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 Notification to Teachers claims.

If you need any further information, or would like to meet to resolve this matter, I can be reached at (619) 725-7785.

Sincerely,



Art M. Palkowitz

Manager, Office of Resource Development

AMP:jlt

**State Controller's Office
Division of Audits
Post Office Box 942850
Sacramento, California 94250-5874**


<http://www.sco.ca.gov>

RECEIVED
JUL 28 2005

S04-MCC-063



Exhibit J



SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EUGENE BRUCKER EDUCATION CENTER
4100 Normal Street, San Diego, CA 92103-8363

(619) 725-7785
Fax: (619) 725-7564

FINANCIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Office of Resource Development

May 31, 2005

Jim L. Spano, Chief
Compliance Audits Bureau
State Controller's Office
Division of Audits
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 518
Sacramento, California 95814

RE: NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS 1306/89 & 1257/93

Dear Mr. Spano:

This letter is in response to the May 2005 Draft Audit Report. The State Controller's Office performed an audit of San Diego Unified School District's (district) Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension Expulsion Program claims for fiscal years 2001/2002 and 2002/2003. The district respectfully disputes findings 1, 2, 3 & 4 as noted below.

Response to Finding 1:

We do not deny the fact that our methodology for calculating costs changed in 2002/2003. We believe the revised method is a more realistic representation of actual school site activities.

In 2000-2001 we differentiated the time spent completing the mandate by job description and associated responsibilities. At that time, our rationale was that it was not reasonable to assume that school secretaries, school front-office clerks and similar school site staff 'support' positions would be involved in the identification of pupils reasonably suspected to have engaged in suspendable or expulsionable offenses and that the identification procedure would be handled by upper-echelon school site administrators (vice principal level and above). Per direction of school site administrators, the subsequent notification of teachers and the ongoing information maintenance activities would be carried out by school site support personnel. In 2002-2003 we reevaluated the above 'division of labor' premise. In doing so, we discovered the defining lines between school sites job responsibilities are often blurred. While front office personnel may not take the lead in

"The mission of the San Diego City Schools is to improve student achievement by supporting teaching and learning in the classroom."

identifying pupils reasonably suspected to have engaged in suspendable or expulsionable offenses, their support function cannot be entirely dismissed. Conversely, while the school site's front office will usually carry out the notification of teacher requirement, school site administrators will occasionally perform that function.

Response to Finding 2:

Unfilled and eliminated support positions are 'covered' by existing front office personnel. Each school site allocates the mandate requirements according to their contemporaneous staffing levels. This dynamic staffing precludes a Notification to Teachers district-wide time study. As such, we are unable to define specific 'representatives of the population'. We maintain that the high submission percentages, when viewed as a representative sample of the entire school site population, is a very accurate reflection of actual school site mandate activity and performance.

Job descriptions of school secretaries, school front-office clerks and similar school site staff 'support' positions do not vary by school site. Additionally, job descriptions of school site administrators are not established by school sites. As such, there is no "representative of the population" variable.

The suspended students listed in the district's claims have all been suspended for the reasons listed in section 48900 of the Ed Code excluding subdivision "h" (tobacco offenses). This information is supported by a discipline report from the district's student information system which is entered at the school site level per component B (information maintenance). Component 3 (notifying teachers) is a function of the overall number of suspensions. State law and district procedures require principals or their designees to notify the teachers of the students who have been suspended for the acts mentioned above.

In regards to the statistical validity of our sample, forty-nine percent of our elementary schools submitted 'Notification to Teachers' time logs. The submissions of our middle schools and high schools were even higher (fifty-two percent and fifty-six percent, respectively). The average times were derived from these large samples, thereby providing us a very high statistical level of confidence.

Response to Finding 3:

Activity	Fiscal Year			
	2001-02		2002-03	
	Shortest time reported per student	Longest time reported per student	Shortest time reported per student	Longest time reported per student
Identifying students	1 minute	18 hours	1 minute	299 minutes
Information Maintenance	1 minute	144 minutes	1 minute	191 minutes
Notifying teachers	1 minute	64 minutes	1 minute	125 minutes

The outliers cited in the chart are easily identified as extremes. We are confident that the average times spent per activity/per student are representative of school site performances.

2001/2002:

In the previous table, the 'longest time reported identifying students' cell is an aberration. In calculating average times, a middle school with 449 suspensions was incorrectly credited with only 7 suspensions. The aggregate time calculations for this middle school are correct but the average time spent per student / per activity are skewed. The next highest 'per student identification' submission was 1.85 hours (111 minutes). The average times spent on identifying students, information maintenance and notifying teachers was 22 minutes, 16 minutes and 15 minutes, respectively. The extremes noted in the table are uncommon.

2002/2003:

The average times spent on identifying students, information maintenance and notifying teachers was 27 minutes, 15 minutes and 11 minutes, respectively. As with the 2001/2002 table, the extremes noted are uncommon.

Response to Finding 4:

School site job responsibilities are not static. As noted in our response to finding 2, each school site allocates the mandate requirements according to their contemporaneous staffing levels. This dynamic staffing precludes a Notification to Teachers district-wide time study.

District Administrative Procedure 6290 specifies that "the principal or designee shall inform the teacher of each student who has engaged in, or is reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in C.4."(causes of suspension). The parameters and guidelines does not require a district procedure that specifies who is to identify pupils or maintain the information.

Conclusion

Finding 1:

For 2002-2003 we reevaluated the previous year's 'division of labor' premise. In doing so, we discovered the dividing lines between school site job activities were not clearly defined. We are confident that our change in methodology resulted in a more accurate representation of actual school-site job performance. This change in methodology would seem 'inconsistent' when looking at a brief two-year snapshot but was clearly an improvement over prior year procedures.

Finding 2:

Notification to Teachers mandate responsibilities vary from school to school and are not strictly defined by district procedures. With their ever changing front-office landscape,

May 31, 2005

schools have become very adept at modifying job duties and responsibilities. Front-office mandate responsibilities are certainly not comparable between school levels (elementary vs. high schools) and only marginally similar with peer schools. For this multi-task mandate, a district-wide time study would be inconclusive.

Finding 3:

Though mandate responsibilities vary from school to school, the outliers noted in finding #3 are clearly exceptions. The inferential means from 2001/2002 are consistent with 2002/2003 means. We are confident that these large-sample averages are representative of district-wide activity.

Finding 4:


The district's procedure is reasonable and may be used as a basis for time studies.

In a district of 170 individual schools, time allotted to mandate activities will certainly vary site-by-site but the district-wide inferential mean smoothes out these fluctuations and allows us to apply the averages to ALL traditional and alternative San Diego Unified School District schools.

We respectfully ask you to reevaluate our 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 Notification to Teachers claims.

If you need any further information, or would like to meet to resolve this matter, I can be reached at (619) 725-7785.

Sincerely,



Art M. Palkowitz

Manager, Office of Resource Development

AMP:jlt



JOHN CHIANG
California State Controller

RECEIVED

DEC 21 2007

COMMISSION ON
STATE MANDATES

December 17, 2007

Paula Higashi
Executive Director
Commission on State Mandates
980 Ninth Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Arthur M. Palkowitz
Director of the Office of Resource Dev.
San Diego Unified School District
4100 Normal Street, Room 3160
San Diego, CA 92103-2682

Re: **Incorrect Reduction Claim**

Notification to Teachers: Pupil Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Program

CSM 05-4452-I-01

San Diego Unified School District, Claimant

Statutes 1989, Chapter 1306 and Statutes 1993, Chapter 1257

Fiscal Years 2001-2002, and 2002-2003

Dear Ms. Higashi and Mr. Palkowitz:

This letter constitutes the response of the Controller's Office to the Incorrect Reduction Claim of San Diego Unified School District. Enclosed are the required copies of supporting documentation along with the Division of Audits' response to the Incorrect Reduction Claim (See Tab 2). A proof of service is also included as required by regulation.

An audit performed by the State Controller's Office disclosed that a significant portion of the District's claimed costs of the legislatively mandated Notification to Teachers: Pupil Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Program for fiscal years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 were not allowable.

The District failed to provide documentation to support salary and benefits costs based on actual time records or an average number of hours supported by a documented time study, and indirect costs for these disallowed claimed costs.

For schools that did not provide any contemporaneous time records, there was no evidence that these non-reporting schools performed all of the mandated activities; performed the alleged activities in the same manner as those schools that did submit time records; and performed the alleged activities with the same frequency as those schools that submitted time records.

The District erroneously claims Government Code section 17518.5 allows it to use any reasonable reimbursement methodology to claim costs. However, this section does not permit a district to unilaterally develop, adopt and implement, outside of the Parameters and Guidelines, any methodology it might come up with. For these particular claims, the District's alleged methodology changed from one fiscal year to the next. Under Government Code section 17557, a reasonable reimbursement methodology is adopted as part of the Parameters and Guidelines by the Commission on State Mandates, not by a district.

The District claims it "used an average derived from contemporaneous activities ... to calculate an average rate per mandated activity, per student suspended." However, the District used questionable data in its alleged methodologies. Despite its assertion to the contrary, the District did not use "conservative" numbers. The District either did not exclude highest reported data per student as it claimed or did not exclude any data at all.

Moreover, the District failed to use a statistically valid methodology. There was no evidence the District used a representative population in its statistical analysis. The population used by the District changed between the two fiscal years in question. In addition, the activity logs used by the District were not appropriate for a time study since the time reported per student varied enormously. In fact, the District admits there was no uniform district-wide procedure for the mandated activity and that "dynamic staffing" precluded it from using a district-wide time study.

The District's complaints about the need for "contemporaneous logs" and that reimbursement should not be denied because its staff does not have time to document their work are without merit. The program's Parameters and Guidelines, for which this District submitted the test claim, established the requirements for supporting documentation. If the District had problems with this requirement, it should have applied for an amendment to the Parameters and Guidelines, which could have included a reasonable reimbursement methodology.

The District states that under Government Code section 17561, subdivision (d), the State Controller's Office is required to pay the District's claims. However, it neglects to mention that payment, pursuant to this same section, is made provided the Controller can audit the District's records "to verify the actual amounts of the mandated costs" and

Paula Higashi
Arthur M. Palkowitz
December 17, 2007
Page 3

“reduce any claim that the Controller determines is excessive or unreasonable.” The District’s faulty and invalid methodology resulted in excessive and unreasonable claims.

Since all of the disallowed claims were not supported by required source documentation, the adjustments made by the Division of Audits were appropriate, and the Incorrect Reduction Claim should be rejected. For a more complete discussion, see Tab 2 of the Controller’s Office’s response.

Sincerely,



RONALD V. PLACET
Senior Staff Counsel

RVP/ac

Enclosures

cc: Jim Spano, Division of Audits, State Controller’s Office, (w/o encl.)
Ginny Brummels, Div. of Acctg. & Rptg., State Controller’s Office (w/o encl.)

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 I am employed in the County of Sacramento, State of California. At the time of service, I was at least 18
3 years of age, a United States citizen employed in the county where the mailing occurred, and not a party to the
4 within action. My business address is 300 Capitol Mall, Suite 1850, Sacramento, CA 95814.

5 On December 18, 2007, I served the foregoing document entitled:

6 **SCO'S RESPONSE TO THE INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIM FOR
7 SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CSM 05-4452-I-01**

8 on all interested parties in this action by placing a true and correct copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope,
9 addressed as follows:

10 Paula Higashi (*original*)
11 Executive Director
12 Commission on State Mandates
13 980 Ninth Street, Suite 300
14 Sacramento, CA 95814

15 Arthur M. Palkowitz
16 Director of the Office of Resource Dev.
17 San Diego Unified School District
18 4100 Normal Street, Room 3160
19 San Diego, CA 92103-2682

20 **BY MAIL**

21 I placed the envelope for collection and processing for mailing following this business's ordinary practice with
22 which I am readily familiar. On the same day correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited
23 in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service.

24 **BY PERSONAL SERVICE**

25 I caused to be delivered by hand to the above-listed addressees.

BY OVERNIGHT MAIL/COURIER

To expedite the delivery of the above-named document, said document was sent via overnight courier for next day
delivery to the above-listed party.

BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

In addition to the manner of service indicated above, a copy was sent by facsimile transmission to the above-listed
party.

I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the
service was made. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California that the foregoing is true and
correct.

Executed on December 18, 2007, at Sacramento, California.


Amber A. Camarena

**RESPONSE BY THE STATE CONTROLLER’S OFFICE
TO THE INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIM BY
SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Program**

Table of Contents

<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
State Controller’s Office’s Response to District Comments	
Declaration	Tab 1
State Controller’s Office (SCO) Analysis and Response	Tab 2
Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993 (Senate Bill 1130)	Tab 3
Education Code section 49079	Tab 4
Attachment – District’s Comments	
Incorrect Reduction Claim (June 26, 2006)	
Parameters and Guidelines (adopted July 20, 1995)	Exhibit A
Government Code section 17518.5	Exhibit B
SCO Notice—FY 2001-2002 (February 22, 2002)	Exhibit C
District Reimbursement Claim—FY 2001-2002.....	Exhibit D
SCO Claiming Instructions (March 1997).....	Exhibit E
SCO Notice of Claim Adjustment—FY 2001-2002	Exhibit F
District Reimbursement Claim—FY 2002-2003.....	Exhibit G
SCO Notice of Claim Adjustment—FY 2002-2003.....	Exhibit H
SCO Audit Report (June 30, 2005)	Exhibit I
District’s Response to SCO Draft Audit Report (May 31, 2005).....	Exhibit J

Tab 1

1 **OFFICE OF THE STATE CONTROLLER**
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 1850
2 Sacramento, CA 94250
3 Telephone No.: (916) 445-6854

4 BEFORE THE
5 COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES
6 STATE OF CALIFORNIA
7

8
9
10 INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIM ON:
11 *Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to*
Suspension or Expulsion Program
12 Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, and Chapter
13 1257, Statutes of 1993
14 SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Claimant
15

No.: CSM 05-4452-I-01

AFFIDAVIT OF BUREAU CHIEF

16 I, Jim L. Spano, make the following declarations:

- 17 1) I am an employee of the State Controller's Office (SCO) and am over the age of 18
years.
18 2) I am currently employed as a bureau chief, and have been so since April 21, 2000.
19 3) I am a California Certified Public Accountant.
20 4) I reviewed the work performed by the SCO auditor.
21 5) Any attached copies of records are true copies of records, as provided by the San Diego
22 Unified School District or retained at our place of business.
23

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25


6) The records include claims for reimbursement, with attached supporting documentation, explanatory letters, or other documents relating to the above-entitled Incorrect Reduction Claim.

7) A field audit of the claims for fiscal year (FY) 2001-02 and FY 2002-03 commenced on July 12, 2004, and ended on March 29, 2005.

I do declare that the above declarations are made under penalty of perjury and are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, and that such knowledge is based on personal observation, information, or belief.

Date: October 9, 2007

OFFICE OF THE STATE CONTROLLER

By: 
Jim L. Spano, Chief
Mandated Cost Audits Bureau
Division of Audits
State Controller's Office

Tab 2

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE ANALYSIS AND RESPONSE
TO THE INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIM FILED BY
SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
For Fiscal Year (FY) 2001-02 and FY 2002-03**

**Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Program
Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993**

SUMMARY

The following is the State Controller's Office's (SCO) response to the Incorrect Reduction Claim (IRC) that the San Diego Unified School District filed with the Commission on State Mandates (CSM) on June 26, 2006. The SCO audited the district's claims for costs of the legislatively mandated Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Program for the period of July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2003. The SCO issued its final report on June 30, 2005 (**Exhibit I**).

The district submitted reimbursement claims totaling \$820,909 for FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03 as follows.

- FY 2001-02—\$406,224 (**Exhibit D**)
- FY 2002-03—\$414,685 (**Exhibit G**)

The SCO determined that \$461,378 is allowable and \$359,531 is unallowable. The unallowable costs occurred because the district claimed unallowable salary, benefit, and related indirect costs. The State paid the district \$178,217. Allowable costs exceeded amount paid by \$283,161. The following table summarizes the audit results.

<u>Cost Elements</u>	<u>Actual Costs Claimed</u>	<u>Allowable per Audit</u>	<u>Audit Adjustments</u>
<u>July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2002</u>			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 393,857	\$ 232,144	\$ (161,713)
Indirect costs	12,367	7,289	(5,078)
Total program costs	<u>\$ 406,224</u>	\$ 239,433	<u>\$ (166,791)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		(178,217) ¹	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ 61,216</u>	
<u>July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003</u>			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 405,362	\$ 216,955	\$ (188,407)
Indirect costs	9,323	4,990	(4,333)
Total program costs	<u>\$ 414,685</u>	\$ 221,945	<u>\$ (192,740)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		— ¹	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ 221,945</u>	

<u>Cost Elements</u>	<u>Actual Costs Claimed</u>	<u>Allowable per Audit</u>	<u>Audit Adjustments</u>
<u>Summary: July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2003</u>			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 799,219	\$ 449,099	\$ (350,120)
Indirect costs	21,690	12,279	(9,411)
Total costs	<u>\$ 820,909</u>	<u>\$ 461,378</u>	<u>\$ (359,531)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		(178,217) ¹	
Total allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ 283,161</u>	

¹ Payment information is based on amount paid when the final report was issued.

The district's IRC contests audit adjustments of \$166,791 for FY 2001-02 and \$187,255 for FY 2002-03, totaling \$354,046. For the FY 2002-03 claim, the IRC form shows a disputed amount that differs from the amount noted in the conclusion of the IRC's narrative. The difference represents audit adjustments of \$5,485 related to costs funded from restricted fund sources. The \$5,485 total includes \$5,362 for salary and benefit costs and \$123 for indirect costs. The district did not dispute these unallowable costs.

**I. SCO REBUTTAL TO STATEMENT OF DISPUTE—
CLARIFICATION OF REIMBURSABLE ACTIVITIES, CLAIM CRITERIA,
AND DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS**

Parameters and Guidelines

The Commission on State Mandates (CSM) adopted a statement of decision for this program on January 19, 1995. The CSM found that Education Code section 49079, as added by Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, and amended by Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993, imposes a new program or higher level of service as defined in Section 6, Article XIII B of the California Constitution. The CSM adopted the parameters and guidelines for the Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Program on July 20, 1995 (**Exhibit A**). The program's parameters and guidelines include the following relevant information.

Section I, Summary of the Source of the Mandate, states:

Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, added Education Code section 49079 to require school districts to report to each teacher the names of every student who has caused, or who has attempted to cause, serious bodily injury or injury to another person. The notification was to be based upon any written records the district maintained or received from a law enforcement agency. No district would be liable for failure to comply as long as a good faith effort was made to notify the teacher. Notifications were to commence in the 1990-91 school year utilizing data from the previous year, with a progression to three prior years of data to be reported by fiscal year 1992-93.

Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993, amended Education Code section 49079 to specify for the first time the particular pupil behavior that warrants a teacher notification by including the specific reference to Education Code section 48900. The Section was also amended to immunize school personnel from civil or criminal liability unless the information they provide to the teacher was knowingly false.

Section III identifies eligible claimants as follows.

Any "school district," as defined in Government Code section 17519, except for community colleges, which incurs increased costs as a result of this mandate is eligible to claim reimbursement.

Section V identifies reimbursable activities as follows.

A. Scope of the Mandate

School districts and county offices of education shall be reimbursed for the costs incurred to: identify pupils, from records maintained in the ordinary course of business or received from law enforcement agencies, who have, during the previous three years, engaged in, or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in any of the subdivisions of Education Code section 48900, except subdivision (h); and provide this information to teachers on a routine and timely basis.

B. Reimbursable Activities

For each eligible school district or county office of education, the direct and indirect costs of labor, supplies and services incurred for the following mandate components are reimbursable:

1. Identifying Pupils

For identifying pupils, from records received from law enforcement agencies or otherwise maintained in the ordinary course of business, who have during the previous three years engaged, in or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in any of the subdivisions, except (h), of section 48900.

2. Information Maintenance

For maintaining the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years, and for adopting a cost-effective method of assembling, maintaining, and disseminating the information to teachers.

3. Notifying Teachers

For notifying teachers on a regular and timely basis of the pupils whose behavior makes them subject to suspension and expulsion; such notification shall be made in a manner designed to maintain confidentiality of this information.

Section VI describes the claim preparation process as follows.

Each claim for reimbursement pursuant to this mandate must be filed in a timely manner and must set forth a listing of each item for which reimbursement is claimed under this mandate.

A. Reporting by Components

Claimed costs must be allocated according to the three components of reimbursable activity described in Section V. B.

B. Supporting Documentation

Claimed costs should be supported by the following information:

1. Employee Salaries and Benefits

Identify the employee(s) and their job classification, describe the mandated functions performed, and specify the actual number of hours devoted to each function, the productive hourly rate, and the related benefits. The average number of hours devoted to each function may be claimed if supported by a documented time study.

2. Materials and Supplies

Only the expenditures which can be identified as a direct cost of the mandate can be claimed. List cost of materials which have been consumed or expended specifically for the purpose of this mandate.

3. Contracted Services

Give the name(s) of the contractor(s) who performed the service(s). Describe the activities performed by each named contractor, and give the number of actual hours spent on the activities. Show the inclusive dates when services were performed and itemize all costs for those services.

4. Allowable Overhead Cost

- a. School districts must use the J-380 (or subsequent replacement) non-restrictive indirect cost rate provisionally approved by the California Department of Education.
- b. County offices of education must use the J-580 (or subsequent replacement) non-restrictive indirect cost rate provisionally approved by the State Department of Education.

C. Cost Accounting Statistics

The State Controller is directed to include in its claiming instructions each year the requirement that claimants report to the State Controller the following statistics for the purpose of establishing a database for potential future reimbursement based on prospective rates:

- a. The average number of pupils for which this information is being maintained (i.e., number of pupils identified) for each year.
- b. The average daily attendance for the district for each year.
- c. The number times each year the notification is routinely made to teachers (e.g., quarterly, each semester, or annually).

Section VII describes the supporting data that must be maintained as follows.

For auditing purposes, all costs claimed must be traceable to source documents and/or worksheets that show evidence of the validity of such costs. Pursuant to Government Code section 17558.5, these documents must be kept on file by the agency submitting the claim for a period of no less than four years after the end of the calendar year in which the reimbursement claim is filed, and made available on the request of the State Controller.

SCO Claiming Instructions

In compliance with Government Code section 17558, the SCO issues claiming instructions for mandated programs to assist local agencies and school districts in claiming reimbursable costs. In March 1997, the SCO issued its initial claiming instructions for the Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Program (**Exhibit E**). The claim form that the district filed (SCO Form FAM-27) was modified in September 2001 and subsequently in September 2003. The district used the correct version for filing its FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03 reimbursement claims (**Exhibits D and G**).

Education Code Section 49079

Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, added Education Code section 49079, effective October 11, 1993. The original text of the law is similar to what appears in the program's parameters and guidelines, Section I, Summary of the Source of the Mandate (**Exhibit A**). In 1993, Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993 (Senate Bill 1130, **Tab 3**) amended Education Code section 49079 to specify for the first time the particular pupil behavior that warrants a teacher notification, by including the specific reference to Education Code section 48900. The section was also amended to immunize school personnel from civil or criminal liability, unless the information they provide to the teacher is knowingly false.

II. THE DISTRICT CLAIMED UNALLOWABLE SALARY AND BENEFIT COSTS AND RELATED INDIRECT COSTS

Issue

For the audit period, the district claimed unallowable salary and benefit costs totaling \$350,120 and related indirect costs totaling \$9,411. The district is contesting audit adjustments of \$344,758 for salary and benefit costs and \$9,288 for indirect costs.

SCO Analysis:

The program's parameters and guidelines state that to support the salary and benefit costs claimed, the district must identify the employee(s) and their job classifications, describe the mandated functions performed, and specify the actual number of hours devoted to each function. The district may claim the average number of hours devoted to each function if the claim is supported by a documented time study.

The parameters and guidelines also state that all costs claimed must be traceable to source documents and/or worksheets that show evidence of the validity of such costs.

District's Response

Section 17518.5 of the Government Code allows and even encourages the use of a reasonable reimbursement methodology. The Parameters and Guidelines state that the District may use "the average number of hours devoted to each function" as long as it is "supported by a documented time study." The district used an average derived from contemporaneous activity

reports submitted by school site staff members who performed the activities to calculate an average rate per mandated activity, per student suspended. The District contends its averages are conservative and not excessive for the following reasons:

1. The total hours submitted by each school is divided by the total number of qualifying students suspended at that school regardless of whether the staff turned in time for all students. In cases where school site employees did not turn in all of their contemporaneous activity logs for the year, the average time per student is driven down below the actual average time.
2. To be conservative, data with the highest hours reported was eliminated when calculating the average time per student. As noted in the district's response to the SCO's draft audit, the "longest time reported per student" in fiscal year 2001-02 for "Identifying Students" was due to an error that incorrectly credited a middle school with 7 suspensions instead of the 49 actual suspensions reported (**Exhibit J**). Using the correct figure the average for that school is less than 17 minutes per student. This error did not affect the District's average per student for "Identifying Students" because it was not included in the calculation of the average. None of the high-end extremes shown in SCO's chart on page 5 of the Audit Report (**Exhibit I**) were included in the calculation of the averages used by the District. The district made this adjustment to the average so that it would be more representative of the typical reimbursable situation.
3. The per student cost for extrapolated schools was less than the per student audited costs supported by contemporaneous activity reports for both fiscal years.

Fiscal Year 2001-02

For fiscal year 2001-2002, the District has time logs from 66 schools totaling \$236,587. These schools reported a total of 6,451 suspensions that qualified for the teacher notification program, which breaks down to \$36.67 per student. In their audit, the SCO accepted these activity reports as reasonable reimbursement. The District extrapolated costs for 37 additional schools totaling \$157,270. The additional 37 schools had a total of 4,681 suspensions that qualified for the teacher notification program, which breaks down to \$33.60 per student, approximately \$3.00 less than the supported costs accepted by the SCO. The District argues that this is a reasonable estimate of the actual costs for these 37 schools.

Fiscal Year 2002-03

For fiscal year 2002-2003, the District has time logs from 83 schools totaling \$224,356. These schools reported a total of 6,327 suspensions that qualified for the teacher notification program, which breaks down to \$35.46 per student. In their audit, the SCO accepted these time logs as reasonable reimbursement. The District extrapolated costs for 57 additional schools totaling \$181,006. The additional 57 schools had a total of 5,307 suspensions that qualified for the teacher notification program, which breaks down to \$34.11 per student, \$1.35 less than the supported costs accepted by the SCO. The District contends this is a reasonable estimate of the actual costs for these 57 schools.

A unit rate for Pupil Health Screenings was approved by the Commission despite concerns by the SCO that the “variance was too great” on the basis that the net result created a cost savings to the state (Final Staff analysis, 12/9/04). In both years, the District’s average time per student was less than audited claim amounts.

The SCO is required by law to pay the claims submitted by the District (Government Code Section 17561, subdivision [d]). It is clear in Government Code Section 17518.5 that the legislature’s intent was to reimburse schools for reasonable costs of complying with state mandates without burdening them with the need for “detailed documentation of actual local costs” whenever possible. The District has gone to great effort to comply with the SCO’s desire for contemporaneous logs and has provided these logs for 60 percent of the schools claimed. Many of the District’s school sites are understaffed and overburdened. Denying reasonable funding for these schools whose staff are performing the mandated duties instituted by the state simply because they do not have the time to document their work is unfair and contrary to the intent of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.

SCO’s Comment

The district’s response claims both that it used a reasonable reimbursement methodology and that a documented time study supports its claimed costs. We disagree with both contentions.

The district cites Government Code section 17518.5 and implies that it allows the district to use a reasonable reimbursement methodology to claim costs for this program. However, Government Code section 17518.5 does not allow a local government to unilaterally develop and implement a reasonable reimbursement methodology.

Government Code section 17557, subdivision (d), allows a local government to request that the CSM amend, modify, or supplement a program’s parameters and guidelines. This process allows a local government to request that the parameters and guidelines be amended to include a reasonable reimbursement methodology. However, the district failed to exercise this option. The San Diego Unified School District was the test claimant for this mandated program. As such, the district had an opportunity to establish a reasonable reimbursement methodology when it developed the parameters and guidelines in accordance with Government Code section 17557, subdivision (a). However, the adopted parameters and guidelines do not provide for a reasonable reimbursement methodology. Instead, they state that claimants must document salary and benefit costs claimed based on actual time records or an average number of hours that is supported by a documented time study.

Regarding its alleged time study, the district states, “In cases where school site employees did not turn in all of their contemporaneous activity logs for the year, the average time per student is driven down below the actual average time.” However, the district failed to provide any evidence that employees performed mandated activities that were not accounted for on contemporaneous activity logs.

In addition, the district states, "To be conservative, data with the highest hours reported was eliminated when calculating the average time per student." This statement is false for FY 2001-02 and misleading for FY 2002-03. The district did not exclude any individual schools when calculating averages for FY 2001-02. For FY 2002-03, the district excluded the school that reported the highest number of total hours, but not the highest number of hours per student. For the activity of identifying students, 10 schools reported a higher number of hours per student than the school that the district excluded from its calculations. For the activities of information maintenance and notifying teachers, 4 schools and 23 schools, respectively, reported a higher number of hours per student than the schools that the district excluded from its calculations.

The district also states "None of the high-end extremes shown in the SCO's chart on page 5 of the Audit Report (**Exhibit I**) were included in the calculation of the averages used by the District." This statement is false; the district's calculations included all of the data identified in the chart referenced. In addition, the district admits that FY 2001-02 data included inaccurate information for one school, as it understated the number of students. However, contrary to the district's statement, the district did include this school's data in its calculation of average time. As a result—by the district's own admission—the average is overstated. Therefore, the district failed in its attempt to adjust the averages so that they would be "more representative of the typical reimbursable situation."

The district implies that the extrapolated costs are reasonable because the extrapolated cost per student is less than the cost per student identified in the contemporaneous activity reports submitted. We disagree. In its response to our draft audit report, the district stated that "dynamic staffing" precluded a district-wide time study. The district stated that it was unable to define specific "representatives of the population." The district also confirmed that it does not have uniform district-wide procedures for the mandated activities. Furthermore, the district's time study is not based on a statistically valid sample selection. The district's projections are based on employees who submitted time logs instead of a statistically valid random sample. For those schools that did not submit contemporaneous time records, the district did not provide any evidence that the non-reporting schools (1) performed all of the mandated activities; (2) performed the activities in the same manner as those schools that submitted time records; and (3) performed the activities with the same frequency as those schools that submitted time records. The district itself concluded that, "a district-wide time study would be inconclusive."

The district presents information regarding the Pupil Health Screenings mandated program that is out of context. In the CSM's final staff analysis (December 19, 2004), the SCO commented that the claimant's data "contained a variance too great for a fair and reasonable uniform rate to be developed. As an alternative, the SCO suggested that 'individual districts . . . use their specific uniform allowance as one basis for claiming reimbursable costs.'" [Emphasis added.] As the district states, the CSM approved a uniform cost allowance for the Pupil Health Screenings program on the basis that it created a cost savings to the State when applied to statewide district claims. Statewide cost savings are not relevant to this discussion. Instead, the district erroneously concludes that its extrapolated costs are reasonable, based on its purported time study.

Government Code section 17561, subdivision (d)(2), states that the Controller may audit the records of any school district to verify the actual amount of the mandated costs and may reduce any claim that the Controller determines is excessive or unreasonable. The district used the following average times to calculate claimed costs.

Activity	Average Time (Minutes)	
	FY 2001-02	FY 2002-03
Identifying students	26.4	24.0
Information maintenance	10.8	13.2
Notifying teachers	11.4	10.2

On July 21, 1998, Visalia Unified School District submitted a request to amend the program's parameters and guidelines to establish uniform time allowances for mandated activities under this program. Based on an analysis of various school districts, the district proposed uniform time allowances of 9 minutes for identifying students, 6 minutes for information maintenance, and 10 minutes for notifying teachers. Although Visalia Unified School District failed to follow through on its request to amend the parameters and guidelines, the proposed uniform time allowances infer that San Diego Unified School District's average times are excessive and unreasonable for the activities of identifying students and information maintenance.

FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03 reimbursement claims submitted by large school districts also indicate that San Diego Unified School District's claimed costs were excessive and unreasonable. The California Department of Education's school district enrollment statistics show that San Diego Unified School District had the second-highest enrollment of California school districts. We calculated the total cost claimed per pupil for the reimbursement claims submitted by the 17 most populous California school districts. The analysis shows that San Diego Unified School District's total cost per pupil far exceeded the average claimed cost per pupil for the remaining districts that submitted reimbursement claims. For FY 2001-02, San Diego Unified School District's average claimed cost per pupil was \$2.87, while the average claimed cost per pupil for the remaining districts was \$0.62 per pupil. For FY 2002-03, San Diego Unified School District's average claimed cost per pupil was \$2.95, while the average claimed cost per pupil for the remaining districts was \$0.81 per pupil. The reimbursement claim statistics indicate that San Diego Unified School District's claimed costs were excessive and unreasonable. The following table summarizes the enrollment and reimbursement claim information for each district.

District	Fiscal Year 2001-02			Fiscal Year 2002-03		
	Enrollment	Costs Claimed	Cost Claimed Per Pupil	Enrollment	Costs Claimed	Cost Claimed Per Pupil
Los Angeles Unified	735,058	\$ 505,653	\$ 0.69	746,852	\$ 830,203	\$ 1.11
San Diego Unified	141,599	406,224	2.87	140,753	414,685	2.95
Long Beach Unified	96,488	26,278	0.27	97,212	30,314	0.31
Fresno Unified	81,058	11,737	0.14	81,222	12,384	0.15
Santa Ana Unified	61,909	36,363	0.59	63,610	40,203	0.63
San Francisco Unified	58,566	17,612	0.30	58,216	5,490	0.09
San Bernardino City Unified	54,166	71,042	1.31	56,096	45,908	0.82
Oakland Unified	53,545	30,956	0.58	52,501	11,651	0.22
Sacramento City Unified	53,418	48,948	0.92	52,850	34,500	0.65
San Juan Unified	51,383	14,686	0.29	52,212	20,348	0.39
Elk Grove Unified	49,970	N/A	-	52,418	N/A	-
Garden Grove Unified	49,809	14,649	0.29	50,066	4,288	0.09
Capistrano Unified	46,756	9,731	0.21	48,608	N/A	-
Riverside Unified	39,688	21,664	0.55	40,888	N/A	-
Corona-Norco Unified	39,614	33,398	0.84	41,977	45,726	1.09
Stockton Unified	39,213	13,346	0.34	39,421	21,144	0.54
Fontana Unified	38,930	66,935	1.72	40,168	55,034	1.37

N/A = District did not submit a reimbursement claim.

The district concludes by stating that Government Code section 17561, subdivision (d), requires the SCO to pay the district's claims. Subdivision (d)(2) actually states, "The Controller shall pay these claims from funds appropriated therefore, provided that the Controller (A) may audit the records of any local agency or school district to verify the actual amount of the mandated costs, (B) may reduce any claim that the Controller determines is excessive or unreasonable, and (C) shall adjust the payment to correct for any underpayments or overpayments which occurred in previous fiscal years." [Emphasis added.] The district's reference to Government Code section 17518.5 is irrelevant because a statewide reasonable reimbursement methodology was not adopted for this program.

The district also cites "SCO's desire for contemporaneous logs" and states that funding should not be denied simply because staff do not have time to document their work. The program's parameters and guidelines (initiated by the district) establish the supporting documentation requirements. The parameters and guidelines require that districts specify the actual number of hours devoted to each mandated activity. The parameters and guidelines allow districts to claim the average number of hours if the claimed average is supported by a documented time study. They also state that costs claimed must be traceable to source documents that show evidence of the validity of such costs. However, the district's time study was invalid.

IV. CONCLUSION

The SCO audited the claims filed by the San Diego Unified School District for costs of the legislatively mandated Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Program (Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993) for the period of July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2003. The district claimed unallowable costs totaling \$359,531.

The unallowable costs occurred primarily because the district claimed costs based on an invalid time study. The time study is not statistically valid for the following reasons.

- The district does not have uniform district-wide procedures for the mandated activities.
- The district based its projections on employees who submitted time logs rather than on a statistically valid random sample.
- The district did not provide any evidence that non-reporting schools (1) performed all the mandated activities; (2) performed the activities in the same manner as those schools that submitted time records; and (3) performed the activities with the same frequency as those schools that submitted time records. The district itself concluded that "a district-wide time study would be inconclusive."


In addition, claim statistics from a proposed uniform time allowance and actual FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03 claims indicate that the district's claimed costs are excessive and unreasonable.

In conclusion, the CSM should find that (1) the SCO correctly reduced the district's FY 2001-02 claim by \$166,791; and (2) the SCO correctly reduced the district's FY 2002-03 claim by \$187,255.

V. CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify by my signature below that the statements made in this document are true and correct of my own knowledge, or, as to all other matters, I believe them to be true and correct based upon information and belief.

Executed on October 9, 2007, at Sacramento, California, by:



Jim L. Spano, Chief
Mandated Cost Audits Bureau
Division of Audits
State Controller's Office

BILL NUMBER: SB 1130 CHAPTERED 10/11/93
 BILL TEXT

CHAPTER 1257
 FILED WITH SECRETARY OF STATE OCTOBER 11, 1993
 APPROVED BY GOVERNOR OCTOBER 11, 1993
 PASSED THE SENATE SEPTEMBER 11, 1993
 PASSED THE ASSEMBLY SEPTEMBER 9, 1993
 AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY SEPTEMBER 3, 1993
 AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY AUGUST 23, 1993
 AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY AUGUST 16, 1993
 AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY JULY 13, 1993
 AMENDED IN SENATE MAY 5, 1993
 AMENDED IN SENATE APRIL 27, 1993

INTRODUCED BY Senator Roberti

- MARCH 5, 1993

An act to amend Sections 1981, 48915.1 and 49079 of, and to add Sections 1982.5 and 48915.2 to, the Education Code, and to amend Sections 241.6 and 243.6 of the Penal Code, relating to school crimes.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 1130, Roberti. School crimes.

(1) Existing law requires the principal or superintendent of schools to recommend a pupil's expulsion if the pupil causes serious physical injury to another person, except in self-defense, possesses any designated dangerous object, sells any designated controlled substance, or commits robbery or extortion, as specified.

This bill would authorize a county board of education to enroll those pupils in community schools. Levels of apportionment for pupils otherwise enrolled in community schools would apply to these pupils, as specified.

(2) Existing law requires the governing board of a school district that receives a request from an individual who has been expelled from another district for an act described in (1) to enroll in a school in that district, to hold a hearing to determine whether that pupil poses a continuing threat to the pupils or employees of the school district. If a pupil has been expelled for any of the acts described in (1), the parent or guardian, or emancipated pupil, is required to notify the receiving school district of his or her status with the previous school district. The governing board of the receiving school district may deny enrollment to that pupil under certain circumstances.

This bill would make those provisions inapplicable to pupils that have been expelled for any of the acts described in (1), and would make those provisions applicable to pupils who have been expelled for other reasons. The bill would prohibit any pupil expelled from school for any of the acts described in (1)

from transferring to a school other than a county community school or a juvenile court school, as defined, during the period of expulsion. The bill would authorize a school district to allow a pupil expelled for any of the acts described in (1) to enroll in that school district after the period of expulsion, after a determination is made, as specified, that the pupil does not pose a danger to other pupils or to employees of the school district, and only if the pupil has established legal residence in that district or is enrolled pursuant to an interdistrict agreement.

(3) Under existing law, a school district is required to inform the teacher of every pupil who has caused, or who has attempted to cause, serious bodily injury, as defined, to another person. A school district is not liable for failure to comply with that requirement if it can demonstrate that it made a good faith effort to notify the teacher.

This bill would require a school district to inform the teacher of each pupil who has engaged in, or is reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of several specified acts that subject the pupil to suspension or expulsion. The bill would exempt the officer or employee from civil or criminal liability for providing that information, unless it is proven that the information was knowingly false or made with a reckless disregard for the truth or falsity of it. An officer or employee of a school district who knowingly fails to provide that information would be guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by confinement in the county jail, or a fine, or both.

(4) Existing law makes an assault or battery committed against a school employee, as defined, in retaliation for an act performed in the course of his or her duties, whether on or off campus, during the schoolday or at any other time, where the person committing the offense knows or reasonably should know the victim is a school employee, a misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding one year, or by a fine not exceeding \$2,000, or by both the fine and imprisonment.

This bill would provide, in addition, that it is a violation of this provision if the school employee is engaged in the performance of his or her duties under the above circumstances.

(5) This bill would incorporate additional changes in Section 1981 of the Education Code, proposed by AB 342, or SB 1198, or both, to become operative only if AB 342, or SB 1198, or both, and this bill are chaptered and become effective on or before January 1, 1994, and this bill is chaptered last.

(6) Because this bill would create a crime and would change the definition of a crime, it would impose a state-mandated local program.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 1981 of the Education Code is amended to read:

1981. The county board of education may enroll in community schools any of the following:

(a) Pupils who have been expelled from a school while attending either continuing classes, opportunity classes, or alternative classes, excluding those pupils who are expelled pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 48915.

(b) Pupils who have been referred to county community schools by a school district as a result of the recommendation by a school attendance review board or pupils whose school districts of attendance have, at the request of the pupil's parent or guardian, approved the pupil's enrollment in a county community school.

(c) Pupils who are probation-referred pursuant to Sections 300, 601, 602, and 654 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, or who are on probation or parole and who are not in attendance in any school, or who are expelled pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 48915.

(d) Homeless children.

SEC. 1.1. Section 1981 of the Education Code is amended to read:

1981. The county board of education may enroll in community schools any of the following:

(a) Pupils who have been expelled from a school district, except those pupils who are expelled pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 48915, under one or both of the following circumstances:

(1) While attending continuation classes, opportunity classes, or alternative classes.

(2) On one or more of the grounds set forth in subdivisions (a) to (e), inclusive, of Section 48900.

(b) Pupils who have been referred to county community schools by a school district as a result of the recommendation by a school attendance review board or pupils whose school districts of attendance have, at the request of the pupil's parent or guardian, approved the pupil's enrollment in a county community school.

(c) Pupils who are probation-referred pursuant to Sections 300, 601, 602, and 654 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, or who are on probation or parole and who are not in attendance in any school, or who are expelled pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 48915.

(d) Homeless children.

SEC. 1.2. Section 1981 of the Education Code is amended to read:

1981. The county board of education may enroll in community schools any of the following:

(a) Pupils who have been expelled from a school while attending either continuing classes, opportunity classes, or alternative classes excluding those pupils who are expelled pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 48915.

(b) Pupils who have been referred to county community schools by a school district as a result of the recommendation by a school attendance review board or pupils whose school districts

of attendance have, at the request of the pupil's parent or guardian, approved the pupil's enrollment in a county community school.

(c) Pupils who are probation-referred pursuant to Sections 300, 601, 602, and 654 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, or who are on probation or parole and who are not in attendance in any school, or who are expelled pursuant to subdivision (a) or (b) of Section 48915.

(d) Homeless children.

SEC. 1.3. Section 1981 of the Education Code is amended to read:

1981. The county board of education may enroll in community schools any of the following:

(a) Pupils who have been expelled from a school district, except those pupils who are expelled pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 48915 under one or both of the following circumstances:

(1) While attending continuation classes, opportunity classes, or alternative classes.

(2) On one or more of the grounds set forth in subdivisions (a) to (e), inclusive, of Section 48900.

(b) Pupils who have been referred to county community schools by a school district as a result of the recommendation by a school attendance review board or pupils whose school districts of attendance have, at the request of the pupil's parent or guardian, approved the pupil's enrollment in a county community school.

(c) Pupils who are probation-referred pursuant to Sections 300, 601, 602, and 654 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, or who are on probation or parole and who are not in attendance in any school, or who are expelled pursuant to subdivision (a) or (b) of Section 48915.

(d) Homeless children.

SEC. 2. Section 1982.5 is added to the Education Code, to read:

1982.5. Notwithstanding subdivision (b) of Section 1982, for purposes of making apportionments from the State School Fund, pupils enrolled in juvenile court schools because they were expelled pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 48915 shall be deemed the same as pupils enrolled in county community schools pursuant to subdivision (a), (b), or (d) of Section 1981.

SEC. 2.5. Section 48915.1 of the Education Code is amended to read:

48915.1. (a) If the governing board of a school district receives a request from an individual who has been expelled from another school district for an act other than those described in subdivision (a) of Section 48915, for enrollment in a school maintained by the school district, the board shall hold a hearing to determine whether that individual poses a continuing danger either to the pupils or employees of the school district.

The hearing and notice shall be conducted in accordance with the rules and regulations governing procedures for the expulsion of pupils as described in Section 48918. A school district may request information from another school district regarding a recommendation for expulsion or the expulsion of an applicant for enrollment. The school district receiving the request shall respond to the request with all deliberate speed but shall

respond no later than five working days from the date of the receipt of the request.

(b) If a pupil has been expelled from his or her previous school for offenses other than those listed in subdivision (a) of Section 48915, the parent, guardian, or pupil, if the pupil is emancipated or otherwise legally of age, shall, upon enrollment, inform the receiving school district of his or her status with the previous school district. If this information is not provided to the school district and the school district later determines the pupil was expelled from the previous school, the lack of compliance shall be recorded and discussed in the hearing required pursuant to subdivision (a).

(c) The governing board of a school district may make a determination to deny enrollment to an individual who has been expelled from another school district for an act other than those described in subdivision (a) of Section 48915, for the remainder of the expulsion period after a determination has been made, pursuant to a hearing, that the individual poses a potential danger to either the pupils or employees of the school district.

(d) The governing board of a school district, when making its determination whether to enroll an individual who has been expelled from another school district for these acts, may consider the following options:

(1) Deny enrollment.

(2) Permit enrollment.

(3) Permit conditional enrollment in a regular school program or another educational program.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the governing board of a school district, after a determination has been made, pursuant to a hearing, that an individual expelled from another school district for an act other than those described in subdivision (a) of Section 48915 does not pose a danger to either the pupils or employees of the school district, shall permit the individual to enroll in a school in the school district during the term of the expulsion, provided that he or she, subsequent to the expulsion, either has established legal residence in the school district, pursuant to Section 48200, or has enrolled in the school pursuant to an interdistrict agreement executed between the affected school districts pursuant to Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 46600).

SEC. 3. Section 48915.2 is added to the Education Code, to read:

48915.2. (a) A pupil expelled from school for any of the offenses listed in subdivision (a) of Section 48915, shall not be permitted to enroll in any other school or school district during the period of expulsion unless it is a county community school pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 1981, or a juvenile court school, as described in Section 48645.1.

(b) After a determination has been made, pursuant to a hearing under Section 48918, that an individual expelled from another school district for any act described in subdivision (a) of Section 48915 does not pose a danger to either the pupils or employees of the school district, the governing board of a school district may permit the individual to enroll in the school district after the term of expulsion, subject to one of the following conditions:

(1) He or she has established legal residence in the school district, pursuant to Section 48200.

(2) He or she is enrolled in the school pursuant to an interdistrict agreement executed between the affected school districts pursuant to Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 46600) of Part 26.

SEC. 4. Section 49079 of the Education Code is amended to read:

49079. (a) A school district shall inform the teacher of each pupil who has engaged in, or is reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in any of the subdivisions, except subdivision (h), of Section 48900. The district shall provide the information to the teacher based upon any records that the district maintains in its ordinary course of business, or receives from a law enforcement agency, regarding a pupil described in this section.

(b) No school district, or school district officer or employee, shall be civilly or criminally liable for providing information under this section unless it is proven that the information was false and that the district or district officer or employee knew that the information was false, or was made with a reckless disregard for the truth or falsity of the information provided.

(c) An officer or employee of a school district who knowingly fails to provide information about a pupil who has engaged in, or who is reasonably suspected to have engaged in, the acts referred to in subdivision (a), is guilty of a misdemeanor, which is punishable by confinement in the county jail for a period not to exceed six months, or by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000), or both.

(d) The reporting period of the information required by this section shall commence in the 1990-91 school year. For that school year, the information described in subdivision (a) shall be from the previous school year. For the 1991-92 school year, the information provided shall be from the previous two school years. For the 1992-93 school year and each school year thereafter, the information provided shall be from the previous three school years.

(e) Any information received by a teacher pursuant to this section shall be received in confidence for the limited purpose for which it was provided and shall not be further disseminated by the teacher.

(f) In no event shall this section be retroactively applied to any individual for any act of that individual undertaken, or failure to act by that individual, prior to January 1, 1994.

SEC. 5. Section 241.6 of the Penal Code is amended to read:

241.6. When an assault is committed against a school employee engaged in the performance of his or her duties, or in retaliation for an act performed in the course of his or her duties, whether on or off campus, during the schoolday or at any other time, and the person committing the offense knows or reasonably should know the victim is a school employee, the assault is punishable by imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding one year, or by a fine not exceeding two thousand dollars (\$2,000), or by both the fine and imprisonment.

For purposes of this section, "school employee" has the same meaning as defined in subdivision (d) of Section 245.5.

This section shall not apply to conduct arising during the course of an otherwise lawful labor dispute.

SEC. 6. Section 243.6 of the Penal Code is amended to read:

243.6. When a battery is committed against a school employee engaged in the performance of his or her duties, or in retaliation for an act performed in the course of his or her duties, whether on or off campus, during the schoolday or at any other time, and the person committing the offense knows or reasonably should know that the victim is a school employee, the battery is punishable by imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding one year, or by a fine not exceeding two thousand dollars (\$2,000), or by both the fine and imprisonment. However, if an injury is inflicted on the victim, the battery shall be punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for not more than one year, or by a fine of not more than two thousand dollars (\$2,000), or by imprisonment in the state prison for 16 months, or two or three years.

For purposes of this section, "school employee" has the same meaning as defined in subdivision (d) of Section 245.5.

This section shall not apply to conduct arising during the course of an otherwise lawful labor dispute.

SEC. 7. (a) Section 1.1 of this bill incorporates amendments to Section 1981 of the Education Code proposed by both this bill and AB 342. It shall only become operative if (1) both bills are enacted and become effective on or before January 1, 1994, but this bill becomes operative first, (2) each bill amends Section 1981 of the Education Code, (3) SB 1998 is not enacted or as enacted does not amend that Section 1981 of the Education Code, and (4) this bill is enacted after AB 342, in which case Section 1981 of the Education Code, as amended by AB 342 shall remain operative only until the operative date of this bill, at which time Section 1.1 of this bill shall become operative and Sections 1, 1.2, and 1.3 of this bill shall not become operative.

(b) Section 1.2 of this bill incorporates amendments to Section 1981 of the Education Code proposed by both this bill and SB 1198. It shall only become operative if (1) both bills are enacted and become effective January 1, 1994, (2) each bill amends Section 1981 of the Education Code, (3) AB 342 is not enacted or as enacted does not amend that section, and (4) this bill is enacted after SB 1198 in which case Sections 1, 1.1, and 1.3 of this bill shall not become operative.

(c) Section 1.3 of this bill incorporates amendments to Section 1981 of the Education Code proposed by this bill, AB 342, and SB 1198. It shall only become operative if (1) all three bills are enacted and become effective on or before January 1, 1994, (2) all three bills amend Section 1981 of the Education Code, and (3) this bill is enacted after AB 342 and SB 1198, in which case Section 1981 as amended by A.B. 342, shall remain operative only until the operative date of this bill, at which time Section 1.3 of this bill shall become operative and Sections 1, 1.1, and 1.2 of this bill shall not become operative.

SEC. 8. No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIIIIB of the California Constitution because the only costs which may be incurred by a local agency or school district will be incurred because this act creates a

new crime or infraction, changes the definition of a crime or infraction, changes the penalty for a crime or infraction, or eliminates a crime or infraction. Notwithstanding Section 17580 of the Government Code, unless otherwise specified in this act, the provisions of this act shall become operative on the same date that the act takes effect pursuant to the California Constitution.

49079. (a) A school district shall inform the teacher of each pupil who has engaged in, or is reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in any of the subdivisions, except subdivision (h), of Section 48900 or in Section 48900.2, 48900.3, 48900.4, or 48900.7 that the pupil engaged in, or is reasonably suspected to have engaged in, those acts. The district shall provide the information to the teacher based upon any records that the district maintains in its ordinary course of business, or receives from a law enforcement agency, regarding a pupil described in this section.

(b) A school district, or school district officer or employee, is not civilly or criminally liable for providing information under this section unless it is proven that the information was false and that the district or district officer or employee knew or should have known that the information was false, or the information was provided with a reckless disregard for its truth or falsity.

(c) An officer or employee of a school district who knowingly fails to provide information about a pupil who has engaged in, or who is reasonably suspected to have engaged in, the acts referred to in subdivision (a) is guilty of a misdemeanor, which is punishable by confinement in the county jail for a period not to exceed six months, or by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000), or both.

(d) For the 1994-95 school year, the information provided shall be from the previous two school years. For the 1996-97 school year and each school year thereafter, the information provided shall be from the previous three school years.

(e) Any information received by a teacher pursuant to this section shall be received in confidence for the limited purpose for which it was provided and shall not be further disseminated by the teacher.

**DISTRICT'S
INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIM
FILED WITH THE
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES
ON JUNE 26, 2006**

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

980 NINTH STREET, SUITE 300
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
PHONE: (916) 323-3562
FAX: (916) 445-0278
E-mail: csminfo@csm.ca.gov



July 6, 2006

Mr. Arthur M. Palkowitz
San Diego City Schools
4100 Normal Street, Room 3160
San Diego, CA 92103-2682

Ms. Ginny Brummels
Division of Accounting and Reporting
State Controller's Office
3301 C Street, Suite 501
Sacramento, CA 95816

Re: **Incorrect Reduction Claim**
Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion,
05-4452-I-01
San Diego Unified School District, Claimant
Education Code Section 49079
Statutes 1989, Chapter 1306; Statutes 1993, Chapter 1257
Fiscal Years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003

Dear Mr. Palkowitz and Ms. Brummels:

On June 26, 2006, the San Diego Unified School District filed an incorrect reduction claim (IRC) with the Commission on State Mandates (Commission) based on the *Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion* program for fiscal years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003. Commission staff determined that the IRC filing is complete.

Government Code section 17551, subdivision (b), requires the Commission to hear and decide upon claims filed by local agencies and school districts that the State Controller's Office (SCO) has incorrectly reduced payments to the local agencies or school districts.

SCO Review and Response. Please file the SCO response and supporting documentation regarding this claim within 90 days of the date of this letter. Please include an explanation of the reason(s) for the reductions and the computation of reimbursements. All documentary evidence must be authenticated by declarations under penalty of perjury signed by persons who are authorized and competent to do so and be based on the declarant's personal knowledge, information or belief. The Commission's regulations also require that the responses (opposition or recommendation) filed with the Commission be simultaneously served on the claimants and their designated representatives, and accompanied by a proof of service. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1185.01.)

The failure of the SCO to respond within this 90-day timeline shall not cause the Commission to delay consideration of this IRC.

Claimant's Rebuttal. Upon receipt of the SCO response, the claimant and interested parties may file rebuttals. The rebuttals are due 30 days from the service date of the response.

Prehearing Conference. A prehearing conference will be scheduled if requested.

Public Hearing and Staff Analysis. The public hearing on this claim will be scheduled after the record closes. A staff analysis will be issued on the IRC at least eight weeks prior to the public hearing.

Dismissal of Incorrect Reduction Claims. Under section 1188.31 of the Commission's regulations, IRCs may be dismissed if postponed or placed on inactive status by the claimant for more than one year. Prior to dismissing a claim, the Commission will provide 60 days notice and opportunity for the claimant to be heard on the proposed dismissal.

Please contact Victoria Soriano at (916) 323-8213 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



NANCY PATTON
Assistant Executive Director

Enclosure: Incorrect Reduction Claim Filing - (SCO only)

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES980 NINTH STREET, SUITE 300
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

PHONE: (916) 323-3562

(916) 445-0278

E-mail: csminfo@csm.ca.gov



July 6, 2006

Mr. Arthur M. Palkowitz
San Diego City Schools
4100 Normal Street, Room 3160
San Diego, CA 92103-2682Ms. Ginny Brummels
Division of Accounting and Reporting
State Controller's Office
3301 C Street, Suite 501
Sacramento, CA 95816

Re: **Incorrect Reduction Claim**
Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion,
05-4452-I-01
San Diego Unified School District, Claimant
Education Code Section 49079
Statutes 1989, Chapter 1306; Statutes 1993, Chapter 1257
Fiscal Years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003

Dear Mr. Palkowitz and Ms. Brummels:

On June 26, 2006, the San Diego Unified School District filed an incorrect reduction claim (IRC) with the Commission on State Mandates (Commission) based on the *Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion* program for fiscal years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003. Commission staff determined that the IRC filing is complete.

Government Code section 17551, subdivision (b), requires the Commission to hear and decide upon claims filed by local agencies and school districts that the State Controller's Office (SCO) has incorrectly reduced payments to the local agencies or school districts.

SCO Review and Response. Please file the SCO response and supporting documentation regarding this claim within 90 days of the date of this letter. Please include an explanation of the reason(s) for the reductions and the computation of reimbursements. All documentary evidence must be authenticated by declarations under penalty of perjury signed by persons who are authorized and competent to do so and be based on the declarant's personal knowledge, information or belief. The Commission's regulations also require that the responses (opposition or recommendation) filed with the Commission be simultaneously served on the claimants and their designated representatives, and accompanied by a proof of service. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1185.01.)

The failure of the SCO to respond within this 90-day timeline shall not cause the Commission to delay consideration of this IRC.

State of California
 COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES
 80 Ninth Street, Suite 300
 Sacramento, CA 95814
 (916) 323-3562

For Official Use Only
RECEIVED
JUN 26 2006
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES
Claim No. 05-4452-I-01

INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIM FORM

Local Agency or School District Submitting Claim

San Diego Unified School District

Contact Person

Telephone Number

Arthur M. Palkowitz

(619) 725-7785

Address

4100 Normal Street, Room 3160, San Diego, CA 92103-2682

Representative Organization to be Notified

Mandated Cost Unit

This claim alleges an incorrect reduction of a reimbursement claim filed with the State Controller's Office pursuant to section 17561 of the Government Code. This incorrect reduction claim is filed pursuant to section 17551(b) of the Government Code.

CLAIM IDENTIFICATION: Specify Statute or Executive Order

Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Chapter 1306/89 and 1257/93

Fiscal Year*	Amount of the Incorrect Reduction
2001-2002	\$166,791
2002-2003	\$187,255

*More than one fiscal year may be claimed

IMPORTANT: PLEASE SEE INSTRUCTIONS AND FILING REQUIREMENTS FOR COMPLETING AN INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIM ON THE REVERSE SIDE.

Name and Title of Authorized Representative

Telephone No.

Arthur M. Palkowitz

(619) 725-7785

Signature of Authorized Representative

Date



6-22-06

INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIM OF SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989 and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993
Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion

Table of Contents

Narrative of the Incorrect Reduction Claim..... 1

I. Statement of the Dispute 1

II. The District Used a Reasonable Method to Determine Unsupported Costs 4

Conclusion..... 5

Certification..... 6

Exhibits

- Exhibit A: Original Parameters and Guidelines
- Exhibit B: Government Code Section 17518.5
- Exhibit C: Notice from California State Controller re 2001-2002 Claim (2/22/2002)
- Exhibit D: Claim for Payment for Fiscal Year 2001-2002
- Exhibit E: California State Controller's Claiming Instructions
- Exhibit F: Notice from California State Controller re 2001-2002 Claim Adjustment
- Exhibit G: Claim for Payment for Fiscal Year 2002-2003
- Exhibit H: Notice from California State Controller re 2002-2003 Claim Adjustment
- Exhibit I: California State Controller's Audit Report
- Exhibit J: District's Response to State Controller's Draft Audit Report

attached as Exhibit A. The Parameters and Guidelines describe the reimbursable activities in Section V(B) as follows:

- A. Identifying pupils from records received from law enforcement agencies or otherwise maintained in the ordinary course of business, who have during the past three years engaged in or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in acts described in any subdivision, except (h) of §48900.
- B. Maintaining the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years, and a onetime cost for adopting a cost effective method of assembling and disseminating the information to teachers.
- C. Notifying teachers on a regular and timely basis of the pupils whose behavior makes them subject to suspension and expulsion and maintaining the confidentiality of the dissemination of this information.

Section VI(B)(1) of the Parameters and Guidelines states the following regarding Employee Salaries and Benefits:

“The average number of hours devoted to each function may be claimed if supported by a documented time study.”

C. Government Code Section 17518.5 “Reasonable Reimbursement Methodology”

Government Code Section 17518.5 (Exhibit B) includes the following pertinent statements regarding a “reasonable reimbursement methodology” for purposes of reimbursement of state mandates.

1. The amount reimbursed should be estimated to fully offset at least half of eligible school districts’ projected costs to implement the mandate in a cost-efficient manner.
2. Whenever possible, a reasonable reimbursement methodology shall be based on general allocation formulas, uniform cost allowance, and other approximations of local costs mandated by the state, rather than detailed documentation of the actual local costs.
3. A reasonable reimbursement methodology may be developed by, among other entities, a claimant.

D. The District’s Claim

Fiscal Year 2001-2002

On December 18, 2001, the District estimated its costs for 2001-2002 at \$375,000. On February 22, 2002, the SCO made a \$178,217 payment, which was offset to the Emergency Procedures program, to the District with a balance due of \$196,783 (Exhibit C). The SCO did not make any adjustments at this time.

On December 10, 2002, the District filed its claim for reimbursement of the costs that the District incurred during Fiscal Year 2001-2002. A copy of the District’s

reimbursement claim is attached as Exhibit D. The District's actual costs for Fiscal Year 2001-2002 were \$406,224. The District's claim is complete and contains all information required by the claiming instructions (Exhibit E).

On July 21, 2005, the SCO notified the District that the claimed amount had been adjusted down by \$166,791 (Exhibit F). The adjustment comprised of \$161,713 in "unsupported costs" and \$5,078 in related indirect costs. The District challenges the entire \$166,791 adjustment.

Fiscal Year 2002-2003

On December 10, 2002, the District estimated its costs for 2002-2003 at \$375,000. The SCO did not make an estimated payment to the District in 2003.

On December 22, 2003, the District filed its claim for reimbursement of the costs that the District incurred during Fiscal Year 2002-2003. A copy of the District's reimbursement claim is attached as Exhibit G. The District's actual costs for Fiscal Year 2002-2003 were \$414,685. The District's claim is complete and contains all information required by the Claiming Instructions (Exhibit E).

On July 21, 2005, the SCO notified the District that the claimed amount had been adjusted down by \$192,740 (Exhibit H). The adjustment comprised of \$183,045 in "unsupported costs", \$5,362 in costs funded by restricted funds, and \$4,333 in related indirect costs. The Districts challenges the \$183,045 in "unsupported costs" and \$4,210 in indirect costs related to it.

E. The SCO's Notice of Claim Reduction

On June 30, 2005, the SCO issued its final audit report (Exhibit I), which reduced the Districts claims for Fiscal Years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 from \$820,909 to \$461,378. The SCO stated the following four reasons for the disallowed costs:

1. The district's methodology was inconsistent between fiscal years.
2. The district's methodologies for both fiscal years do not constitute valid statistical analyses.
3. The time logs (contemporaneous activity reports) employees did submit indicate that time studies are not appropriate for these activities because time reported for each student varied significantly.
4. The district's procedures do not lend themselves to time studies performed at the district level.

II. THE DISTRICT USED A REASONABLE METHOD TO DETERMINE UNSUPPORTED COSTS

Section 17518.5 of the Government Code allows and even encourages the use of a reasonable reimbursement methodology. The Parameters and Guidelines state that the District may use "the average number of hours devoted to each function" as long as it is "supported by a documented time study". The district used an average derived from contemporaneous activity reports submitted by school site staff members who performed the activities to calculate an average rate per mandated activity, per student suspended. The District contends its averages are conservative and not excessive for the following reasons:

1. The total hours submitted by each school is divided by the total number of qualifying students suspended at that school regardless of whether the staff turned in time for all students. In cases where school site employees did not turn in all of their contemporaneous activity logs for the year, the average time per student is driven down below the actual average time.
2. To be conservative, data with the highest hours reported was eliminated when calculating the average time per student. As noted in the District's response to the SCO's draft audit, the "longest time reported per student" in fiscal year 2001-02 for "Identifying Students" was due to an error that incorrectly credited a middle school with 7 suspensions instead of the 449 actual suspensions reported (Exhibit J). Using the correct figure the average for that school is less than 17 minutes per student. This error did not affect the District's average per student for "Identifying Students" because it was not included in the calculation of the average. None of the high-end extremes shown in SCO's chart on page 5 of the Audit Report (Exhibit I) were included in the calculation of the averages used by the District. The District made this adjustment to the average so that it would be more representative of the typical reimbursable situation.
3. The per student cost for extrapolated schools was less than the per student audited costs supported by contemporaneous activity reports for both fiscal years.

Fiscal Year 2001-2002

For fiscal year 2001-2002, the District has time logs from 66 schools totaling \$236,587. These schools reported a total of 6,451 suspensions that qualified for the teacher notification program, which breaks down to \$36.67 per student. In their audit, the SCO accepted these activity reports as reasonable reimbursement. The District extrapolated costs for 37 additional schools totaling \$157,270. The additional 37 schools had a total of 4,681 suspensions that qualified for the teacher notification program, which breaks down to \$33.60 per student, approximately \$3.00

less than the supported costs accepted by the SCO. The District argues that this is a reasonable estimate of the actual costs for these 37 schools.

Fiscal Year 2002-2003

For fiscal year 2002-2003, the District has time logs from 83 schools totaling \$224,356. These schools reported a total of 6,327 suspensions that qualified for the teacher notification program, which breaks down to \$35.46 per student. In their audit, the SCO accepted these time logs as reasonable reimbursement. The District extrapolated costs for 57 additional schools totaling \$181,006. The additional 57 schools had a total of 5,307 suspensions that qualified for the teacher notification program, which breaks down to \$34.11 per student, \$1.35 less than the supported costs accepted by the SCO. The District contends this is a reasonable estimate of the actual costs for these 57 schools.

A unit rate for *Pupil Health Screenings* was approved by the Commission despite concerns by the SCO that the "variance was too great" on the basis that the net result created a cost savings to the state (Final Staff Analysis, 12/9/04). In both years, the District's average time per student was less than audited claim amounts.

CONCLUSION

The SCO is required by law to pay the claims submitted by the District (Government Code Section 17561, subdivision [d]). It is clear in Government Code Section 17518.5 that the legislature's intent was to reimburse schools for reasonable costs of complying with state mandates without burdening them with the need for "detailed documentation of actual local costs" whenever possible. The District has gone to great effort to comply with the SCO's desire for contemporaneous logs and has provided these logs for 60 percent of the schools claimed. Many of the District's school sites are understaffed and overburdened. Denying reasonable funding for these schools whose staff are performing the mandated duties instituted by the state simply because they do not have the time to document their work is unfair and contrary to the intent of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution. The District is entitled to fair compensation for the cost of complying with this mandate and argues that the method used was reasonable, conservative, and consistent with the manner in which uniform cost rates have been developed for other mandates.


The Commission should find that:

- (1) The SCO incorrectly reduced the District's Fiscal Year 2001-2002 claim by \$161,713
- (2) The SCO incorrectly reduced the District's Fiscal Year 2002-2003 claim by \$192,740.

CERTIFICATION

I certify by my signature below that the statements made in this document are true and correct of my own knowledge, or as to all other matters, I believe them to be true and correct based upon information and belief.

Executed on June 22, 2006, in San Diego, California, by:



Arthur M. Palkowitz
Director, Office of Resource Development

Proposed Parameters and Guidelines

Education Code Section 49079
Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989
Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993

Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion

I. Summary of the Source of the Mandate

Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, added Education Code section 49079 to require school districts to report to each teacher the names of every student who has caused, or who has attempted to cause, serious bodily injury or injury to another person. The notification was to be based upon any written records the district maintained or received from a law enforcement agency. No district would be liable for failure to comply as long as a good faith effort was made to notify the teacher. Notifications were to commence in the 1990-91 school year utilizing data from the previous year, with a progression to three prior-years of data to be reported by fiscal year 1992-93.

Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993, amended Education Code section 49079 to specify for the first time the particular pupil behavior that warrants a teacher notification by including the specific reference to Education Code section 48900. The Section was also amended to immunize school personnel from civil or criminal liability unless the information they provide to the teacher was knowingly false.

II. Commission on State Mandates' Decision

The Commission on State Mandates, in the Statement of Decision adopted at the January 19, 1995 hearing found that Education Code section 49079 as added by Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989 and amended by Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993 imposes a new program or higher level of service within the meaning of Section 6, Article XIII B of the California Constitution, for school districts and county offices of education.

The Commission determined that the following provisions of Education Code Section 49079 established costs mandated by the state pursuant to Government Code section 17514, by requiring school districts to:

- (1) From records maintained in the ordinary course of business or received from law enforcement agencies, identify pupils who have, during the previous three years, engaged in, or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in any of the subdivisions of Education Code section 48900, except subdivision (h).
- (2) Provide this information to teachers on a routine and timely basis.
- (3) Maintain the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years, and adopt a cost effective method to assemble, maintain and disseminate the information to teachers.

III. Eligible Claimants

Any "school district", as defined in Government Code section 175 19, except for community colleges, which incurs increased costs as a result of this mandate is eligible to claim reimbursement.

IV. Period of Reimbursement

Section 17557 of the Government Code states that a test claim must be submitted on or before December 31 following a given fiscal year to establish eligibility for that fiscal year. The test claim for this mandate was filed on February 18, 1994, therefore all mandated costs incurred on or after July 1, 1993, for implementation of Education Code Section 49079 are reimbursable.

Actual costs for one fiscal year should be included in each claim. Estimated costs for the subsequent year may be included on the same claim, if applicable. Pursuant to Section 17561 (d) (3) of the Government Code, all claims for reimbursement of initial years' costs shall be submitted within 120 days from the date on which the State Controller's Office issues claiming instructions on funded mandates contained in the claims bill.

If the total costs for a given fiscal year do not exceed \$200, no reimbursement shall be allowed, except as otherwise allowed by Government Code section 17564.

V. Reimbursable Costs

A. Scope of the Mandate

School districts and county offices of education shall be reimbursed for the costs incurred to: identify pupils, from records maintained in the ordinary course of business or received from law enforcement agencies who have, during the previous three years engaged in, or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in any of the subdivisions of Education Code section 48900, except subdivision (h); and provide this information to teachers on a routine and timely basis.

B. Reimbursable Activities

For each eligible school district or county office of education, the direct and indirect costs of labor, supplies and services incurred for the following mandate components are reimbursable:

1. Identifying Pupils

For identifying pupils, from records received from law enforcement agencies or otherwise maintained in the ordinary course of business, who have during the previous three years engaged in or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in any of the acts described in any of the subdivisions, except (h), of section 48900.

2. Information Maintenance

For maintaining the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years, and a one-time cost for adopting a cost effective method of assembling, maintaining and disseminating the information to teachers.

3. Notifying Teachers

For notifying teachers on a regular and timely basis of the pupils whose behavior makes them subject to suspension and expulsion and such notification shall be made in a manner designed to maintain confidentiality of this information.

VI. Claim Preparation

Each claim for reimbursement pursuant to this mandate must be timely filed and set forth a listing of each item for which reimbursement is claimed under this mandate.

A. Reporting by Components

Claimed costs must be allocated according to the three components of reimbursable activity described in Section V. B.

B. Supporting Documentation

Claimed costs should be supported by the following information:

1. Employee Salaries and Benefits

Identify the employee(s) and their job classification, describe the mandated functions performed, and specify the actual number of hours devoted to each function, the productive hourly rate, and the related benefits. The average number of hours devoted to each function may be claimed if supported by a documented time study.

2. Materials and Supplies

Only the expenditures which can be identified as a direct cost of the mandate can be claimed. List cost of materials which have been consumed or expended specifically for the purpose of this mandate.

3. Contracted Services

Give the name(s) of the contractor(s) who performed the service(s). Describe the activities performed by each named contractor, and give the number of actual hours spent on the activities. Show the inclusive dates when services were performed and itemize all costs for those services.

4. Allowable Overhead Cost

- a. School districts must use the J-380 (or subsequent replacement) non-restrictive indirect cost rate provisionally approved by the California Department of Education.
- b. County offices of education must use the J-580 (or subsequent replacement) non-restrictive indirect cost rate provisionally approved by the State Department of Education.

C. Cost Accounting Statistics

The State Controller is directed to include in its claiming instructions each year the requirement that claimants report to the State Controller the following statistics for the

purpose of establishing a database for potential future reimbursement based on prospective rates:

- a. The average number of pupils for which this information is being maintained (i.e., number of pupils identified) for each year.
- b. The average daily attendance for the district for each year.
- c. The number times each year the notification is routinely made to teachers (e.g., quarterly, each semester, or annually).

VII. Supporting Data

For auditing purposes, all costs claimed must be traceable to source documents and/or worksheets that show evidence of the validity of such costs. Pursuant to Government Code section 17558.5, these documents must be kept on file by the agency submitting the claim for a period of no less than four years after the end of the calendar year in which the reimbursement claim is filed, and made available on the request of the State Controller.

VIII. Offsetting Savings and Other Reimbursements

Any offsetting savings claimant experiences as a direct result of this statute must be deducted from the costs claimed. In addition, reimbursement for this mandate received from any source, e.g., service fees collected, federal funds, other state funds etc., shall be identified and deducted from this claim. While not specifically researched, the Commission has not identified any specific offsetting savings from state or federal sources applicable to this mandate.

IX. State Controller's Office Required Certification

An authorized representative of the claimant will be required to provide a certification of claim, as specified in the State Controller's claiming instructions, for those cost mandated by the state contained herein.

EXHIBIT B

CALIFORNIA CODES
GOVERNMENT CODE
SECTION 17518.5

17518.5. (a) "Reasonable reimbursement methodology" means a formula for reimbursing local agency and school district costs mandated by the state that meets the following conditions:

(1) The total amount to be reimbursed statewide is equivalent to total estimated local agency and school district costs to implement the mandate in a cost-efficient manner.

(2) For 50 percent or more of eligible local agency and school district claimants, the amount reimbursed is estimated to fully offset their projected costs to implement the mandate in a cost-efficient manner.

(b) Whenever possible, a reasonable reimbursement methodology shall be based on general allocation formulas, uniform cost allowances, and other approximations of local costs mandated by the state, rather than detailed documentation of actual local costs. In cases when local agencies and school districts are projected to incur costs to implement a mandate over a period of more than one fiscal year, the determination of a reasonable reimbursement methodology may consider local costs and state reimbursements over a period of greater than one fiscal year, but not exceeding 10 years.

(c) A reasonable reimbursement methodology may be developed by any of the following:

- (1) The Department of Finance.
- (2) The Controller.
- (3) An affected state agency.
- (4) A claimant.
- (5) An interested party.

CONTROLLER OF CALIFORNIA
P.O. BOX 942850, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 94250

THIS NOTICE IS FOR INFORMATION PURPOSE ONLY.
NO WARRANT WILL BE MAILED.
THE NET PAYMENT AMOUNT WAS ZERO.

*****.00

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SAN DIEGO CITY UN SCH DIST
SAN DIEGO COUNTY
4100 NORMAL STREET
SAN DIEGO CA 92103

PAYEE: TREASURER, SAN DIEGO CITY UN SCH DIST
FUND NAME: GENERAL FUND

ISSUE DATE: 02/22/2002

CLAIM SCHEDULE NBR: MA13311E

REIMBURSEMENT OF STATE MANDATED COSTS
ANY QUESTIONS PLEASE CALL KIM NGUYEN AT (916) 324-7876
ACL : 6110-295-0001 PROG : NOTICE TO TEACH SUS CH 1306/89
2001/2002 ESTIMATED PAYMENT CLAIMED AMT: 375,000.00
TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS: .00
TOTAL APPROVED CLAIMED AMT: 375,000.00
LESS PRIOR PAYMENTS: .00
PRORATA PERCENT: 47.524629 196,783.00-
PRORATA BALANCE DUE: 178,217.00
APPROVED PAYMENT AMOUNT:
PAYMENT OFFSETS (ACL NBR, NAME, FY, AMT.): 178,217-
6100-295-0001-1996 EMERGENCY PROCEDURE CH 1 96/97 .00
NET PAYMENT AMOUNT:

<p>CLAIM FOR PAYMENT Pursuant to Government Code Section 17561 NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION</p>	(19) Program Number 00150 (20) Date File ___/___/___ (21) LRS Input ___/___/___	Program 150
--	---	--


L A B E L H E R E	(01) Claimant Identification Number: S37165		Reimbursement Claim Data		
	(02) San Diego Unified School District		(22) NTT-1, (03)(a)	13,766	
	San Diego County		(23) NTT-1, (03)(b)	125,915	
	4100 Normal Street		(24) NTT-1, (03)(c)	Daily	
	San Diego	California	92103	(25) NTT-1, (04)(1)(d)	230,778
	Type of Claim	Estimated Claim	Reimbursement Claim	(26) NTT-1, (04)(2)(d)	85,211
	(03) Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(09) Reimbursement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(27) NTT-1, (04)(3)(d)	77,868	
	(04) Combined <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) Combined <input type="checkbox"/>	(28)		
	(05) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(29)		
Fiscal Year of Cost	(06) 2002/2003	(12) 2001/2002	(30)		
Total Claimed Amount	(07) \$ 375,000	(13) \$ 406,224	(31)		
Less: 10% Late Penalty, not to exceed \$1000		(14)	(32)		
Less: Estimated Claim Payment Received		(15) \$ 178,217	(33)		
Net Claimed Amount		(16) \$ 228,007	(34)		
Due from State	(08) \$ 375,000	(17) \$ 228,007	(35)		
Due to State		(18)	(36)		

(37) CERTIFICATION OF CLAIM

In accordance with the provisions of Government Code 17561, I certify that I am the officer authorized by the local agency to file claims with the State of California for costs mandated by Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993; and certify under penalty of perjury that I have not violated any of the provisions of Government Code Sections 1090 to 1096, inclusive.

I further certify that there was no application other than from the claimant, nor any grant or payment received, for reimbursement of costs claimed herein; and such costs are for a new program or increased level of services of an existing program mandated by Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989 and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993.

The amounts for Estimated Claim and/or Reimbursement Claim are hereby claimed from the State for payment of estimated and/or actual costs for the mandated program of Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989 and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993, set forth on the attached statements.

Signature of Authorized Officer


 Gamy Rayburn
 Type or Print Name

Date
 12-10-02


 Accounting Director
 Title

(39) Name of Contact Person for Claim Telephone Number (619) 725-7566
 Camille Y. Chacon E-mail Address cchacon@mail.sandi.net

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION CLAIM SUMMARY	FORM NTT-1
---	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Type of Claim: Reimbursement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>	Fiscal Year 2001/2002
---	--	--------------------------

Claim Statistics	
(03) (a) Number of pupils identified for the fiscal year (Refer to instructions)	13,766
(b) Average daily attendance for the fiscal year	125,915
(c) Number of times teachers were notified in the fiscal year (Refer to instructions)	Daily



Direct Costs	Object Accounts			
(04) Reimbursable Components:	(a) Salaries and Benefits	(b) Materials and Supplies	(c) Contracted Services	(d) Total
1. Identifying Pupils	\$ 230,777.92			\$ 230,777.92
2. Information Maintenance	\$ 85,210.51			\$ 85,210.51
3. Notifying Teachers	\$ 77,868.45			\$ 77,868.45
(05) Total Direct Cost	\$ 393,856.88			\$ 393,856.88

Indirect Costs	
(06) Indirect Cost Rate	[From J-380 or J-580] 3.14%
(07) Total Indirect Costs	[Line (06) x (line (05)(d) - line (05)(c))] \$ 12,367.11
(08) Total Direct and Indirect Costs	[Line (05)(d) + line (07)] \$ 406,223.99

Cost Reduction	
(09) Less: Offsetting Savings, if applicable	0
(10) Less: Other Reimbursements, if applicable	0
(11) Total Claimed Amount:	[Line (08) - (Line (09) + Line (10))] \$ 406,223.99

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Identifying pupils who have engaged in or are reasonably suspected of engaging in acts described in any subdivision, except (h), of Ed. Code 48900 from records from law enforcement agencies or otherwise maintained in the ordinary course of business.					
Alcantar Cesar, Vice Principal	\$ 62.13	44	\$ 2,733.72		
Alexander Julia, Vice Principal	\$ 62.13	15.4	\$ 956.80		
Alfstad Dennis, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	138.6	\$ 8,820.50		
Andrews Virginia, Vice Principal	\$ 52.35	46	\$ 2,408.10		
Baca Laura, Guidance Assist.	\$ 18.76	59.5	\$ 1,116.22		
Baird Thomas, Vice Principal	\$ 47.80	69.08	\$ 3,302.02		
Bandiola Francisca, School Clerk I	\$ 23.92	2.5	\$ 59.80		
Barnes Julie, School Secretary II	\$ 24.24	1.66	\$ 40.24		
Beraud Beatriz, School Clerk I	\$ 24.98	29.75	\$ 743.16		
Beraud Michael, Vice Principal	\$ 62.13	6.6	\$ 410.06		
Berman Jo, Vice Principal	\$ 60.66	54.56	\$ 3,309.61		
Bishop-Irwin Michelle, Vice Principal	\$ 47.01	23.83	\$ 1,120.25		
Blackman Kristin, District Counselor	\$ 37.07	2.42	\$ 89.71		
Blair Leslie, School Clerk I	\$ 20.44	1.88	\$ 38.43		
Brings Judith, Principal	\$ 67.78	35.64	\$ 2,415.68		
Brower Chester, District Counselor	\$ 38.60	6	\$ 231.60		
Campbell Donna, Vice Principal	\$ 65.06	54.56	\$ 3,549.67		
Candage Beverly, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	10.56	\$ 566.12		
Caporale Leslie, School Secretary	\$ 30.42	15.84	\$ 481.85		
Carrillo Cecilia, Principal	\$ 66.04	13.64	\$ 900.79		
Casey Kathleen, Vice Principal	\$ 56.10	73.48	\$ 4,122.23		
Chappell Lois, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	26	\$ 1,732.38		
Coffey Douglas, Vice Principal	\$ 56.10	124.5	\$ 6,984.45		
Coleman-Barbara, Vice Principal	\$ 59.37	7	\$ 415.59		
Conaway Colleen, Principal	\$ 64.60	1.75	\$ 113.05		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 1 of 5 \$ 46,662.03

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Connolly Renee, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	147.25	\$ 9,811.27		
Coody Kimberly, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	134.2	\$ 8,941.75		
Cook Arlene, Teacher	\$ 47.19	0.25	\$ 11.80		
Cross Evvalenora, Vice Principal	\$ 65.06	15	\$ 975.90		
Dalal Anisha, Vice Principal	\$ 38.99	74.36	\$ 2,899.30		
Ernst Judith, Principal	\$ 66.04	0.25	\$ 16.51		
Esparza Ruth, Clerk Typist I	\$ 17.47	1.08	\$ 18.87		
Estrada Alma, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	38.72	\$ 2,075.78		
Fink Dianne, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	146.96	\$ 9,791.94		
Fischer-Garza Jerrilee, Principal	\$ 66.04	22.75	\$ 1,502.41		
Garcia Marina, Vice Principal	\$ 47.80	46.2	\$ 2,208.36		
Garcia Moreno George, Teacher	\$ 41.92	1.17	\$ 49.05		
Gardner Laura, School Clerk I	\$ 21.33	3.91	\$ 83.40		
George Michael, Vice Principal	\$ 56.10	161.92	\$ 9,083.71		
Gibson Gail, Guidance Asst.	\$ 22.16	8	\$ 177.28		
Gingery Trudy, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	0.17	\$ 4.84		
Graham Marthe, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	46.5	\$ 2,492.87		
Gray Patricia, School Clerk I	\$ 21.97	26.18	\$ 575.17		
Grimes Marilyn, Vice Principal	\$ 60.66	19.36	\$ 1,174.38		
Guido Laurie, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	55.88	\$ 3,723.28		
Halfpenny Ruth, District Counselor	\$ 36.04	18.75	\$ 675.75		
Harper, Yvonne	\$ 64.60	18.48	\$ 1,193.81		
Hernandez Joseph, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	28.6	\$ 1,820.10		
Hernandez Sergio, District Counselor	\$ 44.99	12.08	\$ 543.48		
Higgins Joann, Vice Principal	\$ 50.05	25.52	\$ 1,277.28		
Hoerr Rita, School Clerk I	\$ 23.92	56	\$ 1,339.52		
Huggins Deborah, Vice Principal	\$ 54.79	22.44	\$ 1,229.49		
Hunold DeAnne, School Secretary	\$ 23.42	14	\$ 327.88		
Iglesias Marilyn, District Counselor	\$ 37.17	16.49	\$ 612.93		
Jacobs Marian, Vice Principal	\$ 50.05	6.5	\$ 325.33		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 2 of 5 \$ 64,963.44

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Jeffers Melissa, Vice Principal	\$ 55.13	3.75	\$ 206.74		
Jennings Elizabeth, Vice Principal	\$ 51.12	19.5	\$ 996.84		
Jimenez James, Vice Principal	\$ 38.99	158.84	\$ 6,193.17		
Johnson Minerva, Vice Principal	\$ 54.22	24.5	\$ 1,328.39		
Jordan Claudia, Principal	\$ 46.52	36.08	\$ 1,678.44		
Juarez Christopher, Vice Principal	\$ 46.09	69.52	\$ 3,204.18		
Karpowich Linda, Principal	\$ 64.60	4.5	\$ 290.70		
Kheo, Phinga-Evelyn, Counselor	\$ 48.43	12	\$ 581.16		
Kotnik David, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	92.4	\$ 6,156.61		
Laine William, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	165	\$ 10,500.60		
Lewis Yolanda, Vice Principal	\$ 44.50	1.5	\$ 66.75		
Little Linda, Vice Principal	\$ 65.09	31.43	\$ 2,045.78		
Longo Mary Jo, Vice Principal	\$ 53.05	4.25	\$ 225.46		
Madden Jean, Principal	\$ 57.54	32	\$ 1,841.28		
Malcom Keith, Vice Principal	\$ 59.37	12.75	\$ 756.97		
Malone Sandra, Guidance Asst.	\$ 14.01	14	\$ 196.14		
Marra Christine, School Assistant	\$ 22.46	1.5	\$ 33.69		
Mc Fee Linda, School Secretary	\$ 20.11	0.67	\$ 13.47		
McCann Michael, Attendance Assist.	\$ 23.92	25	\$ 598.00		
McGee Stephen, District Counselor	\$ 43.53	4.75	\$ 206.77		
McGee Stephen, District Counselor	\$ 43.53	16.05	\$ 698.66		
Medina Mary, School Clerk	\$ 23.92	0.33	\$ 7.89		
Mendez Jovita, Attendance Assit.	\$ 18.76	7.66	\$ 143.70		
Mills Floyd, Dean of Students	\$ 55.78	73.5	\$ 4,099.83		
Mooney Karen, Principal	\$ 58.94	0.03	\$ 1.77		
Moran Sheelagh, Vice Principal	\$ 62.13	37.4	\$ 2,323.66		
Morrill Greg, District Counselor	\$ 55.78	0.25	\$ 13.95		
Mrachek Rebecca, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	67.76	\$ 4,312.25		
Nimtz Joan, Sub-Teacher	\$ 18.74	0.08	\$ 1.50		
Nydam Julie, Vice Principal	\$ 56.67	158	\$ 8,953.86		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 3 of 5 \$ 57,678.21

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Olivero Jeff, Vice Principal	\$ 65.06	290	\$ 18,867.40		
Omogbehin Arinola, Vice Principal	\$ 44.50	37.84	\$ 1,683.88		
Ontiveros Darrio, Guidance Asst	\$ 15.62	39.25	\$ 613.09		
Passanisi Laura, Vice Principal	\$ 45.54	9.5	\$ 432.63		
Penn Marilyn, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	22	\$ 1,179.42		
Perez Concepcion, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	15	\$ 426.90		
Piper Theresa, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	14	\$ 398.44		
Ramirez Alyson, District Counselor	\$ 26.28	59.25	\$ 1,557.09		
Rapp-McCreary Jessica, Principal	\$ 54.90	34	\$ 1,866.60		
Rayburn Rachel, School Clerk	\$ 23.92	0.42	\$ 10.05		
Remillard Bryan, Vice Principal	\$ 56.67	28.75	\$ 1,629.26		
Rich Vivian, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	37.5	\$ 2,386.50		
Richard Jean, Principal	\$ 64.60	27.5	\$ 1,776.50		
Rizzo Courtney, Vice Principal	\$ 42.08	2.5	\$ 105.20		
Robinson Dana, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	88.88	\$ 5,922.07		
Santiago Mercedes, District Counselor	\$ 47.06	1	\$ 47.06		
Sawyers Roberta, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	20.68	\$ 1,316.08		
Sell Patricia, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	70.4	\$ 4,690.75		
Serritella Matthew, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	66.88	\$ 4,456.21		
Sexton Judith, School Clerk	\$ 22.26	4.83	\$ 107.52		
Smith Arlene, Teacher	\$ 41.92	0.42	\$ 17.61		
Smith-Rios Christina, School Clerk	\$ 23.92	0.5	\$ 11.96		
Soderberg Loni, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	5	\$ 268.05		
Stern Robin, Principal	\$ 64.60	1.5	\$ 96.90		
Stevenson James Jr., Comm Serv Offcer	\$ 27.45	22.5	\$ 617.63		
Sullivan Mary, School Clerk II	\$ 26.09	116.5	\$ 3,039.49		
Sund Deborah, Peer Coach	\$ 53.19	2	\$ 106.38		
Taggart Linda, Principal	\$ 60.36	17	\$ 1,026.12		
Tavasci Magdalena, Vice Principal	\$ 52.35	15.84	\$ 829.22		
Taylor Sheari, Vice Principal	\$ 44.50	32.56	\$ 1,448.92		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 4 of 5 \$ 56,934.93

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Thibeault Sharon, Teacher	\$ 47.19	0.55	\$ 25.95		
Van Zant Robert, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	32.76	\$ 2,182.80		
Vidana-Cross Martha, Vice Principal	\$ 48.79	9.68	\$ 472.29		
Vine Edna, School Clerk	\$ 23.92	58.32	\$ 1,395.01		
Watry Mary, Principal	\$ 67.07	1.5	\$ 100.61		
White Lydia, Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.01	9	\$ 162.09		
Williams Molly, District Counselor	\$ 28.32	0.5	\$ 14.16		
Wraith Josephine, Principal	\$ 67.78	2.75	\$ 186.40		
Total Page 1 of 5			\$ 46,662.03		
Total Page 2 of 5			\$ 64,963.44		
Total Page 3 of 5			\$ 57,678.21		
Total Page 4 of 5			\$ 56,934.93		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 5 of 5 \$230,777.92

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Maintaining the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years.					
Acuna Amalia, Schl Clerk I	\$ 18.05	7.56	\$ 136.46		
Andrews Virginia, Vice Principal	\$ 52.35	9	\$ 471.15		
Arzaga Beatriz, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 19.61	9	\$ 176.49		
Baca Laura, Guidance Assist.	\$ 18.76	36.5	\$ 684.74		
Bandiola Francisca, School Clerk I	\$ 23.92	2.5	\$ 59.80		
Barnes Julie, School Secretary II	\$ 24.24	1.44	\$ 34.91		
Bas Frances, Instructional Assistant	\$ 19.13	56.5	\$ 1,080.85		
Beraud Beatriz, School Clerk I	\$ 24.98	44.17	\$ 1,103.37		
Bishop-Irwin Michelle, Vice Principal	\$ 47.01	23.5	\$ 1,104.74		
Blackman Kristin, District Counselor	\$ 37.07	3.5	\$ 129.75		
Blair Leslie, School Clerk I	\$ 20.44	4.25	\$ 86.87		
Boyd Rupinder, Vice Principal	\$ 39.75	5	\$ 198.75		
Bravo Sylvia, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	15.84	\$ 337.87		
Brower Chester, District Counselor	\$ 38.60	1.75	\$ 67.55		
Caporale Leslie, School Secretary	\$ 30.42	15.91	\$ 483.98		
Chambers Ana, Schl Clerk I	\$ 21.97	15.3	\$ 336.14		
Chappell Lois, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	0.74	\$ 49.31		
Coffey Douglas, Vice Principal	\$ 56.10	75.5	\$ 4,235.55		
Coleman Barbara, Vice Principal	\$ 59.37	3	\$ 178.11		
Connolly Renee, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	34.42	\$ 2,293.40		
Cook Arlene, Teacher	\$ 47.19	1	\$ 47.19		
Cross Evvalenora, Vice Principal	\$ 65.06	15.25	\$ 992.17		
Cucinotta Patricia, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.44	6.48	\$ 132.45		
Davies Charlotte, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	54.9	\$ 1,313.21		
Ernst Judith, Principal	\$ 66.04	0.25	\$ 16.51		
Esparza Ruth, Clerk Typist I	\$ 17.47	4.58	\$ 80.01		
Fierro Frances, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	4.32	\$ 92.15		

(05) **Total** **Subtotal** Page: 1 of 5 \$ 15,923.48

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Fischer-Garza Jerrilee, Principal	\$ 66.04	9.25	\$ 610.87		
Garcia Moreno George, Teacher	\$ 41.92	0.83	\$ 34.79		
Gardner Laura, School Clerk I	\$ 21.33	3.17	\$ 67.62		
Gibson Gail, Guidance Asst.	\$ 22.16	3.25	\$ 72.02		
Gingery Trudy, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	0.33	\$ 9.39		
Gonzalez Maria, Schl Clerk I	\$ 21.06	.18	\$ 379.08		
Graham Marthe, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	.18	\$ 964.98		
Gray Patricia, School Clerk I	\$ 21.97	14.01	\$ 307.80		
Griffith Linda, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	14.58	\$ 348.75		
Guevara Ana, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.06	11.7	\$ 246.40		
Halfpenny Ruth, District Counselor	\$ 36.04	13	\$ 468.52		
Heartel Mary, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	56.7	\$ 1,356.26		
Hernandez Sergio, District Counselor	\$ 44.99	5	\$ 224.95		
Huezo Laura, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 22.92	28.8	\$ 660.10		
Hunold DeAnne, School Secretary	\$ 23.42	4.84	\$ 113.35		
Hurlburt Carol, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	27.36	\$ 654.45		
Iglesias Marilyn, District Counselor	\$ 37.17	16.49	\$ 612.93		
Island Carmen, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 24.98	7.92	\$ 197.84		
Jacobs Marian, Vice Principal	\$ 50.05	2.33	\$ 116.62		
Jeffers Melissa, Vice Principal	\$ 55.13	3	\$ 165.39		
Jennings Elizabeth, Vice Principal	\$ 51.12	5.7	\$ 291.38		
Jimenez Margarita, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 24.98	8.46	\$ 211.33		
Jones Idabelle, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.44	9.18	\$ 187.64		
Kheo, Phinga-Evelyn, Counselor	\$ 48.43	46	\$ 2,227.78		
King Brenda, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	6.3	\$ 150.70		
Kramer Linda, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.44	10.44	\$ 213.39		
Lackman Sharen, School Secretary	\$ 26.67	6.67	\$ 177.89		
Laine William, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	1.5	\$ 95.46		
Lakin Karen, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	0.25	\$ 7.12		
Lancey-Jewell Carol, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.44	66.24	\$ 1,353.95		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 2 of 5 \$ 12,528.75

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Lewis Yolanda, Vice Principal	\$ 44.50	0.5	\$ 22.25		
Little Linda, Vice Principal	\$ 65.09	22.85	\$ 1,487.31		
Longo Mary Jo, Vice Principal	\$ 53.05	21	\$ 1,114.05		
Loya Blanca, School Clerk	\$ 22.92	1	\$ 22.92		
Madden Jean, Principal	\$ 57.54	15.5	\$ 891.87		
Maiorano Karla, School Clerk	\$ 17.33	12.5	\$ 216.63		
Malcom Keith, Vice Principal	\$ 59.37	4.58	\$ 271.91		
Malone Sandra, Guidance Asst.	\$ 14.01	7	\$ 98.07		
Marquez Guadalupe, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	14.76	\$ 314.83		
Marquez Marie, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 23.20	30.42	\$ 705.74		
Marra Christine, School Assistant	\$ 22.46	3	\$ 67.38		
Mc Fee Linda, School Secretary	\$ 20.11	0.83	\$ 16.69		
McCann Michael, Attendance Assist.	\$ 23.92	18.75	\$ 448.50		
Mcdonald Joyce, Schl Clerk I	\$ 22.92	64.98	\$ 1,489.34		
Mcdougall Linda, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	2.7	\$ 64.58		
McGee Stephen, District Counselor	\$ 43.53	0.7	\$ 30.47		
McGee Stephen, District Counselor	\$ 43.53	15.15	\$ 659.48		
Medina Mary, School Clerk	\$ 23.92	1.33	\$ 31.81		
Medrano Rita, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	13.32	\$ 284.12		
Mendez Jovita, Attendance Assist.	\$ 18.76	8.34	\$ 156.46		
Mills Floyd, Dean of Students	\$ 55.78	85	\$ 4,741.30		
Montano Crusita, School Clerk II	\$ 26.09	36.36	\$ 948.63		
Morrill Greg, District Counselor	\$ 55.78	0.25	\$ 13.95		
Moya Josephina, Systems Tech II	\$ 28.46	59.75	\$ 1,700.49		
Nimtz Joan, Sub-Teacher	\$ 18.74	0.08	\$ 1.50		
Norris Katrina, Clerk Typist I	\$ 18.21	0.5	\$ 9.11		
Nydam Julie, Vice Principal	\$ 56.67	29.75	\$ 1,685.93		
Olivero Jeff, Vice Principal	\$ 65.06	119	\$ 7,742.14		
Ontiveros Darrio, Guidance Asst	\$ 15.62	17.6	\$ 274.91		
Palreiro Jo Ellen, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	22.32	\$ 533.89		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 3 of 5 \$ 26,046.26

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred:	2001/2002
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).	Object Accounts
--	------------------------

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Passanisi Laura, Vice Principal	\$ 45.54	5.5	\$ 250.47		
Peck Barbara, Attendance Assistant	\$ 20.79	4.66	\$ 96.88		
Pena-Aguilar Ana, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	18.9	\$ 403.14		
Perez Concepcion, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	9.33	\$ 265.53		
Piper Theresa, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	43.17	\$ 1,228.62		
Prince Barbara, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.19	30.06	\$ 606.91		
Ramirez Alyson, District Counselor	\$ 26.28	22	\$ 578.16		
Remillard Bryan, Vice Principal	\$ 56.67	14.5	\$ 821.72		
Rich Vivian, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	28	\$ 1,781.92		
Rieger Annette, Vice Principal	\$ 50.32	91	\$ 4,579.12		
Riley Patricia, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	37.8	\$ 904.18		
Rodriguez Cecilia, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 18.05	5.58	\$ 100.72		
Rodriguez Christopher, Schl Clerk I	\$ 21.31	28.26	\$ 602.22		
Rodriguez Irene, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	3.96	\$ 84.47		
Rohm Aumi, School Clerk II	\$ 24.98	27.72	\$ 692.45		
Rowley Linda, School Clerk	\$ 26.09	19.58	\$ 510.84		
Rutherford Dolores, School Secretary	\$ 18.32	2.25	\$ 41.22		
Salom Sandra, School Secretary	\$ 26.09	40.8	\$ 1,064.47		
Santiago Mercedes, District Counselor	\$ 47.06	0.15	\$ 7.06		
Serrano Gualberto, Guidance Asst.	\$ 19.94	36.5	\$ 727.81		
Sexton Judith, School Clerk	\$ 22.26	6.5	\$ 144.69		
Shuffler Paulette, School Clerk I	\$ 24.98	106	\$ 2,647.88		
Skinner Susan, Head Counselor	\$ 52.60	12	\$ 631.20		
Smith Arlene, Teacher	\$ 41.92	0.16	\$ 6.71		
Smith-Rios Christina, School Clerk	\$ 23.92	1.67	\$ 39.95		
Soderberg Loni, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	1	\$ 53.61		
Spire Patricia, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	28.44	\$ 680.28		
Stem Joann, School Clerk II	\$ 26.09	25.33	\$ 660.86		
Stevenson James Jr., Comm Serv Offcr	\$ 27.45	17	\$ 466.65		
Sullivan Mary, School Clerk II	\$ 26.09	171	\$ 4,461.39		

(05)	Total <input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page: 4 of 5	\$ 25,141.13
------	--------------------------------	--	--------------	--------------

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred:	2001/2002
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).	Object Accounts				
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Taggart Linda, Principal	\$ 60.36	12	\$ 724.32		
Thibeault Sharon, Teacher	\$ 47.19	0.55	\$ 25.95		
Trombley Mary, School Clerk II	\$ 24.98	13.66	\$ 341.23		
Trowbridge Adele, School Clerk I	\$ 23.92	6.5	\$ 155.48		
Van Zant Robert, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	24.33	\$ 1,621.11		
Vanella Laura, Schl Clerk I	\$ 22.92	60.12	\$ 1,377.95		
Vindel Any, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.06	15.48	\$ 326.01		
Waty Mary, Principal	\$ 67.07	5	\$ 335.35		
White Lydia, Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.01	6.41	\$ 115.44		
Williams Margaret, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	22.32	\$ 533.89		
Williams Molly, District Counselor	\$ 28.32	0.5	\$ 14.16		
Total Page 1 of 5			\$ 15,923.48		
Total Page 2 of 5			\$ 12,528.75		
Total Page 3 of 5			\$ 26,046.26		
Total Page 4 of 5			\$ 25,141.13		

(05)	Total <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal <input type="checkbox"/>	Page: 5 of 5	\$ 85,210.51	
------	---	-----------------------------------	--------------	--------------	--

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Maintaining the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years.					
Acuna Amalia, Schl Clerk I	\$ 18.05	7.98	\$ 144.04		
Andrews Virginia, Vice Principal	\$ 52.35	5	\$ 261.75		
Arzaga Beatriz, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 19.61	9.5	\$ 186.30		
Baca Laura, Guidance Assist.	\$ 18.76	34	\$ 637.84		
Bandiola Francisca, School Clerk I	\$ 23.92	2.5	\$ 59.80		
Barnes Julie, School Secretary II	\$ 24.24	3.08	\$ 74.66		
Beraud Beatriz, School Clerk I	\$ 24.98	28.66	\$ 715.93		
Berlin Janet, School Clerk II	\$ 26.09	146	\$ 3,809.14		
Bishop-Irwin Michelle, Vice Principal	\$ 47.01	3.91	\$ 183.81		
Blackman Kristin, District Counselor	\$ 37.07	2.67	\$ 98.98		
Blair Leslie, School Clerk I	\$ 20.44	2.02	\$ 41.29		
Bravo Sylvia, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	16.72	\$ 356.64		
Brower Chester, District Counselor	\$ 38.60	2	\$ 77.20		
Caporale Leslie, School Secretary	\$ 30.42	19.08	\$ 580.41		
Chambers Ana, Schl Clerk I	\$ 21.97	16.15	\$ 354.82		
Coffey Douglas, Vice Principal	\$ 56.10	50.33	\$ 2,823.51		
Conaway Colleen, Principal	\$ 64.60	2.5	\$ 161.50		
Connolly Renee, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	29.08	\$ 1,937.60		
Cross Evvalenora, Vice Principal	\$ 65.06	5.63	\$ 366.29		
Cucinotta Patricia, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.44	6.84	\$ 139.81		
Davies Charlotte, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	57.95	\$ 1,386.16		
Ernst Judith, Principal	\$ 66.04	0.5	\$ 33.02		
Esparza Ruth, Clerk Typist I	\$ 17.47	4.58	\$ 80.01		
Fierro Frances, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	4.56	\$ 97.26		
Fischer-Garza Jerrilee, Principal	\$ 66.04	6	\$ 396.24		
Gardner Laura, School Clerk I	\$ 21.33	1.67	\$ 35.62		
Gibson Gail, Guidance Asst.	\$ 22.16	2.5	\$ 55.40		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 1 of 5 \$ 15,095.03

MANDATED COSTS

**NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL**

**FORM
NTT-2**

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

- Identifying Pupils
- Information Maintenance
- Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Gloria Marietta, School Clerk I	\$ 21.33	11	\$ 234.63		
Gonzalez Maria, Schl Clerk I	\$ 21.06	19	\$ 400.14		
Graham Marthe, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	35	\$ 1,876.35		
Griffith Linda, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	15.39	\$ 368.13		
Guevara Ana, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.06	12.35	\$ 260.09		
Halfpenny Ruth, District Counselor	\$ 36.04	9.25	\$ 333.37		
Heartel Mary, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	59.85	\$ 1,431.61		
Hernandez Sergio, District Counselor	\$ 44.99	5	\$ 224.95		
Huezo Laura, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 22.92	30.4	\$ 696.77		
Hunold DeAnne, School Secretary	\$ 23.42	4.84	\$ 113.35		
Hurlburt Carol, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	28.88	\$ 690.81		
Iglesias Marilyn, District Counselor	\$ 37.17	16.49	\$ 612.93		
Island Carmen, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 24.98	8.36	\$ 208.83		
Jacobs Marian, Vice Principal	\$ 50.05	0.75	\$ 37.54		
Jeffers Melissa, Vice Principal	\$ 55.13	4.25	\$ 234.30		
Jennings Elizabeth, Vice Principal	\$ 51.12	2.6	\$ 132.91		
Jimenez Margarita, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 24.98	8.93	\$ 223.07		
Johnson Minerva, Vice Principal	\$ 54.22	11.5	\$ 623.53		
Jones Idabelle, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.44	9.69	\$ 198.06		
Karpowich Linda, Principal	\$ 64.60	2.25	\$ 145.35		
Kheo, Phinga-Evelyn, Counselor	\$ 48.43	30	\$ 1,452.90		
King Brenda, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	6.65	\$ 159.07		
Kramer Linda, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.44	11.02	\$ 225.25		
Lackman Sharen, School Secretary	\$ 26.67	1	\$ 26.67		
Laine William, Vice Principal	\$ 63.64	102	\$ 6,491.28		
Lancey-Jewell Carol, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.44	69.92	\$ 1,429.16		
Lee-Farley Wendy, District Counselor	\$ 30.76	0.83	\$ 25.53		
Lewis Yolanda, Vice Principal	\$ 44.50	0.5	\$ 22.25		
Little Linda, Vice Principal	\$ 65.09	17.86	\$ 1,162.51		
Longo Mary Jo, Vice Principal	\$ 53.05	6.75	\$ 358.09		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page: 2 of 5	\$ 20,399.43		

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

FORM
NTT-2

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f). **Object Accounts**

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Loya Blanca, School Clerk	\$ 22.92	0.67	\$ 15.36		
Madden Jean, Principal	\$ 57.54	42	\$ 2,416.68		
Malone Sandra, Guidance Asst.	\$ 14.01	0.9	\$ 12.61		
Marquez Guadalupe, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	15.58	\$ 332.32		
Marquez Marie, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 23.20	32.11	\$ 744.95		
Marra Christine, School Assistant	\$ 22.46	0.25	\$ 5.62		
Mc Fee Linda, School Secretary	\$ 20.11	0.25	\$ 5.03		
McCann Michael, Attendance Assist.	\$ 23.92	7	\$ 167.44		
McDonald Joyce, Schl Clerk I	\$ 22.92	68.59	\$ 1,572.08		
Mcdougall Linda, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	2.85	\$ 68.17		
McGee Stephen, District Counselor	\$ 43.53	0.35	\$ 15.24		
McGee Stephen, District Counselor	\$ 43.53	10	\$ 435.30		
Medina Mary, School Clerk	\$ 23.92	0.14	\$ 3.35		
Medrano Rita, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	14.06	\$ 299.90		
Mendez Jovita, Attendance Assit.	\$ 18.76	7.32	\$ 137.32		
Mills Floyd, Dean of Students	\$ 55.78	74.67	\$ 4,165.09		
Montano Crusita, School Clerk Ii	\$ 26.09	38.38	\$ 1,001.33		
Mooney Karen, Principal	\$ 58.94	0.5	\$ 29.47		
Nimtz Joan, Sub-Teacher	\$ 18.74	0.17	\$ 3.19		
Norris Katrina, Clerk Typist I	\$ 18.21	5	\$ 91.05		
Nydam Julie, Vice Principal	\$ 56.67	15.25	\$ 864.22		
Olivero Jeff, Vice Principal	\$ 65.06	65.25	\$ 4,245.17		
Ontiveros Dario, Guidance Asst	\$ 15.62	7.5	\$ 117.15		
Palreiro Jo Ellen, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	23.56	\$ 563.56		
Parks Patricia, Principal	\$ 64.60	0.25	\$ 16.15		
Passanisi Laura, Vice Principal	\$ 45.54	5.5	\$ 250.47		
Pena-Aguilar Ana, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	19.95	\$ 425.53		
Perez Concepcion, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	8.5	\$ 241.91		
Piper Theresa, School Secretary	\$ 28.46	7	\$ 199.22		
Prince Barbara, Schl Clerk I	\$ 20.19	31.73	\$ 640.63		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 3 of 5 \$ 19,085.51

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).	Object Accounts
--	------------------------

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Ramirez Alyson, District Counselor	\$ 26.28	43.75	\$ 1,149.75		
Rayburn Rachel, School Clerk	\$ 23.92	0.25	\$ 5.98		
Remillard Bryan, Vice Principal	\$ 56.67	14.5	\$ 821.72		
Richard Jean, Principal	\$ 64.60	0.17	\$ 10.98		
Riley Patricia, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	39.9	\$ 954.41		
Rodriguez Cecilia, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 18.05	5.89	\$ 106.31		
Rodriguez Christopher, Schl Clerk I	\$ 21.31	29.83	\$ 635.68		
Rodriguez Irene, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.33	4.18	\$ 89.16		
Rohm Aumi, School Clerk Ii	\$ 24.98	29.26	\$ 730.91		
Rowley Linda, School Clerk	\$ 26.09	19.17	\$ 500.15		
Santiago Mercedes, District Counselor	\$ 47.06	0.15	\$ 7.06		
Serrano Gualberto, Guidance Asst.	\$ 19.94	126.95	\$ 2,531.38		
Sexton Judith, School Clerk	\$ 22.26	13.43	\$ 298.95		
Skinner Susan, Head Counselor	\$ 52.60	11	\$ 578.60		
Smith Arlene, Teacher	\$ 41.92	0.34	\$ 14.25		
Soderberg Loni, Vice Principal	\$ 53.61	1	\$ 53.61		
Spire Patricia, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	30.02	\$ 718.08		
Stem Joann, School Clerk II	\$ 26.09	25	\$ 652.25		
Stern Robin, Principal	\$ 64.60	1	\$ 64.60		
Stevenson James Jr., Comm Serv Offcr	\$ 27.45	3	\$ 82.35		
Sullivan Mary, School Clerk II	\$ 26.09	314	\$ 8,192.26		
Sund Deborah, Peer Coach	\$ 53.19	0.58	\$ 30.85		
Taggart Linda, Principal	\$ 60.36	3.75	\$ 226.35		
Thibeault Sharon, Teacher	\$ 47.19	0.55	\$ 25.95		
Trombley Mary, School Clerk II	\$ 24.98	10.25	\$ 256.05		
Van Zant Robert, Vice Principal	\$ 66.63	22.33	\$ 1,487.85		
Vanella Laura, Schl Clerk I	\$ 22.92	63.46	\$ 1,454.50		
Vindel Any, Schl Clerk I-Bil	\$ 21.06	16.34	\$ 344.12		
Watry Mary, Principal	\$ 67.07	1.5	\$ 100.61		
Wesch Patricia, School Clerk	\$ 22.92	22.25	\$ 509.97		

(05)	Total <input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page: 4 of 5	\$ 22,634.69
------	--------------------------------	--	--------------	--------------

MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL

**FORM
NTT-2**

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred: 2001/2002

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils
 Information Maintenance
 Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expense: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications and Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
White Lydia, Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.01	5.01	\$ 90.23		
Williams Margaret, Schl Clerk I	\$ 23.92	23.56	\$ 563.56		
Total Page 1 of 5			\$ 15,095.03		
Total Page 2 of 5			\$ 20,399.43		
Total Page 3 of 5			\$ 19,085.51		
Total Page 4 of 5			\$ 22,634.69		

(05) Total Subtotal Page: 5 of 5 \$ 77,868.45

EXHIBIT E

NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION

1. Summary of Chapters 1306/89 and 1257/93

Education Code § 49079, as added and amended by Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993, requires that school districts report to each teacher the names of every student who has caused, or attempted to cause, serious bodily injury or injury to another person. The notification is to be based on any written records the district maintained or received from a law enforcement agency. No district would be liable for failure to comply as long as a good faith effort was made to notify the teacher. School personnel are immune from civil or criminal liability unless the information they provided was knowingly false. Notifications were to commence in the 1990/91 school year utilizing data from the previous year, with a progression to three prior years of data to be reported by fiscal year 1992/93.

On January 19, 1995, the Commission on State Mandates determined that Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989 and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993, resulted in state mandated costs that are reimbursable pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Government Code § 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2.

2. Eligible Claimants

Any school district (K-12) or county office of education that incurs increased costs as a result of this mandate is eligible to claim reimbursement of these costs.

3. Appropriations

Funding in the amount of \$6,876,000 for payment of initial claims covering fiscal years 1993/94, 1994/95, 1995/96, and 1996/97, is provided by the local government claims bill SB 91, enacted as Chapter 748, Statutes of 1996.

To determine if this program is funded in subsequent fiscal years, refer to the schedule "Appropriation for State Mandated Cost Programs" in the "Annual Claiming Instructions for State Mandated Costs" issued in September of each year to county superintendents of schools and superintendents of schools.

4. Types of Claims

A. Reimbursement and Estimated Claims

A claimant may file a reimbursement and/or an estimated claim. A reimbursement claim detail the costs actually incurred for a prior fiscal year. An estimated claim shows the costs to be incurred for the current fiscal year.

B. Minimum Claim

Government Code § 17564(a) provides that no claim shall be filed pursuant to Government Code § 17561 unless such a claim exceeds \$200 per program per fiscal year. However, any county superintendent of schools, as fiscal agent for the school district, may submit a combined claim in excess of \$200 on behalf of one or more districts within the county even if the individual district's claim does not exceed \$200.

A combined claim must show the individual costs for each district. Once a combined claim is filed, all subsequent years relating to the same mandate must be filed in a combined form. The county receives the reimbursement payment and is responsible for disbursing funds to each participating district. A district may withdraw from the combined claim form by providing a written notice to the county superintendent of schools and the State Controller's Office of its intent to file a separate claim, at least 180 days prior to the deadline for filing the claim.

5. Filing Deadline

A. Initial Claims

Initial claims must be filed within 120 days from the issuance of claiming instructions. Accordingly:

Reimbursement claims detailing the actual costs incurred for the 1993/94, 1994/95, and 1995/96 fiscal years must be filed with the State Controller's Office and postmarked by July 28, 1997. If the reimbursement claim is filed after the deadline of July 28, 1997, the approved claim must be reduced by a late penalty of 10%, not to exceed \$1,000. Claims filed more than one year after the deadline will not be accepted.

Estimated claims for costs to be incurred during the 1996/97 fiscal year must be filed with the State Controller's Office and postmarked by July 28, 1997. Timely filed estimated claims are paid before late claims. If a payment is received for the estimated claim, a 1996/97 reimbursement claim must be filed by November 30, 1997.

B. Annually Thereafter

Refer to the item, "Reimbursable State Mandated Cost Programs", contained in the annual cover letter for mandated cost programs issued annually in September, which identifies the fiscal years for which claims may be filed. If an "x" is shown for the program listed under "19__/19__ Reimbursement Claim", and/or "19__/19__ Estimated Claim", claims may be filed as follows:

An estimated claim must be filed with the State Controller's Office and postmarked by November 30 of the fiscal year in which costs are to be incurred. Timely filed estimated claims will be paid before late claims.

After having received payment for an estimated claim, the claimant must file a reimbursement claim by November 30 of the following fiscal year. If the district fails to file a reimbursement claim, monies received must be returned to the State. If no estimated claim was filed, the agency may file a reimbursement claim detailing the actual costs incurred for the fiscal year, provided there was an appropriation for the program for that fiscal year. For information regarding appropriations for reimbursement claims, refer to the "Appropriation for State Mandated Cost Programs", in the previous fiscal year's annual claiming instructions.

A reimbursement claim detailing the actual costs must be filed with the State Controller's Office and postmarked by November 30 following the fiscal year in which costs were incurred. If the claim is filed after the deadline but by November 30 of the succeeding fiscal year, the approved claim must be reduced by a late penalty of 10%, not to exceed \$1,000. Claims filed more than one year after the deadline will not be accepted.

6. Reimbursable Components

Eligible claimants will be reimbursed for the direct and indirect cost of labor, supplies, and services incurred for the following mandated activities:

A. Identifying Pupils

Identifying pupils from records received from law enforcement agencies or otherwise maintained in the ordinary course of business, who have during the past three years engaged in or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in acts described in any subdivision, except (h) of § 48900.

B. Information Maintenance

Maintaining the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years, and a one-time cost for adopting a cost effective method of assembling and disseminating the information to teachers.

C. Notifying Teachers

Notifying teachers on a regular and timely basis of the pupils whose behavior makes them subject to suspension and expulsion and maintaining the confidentiality of the dissemination of this information.

7. Reimbursement Limitations

Any offsetting savings or reimbursement the claimant received from any source (e.g. service fees collected, federal funds, other state funds, etc.) as a result of this mandate shall be identified and deducted so only net local costs are claimed.

8. Claiming Forms and Instructions

The diagram "Illustration of Claim Forms" provides a graphical presentation of forms required to be filed with a claim. A claimant may submit a computer generated report in substitution for forms NTT-1 and NTT-2 provided the format of the report and data fields contained within the report are identical to the claim forms included in these instructions. The claim forms provided with these instructions should be duplicated and used by the claimant to file estimated or reimbursement claims. The State Controller's Office will revise the manual and claim forms as necessary. In such instances, new replacement forms will be mailed to claimants.

A. Form NTT-2, Component/Activity Cost Detail

This form is used to segregate the detailed costs by claim component. A separate form NTT-2 must be completed for each cost component being claimed. Costs reported on this form must be supported as follows:

1) Salaries and Benefits

Identify the employee(s), and/or show the classification of the employee(s) involved. Describe the mandated functions performed and specify the actual time devoted to each function by each employee, the productive hourly rates and related fringe benefits.

Source documents required to be maintained by the claimant may include, but are not limited to, employee time records that show the employee's actual time spent on this mandate.

2) Materials and Supplies

Only expenditures that can be identified as a direct cost of this mandate may be claimed. List the cost of materials consumed or expended specifically for the purpose of this mandate.

Source documents required to be maintained by the claimant may include, but are not limited to, invoices, receipts, purchase orders and other documents evidencing the validity of the expenditures.

3) Contracted Services

Contracting costs are reimbursable to the extent that the function to be performed requires special skill or knowledge that is not readily available from the claimant's staff or the service to be provided by the contractor is cost effective. Use of contract services must be justified by the claimant. Give the name(s) of contractor(s) who performed the service(s). Describe the activities performed by each named contractor, actual time spent on this mandate, inclusive dates when services were performed, and itemize all costs for services performed. Attach consultant invoices with the claim.

Source documents required to be maintained by the claimant may include, but are not limited to, contracts, invoices, and other documents evidencing the validity of the expenditures.

For audit purposes, all supporting documents must be retained for a period of two years after the end of the calendar year in which the reimbursement claim was filed or last amended, whichever is later. Such documents shall be made available to the State Controller's Office on request.

B. Form NTT-1, Claim Summary

This form is used to summarize direct costs by claim component and compute allowable indirect costs for the mandate. Claim statistics shall identify the work performed for costs claimed. The claimant must give the number of pupils identified for each year, the average daily attendance for each year, the number of times teachers were notified in the fiscal year.

School districts and local offices of education may compute the amount of indirect costs utilizing the State Department of Education's Annual Program Cost Data Report J-380 or J-580 rate, as applicable. The cost data on this form are carried forward to Form FAM-27.

C. Form FAM-27, Claim for Payment

Form FAM-27 contains a certification that must be signed by an authorized representative of the district. All applicable information that from form NTT-1 must be carried forward to this form for the State Controller's Office to process the claim for payment.

CLAIM FOR PAYMENT Pursuant to Government Code Section 17561 NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION	For State Controller Use Only (19) Program Number 00150 (20) Date Filed ____/____/____ (21) LRS Input ____/____/____	Program 150
---	---	-----------------------

L A B E L H E R E	(01) Claimant Identification Number		Reimbursement Claim Data	
	(02) Claimant Name		(22) NTT-1, (03)(a)	
	County of Location		(23) NTT-1, (03)(b)	
	Street Address or P.O. Box		(24) NTT-1, (03)(e)	
	City State Zip Code		(25) NTT-1, (04)(1)(d)	

Type of Claim	Estimated Claim	Reimbursement Claim	
	(03) Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>	(09) Reimbursement <input type="checkbox"/>	(26) NTT-1, (04)(2)(d)
	(04) Combined <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) Combined <input type="checkbox"/>	(27) NTT-1, (04)(3)(d)
	(05) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(28) NTT-1, (06)
			(29) NTT-1, (07)
Fiscal Year of Cost	(06) 20__/20__	(12) 20__/20__	(30) NTT-1, (09)
Total Claimed Amount	(07)	(13)	(31) NTT-1, (10)
Less: 10% Late Penalty, not to exceed \$1,000		(14)	(32)
Less: Prior Claim Payment Received		(15)	(33)
Net Claimed Amount		(16)	(34)
Due from State	(08)	(17)	(35)
Due to State		(18)	(36)

(37) CERTIFICATION OF CLAIM

In accordance with the provisions of Government Code Section 17561, I certify that I am the officer authorized by the school district to file mandated cost claims with the State of California for this program, and certify under penalty of perjury that I have not violated any of the provisions of Government Code Sections 1090 to 1098, inclusive.

I further certify that there was no application other than from the claimant, nor any grant or payment received, for reimbursement of costs claimed herein, and such costs are for a new program or increased level of services of an existing program. All offsetting savings and reimbursements set forth in the Parameters and Guidelines are identified, and all costs claimed are supported by source documentation currently maintained by the claimant.

The amounts for this Estimated Claim and/or Reimbursement Claim are hereby claimed from the State for payment of estimated and/or actual costs set forth on the attached statements. I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature of Authorized Officer _____ Date _____

Type or Print Name _____ Title _____

(38) Name of Contact Person for Claim _____ Telephone Number () - _____ Ext. _____

E-Mail Address _____

Program 150	NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION Certification Claim Form Instructions	FORM FAM-27
-----------------------	---	---------------------------------

- (01) Enter the payee number assigned by the State Controller's Office.
- (02) Enter your Official Name, County of Location, Street or P. O. Box address, City, State, and Zip Code.
- (03) If filing an estimated claim, enter an "X" in the box on line (03) Estimated.
- (04) If filing a combined estimated claim on behalf of districts within the county, enter an "X" in the box on line (04) Combined.
- (05) If filing an amended estimated claim, enter an "X" in the box on line (05) Amended.
- (06) Enter the fiscal year in which costs are to be incurred.
- (07) Enter the amount of the estimated claim. If the estimate exceeds the previous year's actual costs by more than 10%, complete form NTT-1 and enter the amount from line (11).
- (08) Enter the same amount as shown on line (07).
- (09) If filing a reimbursement claim, enter an "X" in the box on line (09) Reimbursement.
- (10) If filing a combined reimbursement claim on behalf of districts within the county, enter an "X" in the box on line (10) Combined.
- (11) If filing an amended reimbursement claim, enter an "X" in the box on line (11) Amended.
- (12) Enter the fiscal year for which actual costs are being claimed. If actual costs for more than one fiscal year are being claimed, complete a separate form FAM-27 for each fiscal year.
- (13) Enter the amount of the reimbursement claim from form NTT-1, line (11). The total claimed amount must exceed \$1,000.
- (14) Reimbursement claims must be filed by January 15 of the following fiscal year in which costs are incurred or the claims shall be reduced by a late penalty. Enter zero if the claim was timely filed, otherwise, enter the product of multiplying line (13) by the factor 0.10 (10% penalty), not to exceed \$1,000.
- (15) If filing a reimbursement claim or a claim was previously filed for the same fiscal year, enter the amount received for the claim. Otherwise, enter a zero.
- (16) Enter the result of subtracting line (14) and line (15) from line (13).
- (17) If line (16), Net Claimed Amount, is positive, enter that amount on line (17), Due from State.
- (18) If line (16), Net Claimed Amount, is negative, enter that amount on line (18), Due to State.
- (19) to (21) Leave blank.
- (22) to (36) Reimbursement Claim Data. Bring forward the cost information as specified on the left-hand column of lines (22) through (36) for the reimbursement claim, e.g., NTT-1, (03)(a), means the information is located on form NTT-1, block (03), line (a). Enter the information on the same line but in the right-hand column. Cost information should be rounded to the nearest dollar, i.e., no cents. Indirect costs percentage should be shown as a whole number and without the percent symbol, i.e., 7.548% should be shown as 8. **Completion of this data block will expedite the payment process.**
- (37) Read the statement "Certification of Claim." If it is true, the claim must be dated, signed by the agency's authorized officer, and must include the person's name and title, typed or printed. **Claims cannot be paid unless accompanied by an original signed certification. (To expedite the payment process, please sign the form FAM-27 with blue ink, and attach a copy of the form FAM-27 to the top of the claim package.)**
- (38) Enter the name, telephone number, and e-mail address of the person to contact if additional information is required.

SUBMIT A SIGNED ORIGINAL, AND A COPY OF FORM FAM-27, WITH ALL OTHER FORMS AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS TO:

Address, if delivered by U.S. Postal Service:

OFFICE OF THE STATE CONTROLLER
 ATTN: Local Reimbursements Section
 Division of Accounting and Reporting
 P.O. Box 942850
 Sacramento, CA 94250

Address, if delivered by other delivery service:

OFFICE OF THE STATE CONTROLLER
 ATTN: Local Reimbursements Section
 Division of Accounting and Reporting
 3301 C Street, Suite 500
 Sacramento, CA 95816

Program 150	MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION CLAIM SUMMARY	FORM NTT-1	
(01) Claimant		(02) Type of Claim Reimbursement <input type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Fiscal Year 20__/20__	
Claim Statistics			
(03) (a) Number of pupils identified for the fiscal year (Refer to instructions)			
(b) Average daily attendance for the fiscal year			
(c) Number of times teachers were notified in the fiscal year (Refer to instructions)			
Direct Costs	Object Accounts		
(04) Reimbursable Components	(a)	(b)	(c)
	Salaries and Benefits	Materials and Supplies	Contracted Services
	(d)		
	Total		
1. Identifying Pupils			
2. Information Maintenance			
3. Notifying Teachers			
(05) Total Direct Costs			
Indirect Costs			
(06) Indirect Cost Rate	[From J-380 or J-580]		%
(07) Total Indirect Costs	[Line (05)(a) x line (06)]		
(08) Total Direct and Indirect Costs	[Line (05)(d) + line (07)]		
Cost Reduction			
(09) Less: Offsetting Savings			
(10) Less: Other Reimbursements			
(11) Total Claimed Amount	[Line (08) - (line (09) + line (10))]		

	NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION CLAIM SUMMARY INSTRUCTIONS	FORM NTT-1
---	---	-----------------------

- (01) Enter the name of the claimant.
- (02) Type of Claim. Check a box, Reimbursement or Estimated, to identify the type of claim being filed. Enter the fiscal year of costs. Form NTT-1 must be filed for a reimbursement claim. Do not complete form NTT-1 if you are filing an estimated claim and the estimate does not exceed the previous fiscal year's actual costs by 10%, do not complete form NTT-1. Simply enter the amount of the estimated claim on form FAM-27, line (07), Estimated. However, if the estimated claim exceeds the previous fiscal year's actual costs by more than 10%, form NTT-1 must be completed and a statement attached explaining the increased costs. Without this information the estimated claim will automatically be reduced to 110% of the previous fiscal year's actual costs.
- (03)
- (a) Enter the number of pupils for whom information is being maintained for the fiscal year. For the period 7/1/93 to 12/31/93, report only the number of students who have attempted to cause bodily injury or injury to another person. After 1/1/94, report the number of students who have engaged in offenses listed in Education Code § 48900, except subdivision (h).
- (b) Enter the average daily attendance for the fiscal year.
- (c) Enter the number of times during the fiscal year in which teachers were notified of students described in Education Code § 49079 (e.g., quarterly, each semester, or annually).
- (04) Reimbursable Components. For each reimbursable component, enter the totals from form NTT-2, line (05) columns (d), (e) and (f) to form NTT-1, block (04) columns (a), (b) and (c) in the appropriate row. Total each row.
- (05) Total Direct Costs. Total columns (a) through (d).
- (06) Indirect Cost Rate. Enter the indirect cost rate from the Department of Education form J-380 or J-580, as applicable, for the fiscal year of costs.
- (07) Total Indirect Costs. Enter the result of multiplying Total Salaries and Benefits, line (05)(a), by the Indirect Cost Rate, line (06).
- (08) Total Direct and Indirect Costs. Enter the sum of Total Direct Costs, line (05)(d) and Total indirect Costs line (07)
- (09) Less: Offsetting Savings, if applicable. Enter the total savings experienced by the claimant as direct result of this mandate. Submit a detail schedule of savings with the claim.
- (10) Less: Other Reimbursements. If applicable, enter the amount of other reimbursements received from any source, (i.e., service fees collected, federal funds, and other state funds, etc.) which reimbursed any portion of the mandated cost program. Submit a schedule detailing the reimbursement sources and amounts.
- (11) Total Claimed Amount. Subtract the sum of Offsetting Savings, line (09), and Other Reimbursements, line (10), from Total Direct and Indirect Costs, line (08). Enter the remainder on this line and carry the amount forward to form FAM-27, line (07) for the Estimated Claim or line (13) for the Reimbursement Claim.

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
---	--

(01) Claimant	(02) Fiscal Year Costs Were Incurred
---------------	--------------------------------------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check **only** one box per form to identify the component being claimed.

Identifying Pupils

Information Maintenance

Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services

(05) Total <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/>	Subtotal <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/>	Page: _____ of _____
--	--	----------------------

NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL Instructions	FORM NTT-2
---	--

- (01) Enter the name of the claimant.
- (02) Enter the fiscal year for which costs were incurred.
- (03) Reimbursable Components. Check the box which indicates the cost component being claimed. Check only one box per form. A separate form NTT-2 shall be prepared for each component which applies.
- (04) Description of Expenses. The following table identifies the type of information required to support reimbursable costs. To detail costs for the component activity box "checked" in block (03), enter the employee names, position titles, a brief description of their activities performed, actual time spent by each employee, productive hourly rates, fringe benefits, supplies used, contracted services, etc. Describe the method used for assembling and disseminating information to teachers and for information maintenance. **The descriptions required in column (4)(a) must be of sufficient detail to explain the cost of activities or items being claimed. If the descriptions are incomplete, the claim cannot be processed for payment.** For audit purposes, all supporting documents must be retained by the claimant for a period of not less than two years after the end of the calendar year in which the reimbursement claim was filed or last amended, whichever is later. Such documents shall be made available to the State Controller's Office on request.

Object/ Subobject Accounts	Columns						Submit these supporting documents with the claim
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	
Salaries	Employee Name	Hourly Rate	Hours Worked	Salaries = Hourly Rate x Hours Worked			
Benefits	Title Activities Performed	Benefit Rate		Benefits = Benefit Rate x Salaries			
Materials and Supplies	Description of Supplies Used	Unit Cost	Quantity Used		Cost = Unit Cost x Quantity Consumed		
Contracted Services	Name of Contractor Specific Tasks Performed	Hourly Rate	Hours Worked Inclusive Dates of Service			Itemized Cost of Services Performed	Invoice

- (05) Total line (04), columns (d), (e), and (f) and enter the sum on this line. Check the appropriate box to indicate if the amount is a total or subtotal. If more than one form is needed for the component/activity, number each page. Enter totals from line (05), columns (d), (e), and (f) to form NTT-1, block (04) columns (a), (b), and (c) in the appropriate row.

EXHIBIT F



STEVE WESTLY
 California State Controller
 Division of Accounting and Reporting
 JULY 21, 2005

S37165
 00150
 2005/07/21

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
 SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCH DIST
 SAN DIEGO COUNTY
 4100 NORMAL STREET ROOM 3159
 SAN DIEGO CA 92103

DEAR CLAIMANT:

RE: NOTICE TO TEACH SUS CH 1306/89

WE HAVE REVIEWED YOUR 2001/2002 FISCAL YEAR REIMBURSEMENT CLAIM FOR THE MANDATED COST PROGRAM REFERENCED ABOVE. THE RESULTS OF OUR REVIEW ARE AS FOLLOWS:

AMOUNT CLAIMED	406,224.00
----------------	------------

ADJUSTMENT TO CLAIM:

FIELD AUDIT FINDINGS	-	166,791.00
----------------------	---	------------

TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS	-	<u>166,791.00</u>
-------------------	---	-------------------

LESS PRIOR PAYMENT: SCHEDULE NO. MA13311E PAID 02-22-2002	<u>178,217.00</u>
--	-------------------

AMOUNT DUE CLAIMANT	<u>\$ 61,216.00</u> =====
---------------------	------------------------------

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, PLEASE CONTACT KIM NGUYEN AT (916) 324-7876 OR IN WRITING AT THE STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE, DIVISION OF ACCOUNTING AND REPORTING, P.O. BOX 942850, SACRAMENTO, CA 94250-5875. DUE TO INSUFFICIENT APPROPRIATION, THE BALANCE DUE WILL BE FORTHCOMING WHEN ADDITIONAL FUNDS ARE MADE AVAILABLE.

SINCERELY,

Ginny Brummels
 GINNY BRUMMELS, MANAGER

EXHIBIT G

CLAIM FOR PAYMENT Pursuant to Government Code Section 17561 NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION	(19) Program Number 00150 (20) Date File ___/___/___ (21) LRS Input ___/___/___	PROGRAM 150
---	---	-----------------------

(01) Claimant Identification Number: S37165 (02) San Diego Unified School District San Diego County 4100 Normal Street San Diego California 92103	Reimbursement Claim Data (22) NTT-1, (03)(a) 12,935 (23) NTT-1, (03)(b) 124,373 (24) NTT-1, (03)(c) Daily (25) NTT-1, (04)(1)(d) 250,900
---	---

Type of Claim	Estimated Claim	Reimbursement Claim			
	(03) Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(09) Reimbursement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(26) NTT-1, (04)(2)(d)		88,573
	(04) Combined <input type="checkbox"/>	(10) Combined <input type="checkbox"/>	(27) NTT-1, (04)(3)(d)		65,889
	(05) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(11) Amended <input type="checkbox"/>	(28) NTT-1, (06)		2
			(29) NTT-1, (07)		9,323
Fiscal Year of Cost	(06) 2003/2004	(12) 2002/2003	(30) NTT-1, (09)		0
Total Claimed Amount	(07) \$ 425,000	(13) \$ 414,685	(31) NTT-1, (10)		0
Less: 10% Late Penalty, not to exceed \$1000		(14)	(32)		
Less: Prior Claim Payment Received		(15)	(33)		
Net Claimed Amount		(16) \$ 414,685	(34)		
Due from State	(08) \$ 425,000	(17) \$ 414,685	(35)		
Due to State		(18)	(36)		

(37) CERTIFICATION OF CLAIM

In accordance with the provisions of Government Code Section 17561, I certify that I am the officer authorized by the school district to file mandated cost claims with the State of California for this program, and certify under penalty of perjury that I have not violated any of the provisions of Government Code Sections 1090 to 1098, inclusive.

I further certify that there was no application other than from the claimant, nor any grant or payment received, for reimbursement of costs claimed herein; and such costs are for a new program or increased level of services of an existing program. All offsetting savings and reimbursements set forth in the Parameters and Guidelines are identified, and all costs claimed are supported by source documentation currently maintained by the claimant.


The amounts for this Estimated Claim and/or Reimbursement Claim are hereby claimed from the State for payment of estimated and/or actual costs set forth on the attached statements. I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

 Scott Patterson Type or Print Name	12/22/03 Chief Financial Officer Title
(39) Name of Contact Person for Claim Camille Y. Hom	Telephone Number (619) 725-7566 E-mail Address chom1@sandi.net

Project 150	MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION CLAIM SUMMARY	FORM NTT-1
-----------------------	---	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Type of Claim: Reimbursement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimated <input type="checkbox"/>	Fiscal Year 2002/2003
---	--	--------------------------

Claim Statistics	
(03) (a) Number of pupils identified for the fiscal year (Refer to instructions)	12,935
(b) Average daily attendance for the fiscal year	124,373
(c) Number of times teachers were notified in the fiscal year (Refer to instructions)	Daily



Direct Costs	Object Accounts			
(04) Reimbursable Components:	(a) Salaries and Benefits	(b) Materials and Supplies	(c) Contracted Services	(d) Total
Identifying Pupils	\$ 250,900.21			\$ 250,900.21
2. Information Maintenance	\$ 88,572.74			\$ 88,572.74
3. Notifying Teachers	\$ 65,888.91			\$ 65,888.91
(05) Total Direct Cost	\$ 405,361.86			\$ 405,361.86

Indirect Costs	
(06) Indirect Cost Rate	[From J-380 or J-580] 2.30%
(07) Total Indirect Costs	[Line (05)(a) x line (06)] \$ 9,323.32
(08) Total Direct and Indirect Costs	[Line (05)(d) + line (07)] \$ 414,685.18

Cost Reduction	
(09) Less: Offsetting Savings	0
(10) Less: Other Reimbursements	0
(11) Total Claimed Amount:	[Line (08) - (Line (09) + Line (10))] \$ 414,685.18

Revised 09/03

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Identifying pupils who have engaged in or are reasonably suspected of engaging in acts described in any subdivision, except (h), of Ed. Code 48900 from records from law enforcement agencies or otherwise maintained in the ordinary course of business.					
ALANIS, ROSA/Secretary	\$ 28.69	3.50	\$ 100.42		
ALCANTAR, CESAR/Vice Principal	\$ 65.64	61.60	\$ 4,043.42		
ALTOMARE, PETER/Vice Principal	\$ 65.64	137.36	\$ 9,016.31		
ALVAREZ, ANA/Vice Principal	\$ 59.91	19.50	\$ 1,168.25		
ANDREWS, VIRGINIA/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	21.00	\$ 1,109.64		
ANKERS, LETICIA/Administrative Assistant	\$ 35.20	0.75	\$ 26.40		
ANKERS, LETICIA/Secretary	\$ 20.85	2.00	\$ 41.70		
APPLEMAN, SHELAGH/Vice Principal	\$ 62.69	2.80	\$ 175.53		
BACA, LAURA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 19.70	13.42	\$ 264.37		
BAILEY, J/Vice Principal	\$ 48.26	12.00	\$ 579.12		
BAIN MURPHY, TYRA/Counselor	\$ 33.92	4.00	\$ 135.68		
BALLINGER, DAVID/Teacher	\$ 47.52	1.50	\$ 71.28		
BARNES, LESLIE/Principal	\$ 62.27	2.80	\$ 174.36		
BELKNAP, MARY/Counselor	\$ 41.13	6.50	\$ 267.35		
BENECCHI, MICHAEL/Counselor	\$ 29.49	2.09	\$ 61.63		
BERAUD, MICHAEL/Principal	\$ 62.27	14.40	\$ 896.69		
BERMAN, JO/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	24.00	\$ 1,541.04		
BLACKMAN, KRISTIN/Counselor	\$ 37.46	0.50	\$ 18.73		
BLACKMAN, SANDRA/Principal	\$ 65.18	7.60	\$ 495.37		
BLAIR, LESLIE/School Clerk	\$ 24.98	9.00	\$ 224.82		
BLUMENSHEIN, STEPHAN/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	94.40	\$ 6,061.42		

(05) Total	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 1 of 9	\$ 26,473.53	
------------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------------	--------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
BRADY, ANNETTE/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	18.00	\$ 951.12		
BRANDI, BARBARA/Secretary	\$ 23.06	31.00	\$ 714.86		
BRAUN, DAVID/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	27.00	\$ 1,733.67		
BUSBY, E/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	48.40	\$ 3,253.45		
BUSTAMANTE, RUTH/School Assistant	\$ 22.81	2.25	\$ 51.32		
BUSTANI, TAVGA/Vice Principal	\$ 42.93	5.20	\$ 223.24		
BUTLER, CARLA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 22.22	109.50	\$ 2,433.09		
CAHILL, DENISE/Guidance Assistant	\$ 10.99	3.75	\$ 41.21		
CARLIN, DONNA/Attendance Assistant	\$ 23.15	4.67	\$ 108.11		
CARRILLO, CECILIA/Principal	\$ 66.63	1.25	\$ 83.29		
CASEY, KATHLEEN/Principal	\$ 67.22	17.00	\$ 1,142.74		
CASHMAN, CHRISTINE/Principal	\$ 56.85	5.00	\$ 284.25		
CASTILLO-DUVALL, ELIZABETH/Res. Tchr.	\$ 44.83	1.67	\$ 74.87		
CHAPPELL, LOIS/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	27.50	\$ 1,848.55		
COFFEY, DOUGLAS/Vice Principal	\$ 56.62	188.50	\$ 10,672.87		
COLANDREA, RICHARD/Counselor	\$ 31.01	40.00	\$ 1,240.40		
COLLINS, COURTNEE/Teacher	\$ 41.41	0.67	\$ 27.74		
CONAWAY, COLLEEN/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	17.50	\$ 967.75		
CONNER, BEVERLEY/Attendance Assistant	\$ 18.94	4.00	\$ 75.76		
CONTRERAS, JOE/Attendance Assistant	\$ 23.15	38.00	\$ 879.70		
COODY, KIMBERLY/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	109.20	\$ 7,340.42		
CRAWFORD, CHARLES/Counselor	\$ 56.30	1.67	\$ 94.02		
CURTIS, JAMES/Vice Principal	\$ 62.69	38.40	\$ 2,407.30		

(05) Total	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 2 of 9	\$ 36,649.73	
------------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------------	--------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
DALAL, ANISHA/Vice Principal	\$ 42.93	50.80	\$ 2,180.84		
DALE, TIMOTHY/Vice Principal	\$ 52.01	3.60	\$ 187.24		
DALTON, TERESA/Teacher	\$ 35.56	17.59	\$ 625.50		
DAVIS, JANE/Principal	\$ 66.63	2.00	\$ 133.26		
DAVIS, YVETTE/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	148.20	\$ 9,962.00		
DECK, PATRICIA/School Clerk	\$ 24.77	2.08	\$ 51.52		
DEERING, ANNETTE/Attendance Assistant	\$ 18.94	26.00	\$ 492.44		
DELEON, ELSITA/School Clerk	\$ 20.43	17.00	\$ 347.31		
DERWAE, E./Principal	\$ 65.18	2.00	\$ 130.36		
DEVOE, SYLVIA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	5.83	\$ 134.96		
DIAZ, ALMA/School Clerk	\$ 23.97	5.25	\$ 125.84		
DIME, ROBIN/Vice Principal	\$ 61.21	24.40	\$ 1,493.52		
DOWLEN, NANCY/School Clerk	\$ 26.95	16.84	\$ 453.84		
DYSON JR, LLOYD/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	35.00	\$ 2,352.70		
EARLSTON, LINDA/Secretary	\$ 25.31	1.12	\$ 28.35		
ECKLES, GAIL/School Assistant	\$ 22.07	1.75	\$ 38.62		
ENGBLOM, MOLLY/Counselor	\$ 36.82	0.50	\$ 18.41		
ESTILL, MARY/Principal	\$ 65.18	3.20	\$ 208.58		
ESTRADA, ALMA/Vice Principal	\$ 54.11	28.80	\$ 1,558.37		
ESTRADA, EDUARDO/Counselor	\$ 28.64	5.24	\$ 150.07		
EVERETT, JOHN/Community Serv. Off.	\$ 25.28	4.00	\$ 101.12		
FOSTER, SHELLEY/Teacher	\$ 40.02	0.33	\$ 13.21		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 3 of 9		\$ 20,788.06		

**MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL**

**FORM
NTT-2**

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District

(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:

2002/2003

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

- 1. Identifying Pupils
- 2. Information Maintenance
- 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).

Object Accounts

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
FREEMAN, KEITH/Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.94	19.00	\$ 359.86		
GALLARDO, ROBERT/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	8.25	\$ 456.23		
GARDNER, LAURA/School Clerk	\$ 22.34	15.66	\$ 349.84		
GARZA, ADOLFO/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	38.50	\$ 2,129.05		
GENNARO, STEVEN/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	100.00	\$ 6,421.00		
GEORGE, MICHAEL/Vice Principal	\$ 56.62	148.40	\$ 8,402.41		
GIBSON, GAIL/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	8.73	\$ 202.10		
GILWEE, HARRIET/Principal	\$ 65.18	7.60	\$ 495.37		
GINGERY, TRUDY/Secretary	\$ 29.34	5.50	\$ 161.37		
GONZALEZ, NIDIA/Counselor	\$ 33.08	31.50	\$ 1,042.02		
GONZALEZ, SYLVIA/Principal	\$ 72.79	2.25	\$ 163.78		
GRAY, PATRICIA/School Clerk	\$ 23.77	64.66	\$ 1,536.97		
GREENFELD, SALLY/Vice Principal	\$ 54.11	4.00	\$ 216.44		
GRIMES, MARILYN/Vice Principal	\$ 62.69	12.00	\$ 752.28		
GUTIERREZ, FRANCES/Vice Principal	\$ 46.97	24.25	\$ 1,139.02		
HALFPENNY, RUTH/Counselor	\$ 37.57	6.00	\$ 225.42		
HAMMOND-WILLIAMS, AMANDA/Principal	\$ 62.27	33.00	\$ 2,054.91		
HERNANDEZ, JOSEPH/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	4.00	\$ 256.84		
HERNANDEZ, SERGIO/Counselor	\$ 45.31	13.00	\$ 589.03		
HILGERS, FREDERICK/Vice Principal	\$ 48.62	85.60	\$ 4,161.87		
HILLIER, SCOTT/Vice Principal	\$ 61.21	115.60	\$ 7,075.88		
HUNT, MARLENE/Teacher	\$ 33.08	0.50	\$ 16.54		
IGLESIAS, MARILYN/Counselor	\$ 37.46	4.91	\$ 183.93		

(05) Total Subtotal

Page 4 of 9

\$38,392.16

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
IZU, SUSAN/Principal	\$ 65.18	4.00	\$ 260.72		
JAI ME, TERESA/Vice Principal	\$ 45.99	4.33	\$ 199.14		
JEFFERS, MELISSA/Vice Principal	\$ 58.39	13.00	\$ 759.07		
JIMENEZ, JAMES/Vice Principal	\$ 46.25	14.50	\$ 670.63		
JOHNSON, JOHN/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	60.00	\$ 4,033.20		
JUAREZ, CHRISTOPHER/Vice Principal	\$ 48.62	8.00	\$ 388.96		
KARPOWICH, LINDA/Principal	\$ 65.18	2.00	\$ 130.36		
KEIFETZ, SHEILA/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	106.00	\$ 7,125.32		
KELLY, MELINDA/Teacher	\$ 34.87	0.50	\$ 17.44		
KERR, PATRICIA/Counselor	\$ 53.65	10.50	\$ 563.33		
KING, CAROLINE/Vice Principal	\$ 47.46	30.40	\$ 1,442.78		
LAINE, WILLIAM/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	47.20	\$ 3,030.71		
LASWELL, ROBIN/Counselor	\$ 26.52	32.50	\$ 861.90		
LEON-MAAS, THERON/Counselor	\$ 53.65	13.13	\$ 704.42		
LEWIS, YOLANDA/Vice Principal	\$ 46.97	6.00	\$ 281.82		
LOCHTEFELD, KIMIE/Principal	\$ 54.28	2.00	\$ 108.56		
LONGO, MARY JO/Principal	\$ 63.76	7.50	\$ 478.20		
MADDEN, JEAN/Principal	\$ 60.91	17.00	\$ 1,035.47		
MALONE, SANDRA/School Assistant	\$ 16.22	2.00	\$ 32.44		
MARTIN JR, MILTON/Vice Principal	\$ 39.38	13.60	\$ 535.57		
MASON, EMMA/Principal	\$ 66.63	4.80	\$ 319.82		
MCCLURE-LOTT, DIANE/Teacher	\$ 57.66	37.25	\$ 2,147.84		
MCDADE, JONATHAN/Vice Principal	\$ 49.63	8.80	\$ 436.74		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 5 of 9		\$ 25,564.44		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
MCFEE, LINDA/School Clerk	\$ 21.26	1.17	\$ 24.87		
MCGEE, STEPHEN/Counselor	\$ 45.31	2.75	\$ 124.60		
MCGEE-BOLDEN, GLENDA/Secretary	\$ 23.48	0.91	\$ 21.37		
MCMILLAN, LILLIE/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	1.00	\$ 55.30		
MEDINA, DIANA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.57	31.00	\$ 575.67		
MELEO, KRISTINA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 15.91	2.25	\$ 35.80		
MENDEZ, JOVITA/School Assistant	\$ 19.70	0.83	\$ 16.35		
MERCIER, RITA/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	71.00	\$ 3,926.30		
MIHALKA, BRIAN/Vice Principal	\$ 61.21	104.00	\$ 6,365.84		
MITCHELL RICKS, DIANETTE/Principal	\$ 70.14	16.00	\$ 1,122.24		
MORAN, SHEELAGH/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	5.50	\$ 353.16		
MORGENSTEIN, ROBERT/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	2.00	\$ 128.42		
MORRIS, MICHELLE/Counselor	\$ 28.17	6.75	\$ 190.15		
MORRIS, VINCENT/Vice Principal	\$ 55.64	36.40	\$ 2,025.30		
MRACHEK, REBECCA/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	54.80	\$ 3,518.71		
MUNOZ, VIOLA/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	23.20	\$ 1,225.89		
NYDAM, JULIE/Vice Principal	\$ 59.91	76.50	\$ 4,583.12		
OCHS, GINA/Attendance Assistant	\$ 20.08	2.00	\$ 40.16		
OLIVERO, JEFF/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	106.92	\$ 7,187.16		
OMAHONEY, M/School Clerk	\$ 24.77	2.00	\$ 49.54		
ORTIZ, TANIA/School Clerk	\$ 18.87	21.50	\$ 405.71		
PACIS, DINA/Vice Principal	\$ 58.39	12.50	\$ 729.88		
PARRA, RAQUEL/Counselor	\$ 38.77	2.00	\$ 77.54		

(05) Total	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 6 of 9	\$32,783.08	
------------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------------	-------------	--

**MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL**

**FORM
NTT-2**

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

- 1. Identifying Pupils
- 2. Information Maintenance
- 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).

Object Accounts

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
PENFOLD, DEBORAH/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	14.60	\$ 937.47		
PENN, MARILYN/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	2.00	\$ 105.68		
PETERSEN, VICTORIA/Vice Principal	\$ 54.11	2.00	\$ 108.22		
PICKETT, JOLIE/Principal	\$ 64.65	83.60	\$ 5,404.74		
PIPER, ELIZABETH/School Clerk	\$ 19.17	9.41	\$ 180.39		
PORTER, SUSAN/School Clerk	\$ 27.18	1.00	\$ 27.18		
PRISE, SUSAN/Counselor	\$ 31.10	7.33	\$ 227.96		
RAMIREZ, ALYSON/Counselor	\$ 27.33	23.50	\$ 642.26		
RAPP-MCCREARY, JESSICA/Principal	\$ 58.07	4.80	\$ 278.74		
RAWLINGS, CLAUDETTE/Counselor	\$ 47.52	32.26	\$ 1,533.00		
REMILLARD, BRYAN/Vice Principal	\$ 59.91	114.80	\$ 6,877.67		
REYES, KARINA/Vice Principal	\$ 65.64	129.90	\$ 8,526.64		
RICHMOND, ALAN/Principal	\$ 65.18	6.40	\$ 417.15		
RICHMOND, JEAN/Principal	\$ 65.18	4.00	\$ 260.72		
RIOS, ARNOLD/Counselor	\$ 36.56	75.00	\$ 2,742.00		
ROBINSON, DANA/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	36.80	\$ 2,473.70		
ROMO, JUAN/Vice Principal	\$ 56.62	5.33	\$ 301.78		
ROWAN, RENBE/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	220.50	\$ 14,822.01		
ROWLEY, LINDA/School Clerk	\$ 26.95	8.25	\$ 222.34		
ROY, GREGORY/Teacher	\$ 35.85	1.00	\$ 35.85		
RUCKER, ELVIA/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	16.80	\$ 929.04		
RYAN, DIANE/Principal	\$ 66.59	38.40	\$ 2,557.06		
RYAN, LYNN/Vice Principal	\$ 42.93	6.40	\$ 274.75		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Page 7 of 9	\$ 49,886.35		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
SAMOLES, KAREN/Secretary	\$ 29.60	4.76	\$ 140.90		
SANCHEZ, ELIZABETH/Guidance Assistant	\$ 20.08	2.50	\$ 50.20		
SANTOS, ANTHONY/Comm. Serv. Officer	\$ 29.58	5.83	\$ 172.45		
SANTOS, FRANCISCO/Counselor	\$ 35.85	6.50	\$ 233.03		
SARDINA, TERESA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	11.17	\$ 258.59		
SEXTON, JUDITH/School Clerk	\$ 23.09	18.24	\$ 421.16		
SILVA, PAMELA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	38.50	\$ 891.28		
SLOAN, ELIZABETH/Vice Principal	\$ 59.91	241.00	\$ 14,438.31		
SMITH-RIOS, CHRISTINA/School Clerk	\$ 25.83	4.50	\$ 116.24		
TAGGART, LINDA/Principal	\$ 63.76	6.00	\$ 382.56		
THOMAS, SHANNA/Teacher	\$ 47.52	20.00	\$ 950.40		
TOYOHARA, KAREN/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	6.40	\$ 338.18		
TRAKAS, ANDY/Vice Principal	\$ 48.62	11.25	\$ 546.98		
TROMBLEY, MARY/School Clerk	\$ 25.83	3.66	\$ 94.54		
VIDANA-CROSS, MARTHA/Vice Principal	\$ 51.62	3.83	\$ 197.70		
VIENNA, KATHLEEN/Counselor	\$ 47.31	7.75	\$ 366.65		
WALTER, TERESA/Vice Principal	\$ 65.64	2.00	\$ 131.28		
WEHAGE, CHERIE/Counselor	\$ 35.23	3.00	\$ 105.69		
WHITE, LYDIA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.94	12.33	\$ 233.53		
WILLIAMS, LINDA/Vice Principal	\$ 62.69	2.40	\$ 150.46		
WOLFE, KATHRYN/Principal	\$ 59.47	2.40	\$ 142.73		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 8 of 9		\$ 20,362.86		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Total Page 1 of 9 Total Page 2 of 9 Total Page 3 of 9 Total Page 4 of 9 Total Page 5 of 9 Total Page 6 of 9 Total Page 7 of 9 Total Page 8 of 9			\$ 26,473.53 \$ 36,649.73 \$ 20,788.06 \$ 38,392.16 \$ 25,564.44 \$ 32,783.08 \$ 49,886.35 \$ 20,362.86		

(05) Total	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input type="checkbox"/>	Page 9 of 9	\$ 250,900.21		
------------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	-------------	---------------	--	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

- 1. Identifying Pupils
- 2. Information Maintenance
- 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).

Object Accounts

(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Maintaining the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years.					
ABAGAT, KIM/ELEM Counselor	\$ 37.30	45.98	\$ 1,715.05		
AGUIRRE, NORA/School Clerk I	\$ 18.14	6.60	\$ 119.72		
ALANIS, ROSA/Secretary	\$ 28.69	3.50	\$ 100.42		
ALVAREZ, ANA/Vice Principal	\$ 59.91	8.50	\$ 509.24		
ANDREWS, VIRGINIA/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	25.00	\$ 1,321.00		
ANKERS, LETICIA/Administrative Assistant	\$ 35.20	5.67	\$ 199.58		
ANKERS, LETICIA/Secretary	\$ 20.85	6.75	\$ 140.74		
BACA, LAURA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 19.70	10.24	\$ 201.73		
BAIN MURPHY, TYRA/Counselor	\$ 33.92	1.75	\$ 59.36		
BARANSKI, JANICE/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	3.52	\$ 74.84		
BARNES, JULIE/Secretary	\$ 27.26	5.00	\$ 136.30		
BELKNAP, MARY/Counselor	\$ 41.13	4.00	\$ 164.52		
BENECCHI, MICHAEL/Counselor	\$ 29.49	0.75	\$ 22.12		
BERAUD, BEATRIZ/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	58.30	\$ 1,505.89		
BLACKMAN, KRISTIN/Counselor	\$ 37.46	0.17	\$ 6.37		
BLAIR, LESLIE/School Clerk	\$ 24.98	9.00	\$ 224.82		
BLAKLEY, TERRI/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	57.20	\$ 1,416.84		
BOOTH-FRANKEL, JOYCE/DIST Counselor	\$ 44.23	4.18	\$ 184.88		
BRADY, ANNETTE/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	3.25	\$ 171.73		
BRANDI, BARBARA/Secretary	\$ 23.06	15.50	\$ 357.43		
BRAVO, SYLVIA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 22.16	15.84	\$ 351.01		

(05) Total	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 1 of 9	\$ 8,983.59
------------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------------	-------------

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
BROWN, VERONNA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.98	\$ 49.04		
BURTON, MELINDA/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	1.10	\$ 23.39		
BUSTAMANTE, RUTH/School Assistant	\$ 22.81	0.82	\$ 18.70		
BUTLER, CARLA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 22.22	70.00	\$ 1,555.40		
BUTTERWORTH, TRAVES/School Clerk I	\$ 21.02	85.80	\$ 1,803.52		
CAHILL, DENISE/Guidance Assistant	\$ 10.99	2.00	\$ 21.98		
CANTON, JOYLYN/School Clerk I	\$ 21.02	33.88	\$ 712.16		
CARLIN, DONNA/Attendance Assistant	\$ 23.15	4.67	\$ 108.11		
CARRILLO, CECILIA/Principal	\$ 66.63	1.25	\$ 83.29		
CASHMAN, CHRISTINE/Principal	\$ 56.85	1.25	\$ 71.06		
CASTILLO-DUVAL, ELIZABETH/Res. Teach	\$ 44.83	1.83	\$ 82.04		
CASTRO, DANIEL/School Clerk	\$ 22.07	6.50	\$ 143.46		
CASTRO, IVAN/School Assistant	\$ 19.70	0.75	\$ 14.78		
CHAPPELL, LOIS/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	5.00	\$ 336.10		
CHISM, MARGARET/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	12.76	\$ 271.28		
CLARK-CORBETT, BARBARA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	47.08	\$ 1,166.17		
COFFEY, DOUGLAS/Vice Principal	\$ 56.62	111.84	\$ 6,332.38		
COLANDREA, RICHARD/Counselor	\$ 31.01	2.34	\$ 72.56		
COMAN, TERRIE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	13.20	\$ 326.96		
CONAWAY, COLLEEN/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	7.50	\$ 414.75		
CONNER, BEVERLEY/Attendance Assistant	\$ 18.94	2.20	\$ 41.67		
CONTRERAS, JOE/Attendance Assistant	\$ 23.15	19.00	\$ 439.85		
CRANE, ALEXIS/DIST Counselor	\$ 31.10	21.12	\$ 656.83		

(05)	Total <input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 2 of 9	\$14,745.48		
------	--------------------------------	--	-------------	-------------	--	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
CRAWFORD, CHARLES/Counselor	\$ 56.30	1.25	\$ 70.38		
DALTON, TERESA/Teacher	\$ 35.56	7.50	\$ 266.70		
DAVID, JACKIE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.32	\$ 32.70		
DAVIES, CHARLOTTE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	60.06	\$ 1,487.69		
DECK, PATRICIA/School Clerk	\$ 24.77	0.17	\$ 4.21		
DEERING, ANNETTE/Attendance Assistant	\$ 18.94	8.60	\$ 162.88		
DEVOE, SYLVIA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	1.50	\$ 34.73		
DEVOE-BROWN, DYELENE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	26.62	\$ 659.38		
DIAZ, ALMA/School Clerk	\$ 23.97	10.00	\$ 239.70		
DOWLEN, NANCY/School Clerk	\$ 26.95	16.83	\$ 453.57		
DUERFELDT, MARTHA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 21.26	2.86	\$ 60.80		
DYSON JR, LLOYD/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	35.00	\$ 2,352.70		
EARLSTON, LINDA/Secretary	\$ 25.31	2.25	\$ 56.95		
ECKLES, GAIL/School Assistant	\$ 22.07	3.75	\$ 82.76		
EGGERT, NANCY/Site Tech	\$ 28.11	9.50	\$ 267.05		
ESPARZA, RUTH/School Clerk	\$ 19.17	14.00	\$ 268.38		
ESPINOZA, ANA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 23.77	21.12	\$ 502.02		
FAIRCHILD, JANET/School Clerk I	\$ 19.63	1.10	\$ 21.59		
FLORES, BREE/School Clerk I	\$ 21.02	13.42	\$ 282.09		
FREEMAN, KEITH/Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.94	7.00	\$ 132.58		
GABUYA, CAROLINE/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	3.30	\$ 70.16		
GALLARDO, ROBERT/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	6.63	\$ 366.64		
GARDNER, LAURA/School Clerk	\$ 22.16	18.42	\$ 408.19		

(05) Total	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 3 of 9	\$ 8,283.85	
------------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------------	-------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries- and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
GARZA, ADOLFO/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	10.00	\$ 553.00		
GIBSON, GAIL/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	5.00	\$ 115.75		
GILLASPIE, NATALIE/School Clerk	\$ 21.89	46.25	\$ 1,012.41		
GLORIA, MARIETTA/School Clerk	\$ 22.16	7.00	\$ 155.12		
GONZALEZ, NIDIA/Counselor	\$ 33.08	7.50	\$ 248.10		
GRAY, PATRICIA/School Clerk	\$ 23.77	24.91	\$ 592.11		
GRIFFITH, LINDA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	4.84	\$ 119.89		
GRIFFITH, SALLY/School Clerk	\$ 21.44	2.75	\$ 58.96		
GROH, MAXINE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	4.18	\$ 103.54		
GUEVARA, ANA/School Clerk	\$ 22.81	8.51	\$ 194.11		
GUTIERREZ, FRANCES/Vice Principal	\$ 46.97	12.25	\$ 575.38		
HALFPENNY, RUTH/Counselor	\$ 37.57	4.25	\$ 159.67		
HAMMOND-WILLIAMS, AMANDA/Principal	\$ 62.27	11.00	\$ 684.97		
HATLEY, MARIA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 18.87	27.94	\$ 527.23		
HEARTEL, MARY/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	63.58	\$ 1,574.88		
HERNANDEZ, JOSEPH/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	3.25	\$ 208.68		
HERNANDEZ, SERGIO/Counselor	\$ 45.31	11.50	\$ 521.07		
HERSCHE-HOWARD, ALISON/DIST Counselor	\$ 56.30	2.64	\$ 148.63		
HINZE, KAREN/School Clerk I	\$ 23.77	1.10	\$ 26.15		
HOBSON, CHRISTINE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.54	\$ 38.15		
HUEZO, LAURA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 23.77	20.02	\$ 475.88		
HUNT, MARLENE/Teacher	\$ 33.08	0.50	\$ 16.54		
HYDE, PATRICIA/HEAD Counselor I	\$ 56.30	20.24	\$ 1,139.51		

(05)	Total <input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 4 of 9	\$ 9,249.73	
------	--------------------------------	--	-------------	-------------	--

**MANDATED COSTS
NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS:
PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION
COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL**

**FORM
NTT-2**

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District (02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

- 1. Identifying Pupils
- 2. Information Maintenance
- 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
IGLESIAS, J./School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 22.16	2.64	\$ 58.50		
IGLESIAS, MARILYN/Counselor	\$ 37.46	2.25	\$ 84.29		
ISLAND, CARMEN/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	6.60	\$ 170.48		
IZU, SUSAN/Principal	\$ 65.18	0.91	\$ 59.31		
JAIME, TERESA/Vice Principal	\$ 45.99	1.02	\$ 46.91		
JAMES, JULIA/School Clerk	\$ 22.07	1.25	\$ 27.59		
JIMENEZ, JAMES/Vice Principal	\$ 46.25	6.50	\$ 300.63		
JOHNSON BLAKE, LULA/DIST Counselor	\$ 54.98	1.76	\$ 96.76		
JOHNSON, JOHN/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	60.00	\$ 4,033.20		
JOHNSON, MINERVA/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	1.50	\$ 82.95		
JUAREZ, CHRISTOPHER/Vice Principal	\$ 48.62	1.60	\$ 77.79		
KEITH, HEATHER/SEC Counselor	\$ 54.98	51.92	\$ 2,854.56		
KERR, PATRICIA/Counselor	\$ 53.65	4.75	\$ 254.84		
LACKMAN, E/Secretary	\$ 27.53	0.67	\$ 18.45		
LANCEY-JEWELL, CAROL/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	81.62	\$ 1,735.24		
LANE, KIM/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	63.14	\$ 1,563.98		
LASWELL, ROBIN/Counselor	\$ 26.52	37.75	\$ 1,001.13		
LEON-MAAS, THERON/Counselor	\$ 53.65	10.09	\$ 541.33		
LITTLETON, ERICKA/School Clerk I	\$ 18.87	7.48	\$ 141.15		
LONG, DIANE/Secretary	\$ 29.60	7.50	\$ 222.00		
LOYA, BLANCA/School Clerk	\$ 24.98	1.16	\$ 28.98		
LUNA, JEFFREY/Vice Principal	\$ 53.20	1.75	\$ 93.10		
MADDEN, JEAN/Principal	\$ 60.91	8.50	\$ 517.74		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Page 5 of 9	\$14,010.91		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL					FORM NTT-2
(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District		(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:		2002/2003	
(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.					
<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Identifying Pupils <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. Information Maintenance <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Notifying Teachers					
(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
MAIORANO, KARLA/School Assistant	\$ 18.87	2.50	\$ 47.18		
MALONE, SANDRA/School Assistant	\$ 16.22	1.50	\$ 24.33		
MANCILLA, HORTENCIA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 18.87	9.24	\$ 174.36		
MARRA, CHRISTINE/School Assistant	\$ 22.22	0.75	\$ 16.67		
MASON, DEBORA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	7.92	\$ 204.57		
MCCAULEY, SANDRA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.54	\$ 38.15		
MCCLURE-LOTT, DIANE/Teacher	\$ 57.66	29.00	\$ 1,672.14		
MCDUGALL, LINDA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	8.80	\$ 217.98		
MCFEE, LINDA/School Clerk	\$ 21.26	2.34	\$ 49.75		
MCGEE, BARBARA/Counselor	\$ 41.41	3.00	\$ 124.23		
MCGEE, STEPHEN/Counselor	\$ 45.31	0.75	\$ 33.98		
MCGEE-BOLDEN, GLENDA/Secretary	\$ 23.48	0.67	\$ 15.73		
MCGIRR, BRUCE/Principal	\$ 66.63	5.34	\$ 355.80		
MCMILLAN, LILLIE/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	1.00	\$ 55.30		
MEDINA, DIANA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.57	12.00	\$ 222.84		
MEDINA, MARY/School Clerk	\$ 24.98	4.33	\$ 108.16		
MELEO, KRISTINA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 15.91	20.25	\$ 322.18		
MENDEZ, JOVITA/School Assistant	\$ 19.70	0.92	\$ 18.12		
MERCIER, RITA/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	22.83	\$ 1,262.50		
MORAN, SHEBLAGH/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	1.75	\$ 112.37		
MORRIS, MICHELLE/Counselor	\$ 28.17	2.50	\$ 70.43		
MOYA, JOSEFINA/Site Tech	\$ 29.34	96.00	\$ 2,816.64		
NARCISSE, DEBORAH/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	3.52	\$ 74.84		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			\$ 8,038.25		
Page 6 of 9					

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
NGUYEN, DAO/Site Tech	\$ 26.13	23.75	\$ 620.59		
NYDAM, JULIE/Vice Principal	\$ 59.91	18.00	\$ 1,078.38		
OCHS, GINA/Attendance Assistant	\$ 20.08	2.66	\$ 53.41		
OLIVERO, JEFF/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	33.32	\$ 2,239.77		
OMAHONEY, M/School Clerk	\$ 24.77	1.36	\$ 33.69		
ORTIZ, TANIA/School Clerk	\$ 18.87	43.00	\$ 811.41		
PACIS, DINA/Vice Principal	\$ 58.39	11.50	\$ 671.49		
PARRA, RAQUEL/Counselor	\$ 38.77	3.00	\$ 116.31		
PECK, BARBARA/Attendance Assistant	\$ 22.22	3.50	\$ 77.77		
PENFOLD, DEBORAH/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	11.75	\$ 754.47		
PEREZ, CHERYL/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	25.96	\$ 643.03		
PERRINE, MADGE/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	8.80	\$ 187.09		
PIPER, ELIZABETH/School Clerk	\$ 19.17	12.50	\$ 239.63		
PORTER, SUSAN/School Clerk	\$ 27.18	3.50	\$ 95.13		
PRISE, SUSAN/Counselor	\$ 31.10	4.00	\$ 124.40		
RADDEN, ROSA/School Clerk	\$ 25.83	0.15	\$ 3.87		
RAMIREZ, ALYSON/Counselor	\$ 27.33	6.75	\$ 184.48		
RATTAN, KARINA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 20.43	2.20	\$ 44.95		
RAWLINGS, CLAUDETTE/Counselor	\$ 47.52	3.75	\$ 178.20		
REED, MARQUALENE/SEC Counselor	\$ 40.72	30.14	\$ 1,227.30		
RILEY, PATRICIA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	55.00	\$ 1,362.35		
RIOS, ARNOLD/Counselor	\$ 36.56	21.25	\$ 776.90		
RODRIGUEZ, IRENE/School Clerk	\$ 22.34	3.83	\$ 85.56		

(05) Total	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 7 of 9	\$11,610.18
------------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------------	-------------

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
ROMERO, DUREZA/School Clerk	\$ 21.19	3.16	\$ 66.96		
ROMO, JUAN/Vice Principal	\$ 56.62	3.83	\$ 216.85		
ROWAN, RENEE/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	51.50	\$ 3,461.83		
ROWLEY, LINDA/School Clerk	\$ 26.95	41.70	\$ 1,123.82		
SAMOLES, KAREN/Secretary	\$ 29.60	4.51	\$ 133.50		
SANCHEZ, ELIZABETH/Guidance Assistant	\$ 20.08	1.25	\$ 25.10		
SANTOS, ANTHONY/Comm. Serv. Officer	\$ 29.58	1.50	\$ 44.37		
SANTOS, FRANCISCO/Counselor	\$ 35.85	13.50	\$ 483.98		
SARDINA, TERESA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	17.16	\$ 397.25		
SCHREIBER, GAVINA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	1.10	\$ 28.41		
SEXTON, JUDITH/School Clerk	\$ 23.09	36.24	\$ 836.78		
SHUFFLER, PAULETTE/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	88.88	\$ 2,295.77		
SILVA, PAMELA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	76.00	\$ 1,759.40		
SMITH-RIOS, CHRISTINA/School Clerk	\$ 25.83	5.00	\$ 129.15		
SOCIE, MARTHA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	3.52	\$ 87.19		
STAPA, SUSAN/School Clerk I	\$ 22.81	1.10	\$ 25.09		
TEMPLIN, DONNA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.32	\$ 32.70		
THOMAS, SHANNA/Teacher	\$ 47.52	5.50	\$ 261.36		
TRAKAS, ANDY/Vice Principal	\$ 48.62	7.25	\$ 352.50		
TROMBLEY, MARY/School Clerk	\$ 25.83	3.66	\$ 94.54		
TROWBRIDGE, ADELE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.10	\$ 27.25		
VALDEZ, LINDA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	1.10	\$ 28.41		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Page 8 of 9	\$11,912.21		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
VAZQUEZ, MARTHA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 23.77	16.72	\$ 397.43		
VIENNA, KATHLEEN/Counselor	\$ 47.31	2.00	\$ 94.62		
VINE, EDNA/School Clerk	\$ 24.77	30.99	\$ 767.62		
WALTER, TERESA/Vice Principal	\$ 65.64	3.83	\$ 251.40		
WEHAGE, CHERIE/Counselor	\$ 35.23	1.00	\$ 35.23		
WHITE, LYDIA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.94	10.15	\$ 192.24		
Total Page 1 of 9			\$ 8,983.59		
Total Page 2 of 9			\$ 14,745.48		
Total Page 3 of 9			\$ 8,283.85		
Total Page 4 of 9			\$ 9,249.73		
Total Page 5 of 9			\$ 14,010.91		
Total Page 6 of 9			\$ 8,038.25		
Total Page 7 of 9			\$ 11,610.18		
Total Page 8 of 9			\$ 11,912.21		

(05) Total	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input type="checkbox"/>	Page 9 of 9	\$ 88,572.74	
------------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	-------------	--------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
Maintaining the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years.					
ABAGAT, KIM/ELEM Counselor	\$ 37.30	35.53	\$ 1,325.27		
AGUIRRE, NORA/School Clerk I	\$ 18.14	5.10	\$ 92.51		
ALANIS, ROSA/Secretary	\$ 28.69	3.50	\$ 100.42		
ALVAREZ, ANA/Vice Principal	\$ 59.91	8.50	\$ 509.24		
ANDREWS, VIRGINIA/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	16.50	\$ 871.86		
ANKERS, LETICIA/Secretary	\$ 20.85	0.25	\$ 5.21		
AVERY, APRIL/School Clerk	\$ 27.18	17.50	\$ 475.65		
BACA, LAURA/Guidance Assistnat	\$ 19.70	5.57	\$ 109.73		
BAIN MURPHY, TYRA/Counselor	\$ 33.92	1.75	\$ 59.36		
BARANSKI, JANICE/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	2.72	\$ 57.83		
BARNES, JULIE/Secretary	\$ 27.26	1.00	\$ 27.26		
BELKNAP, MARY/Counselor	\$ 41.13	2.50	\$ 102.83		
BENECCHI, MICHAEL/Counselor	\$ 29.49	0.83	\$ 24.48		
BERAUD, BEATRIZ/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	45.05	\$ 1,163.64		
BERLIN, JANET/School Clerk	\$ 26.95	39.50	\$ 1,064.53		
BLACKMAN, KRISTIN/Counselor	\$ 37.46	0.17	\$ 6.37		
BLAIR, LESLIE/School Clerk	\$ 24.98	4.50	\$ 112.41		
BLAKLEY, TERRI/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	44.20	\$ 1,094.83		
BOOTH-FRANKBL, JOYCE/DIST Counselor	\$ 44.23	3.23	\$ 142.86		
BRADY, ANNETTE/Vice Principal	\$ 52.84	4.50	\$ 237.78		
BRANDI, BARBARA/Secretary	\$ 23.06	15.50	\$ 357.43		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 1 of 8		\$ 7,941.50		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
BRAVO, SYLVIA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 22.16	12.24	\$ 271.24		
BROWN, VERONNA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.53	\$ 37.90		
BURTON, MELINDA/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	0.85	\$ 18.07		
BUTTERWORTH, TRAVES/School Clerk I	\$ 21.02	66.30	\$ 1,393.63		
CAHILL, DENISE/Guidance Assistant	\$ 10.99	3.25	\$ 35.72		
CANTON, JOYLYN/School Clerk I	\$ 21.02	26.18	\$ 550.30		
CARLIN, DONNA/Attendance Assistant	\$ 23.15	4.66	\$ 107.88		
CARRILLO, CECILIA/Principal	\$ 66.63	1.25	\$ 83.29		
CASHMAN, CHRISTINE/Principal	\$ 56.85	1.25	\$ 71.06		
CASTILLO-DUVALL, ELIZABETH/Resource T	\$ 44.83	3.83	\$ 171.70		
CHISM, MARGARET/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	9.86	\$ 209.62		
CLARK-CORBETT, BARBARA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	36.38	\$ 901.13		
COFFEY, DOUGLAS/Vice Principal	\$ 56.62	48.33	\$ 2,736.44		
COLANDREA, RICHARD/Counselor	\$ 31.01	0.34	\$ 10.54		
COMAN, TERRIE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	10.20	\$ 252.65		
CONAWAY, COLLEEN/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	15.50	\$ 857.15		
CONNER, BEVERLEY/Attendance Assistant	\$ 18.94	0.50	\$ 9.47		
CONTRERAS, JOE/Attendance Assistant	\$ 23.15	19.00	\$ 439.85		
CRANE, ALEXIS/DIST Counselor	\$ 31.10	16.32	\$ 507.55		
CRAWFORD, CHARLES/Counselor	\$ 56.30	1.08	\$ 60.80		
DAVID, JACKIE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.02	\$ 25.27		
DAVIES, CHARLOTTE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	46.41	\$ 1,149.58		
DECK, PATRICIA/School Clerk	\$ 24.77	0.50	\$ 12.39		

(05)	Total <input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 2 of 8	\$ 9,913.23	
------	--------------------------------	--	-------------	-------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
DEERING, ANNETTE/Attendance Assistant	\$ 18.94	2.10	\$ 39.77		
DEVOE, SYLVIA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	5.83	\$ 134.96		
DEVOE-BROWN, DYELENE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	20.57	\$ 509.52		
DIAZ, ALMA/School Clerk	\$ 23.97	5.00	\$ 119.85		
DOWLEN, NANCY/School Clerk	\$ 26.95	16.83	\$ 453.57		
DUERFELDT, MARTHA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 21.26	2.21	\$ 46.98		
DYSON, YVONNE/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	83.00	\$ 5,579.26		
EARLSTON, LINDA/Secretary	\$ 25.31	0.68	\$ 17.21		
ECKLES, GAIL/School Assistant	\$ 22.07	1.75	\$ 38.62		
EGBERT, NANCY/Site Tech	\$ 28.11	22.83	\$ 641.75		
ESPARZA, RUTH/School Clerk	\$ 19.17	5.24	\$ 100.45		
ESPINOZA, ANA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 23.77	16.32	\$ 387.93		
ESTRADA, EDUARDO/Counselor	\$ 28.64	2.42	\$ 69.31		
FAIRCHILD, JANET/School Clerk I	\$ 19.63	0.85	\$ 16.69		
FINK, DIANNE/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	28.75	\$ 1,932.58		
FLORES, BREE/School Clerk I	\$ 21.02	10.37	\$ 217.98		
GABUYA, CAROLINE/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	2.55	\$ 54.21		
GALLARDO, ROBERT/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	0.50	\$ 27.65		
GARDNER, LAURA/School Clerk	\$ 22.16	13.67	\$ 302.93		
GARZA, ADOLFO/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	8.75	\$ 483.88		
GIBSON, GAIL/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	4.25	\$ 98.39		
GILLASPIE, NATALIE/School Clerk	\$ 21.89	1.75	\$ 38.31		
GLORIA, MARIETTA/School Clerk	\$ 22.16	7.00	\$ 155.12		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 3 of 8		\$11,466.92		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
GONZALEZ, NIDIA/Counselor	\$ 33.08	7.50	\$ 248.10		
GONZALEZ, SYLVIA/Principal	\$ 72.79	1.75	\$ 127.38		
GRIFFITH, LINDA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	3.74	\$ 92.64		
GROH, MAXINE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	3.23	\$ 80.01		
GUEVARA, ANA/School Clerk	\$ 22.81	4.07	\$ 92.84		
GUTIERREZ, FRANCES/Vice Principal	\$ 46.97	22.75	\$ 1,068.57		
HALFPENNY, RUTH/Counselor	\$ 37.57	4.50	\$ 169.07		
HAMMOND-WILLIAMS, AMANDA/Principal	\$ 62.27	2.75	\$ 171.24		
HATLEY, MARIA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 18.87	21.59	\$ 407.40		
HEARTEL, MARY/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	49.13	\$ 1,216.95		
HERNANDEZ, SERGIO/Counselor.	\$ 45.31	17.00	\$ 770.27		
HERSCHE-HOWARD, ALISON/DIST Counselor	\$ 56.30	2.04	\$ 114.85		
HINZE, KAREN/School Clerk I	\$ 23.77	0.85	\$ 20.20		
HOBSON, CHRISTINE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.19	\$ 29.48		
HOERR, RITA/School Clerk	\$ 24.98	94.50	\$ 2,360.61		
HUEZO, LAURA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 23.77	15.47	\$ 367.72		
HYDE, PATRICIA/HEAD Counselor I	\$ 56.30	15.64	\$ 880.53		
IGLESIAS, J./School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 22.16	2.04	\$ 45.21		
IGLESIAS, MARILYN/Counselor	\$ 37.46	2.33	\$ 87.28		
ISLAND, CARMEN/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	5.10	\$ 131.73		
IZU, SUSAN/Principal	\$ 65.18	0.75	\$ 48.89		
JAIME, TERESA/Vice Principal	\$ 45.99	1.51	\$ 69.44		
JIMENEZ, JAMES/Vice Principal	\$ 46.25	4.75	\$ 219.69		

(05) Total	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 4 of 8	\$ 8,820.10	
------------	--------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------------	-------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
JOHNSON BLAKE, LULA/DIST Counselor	\$ 54.98	1.36	\$ 74.77		
JUAREZ, CHRISTOPHER/Vice Principal	\$ 48.62	1.60	\$ 77.79		
KEITH, HEATHER/SEC Counselor	\$ 54.98	40.12	\$ 2,205.80		
KERR, PATRICIA/Counselor	\$ 53.65	11.50	\$ 616.98		
LANCEY-JEWELL, CAROL/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	63.07	\$ 1,340.87		
LANE, KIM/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	48.79	\$ 1,208.53		
LASWELL, ROBIN/Counselor	\$ 26.52	18.00	\$ 477.36		
LEON-MAAS, THERON/Counselor	\$ 53.65	9.44	\$ 506.46		
LITTLETON, ERICKA/School Clerk I	\$ 18.87	5.78	\$ 109.07		
LONGO, MARY JO/Principal	\$ 63.76	0.80	\$ 51.01		
LUNA, JEFFREY/Vice Principal	\$ 53.20	13.50	\$ 718.20		
MADDEN, JEAN/Principal	\$ 60.91	25.00	\$ 1,522.75		
MALONE, SANDRA/School Assistant	\$ 16.22	0.50	\$ 8.11		
MANCILLA, HORTENCIA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 18.87	7.14	\$ 134.73		
MASON, DEBORA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	6.12	\$ 158.08		
MCCAULEY, SANDRA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.19	\$ 29.48		
MCCLURE-LOTT, DIANE/Teacher	\$ 57.66	26.75	\$ 1,542.41		
MCDUGALL, LINDA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	6.80	\$ 168.44		
MCGEE, BARBARA/Counselor	\$ 41.41	0.50	\$ 20.71		
MCGEE, STEPHEN/Counselor	\$ 45.31	0.75	\$ 33.98		
MCGEE-BOLDEN, GLENDA/Secretary	\$ 23.48	0.59	\$ 13.85		
MCMILLAN, LILLIE/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	1.00	\$ 55.30		
MEDINA, DIANA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.57	12.00	\$ 222.84		

(05)	Total <input type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 5 of 8	\$11,297.52	
------	--------------------------------	--	-------------	-------------	--

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
MELEO, KRISTINA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 15.91	2.25	\$ 35.80		
MERCIER, RITA/Vice Principal	\$ 55.30	67.00	\$ 3,705.10		
MORAN, SHEBLAGH/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	1.75	\$ 112.37		
MORRIS, MICHELLE/Counselor	\$ 28.17	3.00	\$ 84.51		
NARCISSE, DEBORAH/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	2.72	\$ 57.83		
OCHS, GINA/Attendance Assistant	\$ 20.08	2.00	\$ 40.16		
OLIVERO, JEFF/Vice Principal	\$ 67.22	18.73	\$ 1,259.03		
OMAHONEY, M/School Clerk	\$ 24.77	0.64	\$ 15.85		
ORTIZ, TANIA/School Clerk	\$ 18.87	21.50	\$ 405.71		
PACIS, DINA/Vice Principal	\$ 58.39	5.50	\$ 321.15		
PARRA, RAQUEL/Counselor	\$ 38.77	3.00	\$ 116.31		
PENFOLD, DEBORAH/Vice Principal	\$ 64.21	3.75	\$ 240.79		
PEREZ, CHERYL/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	20.06	\$ 496.89		
PERRINE, MADGE/School Clerk I	\$ 21.26	6.80	\$ 144.57		
PIPER, ELIZABETH/School Clerk	\$ 19.17	9.25	\$ 177.32		
PORTER, SUSAN/School Clerk	\$ 27.18	5.50	\$ 149.49		
PRISE, SUSAN/Counselor	\$ 31.10	6.66	\$ 207.13		
RAMIREZ, ALYSON/Counselor	\$ 27.33	6.25	\$ 170.81		
RATTAN, KARINA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 20.43	1.70	\$ 34.73		
RAWLINGS, CLAUDETTE/Counselor	\$ 47.52	4.00	\$ 190.08		
REED, MARQUALENE/SEC Counselor	\$ 40.72	23.29	\$ 948.37		
RICHMOND, JEAN/Principal	\$ 65.18	0.33	\$ 21.51		
RILEY, PATRICIA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	42.50	\$ 1,052.73		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 6 of 8		\$ 9,988.24		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred: 2002/2003
--	---

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
ROMO, JUAN/Vice Principal	\$ 56.62	3.33	\$ 188.54		
ROWLEY, LINDA/School Clerk	\$ 26.95	32.35	\$ 871.83		
SAMOLES, KAREN/Secretary	\$ 29.60	2.55	\$ 75.48		
SANCHEZ, ELIZABETH/Guidance Assistant	\$ 20.08	1.25	\$ 25.10		
SANTOS, ANTHONY/Comm. Serv. Officer	\$ 29.58	5.83	\$ 172.45		
SARDINA, TERESA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 23.15	39.17	\$ 906.79		
SCHREIBER, GAVINA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	0.85	\$ 21.96		
SEXTON, JUDITH/School Clerk	\$ 23.09	2.17	\$ 50.11		
SHUFFLER, PAULETTE/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	68.68	\$ 1,774.00		
SMITH-RIOS, CHRISTINA/School Clerk	\$ 25.83	2.50	\$ 64.58		
SOCIE, MARTHA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	2.72	\$ 67.37		
STAPA, SUSAN/School Clerk I	\$ 22.81	0.85	\$ 19.39		
TAGGART, LINDA/Principal	\$ 63.76	1.50	\$ 95.64		
TEMPLIN, DONNA/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	1.02	\$ 25.27		
TRAKAS, ANDY/Vice Principal	\$ 48.62	5.25	\$ 255.26		
TROMBLEY, MARY/School Clerk	\$ 25.83	3.66	\$ 94.54		
TROWBRIDGE, ADELE/School Clerk I	\$ 24.77	0.85	\$ 21.05		
TUSSEY, LEAH/Principal	\$ 66.63	10.75	\$ 716.27		
VALDEZ, LINDA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 25.83	0.85	\$ 21.96		
VAZQUEZ, MARTHA/School Clerk I-BIL	\$ 23.77	12.92	\$ 307.11		
VIDANA-CROSS, MARTHA/Vice Principal	\$ 51.62	1.25	\$ 64.53		
VIENNA, KATHLEEN/Counselor	\$ 47.31	1.50	\$ 70.97		
(05) Total <input type="checkbox"/> Subtotal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page 7 of 8		\$ 5,910.20		

MANDATED COSTS NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION COMPONENT/ACTIVITY COST DETAIL	FORM NTT-2
--	-----------------------------

(01) Claimant: San Diego Unified School District	(02) Fiscal Year costs were incurred:	2002/2003
--	---------------------------------------	-----------

(03) Reimbursable Component: Check only ONE box per form to identify the component being claimed.

1. Identifying Pupils
 2. Information Maintenance
 3. Notifying Teachers

(04) Description of Expenses: Complete columns (a) through (f).			Object Accounts		
(a) Employee Names, Job Classifications, Functions Performed and Description of Expenses	(b) Hourly Rate or Unit Cost	(c) Hours Worked or Quantity	(d) Salaries and Benefits	(e) Materials and Supplies	(f) Contracted Services
WALTER, TERESA/Vice Principal	\$ 65.64	4.17	\$ 273.72		
WEHAGE, CHERIE/Counselor	\$ 35.23	3.00	\$ 105.69		
WHITE, LYDIA/Guidance Assistant	\$ 18.94	9.07	\$ 171.79		
Total Page 1 of 8			\$ 7,941.50		
Total Page 2 of 8			\$ 9,913.23		
Total Page 3 of 8			\$11,466.92		
Total Page 4 of 8			\$ 8,820.10		
Total Page 5 of 8			\$11,297.52		
Total Page 6 of 8			\$ 9,988.24		
Total Page 7 of 8			\$ 5,910.20		

(05)	Total	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Subtotal	<input type="checkbox"/>	Page 8 of 8	\$65,888.91		
------	-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	-------------	-------------	--	--

EXHIBIT H



STEVE WESTLY
 California State Controller
 Division of Accounting and Reporting
 JULY 21, 2005

S37165
 00150
 2005/07/21

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
 SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCH DIST
 SAN DIEGO COUNTY
 4100 NORMAL STREET ROOM 3159
 SAN DIEGO CA 92103

DEAR CLAIMANT:

RE: NOTICE TO TEACH SUS CH 1306/89

WE HAVE REVIEWED YOUR 2002/2003 FISCAL YEAR REIMBURSEMENT CLAIM FOR THE MANDATED COST PROGRAM REFERENCED ABOVE. THE RESULTS OF OUR REVIEW ARE AS FOLLOWS:

AMOUNT CLAIMED		414,685.00
ADJUSTMENT TO CLAIM:		
FIELD AUDIT FINDINGS	-	192,740.00
TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS	-	<u>192,740.00</u>
AMOUNT DUE CLAIMANT		<u><u>\$ 221,945.00</u></u>

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, PLEASE CONTACT KIM NGUYEN AT (916) 324-7876 OR IN WRITING AT THE STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE, DIVISION OF ACCOUNTING AND REPORTING, P.O. BOX 942850, SACRAMENTO, CA 94250-5875. DUE TO INSUFFICIENT APPROPRIATION, THE BALANCE DUE WILL BE FORTHCOMING WHEN ADDITIONAL FUNDS ARE MADE AVAILABLE.

SINCERELY,

Ginny Brummels
 GINNY BRUMMELS, MANAGER

EXHIBIT I

SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Audit Report

NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS: PUPILS SUBJECT TO SUSPENSION OR EXPULSION PROGRAM

Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, and
Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993

July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2003



STEVE WESTLY
California State Controller

June 2005



STEVE WESTLY
California State Controller

June 30, 2005

Alan D. Bersin
Superintendent of Public Instruction
San Diego Unified School District
4100 Normal Street
San Diego, CA 92103-2682

Dear Mr. Bersin:

The State Controller's Office audited the costs claimed by the San Diego Unified School District for the legislatively mandated Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Program (Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993) for the period of July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2003.

The district claimed \$820,909 for the mandated program. Our audit disclosed that \$461,378 is allowable and \$359,531 is unallowable. The unallowable costs occurred because the district claimed unallowable salary, benefit, and related indirect costs. The State paid the district \$178,217. The State will pay allowable costs claimed that exceed the amount paid, totaling \$283,161, contingent upon available appropriations.

If you disagree with the audit finding, you may file an Incorrect Reduction Claim (IRC) with the Commission on State Mandates (COSM). The IRC must be filed within three years following the date that we notify you of a claim reduction. You may obtain IRC information at COSM's Web site at www.csm.ca.gov (Guidebook link), and obtain IRC forms by telephone at (916) 323-3562 or by e-mail at csminfo@csm.ca.gov.

If you have any questions, please contact Jim L. Spano, Chief, Compliance Audits Bureau, at (916) 323-5849.

Sincerely,

VINCENT P. BROWN
Chief Operating Officer

VPB:JVB/ams

cc: (See page 2)

cc: Scott Patterson,
Chief Financial Officer
San Diego Unified School District
Arthur M. Palkowitz, Manager
Office of Resource Development
Financial Division
San Diego Unified School District
Jennifer Thompson
Legislative Financial Accountant
Mandated Cost Unit
San Diego Unified School District
Rudy Castruita, County Superintendent of Schools
San Diego County Office of Education
Scott Hannan, Director
School Fiscal Services Division
California Department of Education
Arlene Matsuura, Education Fiscal Services Consultant
School Fiscal Services Division
California Department of Education
Gerry Shelton, Director
Fiscal and Administrative Services Division
California Department of Education
Jeannie Oropeza, Program Budget Manager
Education Systems Unit
Department of Finance

Contents

Audit Report

Summary 1

Background 1

Objective, Scope, and Methodology 1

Conclusion 2

Views of Responsible Official 2

Restricted Use 3

Schedule 1—Summary of Program Costs 4

Finding and Recommendation 5

Attachment—District’s Response to Draft Audit Report

Audit Report

Summary

The State Controller's Office (SCO) audited the costs claimed by the San Diego Unified School District for the legislatively mandated Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Program (Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993) for the period of July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2003. The last day of fieldwork was March 29, 2005.

The district claimed \$820,909 for the mandated program. Our audit disclosed that \$461,378 is allowable and \$359,531 is unallowable. The unallowable costs occurred because the district claimed unallowable salary, benefit, and related indirect costs. The State paid the district \$178,217. The State will pay allowable costs claimed that exceed the amount paid, totaling \$283,161, contingent upon available appropriations.

Background

Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, and Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993 added and amended *Education Code* Section 49079. The law requires that school districts identify to their teachers those students who have engaged in, or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts specified in *Education Code* Sections 48900 (excluding subdivision (h)), 48900.2, 48900.3, 48900.4, and 48900.7. The notification is to be based on any written records the district maintains or receives from a law enforcement agency. No district is liable for failure to comply if the district makes a good faith effort to notify the teacher. Districts were to commence notifications in the 1990-91 school year, using data from the previous year. By fiscal year (FY) 1992-93, districts were to include three years of prior data in their teacher notifications.

On January 19, 1995, the Commission on State Mandates (COSM) determined that the legislation imposed a state mandate reimbursable under *Government Code* Section 17561.

Parameters and Guidelines establishes the state mandate and defines reimbursement criteria. COSM adopted *Parameters and Guidelines* on July 20, 1995. In compliance with *Government Code* Section 17558, the SCO issues claiming instructions for mandated programs, to assist local agencies and school districts in claiming reimbursable costs.

Objective, Scope, and Methodology

We conducted the audit to determine whether costs claimed represent increased costs resulting from the Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Program for the period of July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2003.

Our audit scope included, but was not limited to, determining whether costs claimed were supported by appropriate source documents, not funded by another source, and not unreasonable and/or excessive.

We conducted the audit according to *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, and under the authority of *Government Code* Section 17558.5. We did not audit the district's financial statements. We limited our audit scope to planning and performing audit procedures necessary to obtain reasonable assurance that costs claimed were allowable for reimbursement. Accordingly, we examined transactions, on a test basis, to determine whether the costs claimed were supported.

We limited our review of the district's internal controls to gaining an understanding of the transaction flow and claim preparation process as necessary to develop appropriate auditing procedures.

We asked the district's representative to submit a written representation letter regarding the district's accounting procedures, financial records, and mandated cost claiming procedures as recommended by *Government Auditing Standards*. However, the district did not submit a representation letter.

Conclusion

Our audit disclosed an instance of noncompliance with the requirements outlined above. This instance is described in the accompanying Summary of Program Costs (Schedule 1) and in the Finding and Recommendation section of this report.

For the audit period, the San Diego Unified School District claimed \$820,909 for Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion Program costs. Our audit disclosed that \$461,378 is allowable and \$359,531 is unallowable.

For FY 2001-02, the State paid the district \$178,217. Our audit disclosed that \$239,433 is allowable. The State will pay allowable costs claimed that exceed the amount paid, totaling \$61,216, contingent upon available appropriations.


For FY 2002-03, the State made no payment to the district. Our audit disclosed that \$221,945 is allowable, which the State will pay contingent upon available appropriations.

Views of Responsible Official

We issued a draft audit report on May 6, 2005. Art M. Palkowitz, Manager, Office of Resource Development, responded by letter dated May 31, 2005 (Attachment), disagreeing with the audit results. This final audit report includes the district's response.

Restricted Use

This report is solely for the information and use of the San Diego Unified School District, the San Diego County Office of Education, the California Department of Education, the California Department of Finance, and the SCO; it is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties. This restriction is not intended to limit distribution of this report, which is a matter of public record.


JEFFREY V. BROWNFIELD
Chief, Division of Audits

**Schedule 1—
Summary of Program Costs
July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2003**

<u>Cost Elements</u>	<u>Actual Costs Claimed</u>	<u>Allowable per Audit</u>	<u>Audit Adjustment</u> ¹
<u>July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2002</u>			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 393,857	\$ 232,144	\$ (161,713)
Indirect costs	12,367	7,289	(5,078)
Total program costs	<u>\$ 406,224</u>	239,433	<u>\$ (166,791)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		(178,217)	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ 61,216</u>	
<u>July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003</u>			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 405,362	\$ 216,955	\$ (188,407)
Indirect costs	9,323	4,990	(4,333)
Total program costs	<u>\$ 414,685</u>	221,945	<u>\$ (192,740)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		—	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ 221,945</u>	
<u>Summary: July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2003</u>			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 799,219	\$ 449,099	\$ (350,120)
Indirect costs	21,690	12,279	(9,411)
Total program costs	<u>\$ 820,909</u>	461,378	<u>\$ (359,531)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		(178,217)	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ 283,161</u>	

¹ See the Finding and Recommendation section.

Finding and Recommendation

**FINDING—
Unallowable salary,
benefit, and related
indirect costs**

The district claimed unallowable salary and benefit costs totaling \$350,120 for the audit period. The district claimed employee time that was not supported by actual time records and costs for one employee who was funded by restricted funds.

The district claimed \$344,758 in unallowable salary and benefit costs for school-site employees. Various school-site employees submitted time logs that identified actual time spent on mandate-related activities. The district used these time logs to generate a time study and to calculate the average time spent for each reimbursable activity. The district used the average times calculated to claim costs for school-site employees who did not submit actual time logs. However, the district's time studies and additional costs claimed are unallowable for the following reasons.

1. The district's methodology was inconsistent between fiscal years. For fiscal year (FY) 2001-02, the district calculated average times based on time logs completed by employees in certain positions, rather than on all employees who performed each mandated activity. For the activity of identifying students, the district used only time reported by principals and vice principals to calculate an average time. For the activities of information maintenance and notifying teachers, the district used only time reported by school clerks, school secretaries, and similar positions to calculate average times.

For each mandated activity in FY 2002-03, the district calculated average times based on all employees who submitted time logs. However, the district excluded four school sites that submitted time logs and excluded the "max school" from each calculation. The "max school" was the school that reported the highest number of hours for each activity (but not the highest hours per student).

2. The district's methodologies for both fiscal years do not constitute valid statistical analyses. The projections are based on employees who submitted time logs rather than on randomly selected employees. In calculating average times for each mandated activity, the district provided no documentation that shows the employees used were representative of the population.
3. The time logs employees did submit indicate that time studies are not appropriate for these activities because time reported per student varied significantly. For employees whom the district used to calculate average times, the actual time reported ranged as follows.

	Fiscal Year			
	2001-02		2002-03	
	Shortest time reported per student	Longest time reported per student	Shortest time reported per student	Longest time reported per student
Identifying students	1 minute	18 hours	1 minute	299 minutes
Information maintenance	1 minute	144 minutes	1 minute	191 minutes
Notifying teachers	1 minute	64 minutes	1 minute	125 minutes

4. The district's procedures do not lend themselves to time studies performed at the district level. A district representative advised us that there is no district procedure that specifies which employees will identify students and maintain information at the school sites. In addition, the district has no procedure that specifies how frequently school sites will perform the mandated activities.

The district also claimed unallowable salary and benefit costs totaling \$5,362 for one employee whose costs were funded by a restricted fund source. The following table summarizes the audit adjustment.

	Fiscal Year		Total
	2001-02	2002-03	
Unsupported costs	\$ (161,713)	\$ (183,045)	\$ (344,758)
Costs funded by restricted funds	—	(5,362)	(5,362)
Total salary and benefit costs	(161,713)	(188,407)	(350,120)
Related indirect costs	(5,078)	(4,333)	(9,411)
Audit adjustment	\$ (166,791)	\$ (192,740)	\$ (359,531)

Parameters and Guidelines states that the district must identify the employees and their job classification, describe the mandated functions performed, and specify the actual number of hours devoted to each function to support salary and benefit costs claimed. Districts may claim the average number of hours devoted to each function if supported by a documented time study. *Parameters and Guidelines* also states that all costs claimed must be traceable to source documents and/or worksheets that show evidence of the validity of such costs. In addition, *Parameters and Guidelines* states that reimbursement for this mandate received from any source—e.g., service fees, federal funds, other State funds, etc.—must be identified and deducted from claimed costs.

Recommendation

We recommend the district maintain actual time records to support salary and benefit costs claimed. In addition, the district should deduct from costs claimed any reimbursement received from other sources.

District's Response

- [1.] We do not deny the fact that our methodology for calculating costs changed in 2002/2003. We believe the revised method is a more realistic representation of actual school site activities.

In 2000-2001 we differentiated the time spent completing the mandate by job description and associated responsibilities. . . . In 2002-2003 we reevaluated the above 'division of labor' premise. In doing so, we discovered the defining lines between school sites job responsibilities are often blurred. While front office personnel may not take the lead in identifying pupils reasonably suspected to have engaged in suspendable or expulsionable offenses, their support function cannot be entirely dismissed. Conversely, while the school site's front office will usually carry out the notification of teacher requirement, school site administrators will occasionally perform that function. . . .

- [2.] Unfilled and eliminated support positions are 'covered' by existing front office personnel. Each school site allocates the mandate requirements according to their contemporaneous staffing levels. This dynamic staffing precludes a Notification to Teachers district-wide time study. As such, we are unable to define specific 'representatives of the population'. We maintain that the high submission percentages, when viewed as a representative sample of the entire school site population, is a very accurate reflection of actual school site mandate activity and performance.

Job descriptions of school secretaries, school front-office clerks and similar school site staff "support" positions do not vary by school site. Additionally, job descriptions of school site administrators are not established by school sites. As such, there is no "representative of the population" variable. . . .

In regards to the statistical validity of our sample, forty-nine percent of our elementary schools submitted 'Notification to Teachers' time logs. The submissions of our middle schools and high schools were even higher (fifty-two percent and fifty-six percent, respectively). The average times were derived from these large samples, thereby providing us a very high statistical level of confidence.

Notification to Teachers mandate responsibilities vary from school to school and are not strictly defined by district procedures. With their ever changing front-office landscape, schools have become very adept at modifying job duties and responsibilities. Front-office mandate responsibilities are certainly not comparable between school levels (elementary vs. high schools) and only marginally similar with peer schools. For this multi-task mandate, a district-wide time study would be inconclusive.

- [3.] The outliers cited in the chart are easily identified as extremes. We are confident that the average times spent per activity/per student are representative of school site performances.

2001/2002:

. . . In the [table included in the audit finding], the 'longest time reported identifying students' cell is an aberration. In calculating average times, a middle school with 449 suspensions was incorrectly credited with only 7 suspensions. The aggregate time calculations for this middle school are correct but the average time spent per student / per activity are skewed. The next highest 'per student identification' submission was 1.85 hours (111 minutes). The average times spent on identifying students, information maintenance and notifying teachers was 22 minutes, 16 minutes and 15 minutes, respectively. The extremes noted in the table are uncommon.

2002/2003:

The average times spent on identifying students, information maintenance and notifying teachers was 27 minutes, 15 minutes and 11 minutes, respectively. As with the 2001/2002 table, the extremes noted are uncommon. . . .

- [4.] School site job responsibilities are not static. As noted in our response to finding 2, each school site allocates the mandate requirements according to their contemporaneous staffing levels. This dynamic staffing precludes a Notification to Teachers district-wide time study.

District Administrative Procedure 6290 specifies that "the principal or designee shall inform the teacher of each student who has engaged in, or is reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in C.4." (causes of suspension). The parameters and guidelines does not require a district procedure that specifies who is to identify pupils or maintain the information.

The district's procedure is reasonable and may be used as a basis for time studies.


SCO's Comment

Our finding remains unchanged. Based on the district's response, we revised our recommendation to exclude the alternative of performing a time study to support costs claimed.

1. The district concurs that the methodology it used to calculate mandate-related costs changed between FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03. However, the district's methodology is not appropriate for either fiscal year, because of the remaining issues identified in the finding. In addition, the district did not provide any explanation for excluding four school sites and the "max school" from its calculations for FY 2002-03. Furthermore, in FY 2002-03, the district calculated an average time to identify students from time logs submitted by various employee classifications, such as school clerk, attendance clerk, secretary, and teacher. However, to calculate claimed costs, the district applied the time study results only to the higher wage rates of school vice principals.
2. The district states that the dynamic staffing used to perform mandate-related activities precludes a district-wide time study. The district further states that mandate-related responsibilities vary from school to school, and are not comparable between school levels and are only marginally similar between peer schools. The district concludes that a district-wide time study would be inconclusive. We concur with the district's assessment and conclude that the district must maintain actual time records for employees who perform mandate-related activities. Consistent with this conclusion, we allowed salary and benefit costs claimed that were supported by actual time records and disallowed costs claimed that the district calculated from its time study.

The district believes it achieved a very high statistical level of confidence from the number of time logs that employees submitted. However, the district provided no analysis to support this conclusion, and we disagree with the conclusion. The district's methodology did not provide for a random sample of all employees who performed mandate-related activities. Instead, the district calculated average times from those school sites that submitted employee time logs. In addition, the district did not address how its time study was affected by the lack of uniform mandate-related procedures. Furthermore, the district concedes that a district-wide time study would be inconclusive.

3. The district states that the table shown in the finding identifies an inaccurate datum. The table shows data based on documentation that the district provided. The district did not submit any additional documentation to support the information provided in its response. Regardless of the purportedly erroneous datum, we still conclude that employees reported significant time variations that preclude the district from using time studies to calculate mandate-related costs. For example, 68 school sites reported time spent identifying mandated-related pupils in FY 2002-03. The following chart shows a distribution of information that school sites reported.




The district states that the finding identifies uncommon data extremes; however, the chart shows that 14 school sites reported from 1 to 10 minutes per student, while 18 school sites reported 41 minutes or more per student. The district claimed 24 minutes per student. The chart shows that the district's time study results do not result in a normal distribution; thus, we disagree that the district's time study provides a very high statistical level of confidence. We believe the time variations indicate that school employees use significantly differing procedures to perform mandate-related activities and/or school employees report time spent performing activities outside the scope of mandate-related activities. As discussed in item 4, the district does not have uniform procedures for performing mandate-related activities.

Furthermore, the district's response identifies average times that do not agree with the average times the district used to calculate claimed costs. For FY 2001-02, the district calculated claimed costs based on average times of 26 minutes, 11 minutes, and 11 minutes, respectively, to identify students, maintain information, and notify teachers. For FY 2002-03, the district calculated claimed costs based on average times of 24 minutes, 13 minutes, and 10 minutes, respectively. The district did not provide documentation to support the average times identified in its response.

4. The district did not address how its time study is affected by the lack of uniform district-wide procedures that specify how frequently schools should perform mandated activities. We agree that *Parameters and Guidelines* does not require a district procedure that specifies who will identify pupils or maintain information. However, the district cannot perform a valid district-wide time study without standardized procedures to perform mandate-related activities.

**Attachment—
District's Response to
Draft Audit Report**



SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EUGENE BRUCKER EDUCATION CENTER
4100 Normal Street, San Diego, CA 92103-8363

Fax: (619) 725-7785
(619) 725-7504

FINANCIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Office of Resource Development

May 31, 2005

Jim L. Spano, Chief
Compliance Audits Bureau
State Controller's Office
Division of Audits
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 513
Sacramento, California 95814

RE: NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS 1306/89 & 1257/93

Dear Mr. Spano:

This letter is in response to the May 2005 Draft Audit Report. The State Controller's Office performed an audit of San Diego Unified School District's (district) Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension/Expulsion Program claims for fiscal years 2001/2002 and 2002/2003. The district respectfully disputes findings 1, 2, 3 & 4 as noted below.

Response to Finding 1:

We do not deny the fact that our methodology for calculating costs changed in 2002/2003. We believe the revised method is a more realistic representation of actual school site activities.

In 2000-2001 we differentiated the time spent completing the mandate by job description and associated responsibilities. At that time, our rationale was that it was not reasonable to assume that school secretaries, school front-office clerks and similar school site staff 'support' positions would be involved in the identification of pupils reasonably suspected to have engaged in suspendable or expulsionable offenses and that the identification procedure would be handled by upper-echelon school site administrators (vice principal level and above). Per direction of school site administrators, the subsequent notification of teachers and the ongoing information maintenance activities would be carried out by school site support personnel. In 2002-2003 we reevaluated the above 'division of labor' premise. In doing so, we discovered the defining lines between school sites job responsibilities are often blurred. While front-office personnel may not take the lead in

"The mission of the San Diego City Schools is to improve student achievement by supporting teaching and learning in the classroom."

identifying pupils reasonably suspected to have engaged in suspendable or expulsible offenses, their support function cannot be entirely dismissed. Conversely, while the school site's front office will usually carry out the notification of teacher requirement, school site administrators will occasionally perform that function.

Response to Finding 2:

Unfilled and eliminated support positions are 'covered' by existing front office personnel. Each school site allocates the mandate requirements according to their contemporaneous staffing levels. This dynamic staffing precludes a Notification to Teachers district-wide time study. As such, we are unable to define specific 'representatives of the population'. We maintain that the high submission percentages, when viewed as a representative sample of the entire school site population, is a very accurate reflection of actual school site mandate activity and performance.

Job descriptions of school secretaries, school front-office clerks and similar school site staff 'support' positions do not vary by school site. Additionally, job descriptions of school site administrators are not established by school sites. As such, there is no "representative of the population" variable.

The suspended students listed in the district's claims have all been suspended for the reasons listed in section 48900 of the Ed Code-excluding subdivision "h" (tobacco offenses). This information is supported by a discipline report from the district's student information system which is entered at the school site level per component B (information maintenance). Component 3 (notifying teachers) is a function of the overall number of suspensions. State law and district procedures require principals or their designees to notify the teachers of the students who have been suspended for the acts mentioned above.

In regards to the statistical validity of our sample, forty-nine percent of our elementary schools submitted "Notification to Teachers" time logs. The submissions of our middle schools and high schools were even higher (fifty-two percent and fifty-six percent, respectively). The average times were derived from these large samples, thereby providing us a very high statistical level of confidence.

Response to Finding 3:

Activity	Fiscal Year			
	2001-02		2002-03	
	Shortest time reported per student	Longest time reported per student	Shortest time reported per student	Longest time reported per student
Identifying students	1 minute	18 hours	1 minute	299 minutes
Information Maintenance	1 minute	144 minutes	1 minute	191 minutes
Notifying teachers	1 minute	64 minutes	1 minute	125 minutes

The outliers cited in the chart are easily identified as extremes. We are confident that the average times spent per activity per student are representative of school site performances.

2001/2002:

In the previous table, the 'longest time reported identifying students' cell is an aberration. In calculating average times, a middle school with 449 suspensions was incorrectly credited with only 7 suspensions. The aggregate time calculations for this middle school are correct but the average time spent per student / per activity are skewed. The next highest 'per student identification' submission was 1.85 hours (111 minutes). The average times spent on identifying students, information maintenance and notifying teachers was 22 minutes, 16 minutes and 15 minutes, respectively. The extremes noted in the table are uncommon.

2002/2003:

The average times spent on identifying students, information maintenance and notifying teachers was 27 minutes, 15 minutes and 11 minutes, respectively. As with the 2001/2002 table, the extremes noted are uncommon.

Response to Finding 4:

School site job responsibilities are not static. As noted in our response to finding 2, each school site allocates the mandate requirements according to their contemporaneous staffing levels. This dynamic staffing precludes a Notification to Teachers district-wide time study.

District Administrative Procedure 6290 specifies that "the principal or designee shall inform the teacher of each student who has engaged in, or is reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in C.4." (causes of suspension). The parameters and guidelines does not require a district procedure that specifies who is to identify pupils or maintain the information.

Conclusion

Finding 1:

For 2002-2003 we reevaluated the previous year's 'division of labor' premise. In doing so, we discovered the dividing lines between school site job activities were not clearly defined. We are confident that our change in methodology resulted in a more accurate representation of actual school-site job performance. This change in methodology would seem 'inconsistent' when looking at a brief two-year snapshot but was clearly an improvement over prior-year procedures.

Finding 2:

Notification to Teachers mandate responsibilities vary from school to school and are not strictly defined by district procedures. With their ever changing front-office landscape,

Letter to Jim L. Spano

Page 4

May 31, 2005

schools have become very adept at modifying job duties and responsibilities. Front-office mandate responsibilities are certainly not comparable between school levels (elementary vs. high schools) and only marginally similar with peer schools. For this multi-task mandate, a district-wide time study would be inconclusive.

Finding 3:

Though mandate responsibilities vary from school to school, the outliers noted in finding #3 are clearly exceptions. The inferential means from 2001/2002 are consistent with 2002/2003 means. We are confident that these large-sample averages are representative of district-wide activity.

Finding 4:


The district's procedure is reasonable and may be used as a basis for time studies.

In a district of 170 individual schools, time allotted to mandate activities will certainly vary site-by-site but the district-wide inferential mean smoothes out these fluctuations and allows us to apply the averages to ALL traditional and alternative San Diego Unified School District schools.

We respectfully ask you to reevaluate our 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 Notification to Teachers claims.

If you need any further information, or would like to meet to resolve this matter, I can be reached at (619) 725-7785.

Sincerely,


Art M. Palkowitz
Manager, Office of Resource Development

AMP:jlt

**State Controller's Office
Division of Audits
Post Office Box 942850
Sacramento, California 94250-5874**

<http://www.sco.ca.gov>


RECEIVED

JUL 28 2005

S04-MCC-063



EXHIBIT J



SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EUGENE BRUCKER EDUCATION CENTER
4100 Normal Street, San Diego, CA 92103-8363

(619) 725-7785
Fax: (619) 725-7564

FINANCIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION
Office of Resource Development

May 31, 2005

Jim L. Spano, Chief
Compliance Audits Bureau
State Controller's Office
Division of Audits
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 518
Sacramento, California 95814

RE: NOTIFICATION TO TEACHERS 1306/89 & 1257/93

Dear Mr. Spano:

This letter is in response to the May 2005 Draft Audit Report. The State Controller's Office performed an audit of San Diego Unified School District's (district) Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension Expulsion Program claims for fiscal years 2001/2002 and 2002/2003. The district respectfully disputes findings 1, 2, 3 & 4 as noted below.

Response to Finding 1:

We do not deny the fact that our methodology for calculating costs changed in 2002/2003. We believe the revised method is a more realistic representation of actual school site activities.

In 2000-2001 we differentiated the time spent completing the mandate by job description and associated responsibilities. At that time, our rationale was that it was not reasonable to assume that school secretaries, school front-office clerks and similar school site staff 'support' positions would be involved in the identification of pupils reasonably suspected to have engaged in suspendable or expulsible offenses and that the identification procedure would be handled by upper-echelon school site administrators (vice principal level and above). Per direction of school site administrators, the subsequent notification of teachers and the ongoing information maintenance activities would be carried out by school site support personnel. In 2002-2003 we reevaluated the above 'division of labor' premise. In doing so, we discovered the defining lines between school sites job responsibilities are often blurred. While front office personnel may not take the lead in

"The mission of the San Diego City Schools is to improve student achievement by supporting teaching and learning in the classroom."

identifying pupils reasonably suspected to have engaged in suspendable or expulsionable offenses, their support function cannot be entirely dismissed. Conversely, while the school site's front office will usually carry out the notification of teacher requirement, school site administrators will occasionally perform that function.

Response to Finding 2:

Unfilled and eliminated support positions are 'covered' by existing front office personnel. Each school site allocates the mandate requirements according to their contemporaneous staffing levels. This dynamic staffing precludes a Notification to Teachers district-wide time study. As such, we are unable to define specific 'representatives of the population'. We maintain that the high submission percentages, when viewed as a representative sample of the entire school site population, is a very accurate reflection of actual school site mandate activity and performance.

Job descriptions of school secretaries, school front-office clerks and similar school site staff 'support' positions do not vary by school site. Additionally, job descriptions of school site administrators are not established by school sites. As such, there is no "representative of the population" variable.

The suspended students listed in the district's claims have all been suspended for the reasons listed in section 48900 of the Ed Code excluding subdivision "h" (tobacco offenses). This information is supported by a discipline report from the district's student information system which is entered at the school site level per component B (information maintenance). Component 3 (notifying teachers) is a function of the overall number of suspensions. State law and district procedures require principals or their designees to notify the teachers of the students who have been suspended for the acts mentioned above.

In regards to the statistical validity of our sample, forty-nine percent of our elementary schools submitted 'Notification to Teachers' time logs. The submissions of our middle schools and high schools were even higher (fifty-two percent and fifty-six percent, respectively). The average times were derived from these large samples, thereby providing us a very high statistical level of confidence.

Response to Finding 3:

Activity	Fiscal Year			
	2001-02		2002-03	
	Shortest time reported per student	Longest time reported per student	Shortest time reported per student	Longest time reported per student
Identifying students	1 minute	18 hours	1 minute	299 minutes
Information Maintenance	1 minute	144 minutes	1 minute	191 minutes
Notifying teachers	1 minute	64 minutes	1 minute	125 minutes

The outliers cited in the chart are easily identified as extremes. We are confident that the average times spent per activity/per student are representative of school site performances.

2001/2002:

In the previous table, the 'longest time reported identifying students' cell is an aberration. In calculating average times, a middle school with 449 suspensions was incorrectly credited with only 7 suspensions. The aggregate time calculations for this middle school are correct but the average time spent per student / per activity are skewed. The next highest 'per student identification' submission was 1.85 hours (111 minutes). The average times spent on identifying students, information maintenance and notifying teachers was 22 minutes, 16 minutes and 15 minutes, respectively. The extremes noted in the table are uncommon.

2002/2003:

The average times spent on identifying students, information maintenance and notifying teachers was 27 minutes, 15 minutes and 11 minutes, respectively. As with the 2001/2002 table, the extremes noted are uncommon.

Response to Finding 4:

School site job responsibilities are not static. As noted in our response to finding 2, each school site allocates the mandate requirements according to their contemporaneous staffing levels. This dynamic staffing precludes a Notification to Teachers district-wide time study.

District Administrative Procedure 6290 specifies that "the principal or designee shall inform the teacher of each student who has engaged in, or is reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in C.4."(causes of suspension). The parameters and guidelines does not require a district procedure that specifies who is to identify pupils or maintain the information.

Conclusion

Finding 1:

For 2002-2003 we reevaluated the previous year's 'division of labor' premise. In doing so, we discovered the dividing lines between school site job activities were not clearly defined. We are confident that our change in methodology resulted in a more accurate representation of actual school-site job performance. This change in methodology would seem 'inconsistent' when looking at a brief two-year snapshot but was clearly an improvement over prior year procedures.

Finding 2:

Notification to Teachers mandate responsibilities vary from school to school and are not strictly defined by district procedures. With their ever changing front-office landscape,

May 31, 2005

schools have become very adept at modifying job duties and responsibilities. Front-office mandate responsibilities are certainly not comparable between school levels (elementary vs. high schools) and only marginally similar with peer schools. For this multi-task mandate, a district-wide time study would be inconclusive.

Finding 3:

Though mandate responsibilities vary from school to school, the outliers noted in finding #3 are clearly exceptions. The inferential means from 2001/2002 are consistent with 2002/2003 means. We are confident that these large-sample averages are representative of district-wide activity.

Finding 4:


The district's procedure is reasonable and may be used as a basis for time studies.

In a district of 170 individual schools, time allotted to mandate activities will certainly vary site-by-site but the district-wide inferential mean smoothes out these fluctuations and allows us to apply the averages to ALL traditional and alternative San Diego Unified School District schools.

We respectfully ask you to reevaluate our 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 Notification to Teachers claims.

If you need any further information, or would like to meet to resolve this matter, I can be reached at (619) 725-7785.

Sincerely,



Art M. Palkowitz
Manager, Office of Resource Development

AMP:jlt

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

980 NINTH STREET, SUITE 300
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
 PHONE: (916) 323-3562
 FAX: (916) 445-0278
 E-mail: csminfo@csm.ca.gov



May 16, 2014

Mr. Arthur Palkowitz
 Stutz Artiano Shinoff & Holtz
 2488 Historic Decatur Road
 Suite 200
 San Diego, CA 92106

Ms. Andra Donovan
 San Diego Unified School District
 Legal Services Office
 4100 Normal Street, Room 2148
 San Diego, CA 92103

Ms. Jill Kanemasu
 State Controller's Office
 Accounting and Reporting
 3301 C Street, Suite 700
 Sacramento, CA 95816

And Parties, Interested Parties, and Interested Persons (See Mailing List)

Re: **Draft Staff Analysis and Proposed Statement of Decision, Schedule for Comments, and Notice of Hearing**

Incorrect Reduction Claim, 05-4452-I-01

Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion

Education Code Section 49079, Statutes 1993, Chapter 1257

San Diego Unified School District, Claimant

Dear Mr. Palkowitz, Ms. Donovan, and Ms. Kanemasu:

The draft staff analysis and proposed statement of decision for the above-named matter is enclosed for your review and comment.

Written Comments

Written comments may be filed on the draft staff analysis by **June 6, 2014**. You are advised that comments filed with the Commission are required to be simultaneously served on the other interested parties on the mailing list, and to be accompanied by a proof of service. However, this requirement may also be satisfied by electronically filing your documents. Please see <http://www.csm.ca.gov/dropbox.shtml> on the Commission's website for instructions on electronic filing. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.2.)

If you would like to request an extension of time to file comments, please refer to section 1183.01(c)(1) of the Commission's regulations.

Hearing

This matter is set for hearing on **Friday, July 25, 2014**, at 10:00 a.m., State Capitol, Room 447, Sacramento, California. The final staff analysis will be issued on or about July 11, 2014. Please let us know in advance if you or a representative of your agency will testify at the hearing, and if other witnesses will appear. If you would like to request postponement of the hearing, please refer to section 1183.01(c)(2) of the Commission's regulations.

Please contact Tyler Asmundson at (916) 323-3562 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Heather Halsey
 Executive Director

ITEM ___
INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIM
DRAFT PROPOSED DECISION

Education Code Section 49079, Statutes 1993, Chapter 1257

Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion
05-4452-I-01

Fiscal Years: 2001-2002 and 2002-2003

San Diego Unified School District, Claimant

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

This incorrect reduction claim (IRC) challenges reductions made by the State Controller’s Office (SCO) to reimbursement claims filed by Claimant, San Diego Unified School District (claimant) for the *Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion* program, CSM-4452, for fiscal years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003. Pursuant to the SCO’s final audit issued June 30, 2005, reductions were made for claimed employee salaries, benefits, and related indirect costs in the amount of \$166,791 in fiscal year 2001-2002 and \$187,255 in fiscal year 2002-2003 on the grounds that the claims were not supported by actual time records or a valid “documented” time study. The claimant seeks a determination from the Commission on State Mandates (Commission), pursuant to Government Code section 17551(d), that the SCO incorrectly reduced the claims, and requests that the SCO reinstate the \$354,046 reduced.

As determined in the SCO’s audit in this case, the claimant submitted contemporaneous time logs or activity reports prepared by school site employees that performed the mandated activities showing the actual time spent on the program, and claimed reimbursement for the salary and benefit costs for these employees based on these time logs. These costs are not in dispute.

The disputed costs stem from the claimed reimbursement for the salary and benefit costs for employees that did *not* have actual time logs or other documentation supporting the time spent on the program. For these employees, the claimant reported an average time spent on each reimbursable activity for each student suspended from school. The average time was calculated based on the time logs prepared and submitted by other employees at different schools within the district that documented their time for this program. For fiscal year 2001-2002, the claimant used the average times to calculate the costs for employees at 37 schools that did not have actual time logs. For fiscal year 2002-2003, the claimant used the average times to calculate the costs for employees at 57 schools that did not have actual time logs. The SCO denied the reimbursement claims submitted on behalf of these schools on the grounds that the claims were not supported by actual time records or a valid time study.

Procedural History

On June 30, 2005, the SCO issued the final audit report on the reimbursement claims at issue in this IRC. On June 26, 2006, San Diego filed an IRC for fiscal years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 (05-4452-I-01). On July 6, 2006, Commission staff deemed the incorrect reduction claim filing complete and issued a notice of complete incorrect reduction claim filing and schedule for comments. On November 21, 2007, the SCO filed comments on IRC 05-4452-I-01.

Claims

The following chart provides a brief summary of the claims and issues raised and staff’s recommendation.

Subject	Description	Staff Recommendation
<p>Claimant argues that the reduction made by the SCO for teacher salaries and benefits is incorrect because the parameters and guidelines governing these reimbursement claims allow San Diego to use a time study to support its reimbursement claims.</p>	<p>The SCO reduced salaries, benefits, and other indirect costs claimed for fiscal years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003, on grounds that claimant failed to provide documentation to support salary and benefits costs based on actual time records or an average number of hours supported by a documented time study.</p> <p>Claimant admits that it does not have any documentation to support the actual costs incurred by the schools at issue in this case. However, claimant used cost data from other schools in the district that did collect and maintain source documentation to calculate the average costs incurred for 37 schools in fiscal year 2001-2002 and 57 schools in fiscal year 2002-2003 that did not collect or maintain any source documentation.</p>	<p><i>Deny:</i> The reductions made by the SCO for salaries and benefits are consistent with the parameters and guidelines, reasonable, and not arbitrary and capricious or entirely lacking in evidentiary support.</p>
<p>Claimant asserts that Government Code section 17518.5 allows it to unilaterally develop and implement its own reasonable reimbursement methodology (RRM)</p>	<p>Claimant asserts that the “time study” used to support its undocumented reimbursement claims, qualifies as a RRM.</p>	<p><i>Deny:</i> Claimant’s time study does not constitute a valid reasonable reimbursement methodology, as defined by Government Code section 17518.5.</p>

to support its claimed costs.		
-------------------------------	--	--

Analysis

Government Code Section 17551(d) requires the Commission to hear and decide a claim that the SCO has incorrectly reduced payments to a local agency or school district. If the Commission determines that a reimbursement claim has been incorrectly reduced, section 1185.9 of the Commission’s regulations requires the Commission to send the decision to the SCO and request that the costs in the claim be reinstated.

In hearing and deciding an IRC, the Commission considers issues of law, including the interpretation of the requirements of the parameters and guidelines, de novo. With respect to auditing standards applied by the SCO, the Commission exercises “very limited review ‘out of deference to...the legislative delegation of administrative authority of the agency, and to the presumed expertise of the agency within its scope of authority.’”¹ The Commission “may not reweigh the evidence or substitute it’s judgment for that of” the SCO.² The Commission must also review the SCO’s audit in light of the fact that the initial burden of providing evidence for a claim of reimbursement lies with the claimant.³

A. The reductions made by the SCO’s office for salaries and benefits are consistent with the parameters and guidelines, reasonable, and not arbitrary and capricious or entirely lacking in evidentiary support.

Staff finds that the SCO correctly reduced the claims for fiscal years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003. Section VI B of the parameters and guidelines authorizes reimbursement for salary and benefit costs of an employee performing the mandated activities, but requires the claimant to either specify the actual number of hours an employee devoted to the mandated activities or the average number of hours spent on the program if supported by a “documented” time study. Section VII of the parameters and guidelines further requires supporting data to be kept by the claimant for all costs claimed.

Claimant admits that it does not have any documentation to support the actual costs incurred by the schools at issue in this case.⁴ However, claimant used cost data from other schools within the district that did collect and maintain source documentation to calculate the average costs incurred for 37 schools in fiscal year 2001-2002 and 57 schools in fiscal year 2002-2003 that did not collect or maintain source documentation. Section VI B. 1. of the parameters and guidelines provides that claimants may utilize a time study to support claims for reimbursement and that the time study must be documented to show the average time spent by the employee performing the mandated activities. Claimant did not comply with this requirement.

Moreover, San Diego admits that there is no district policy on this mandated program and that each school within the district performs the mandate differently. Thus, San Diego’s use of data

¹ *Shapell Industries, Inc. v. Governing Board* (1991) 1 Cal.App.4th 218, at p. 230.

² *American Bd. of Cosmetic Surgery, Inc, supra*, 162 Cal.App.4th at pgs. 547-548.

³ *Gilbert v. City of Sunnyvale* (2005) 130 Cal.App.4th 1264, 1274-1275.

⁴ Exhibit A, San Diego IRC, at p. 4.

from other schools within the district to calculate an average cost for those schools that did not maintain any documentation of the costs does not provide sufficient evidence of the validity of the costs actually incurred by these schools.

Staff further finds that the record supports the SCO's contention that San Diego's extrapolation of data from reporting schools to schools that did not collect and maintain source documentation to support the costs claimed raises valid questions regarding whether the data accurately reflects the undocumented costs from those schools. As the administrative agency responsible for auditing mandate reimbursement claims, the interpretation of the SCO is entitled to great weight. The Commission may not reweigh the evidence or substitute its judgment for that of the SCO.

Thus, the reductions made by the SCO for salaries and benefits are consistent with the parameters and guidelines, reasonable, and not arbitrary and capricious or entirely lacking in evidentiary support.

B. Claimant's time study does not constitute a valid reasonable reimbursement methodology, as defined by Government Code section 17518.5.

Staff finds that claimant's purported "time study" does not constitute a valid RRM. Government Code section 17518.5 defines RRM to mean a formula for reimbursing local agencies and school districts for costs mandated by the state. The RRM may be based on a general allocation formula, uniform cost allowance, or other approximations of local costs mandated by the state. The RRM, however, must be adopted by the Commission pursuant to Government Code section 17557. The parties have not submitted a request to include an RRM in the parameters and guidelines for this program, and the Commission has not adopted one.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Pursuant to Government Code section 17551(d) and section 1185.9 of the Commission's regulations, staff finds that the SCO's reduction of salaries, benefits, and related indirect costs claimed by San Diego in the amount of \$166,791 for fiscal year 2001-2002 and \$192,740 for fiscal year 2002-2003 are consistent with the parameters and guidelines, reasonable, and not arbitrary and capricious or entirely lacking in evidentiary support. Therefore, the reductions are correct.

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed decision to deny this IRC and authorize staff to make any technical, non-substantive changes following the hearing.

BEFORE THE
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIM
ON:

Education Code Section 49079

Statutes 1989, Chapter 1306; Statutes 1993,
Chapter 1257

Fiscal Years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003

San Diego Unified School District, Claimant.

Case No.: 05-4452-I-01

*Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to
Suspension or Expulsion*

DECISION PURSUANT TO
GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 17500 ET
SEQ.; CALIFORNIA CODE OF
REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, DIVISION 2,
CHAPTER 2.5. ARTICLE 7

(Adopted July 25, 2014)

DECISION

The Commission on State Mandates (Commission) heard and decided this incorrect reduction claim (IRC) during a regularly scheduled hearing on July 25, 2014. [Witness list will be included in the final decision.]

The law applicable to the Commission’s determination of a reimbursable state-mandated program is article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution, Government Code section 17500 et seq., and related case law.

The Commission [adopted/modified] the staff analysis to approve the IRC and remand this matter to the State Controller’s Office (SCO) at the hearing by a vote of [vote count will be included in the final decision].

Summary of the Findings

This IRC filed by San Diego Unified School District (claimant) challenges reductions made by the SCO to the District’s reimbursement claims for costs incurred in fiscal years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 for the *Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion* program, CSM-4452. Following an audit, the SCO reduced the claims in the amount of \$166,791 in fiscal year 2001-2002 and \$187,255 in fiscal year 2002-2003 on the grounds that the district claimed employee time that was not supported by actual time records or a valid “documented” time study.

The Commission denies this IRC and finds that the reductions made by the SCO for salaries and benefits are consistent with the parameters and guidelines, reasonable, and not arbitrary and capricious or entirely lacking in evidentiary support.

The parameters and guidelines authorize reimbursement for salary and benefit costs of an employee performing the mandated activities, but require the claimant to either specify the actual number of hours an employee devoted to the mandated activities or the average number of hours spent on the program if supported by a “documented” time study. The parameters and guidelines

further require claimants to maintain supporting documentation to evidence the validity of the costs claimed.

Claimant admits that it does not have any documentation to support the actual costs incurred by the schools at issue in this case. However, claimant used cost data from other schools within the district that did collect and maintain source documentation to calculate the average costs incurred for 37 schools in fiscal year 2001-2002 and 57 schools in fiscal year 2002-2003 that did not collect or maintain source documentation. Although Section VI B. 1. of the parameters and guidelines provides that claimants may utilize time studies to support claims for reimbursement, the time studies must be documented to show the average time spent by the employee performing the mandated activities. Here, claimant did not comply with these requirements. Moreover, claimant admits that there is no district policy on this mandated program and that each school within the district performs the mandate differently. Thus, claimant's use of data from other schools within the district to calculate an average cost for those schools that did not maintain any documentation of the costs, does not provide sufficient evidence of the validity of the costs actually incurred by these schools.

The Commission further finds that the record supports the SCO's contention that claimant's extrapolation of data from reporting schools to schools that did not collect and maintain source documentation to support the costs claimed raises valid questions regarding whether the data accurately reflects the undocumented costs from those schools. As the administrative agency responsible for auditing mandate reimbursement claims, the interpretation of the SCO is entitled to great weight. The Commission may not reweigh the evidence or substitute its judgment for that of the SCO.

Finally, the Commission finds that claimant's assertion that its "time study" qualifies as a reasonable reimbursement methodology, is not supported by the law. Government Code section 17518.5 defines reasonable reimbursement methodology (RRM) to mean a formula for reimbursing local agencies and school districts for costs mandated by the state. The RRM may be based on a general allocation formula, uniform cost allowance, or other approximations of local costs mandated by the state. The RRM, however, must be adopted by the Commission pursuant to Government Code section 17557, following a request, an opportunity for comment by the parties, a public hearing, and the adoption of a decision on the matter. The parties have not submitted a request to include an RRM in the parameters and guidelines for this program, and the Commission has not adopted one. The mandates process does not allow a party, on its own, to use a formula for claiming reimbursement of state-mandated costs.

Accordingly, the Commission denies this incorrect reduction claim.

COMMISSION FINDINGS

Chronology

- 01/19/1995 The Commission approved the *Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion* test claim.
- 07/20/1995 The Commission adopted parameters and guidelines.⁵
- 06/30/2005 SCO issued final audit for fiscal years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.
- 06/26/2006 Claimant filed an incorrect reduction claim for fiscal years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.
- 07/06/2006 Commission staff deemed the incorrect reduction claim filing complete and issued a notice of complete incorrect reduction claim filing and schedule for comments.
- 11/21/2007 SCO filed comments on San Diego's incorrect reduction claim for fiscal years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.

I. Introduction

This IRC challenges reductions made by the SCO to reimbursement claims for costs incurred in fiscal years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 for the *Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion* program, CSM-4452. Following an audit, the SCO reduced the claims in the amount of \$166,791 in fiscal year 2001-2002 and \$187,255 in fiscal year 2002-2003⁶ on the grounds that claimant claimed employee time that was not supported by actual time records or a valid time study.

Claimant seeks a determination from the Commission pursuant to Government Code section 17551(d) that the SCO incorrectly reduced the claim, and requests that the SCO reinstate the \$354,046 reduced.

Summary of the Program

Under the *Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion* program, school districts are eligible to claim reimbursement for the costs to perform the following activities:

- (1) From records maintained in the ordinary course of business or received from law enforcement agencies, identify pupils who have, during the previous three years, engaged in, or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in any of the subdivisions of Education Code section 48900, except subdivision (h).

⁵ Exhibit X. Note that the parameters and guidelines have since been amended twice: once on August 1, 2008 and again on May 27, 2010. However, the amended parameters and guidelines are not relevant to this IRC.

⁶ For the 2002-03 claim, the IRC shows a disputed amount that differs from the amount noted in the conclusion of the IRC. The difference represents audit adjustments in the amount of \$5,485 related to costs funded from restricted fund sources. (See Exhibit B, Controller's Comments on San Diego's IRC, attachment Exhibit I, Audit Report dated June 2005.) The claimant has not disputed that adjustment.

- (2) Provide this information to teachers on a routine and timely basis.
- (3) Maintain the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years, and adopt a cost effective method to assemble, maintain and disseminate the information to teachers.⁷

Parameters and guidelines for the program were adopted in 1995.⁸ Section VI B. of the parameters and guidelines provide instructions on supporting documentation for claiming reimbursement for employee salaries and benefits, and requires the claimant to either specify the actual number of hours an employee devoted to the mandated activities or the average number of hours spent on the program if supported by a “documented time study” as follows:

B. Supporting Documentation

Claimed costs should be supported by the following information:

1. Employee Salaries and Benefits

Identify the employee(s) and their job classification, describe the mandated functions performed, and specify the actual number of hours devoted to each function, the productive hourly rate, and the related benefits. The average number of hours devoted to each function may be claimed if supported by a documented time study.

Section VII of the parameters and guidelines requires supporting data to be kept by the claimant, which evidences the validity of the costs claimed as follows:

For auditing purposes, all costs claimed must be traceable to source documents and/or worksheets that show evidence of the validity of such costs. Pursuant to Government Code section 17558.5, these documents must be kept on file by the agency submitting the claim for a period of no less than four years after the end of the calendar year in which the reimbursement claim is filed, and made available on the request of the SCO.

The SCO’s Audit

As determined in the SCO’s audit in this case, claimant submitted contemporaneous time logs or activity reports prepared by school site employees that performed the mandated activities showing the actual time spent on the program, and claimed reimbursement for the salary and benefit costs for these employees based on these time logs for several schools. These costs are not in dispute.

The disputed costs stem from claimed reimbursement for the salary and benefit costs for employees of schools that did *not* maintain actual time logs or maintain other documentation supporting the time spent on the program. For these employees, claimant reported an average time spent on each reimbursable activity for each student suspended from school. The average

⁷ Exhibit C, statement of decision on test claim adopted January 19, 1995.

⁸ Exhibit D, parameters and guidelines adopted on July 25, 1995. Although the parameters and guidelines for the *Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion* (CSM-4452) program were subsequently amended and consolidated with a later claim, the amended and consolidated parameters and guidelines are not applicable to San Diego’s IRC.

time was calculated based on the time logs prepared and submitted by other employees at different schools within the district that documented their time for this program. For fiscal year 2001-2002, claimant used the average times to calculate the costs for employees at 37 schools that did not have actual time logs. Claimant explains the costs claimed as follows:

For fiscal year 2001-2002, the District has time logs from 66 schools totaling \$236,587. These schools reported a total of 6,451 suspensions that qualified for the teacher notification program, which breaks down to \$36.67 per student. In their audit, the SCO accepted these activity reports as reasonable reimbursement. The District extrapolated costs for 37 additional schools totaling \$157,270. The additional 37 schools had a total of 4,681 suspensions that qualified for the teacher notification program, which breaks down to \$33.60 per student, approximately \$3.00 less than the supported costs accepted by the SCO. The District argues that this is a reasonable estimate of the actual costs for these 37 schools.⁹

For fiscal year 2002-2003, claimant used the average times to calculate the costs for employees at 57 schools that did not have actual time logs. Claimant explains the costs claimed as follows:

For fiscal year 2002-2003, the District has time logs from 83 schools totaling \$224,356. These schools reported a total of 6,327 suspensions that qualified for the teacher notification program, which breaks down to \$35.46 per student. In their audit, the SCO accepted these time logs as reasonable reimbursement. The District extrapolated costs for 57 additional schools totaling \$181,006. The additional 57 schools had a total of 5,307 suspensions that qualified for the teacher notification program, which breaks down to \$34.11 per student, \$1.35 less than the supported costs accepted by the SCO. The District contends this is a reasonable estimate of the actual costs for these 57 schools.¹⁰

The SCO denied the reimbursement claims submitted on behalf of these schools on the grounds that the claims were not supported by actual time records or a valid time study.

II. Positions of the Parties

A. Claimant, San Diego Unified School District

Claimant argues that the SCO incorrectly reduced costs of salaries, benefits, and related indirect costs claimed in fiscal years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 in the amount of \$354,046. Claimant seeks a determination from the Commission pursuant to Government Code section 17551(d) that the SCO incorrectly reduced the claim, and requests that the SCO reinstate the full amount reduced.

Although claimant admits that it did not provide actual time records to support some of its reimbursement claims, claimant argues that the parameters and guidelines governing these reimbursement claims allow it to use “the average number hours devoted to each function” as long as it is “supported by a documented time study.”¹¹ Claimant asserts that its reimbursement

⁹ Exhibit A, San Diego IRC, at pp. 4-5.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ Exhibit A, San Diego IRC, at p. 4.

claims are supported by a time study which “used an average derived from contemporaneous activity reports submitted by school site staff members who performed the [reimbursable] activities to calculate an average rate per mandated activity, per student suspended.”¹² Claimant contends that its extrapolation of actual time records to determine salaries and benefits that are not supported by actual time records is a valid time study.¹³ Claimant contends that the averages developed by the time study are “conservative” and not excessive for the following reasons:

- The total hours submitted by each school was divided by the total number of qualifying students suspended at that school regardless of whether the staff turned in time for all students. In cases where school site employees did not turn in all of their contemporaneous activity logs for the year, the average time per student is driven down below the actual average time.
- To be conservative, data with the highest hours reported was eliminated when calculating the average time per student. San Diego made this adjustment to the average so that it would be more representative of the typical reimbursement situation.
- The per student cost for extrapolated schools was less than the per student audited costs supported by contemporaneous activity reports.

Claimant further asserts that, in addition to supporting its claims with a time study, Government Code section 17518.5 allows it to unilaterally develop and implement its own reasonable reimbursement methodology to support its claimed costs.¹⁴ Claimant asserts that its time study qualifies as a reasonable reimbursement methodology.¹⁵

B. State Controller’s Office

The final audit report concluded that \$354,046 in salaries, benefits, and related indirect costs were unallowable, because “the District failed to provide documentation to support salary and benefits costs based on actual time records or an average number of hours supported by a documented time study, and indirect costs for these disallowed claimed costs.”¹⁶ The SCO asserts that its audit was appropriate and the IRC should be denied for the following reasons:

- Government Code section 17518.5 does not allow a local government to unilaterally develop and implement a reasonable reimbursement methodology.
- Claimant failed to provide any evidence that employees performed activities that were not accounted for on contemporaneous activity logs. There is no evidence that the non-reporting schools performed all of the mandated activities, performed the activities in the same manner as those schools that submitted time records, or performed the activities

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Exhibit A, San Diego IRC, at pp. 4 and 7.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Exhibit B, Controller’s Comments on San Diego IRC, at p. 124.

with the same frequency as those schools that submitted time records. Claimant admits that it does not have a district-wide policy or procedure governing this program.

- Claimant’s method of calculating average times was inconsistent between fiscal years. For fiscal year 2001-2001, the district calculated average times based on time logs completed by employees in certain positions, rather than on all employees who performed each mandated activity. For the activity of identifying students, claimant used only time reported by principals and vice principals. For the activities of information maintenance and notifying teachers, claimant used only time reported by school clerks, school secretaries, and similar positions. In 2002-2003, however, claimant calculated time based on all employees who submitted time logs. In that year, claimant also excluded the “max school” that reported the highest number of hours for each activity, but not the highest hours per student.
- Claimant’s methodologies for both fiscal years do not constitute valid statistical analyses. The projections were based on employees that submitted time logs, rather than on randomly selected employees. Claimant provided no documentation to show that the employees used in the calculations were representative of the population.
- The time logs that were submitted indicate that time studies are not appropriate for these activities because the times reported per student varied significantly.
- Reimbursement claims submitted by large school districts indicate that the costs claimed by the claimant were excessive and unreasonable. For fiscal year 2001-2002, claimant’s average claimed cost per pupil was \$2.87, while the average claimed cost per pupil by 17 other populous school districts in the state was \$0.62 per pupil. For fiscal year 2002-2003, claimant’s average claimed cost per pupil was \$2.95, while the average claimed cost for the 17 other districts in the state was \$0.81 per pupil.

V. Discussion

Government Code section 17561(b) authorizes the SCO to audit the claims filed by local agencies and school districts and to reduce any claim for reimbursement of state mandated costs that the SCO determines is excessive or unreasonable. Government Code section 12410 further requires the SCO to:

[S]uperintend the fiscal concerns of the state. The Controller shall audit all claims against the state, and may audit the disbursement of any state money, for correctness, legality, and for sufficient provisions of law for payment.

Although the SCO is required to follow the parameters and guidelines when auditing a claim for mandate reimbursement, the SCO has broad discretion in determining how to audit claims. Government Code section 12410 provides in relevant part:

Whenever, in [the Controller’s] opinion, the audit provided for by [Government Code section 925 et seq.] is not adequate, the Controller *may make such field or other audit* of any claim or disbursement of state money *as may be appropriate to such determination.* (Italics added.)

Government Code Section 17551(d) requires the Commission to hear and decide a claim that the SCO has incorrectly reduced payments to the local agency or school district. If the Commission determines that a reimbursement claim has been incorrectly reduced, section 1185.9 of the

Commission’s regulations requires the Commission to send the decision to the SCO and request that the costs in the claim be reinstated.

The Commission must determine in this case whether the SCO’s audit decisions were arbitrary, capricious, or entirely lacking in evidentiary support. This standard is similar to the standard used by the courts when reviewing an alleged abuse of discretion of a state agency.¹⁷ Under this standard, the courts have found that:

When reviewing the exercise of discretion, “[t]he scope of review is limited, out of deference to the agency’s authority and presumed expertise: ‘The court may not reweigh the evidence or substitute its judgment for that of the agency. [Citation.]’” ... “In general ... the inquiry is limited to whether the decision was arbitrary, capricious, or entirely lacking in evidentiary support. . . .” [Citations.] When making that inquiry, the “court must ensure that an agency has adequately considered all relevant factors, and has demonstrated a rational connection between those factors, the choice made, and the purposes of the enabling statute.” [Citation.]’ ”¹⁸

Thus, with respect to the SCO’s authority and responsibility over state audits, the Commission exercises “very limited review ‘out of deference to...the legislative delegation of administrative authority of the agency, and to the presumed expertise of the agency within its scope of authority.’”¹⁹ The Commission “may not reweigh the evidence or substitute it’s judgment for that of” the SCO.²⁰ The Commission must also review the SCO’s audit in light of the fact that the initial burden of providing evidence for a claim of reimbursement lies with the claimant.²¹ In addition, the Commission must review questions of law *de novo*, without consideration of conclusions made by the SCO in the context of an audit. The Commission is vested with exclusive authority to adjudicate disputes over the existence of state-mandated programs within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6.²² The Commission must also interpret the Government Code and implementing regulations in accordance with the broader constitutional and statutory scheme. In making its decisions, the Commission must strictly construe article XIII B, section 6 and not apply it as an “equitable remedy to cure the perceived unfairness resulting from political decisions on funding priorities.”²³

¹⁷ *Johnston v. Sonoma County Agricultural* (2002) 100 Cal.App.4th 973, 983-984. See also *American Bd. of Cosmetic Surgery, Inc. v. Medical Bd. of California* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 534, 547.

¹⁸ *American Bd. of Cosmetic Surgery, Inc, supra*, 162 Cal.App.4th at pp. 547-548.

¹⁹ *Shapell Industries, Inc. v. Governing Board* (1991) 1 Cal.App.4th 218, at p. 230.

²⁰ *American Bd. of Cosmetic Surgery, Inc, supra*, 162 Cal.App.4th at pgs. 547-548.

²¹ *Gilbert v. City of Sunnyvale* (2005) 130 Cal.App.4th 1264, 1274-1275.

²² *Kinlaw v. State of California* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 326, 331-334; Government Code sections 17551, 17552.

²³ *County of Sonoma, supra*, 84 Cal.App.4th 1264, 1280, citing *City of San Jose v. State of California* (1996) 45 Cal.App.4th 1802, 1817.

A. The reductions made by the SCO for salaries and benefits are consistent with the parameters and guidelines, reasonable, and not arbitrary and capricious or entirely lacking in evidentiary support.

The SCO reduced salaries, benefits, and other indirect costs claimed in the amount of \$166,791 for fiscal year 2001-2002 and \$192,740 for fiscal year 2002-2003, on grounds that claimant failed to provide documentation to support salary and benefits costs based on actual time records or an average number of hours supported by a documented time study.²⁴

Claimant admits that it does not have any documentation to support the actual costs incurred by the schools at issue in this case.²⁵ However, claimant used cost data from other schools in the district that did collect and maintain source documentation to calculate the average costs incurred for 37 schools in fiscal year 2001-2002 and 57 schools in fiscal year 2002-2003 that did not collect or maintain any source documentation.

The Commission finds that the SCO correctly reduced these claims. Although Section VI B. 1. of the parameters and guidelines provides that claimants may utilize time studies to support a claim for reimbursement, the time study must be documented showing the employee's average times spent on the program. In addition, Section VII of the parameters and guidelines requires the claimant to maintain supporting source documentation of the costs incurred to show evidence of the validity of the claim. Here, claimant did not comply with these requirements.

Moreover, claimant admits that there is no district policy on this mandated program and that each school within the district performs the mandate differently. Thus, claimant's use of data from other schools within the district to calculate an average cost for those schools that did not maintain any documentation of the costs, does not provide sufficient evidence of the validity of the costs actually incurred by these schools.

In addition, the record supports the SCO's contention that claimant's extrapolation of data from reporting schools to schools that did not collect and maintain any source documentation raises valid questions whether the data accurately reflects the undocumented costs from other schools. The SCO contends that claimant's costs claimed are unallowable for the following reasons:

- Claimant's procedures for performing mandates activities do not lend themselves to time studies because claimant does not have uniform district-wide procedures for the mandated activities.
- Claimant based its projections on employees who submitted time logs rather than on statistically valid random sample of all employees performing each mandated activity and claimant failed to provide documentation showing that the employees used were representative of the population performing each mandated activity.
- Claimant did not provide any evidence that non-reporting schools: (1) performed all the mandated activities; (2) performed the activities in the same manner as those schools that submitted time records; and (3) performed the activities with the same frequency as those schools that submitted time records.

²⁴ Exhibit B, Controller's Comments on San Diego IRC, at p. 124.

²⁵ Exhibit A, San Diego IRC, at p. 4.

Claimant has not submitted evidence to rebut these findings.

As the administrative agency responsible for auditing mandate reimbursement claims, the interpretation of the SCO is entitled to great weight; the courts have long held that “[a]n agency interpretation of the meaning and legal effect of a statute is entitled to consideration and respect by the courts.”²⁶ The Commission “may not reweigh the evidence or substitute its judgment for that of” the SCO.²⁷

Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds claimant did not comply with the parameters and guidelines for claiming reimbursement for the costs of salaries and benefits, and therefore the SCO’s disallowance of salaries, benefits, and related indirect costs in the amount of \$166,791 for fiscal year 2001-2002 and \$192,740 for fiscal year 2002-2003, was not arbitrary, capricious, or entirely lacking in evidentiary support.

B. San Diego’s time study does not constitute a valid reasonable reimbursement methodology, as defined by Government Code section 17518.5.

Claimant asserts that Government Code section 17518.5 “allows and even encourages the use of a reasonable reimbursement methodology.”²⁸ San Diego further asserts that the “time study” used to support its undocumented reimbursement claims, qualifies as a reasonable reimbursement methodology.²⁹

Claimant is wrong. Government Code section 17518.5 defines reasonable reimbursement methodology (RRM) to mean a formula for reimbursing local agencies and school districts for costs mandated by the state. The RRM may be based on a general allocation formula, uniform cost allowance, or other approximations of local costs mandated by the state. The RRM, however, must be adopted by the Commission pursuant to Government Code section 17557, following a request, an opportunity for comment by the parties, a public hearing, and the adoption of a decision on the matter.³⁰ The parties have not submitted a request to include an RRM in the parameters and guidelines for this program, and the Commission has not adopted one. The mandates process does not allow a party, on its own, to use a formula for claiming reimbursement of state-mandated costs.

Based on the above discussion, the Commission finds claimant’s time study does not qualify as an RRM within the meaning of Government Code section 17518.5.

VI. Conclusion

Pursuant to Government Code section 17551(d) and section 1185.9 of the Commission’s regulations, the Commission finds that the SCO’s reductions of salaries, benefits, and related indirect costs claimed by San Diego in the amount of \$166,791 for fiscal year 2001-2002 and \$192,740 for fiscal year 2002-2003 are consistent with the parameters and guidelines,

²⁶ *Shapell Industries, supra*, 1 Cal.App.4th 218, at p. 230.

²⁷ *American Bd. of Cosmetic Surgery, Inc, supra*, 162 Cal.App.4th at pgs. 547-548.

²⁸ Exhibit A, San Diego IRC, at p. 6, citing Government Code section 17518.5 as added by Statutes of 2004, chapter 890.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ California Code of Regulations, Title 2, 1183.10-1183.13, as effective on July 1, 2014.

reasonable, and not arbitrary and capricious or entirely lacking in evidentiary support. Therefore, the reductions are correct.

Accordingly, the Commission denies this incorrect reduction claim.

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY EMAIL

I, the undersigned, declare as follows:

I am a resident of the County of Solano and I am over the age of 18 years, and not a party to the within action. My place of employment is 980 Ninth Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, California 95814.

On May 16, 2014, I served the:

Draft Staff Analysis and Proposed Statement of Decision, Schedule for Comments, and Notice of First Hearing

Incorrect Reduction Claim, 05-4452-I-01

Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion

Education Code Section 49079, Statutes 1993, Chapter 1257

San Diego Unified School District, Claimant

by making it available on the Commission's website and providing notice of how to locate it to the email addresses provided on the attached mailing list.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on May 16, 2014 at Sacramento, California.



Heidi J. Palchik
Commission on State Mandates
980 Ninth Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 323-3562

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

Mailing List

Last Updated: 5/16/14

Claim Number: 05-4452-I-01

Matter: Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion

Claimant: San Diego Unified School District

TO ALL PARTIES, INTERESTED PARTIES, AND INTERESTED PERSONS:

Each commission mailing list is continuously updated as requests are received to include or remove any party or person on the mailing list. A current mailing list is provided with commission correspondence, and a copy of the current mailing list is available upon request at any time. Except as provided otherwise by commission rule, when a party or interested party files any written material with the commission concerning a claim, it shall simultaneously serve a copy of the written material on the parties and interested parties to the claim identified on the mailing list provided by the commission. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.2.)

Socorro Aquino, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Audits, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 322-7522

SAquino@sco.ca.gov

Tyler Asmundson, *Commission on State Mandates*

980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 323-3562

Tyler.Asmundson@csmd.ca.gov

Lacey Baysinger, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 324-0254

lbaysinger@sco.ca.gov

Marieta Delfin, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 323-0706

mdelfin@sco.ca.gov

Andra Donovan, *San Diego Unified School District*

Legal Services Office, 4100 Normal Street, Room 2148, 4100 Normal Street, Room 2148, San Diego, CA 92103

Phone: (619) 725-5630

adonovan@sandi.net

Donna Ferebee, *Department of Finance*

915 L Street, Suite 1280, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
donna.ferebee@dof.ca.gov

Chris Ferguson, *Department of Finance*

Education Systems Unit, 915 L Street, 7th Floor, 915 L Street, 7th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
Chris.Ferguson@dof.ca.gov

Susan Geanacou, *Department of Finance*

915 L Street, Suite 1280, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
susan.geanacou@dof.ca.gov

Ed Hanson, *Department of Finance*

Education Systems Unit, 915 L Street, 7th Floor, 915 L Street, 7th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-0328
ed.hanson@dof.ca.gov

Michael Johnston, *Clovis Unified School District*

1450 Herndon Ave, Clovis, CA 93611-0599
Phone: (559) 327-9000
michaeljohnston@clovisusd.k12.ca.us

Jill Kanemasu, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 322-9891
jkanemasu@sco.ca.gov

Jay Lal, *State Controller's Office (B-08)*

Division of Accounting & Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 324-0256
JLal@sco.ca.gov

Kathleen Lynch, *Department of Finance (A-15)*

915 L Street, Suite 1280, 17th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
kathleen.lynch@dof.ca.gov

Yazmin Meza, *Department of Finance*

915 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-0328
Yazmin.meza@dof.ca.gov

Keith Nezaam, *Department of Finance*

915 L Street, 8th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-8913
Keith.Nezaam@dof.ca.gov

Andy Nichols, *Nichols Consulting*

1857 44th Street, Sacramento, CA 95819
Phone: (916) 455-3939
andy@nichols-consulting.com

Christian Osmena, *Department of Finance*

915 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-0328
christian.osmena@dof.ca.gov

Arthur Palkowitz, *Stutz Artiano Shinoff & Holtz*
Claimant Representative

2488 Historic Decatur Road, Suite 200, San Diego, CA 92106
Phone: (619) 232-3122
apalkowitz@stutzartiano.com

Keith Petersen, *SixTen & Associates*

P.O. Box 340430, Sacramento, CA 95834-0430
Phone: (916) 419-7093
kbsixten@aol.com

Mark Rewolinski, *MAXIMUS*

625 Coolidge Drive, Suite 100, Folsom, CA 95630
Phone: (949) 440-0845
markrewolinski@maximus.com

Sandra Reynolds, *Reynolds Consulting Group, Inc.*

P.O. Box 894059, Temecula, CA 92589
Phone: (951) 303-3034
sandrareynolds_30@msn.com

Kathy Rios, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 324-5919
krios@sco.ca.gov

Nicolas Schweizer, *Department of Finance*

Education Systems Unit, 915 L Street, 7th Floor, 915 L Street, 7th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-0328
nicolas.schweizer@dof.ca.gov

David Scribner, *Max8550*

2200 Sunrise Boulevard, Suite 240, Gold River, CA 95670
Phone: (916) 852-8970
dscribner@max8550.com

Jim Spano, Chief, Mandated Cost Audits Bureau, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Audits, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 323-5849
jspano@sco.ca.gov

Dennis Speciale, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 324-0254
DSpeciale@sco.ca.gov



JOHN CHIANG
California State Controller

June 4, 2014

RECEIVED
June 04, 2014
*Commission on
State Mandates*

Heather Halsey
Executive Director
Commission on State Mandates
980 Ninth Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: **Draft Staff Analysis and Proposed Statement of Decision, Schedule for Comments, and Notice of Hearing**
Incorrect Reduction Claim, 05-4452-I-01
Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion
Education Code Section 49079, Statutes 1993, Chapter 1257
San Diego Unified School District, Claimant

Dear Ms. Halsey:

The State Controller's Office has reviewed the Commission on State Mandates' draft staff analysis related to the above incorrect reduction claim filed by San Diego Unified School District and concurs with the conclusion and recommendation.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (916) 323-5849.

Sincerely,

JIM L. SPANO, Chief
Mandated Cost Audits Bureau
Division of Audits

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY EMAIL

I, the undersigned, declare as follows:

I am a resident of the County of Yolo and I am over the age of 18 years, and not a party to the within action. My place of employment is 980 Ninth Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, California 95814.

On June 5, 2014, I served the:

SCO Comments

Incorrect Reduction Claim, 05-4452-I-01


Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion

Education Code Section 49079, Statutes 1993, Chapter 1257

San Diego Unified School District, Claimant

by making it available on the Commission's website and providing notice of how to locate it to the email addresses provided on the attached mailing list.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on June 5, 2014 at Sacramento, California.


Jason Hone
Commission on State Mandates
980 Ninth Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 323-3562

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

Mailing List

Last Updated: 5/21/14

Claim Number: 05-4452-I-01

Matter: Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion

Claimant: San Diego Unified School District

TO ALL PARTIES, INTERESTED PARTIES, AND INTERESTED PERSONS:

Each commission mailing list is continuously updated as requests are received to include or remove any party or person on the mailing list. A current mailing list is provided with commission correspondence, and a copy of the current mailing list is available upon request at any time. Except as provided otherwise by commission rule, when a party or interested party files any written material with the commission concerning a claim, it shall simultaneously serve a copy of the written material on the parties and interested parties to the claim identified on the mailing list provided by the commission. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.2.)

Socorro Aquino, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Audits, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 322-7522

SAquino@sco.ca.gov

Tyler Asmundson, *Commission on State Mandates*

980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 323-3562

Tyler.Asmundson@csmd.ca.gov

Lacey Baysinger, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 324-0254

lbaysinger@sco.ca.gov

Marieta Delfin, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 322-4320

mdelfin@sco.ca.gov

Andra Donovan, *San Diego Unified School District*

Legal Services Office, 4100 Normal Street, Room 2148, 4100 Normal Street, Room 2148, San Diego, CA 92103

Phone: (619) 725-5630

adonovan@sandi.net

Donna Ferebee, *Department of Finance*

915 L Street, Suite 1280, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
donna.ferebee@dof.ca.gov

Chris Ferguson, *Department of Finance*

Education Systems Unit, 915 L Street, 7th Floor, 915 L Street, 7th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
Chris.Ferguson@dof.ca.gov

Susan Geanacou, *Department of Finance*

915 L Street, Suite 1280, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
susan.geanacou@dof.ca.gov

Ed Hanson, *Department of Finance*

Education Systems Unit, 915 L Street, 7th Floor, 915 L Street, 7th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-0328
ed.hanson@dof.ca.gov

Michael Johnston, *Clovis Unified School District*

1450 Herndon Ave, Clovis, CA 93611-0599
Phone: (559) 327-9000
michaeljohnston@clovisusd.k12.ca.us

Jill Kanemasu, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 322-9891
jkanemasu@sco.ca.gov

Jay Lal, *State Controller's Office (B-08)*

Division of Accounting & Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 324-0256
JLal@sco.ca.gov

Kathleen Lynch, *Department of Finance (A-15)*

915 L Street, Suite 1280, 17th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
kathleen.lynch@dof.ca.gov

Yazmin Meza, *Department of Finance*

915 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-0328
Yazmin.meza@dof.ca.gov

Keith Nezaam, *Department of Finance*

915 L Street, 8th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-8913
Keith.Nezaam@dof.ca.gov

Andy Nichols, *Nichols Consulting*

1857 44th Street, Sacramento, CA 95819
Phone: (916) 455-3939
andy@nichols-consulting.com

Christian Osmena, *Department of Finance*

915 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-0328
christian.osmena@dof.ca.gov

Arthur Palkowitz, *Stutz Artiano Shinoff & Holtz*
Claimant Representative

2488 Historic Decatur Road, Suite 200, San Diego, CA 92106
Phone: (619) 232-3122
apalkowitz@stutzartiano.com

Keith Petersen, *SixTen & Associates*

P.O. Box 340430, Sacramento, CA 95834-0430
Phone: (916) 419-7093
kbsixten@aol.com

Mark Rewolinski, *MAXIMUS*

625 Coolidge Drive, Suite 100, Folsom, CA 95630
Phone: (949) 440-0845
markrewolinski@maximus.com

Sandra Reynolds, *Reynolds Consulting Group, Inc.*

P.O. Box 894059, Temecula, CA 92589
Phone: (951) 303-3034
sandrareynolds_30@msn.com

Kathy Rios, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 324-5919
krios@sco.ca.gov

Nicolas Schweizer, *Department of Finance*

Education Systems Unit, 915 L Street, 7th Floor, 915 L Street, 7th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-0328
nicolas.schweizer@dof.ca.gov

David Scribner, *Max8550*

2200 Sunrise Boulevard, Suite 240, Gold River, CA 95670
Phone: (916) 852-8970
dscribner@max8550.com

Jim Spano, Chief, Mandated Cost Audits Bureau, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Audits, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 323-5849
jspano@sco.ca.gov

Dennis Speciale, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 324-0254
DSpeciale@sco.ca.gov

Proposed Parameters and Guidelines

Education Code Section 49079
Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989
Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993

Notification to Teachers: Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion

I. Summary of the Source of the Mandate

Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989, added Education Code section 49079 to require school districts to report to each teacher the names of every student who has caused, or who has attempted to cause, serious bodily injury or injury to another person. The notification was to be based upon any written records the district maintained or received from a law enforcement agency. No district would be liable for failure to comply as long as a good faith effort was made to notify the teacher. Notifications were to commence in the 1990-91 school year utilizing data from the previous year, with a progression to three prior-years of data to be reported by fiscal year 1992-93.

Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993, amended Education Code section 49079 to specify for the first time the particular pupil behavior that warrants a teacher notification by including the specific reference to Education Code section 48900. The Section was also amended to immunize school personnel from civil or criminal liability unless the information they provide to the teacher was knowingly false.

II. Commission on State Mandates' Decision

The Commission on State Mandates, in the Statement of Decision adopted at the January 19, 1995 hearing found that Education Code section 49079 as added by Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989 and amended by Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993 imposes a new program or higher level of service within the meaning of Section 6, Article XIII B of the California Constitution, for school districts and county offices of education.

The Commission determined that the following provisions of Education Code Section 49079 established costs mandated by the state pursuant to Government Code section 17514, by requiring school districts to:

- (1) From records maintained in the ordinary course of business or received from law enforcement agencies, identify pupils who have, during the previous three years, engaged in, or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in any of the subdivisions of Education Code section 48900, except subdivision (h).
- (2) Provide this information to teachers on a routine and timely basis.
- (3) Maintain the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years, and adopt a cost effective method to assemble, maintain and disseminate the information to teachers.

III. Eligible Claimants

Any "school district", as defined in Government Code section 175 19, except for community colleges, which incurs increased costs as a result of this mandate is eligible to claim reimbursement.

IV. Period of Reimbursement

Section 17557 of the Government Code states that a test claim must be submitted on or before December 31 following a given fiscal year to establish eligibility for that fiscal year. The test claim for this mandate was filed on February 18, 1994, therefore all mandated costs incurred on or after July 1, 1993, for implementation of Education Code Section 49079 are reimbursable.

Actual costs for one fiscal year should be included in each claim. Estimated costs for the subsequent year may be included on the same claim, if applicable. Pursuant to Section 17561 (d) (3) of the Government Code, all claims for reimbursement of initial years' costs shall be submitted within 120 days from the date on which the State Controller's Office issues claiming instructions on funded mandates contained in the claims bill.

If the total costs for a given fiscal year do not exceed \$200, no reimbursement shall be allowed, except as otherwise allowed by Government Code section 17564.

V. Reimbursable Costs

A. Scope of the Mandate

School districts and county offices of education shall be reimbursed for the costs incurred to: identify pupils, from records maintained in the ordinary course of business or received from law enforcement agencies who have, during the previous three years engaged in, or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in any of the subdivisions of Education Code section 48900, except subdivision (h); and provide this information to teachers on a routine and timely basis.

B. Reimbursable Activities

For each eligible school district or county office of education, the direct and indirect costs of labor, supplies and services incurred for the following mandate components are reimbursable:

1. Identifying Pupils

For identifying pupils, from records received from law enforcement agencies or otherwise maintained in the ordinary course of business, who have during the previous three years engaged in or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in any of the acts described in any of the subdivisions, except (h), of section 48900.

2. Information Maintenance

For maintaining the information regarding the identified pupils for a period of three years, and a one-time cost for adopting a cost effective method of assembling, maintaining and disseminating the information to teachers.

3. Notifying Teachers

For notifying teachers on a regular and timely basis of the pupils whose behavior makes them subject to suspension and expulsion and such notification shall be made in a manner designed to maintain confidentiality of this information.

VI. Claim Preparation

Each claim for reimbursement pursuant to this mandate must be timely filed and set forth a listing of each item for which reimbursement is claimed under this mandate.

A. Reporting by Components

Claimed costs must be allocated according to the three components of reimbursable activity described in Section V. B.

B. Supporting Documentation

Claimed costs should be supported by the following information:

1. Employee Salaries and Benefits

Identify the employee(s) and their job classification, describe the mandated functions performed, and specify the actual number of hours devoted to each function, the productive hourly rate, and the related benefits. The average number of hours devoted to each function may be claimed if supported by a documented time study.

2. Materials and Supplies

Only the expenditures which can be identified as a direct cost of the mandate can be claimed. List cost of materials which have been consumed or expended specifically for the purpose of this mandate.

3. Contracted Services

Give the name(s) of the contractor(s) who performed the service(s). Describe the activities performed by each named contractor, and give the number of actual hours spent on the activities. Show the inclusive dates when services were performed and itemize all costs for those services.

4. Allowable Overhead Cost

- a. School districts must use the J-380 (or subsequent replacement) non-restrictive indirect cost rate provisionally approved by the California Department of Education.
- b. County offices of education must use the J-580 (or subsequent replacement) non-restrictive indirect cost rate provisionally approved by the State Department of Education.

C. Cost Accounting Statistics

The State Controller is directed to include in its claiming instructions each year the requirement that claimants report to the State Controller the following statistics for the

purpose of establishing a database for potential future reimbursement based on prospective rates:

- a. The average number of pupils for which this information is being maintained (i.e., number of pupils identified) for each year.
- b. The average daily attendance for the district for each year.
- c. The number times each year the notification is routinely made to teachers (e.g., quarterly, each semester, or annually).

VII. Supporting Data

For auditing purposes, all costs claimed must be traceable to source documents and/or worksheets that show evidence of the validity of such costs. Pursuant to Government Code section 17558.5, these documents must be kept on file by the agency submitting the claim for a period of no less than four years after the end of the calendar year in which the reimbursement claim is filed, and made available on the request of the State Controller.

VIII. Offsetting Savings and Other Reimbursements

Any offsetting savings claimant experiences as a direct result of this statute must be deducted from the costs claimed. In addition, reimbursement for this mandate received from any source, e.g., service fees collected, federal funds, other state funds etc., shall be identified and deducted from this claim. While not specifically researched, the Commission has not identified any specific offsetting savings from state or federal sources applicable to this mandate.

IX. State Controller's Office Required Certification

An authorized representative of the claimant will be required to provide a certification of claim, as specified in the State Controller's claiming instructions, for those cost mandated by the state contained herein.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

BEFORE THE
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Claim of:)
San Diego Unified)
School District,)
Claimant)

No. CSM-4452
Education Code
Section 49079
Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989
Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993

*Notification to Teachers:
Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion*

ADOPTED STATEMENT OF DECISION

This claim was heard by the Commission on State Mandates (Commission) on November 17, 1994, in Sacramento, California, during a regularly scheduled hearing.

Mr. Keith Petersen appeared on behalf of the San Diego Unified School District, Ms. Carol Miller appeared on behalf of the Education Mandated Cost Network, and Mr. James Apps appeared on behalf of the Department of Finance. Evidence both oral and documentary having been introduced, the matter submitted, and vote taken, the Commission finds:

ISSUE

Do the provisions of Education Code section 49079 as added by Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989 (Chapter 1306/89) and amended by Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993 (Chapter 1257/93), require school districts to implement a new program or provide a higher level of service in an existing program, within the meaning of section 6, article XIII B of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514?

BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS OF FACT

The test claim was filed with the Commission on February 18, 1994, by the San Diego Unified School District.

The elements for filing a test claim, as specified in section 1183 of Title 2 of the California Code of Regulations, were satisfied.

Chapters 1306/89 and 1257/93 added and amended Education Code section 49079 as follows:

~~“(a) A school district shall inform the teacher of every student who has caused, or who has attempted to cause, serious bodily injury or injury, as defined in paragraphs (5) and (6) of subdivision (c) of Section 243 of the Penal Code, to another person each pupil who has engaged in, or is reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in any of the subdivisions, except subdivision (h), of Section 48900. The district shall provide the information to the teacher based on written upon any records that the district maintains in its ordinary course of business, or receives from a law enforcement agency regarding a student described in this section.~~

~~“(b) No school district, or school district officer or employee, shall be civilly or criminally liable for failure to comply with this section if, in a particular instance, it is demonstrated that the district has made a good faith effort to notify the teacher providing information under this section unless it is proven that the information was false and that the district or district officer or employee knew that the information was false, or was made with a reckless disregard for the truth or falsity of the information provided.~~

~~“(c) An officer or employee of a school district who knowingly fails to provide information about a pupil who has engaged in, or who is reasonably suspected to have engaged in, the acts referred to in subdivision (a), is guilty of a misdemeanor, which is punishable by confinement in the county jail for a period not to exceed six months, or by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000), or both.~~

~~“(c)(d) The reporting period of the information required by this section shall commence in the 1990-91 school year. For that school year, the information described in subdivision (a) shall be from the previous school year. For the 1991-92 school year, the information provided shall be from the previous two school years. For the 1992-93 school year and each school year thereafter, the information provided shall be from the previous three school years.~~

~~“(d)(e) Any information received by a teacher pursuant to this section shall be received in confidence for the limited purpose for which it was provided and shall not be further disseminated by the teacher.~~

~~“(f) In no event shall this section be retroactively applied to any individual for any act of that individual undertaken, or failure to act by that individual, prior to January 1, 1994. ”~~

1 The Commission observed that Education Code section 49079, subdivisions (b), (c), (e), and
2 (f), deal with liability of school districts or school district employees, penalties for violation of
3 this section, confidentiality of information, and applicability of the section to actions
4 undertaken or failure to act prior to January 1, 1994.

5
6 The Commission found that these subdivisions do not establish a new program or higher level
7 of service in an existing program upon school districts within the meaning of section 6 of
8 article XIII B of the California Constitution and Government Code section 175 14.

9
10 The Commission observed that Education Code section 49079, subdivisions (a) and (d),
11 requires school districts to, from records maintained in the ordinary course of business or
12 received from law enforcement agencies, identify pupils who have, during the previous three
13 years, engaged in, or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in
14 any of the subdivisions, except subdivision (h), of section 48900. The Commission noted that
15 subdivision (d) specifies that the time frame of the "previous three years" commences with the
16 1992-93 school year and continues for each school year thereafter.

17
18 The Commission observed that Education Code section 49079 does not explicitly require
19 school districts to establish and maintain an information file or data base of such pupils, but
20 simply requires that such pupils be identified and their teachers notified. The requirement
21 contained in Education Code section 49079, subdivision (d), to maintain this information for a
22 period of three years implies that, once the pupils have been identified, the information
23 identifying them must be recorded, and the Commission therefore found that school districts
24 are implicitly required to adopt cost effective methods of assembling and maintaining this
25 information as specified in Education Code section 49079, subdivision (d).

26
27
28

1 The Commission observed that Education Code section 49079, subdivision (a), requires school
2 districts to provide the specified information to teachers, but does not explicitly state time
3 frames for providing such information.

4
5 The Commission recognized that the Legislature had the opportunity to set explicit time frames
6 and chose to not do so, and further noted that subdivision (a) provides that the information
7 provided be based on records the district “maintains in its ordinary course of business”.

8
9 The Commission recognized that the phrase “maintains in its ordinary course of business”
10 implies a routine report, as opposed to one which is specially produced or prepared. Since this
11 information has some degree of time sensitivity, and the untimely providing of information
12 would defeat the purpose of the statute, the Commission also determined that the information
13 must be provided on a timely basis.

14
15 The Commission therefore recognized that the phrase “routine and timely basis”, as alleged by
16 the claimaint, accurately reflects the direction of the Legislature in enacting and amending this
17 subdivision.

18
19 The Commission found that providing, on a routine and timely basis, the information specified
20 in Education Code section 49079, subdivision (a), implicitly requires the school districts to
21 adopt cost effective methods of assembling and disseminating this information to teachers.

22
23 The Commission found that the activities required in Education Code section 49079,
24 subdivisions (a) and (d), were not required under prior law.

1 APPLICABLE LAW RELEVANT TO THE DETERMINATION
2 OF A REIMBURSABLE STATE MANDATED PROGRAM

3 Government Code section 17500 and following, and section 6, article XIII B of the California
4 Constitution and related case law.

5
6 CONCLUSION

7 The Commission determines that it has the authority to decide this claim under the provisions
8 of Government Code sections 17500 and 1755 1, subdivision (a).

9
10 In view of all of the foregoing, the Commission concludes that the provisions of Education
11 Code section 49079, subdivisions (b), (c), (e), and (f), of Chapter 1306/89 and Chapter
12 1257/93, do not impose a new program or higher level of service in an existing program
13 within the meaning of section 6 of article XIII B of the California Constitution and Government
14 Code section 17514.

15
16 In view of all of the foregoing, the Commission concludes that the provisions of Education
17 Code section 49079, subdivisions (a) and (d), of Chapter 1306/89 and Chapter 1257/93, do
18 impose a new program or higher level of service in an existing program within the meaning of
19 section 6 of article XIII B of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514
20 by requiring school districts to, from records maintained in the ordinary course of business or
21 received from law enforcement agencies, identify pupils who have, during the previous three
22 years, engaged in, or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in
23 any of the subdivisions, except subdivision (h), of section 48900; to maintain this
24 information for a period of three years, commencing with the 1992-93 school year and
25 continuing for each school year thereafter; to adopt cost effective methods of assembling and
26 maintaining this information; to provide the specified information to teachers on a routine and
27 timely basis; and to adopt cost effective methods of assembling and disseminating this
28 information to teachers.

1 Accordingly, costs incurred related to the aforementioned reimbursable state mandated
2 programs contained in Education Code section 49079, subdivisions (a) and (d), are costs
3 mandated by the state and are subject to reimbursement within the meaning of section 6,
4 article XIII B of the California Constitution. Therefore, the claimant is directed to submit
5 parameters and guidelines, pursuant to Government Code section 17557 and Title 2, California
6 Code of Regulations, section 1183.1, to the Commission for its consideration.

7
8 The foregoing conclusions pertaining to the requirements contained in Education Code section
9 49079, subdivisions (a) and (d), are subject to the following conditions:

10 The determination of a reimbursable state mandated program does not mean that
11 all increased costs claimed will be reimbursed. Reimbursement, if any, is
12 subject to Commission approval of parameters and guidelines for reimbursement
13 of the mandated program; approval of a statewide cost estimate; a specific
14 legislative appropriation for such purpose; a timely-filed claim for
15 reimbursement; and subsequent review of the claim by the State Controller's
16 Office.

17 As provided in Chapter 1306/89, if the statewide cost estimate for this mandate does
18 not exceed one million dollars (\$1,000,000) during the first twelve (12) month period
19 following the operative date of the mandate, the Commission shall certify such
20 estimated amount to the State Controller's Office, and the State Controller shall
21 receive, review, and pay claims from the State Mandates Claims Fund as claims are
22 received. (Government Code section 17610).

23
24
25 g:\mandates\sfc\4452\stmtdec.wpd
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

BEFORE THE
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Claim of:)
San Diego Unified)
School District,)
Claimant)

No. CSM-4452
Education Code
Section 49079
Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989
Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993

*Notification to Teachers:
Pupils Subject to Suspension or Expulsion*

ADOPTED STATEMENT OF DECISION

This claim was heard by the Commission on State Mandates (Commission) on November 17, 1994, in Sacramento, California, during a regularly scheduled hearing.

Mr. Keith Petersen appeared on behalf of the San Diego Unified School District, Ms. Carol Miller appeared on behalf of the Education Mandated Cost Network, and Mr. James Apps appeared on behalf of the Department of Finance. Evidence both oral and documentary having been introduced, the matter submitted, and vote taken, the Commission finds:

ISSUE

Do the provisions of Education Code section 49079 as added by Chapter 1306, Statutes of 1989 (Chapter 1306/89) and amended by Chapter 1257, Statutes of 1993 (Chapter 1257/93), require school districts to implement a new program or provide a higher level of service in an existing program, within the meaning of section 6, article XIII B of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514?

BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS OF FACT

1 The test claim was filed with the Commission on February 18, 1994, by the San Diego
2 Unified School District.

3
4
5 **The** elements for filing a test claim, as specified in section 1183 of Title 2 of the California
6 Code of Regulations, were satisfied.

7
8 Chapters 1306/89 and 1257/93 added and amended Education Code section 49079 as follows:

9
10 ~~“(a) A school district shall inform the teacher of every student who has caused, or~~
11 ~~who has attempted to cause, serious bodily injury or injury, as defined in~~
12 ~~paragraphs (5) and (6) of subdivision (e) of Section 243 of the Penal Code, to~~
13 ~~another person each pupil who has engaged in, or is reasonably suspected to have~~
14 ~~engaged in, any of the acts described in any of the subdivisions, except subdivision~~
15 ~~(h), of Section 48900. The district shall provide the information to the teacher~~
16 ~~based on written upon any records that the district maintains in its ordinary course~~
17 ~~of business, or receives from a law enforcement agency regarding a student~~
18 ~~described in this section.~~

19 ~~“(b) No school district, or school district officer or employee, shall be civilly or~~
20 ~~criminally liable for failure to comply with this section if, in a particular instance, it~~
21 ~~is demonstrated that the district has made a good faith effort to notify the~~
22 ~~teacher providing information under this section unless it is proven that the~~
23 ~~information was false and that the district or district officer or employee knew that~~
24 ~~the information was false, or was made with a reckless disregard for the truth or~~
25 ~~falsity of the information provided.~~

26 ~~“(c) An officer or employee of a school district who knowingly fails to provide~~
27 ~~information about a pupil who has engaged in, or who is reasonably suspected to~~
28 ~~have engaged in, the acts referred to in subdivision (a), is guilty of a misdemeanor,~~
~~which is punishable by confinement in the county jail for a period not to exceed six~~
~~months, or by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000), or both.~~

~~“(c)(d) The reporting period of the information required by this section shall~~
commence in the 1990-91 school year. For that school year, the information
described in subdivision (a) shall be from the previous school year. For the 1991-
92 school year, the information provided shall be from the previous two school
years. For the 1992-93 school year and each school year thereafter, the
information provided shall be from the previous three school years.

~~“(d)(e) Any information received by a teacher pursuant to this section shall be~~
received in confidence for the limited purpose for which it was provided and shall
not be further disseminated by the teacher.

~~“(f) In no event shall this section be retroactively applied to any individual for any~~
act of that individual undertaken, or failure to act by that individual, prior to
January 1, 1994. ”

1 The Commission observed that Education Code section 49079, subdivisions (b), (c), (e), and
2 (f), deal with liability of school districts or school district employees, penalties for violation of
3 this section, confidentiality of information, and applicability of the section to actions
4 undertaken or failure to act prior to January 1, 1994.

5
6 The Commission found that these subdivisions do not establish a new program or higher level
7 of service in an existing program upon school districts within the meaning of section 6 of
8 article XIII B of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514.

9
10 The Commission observed that Education Code section 49079, subdivisions (a) and (d),
11 requires school districts to, from records maintained in the ordinary course of business or
12 received from law enforcement agencies, identify pupils who have, during the previous three
13 years, engaged in, or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in
14 any of the subdivisions, except subdivision (h), of section 48900. The Commission noted that
15 subdivision (d) specifies that the time frame of the "previous three years" commences with the
16 1992-93 school year and continues for each school year thereafter.

17
18 The Commission observed that Education Code section 49079 does not explicitly require
19 school districts to establish and maintain an information file or data base of such pupils, but
20 simply requires that such pupils be identified and their teachers notified. The requirement
21 contained in Education Code section 49079, subdivision (d), to maintain this information for a
22 period of three years implies that, once the pupils have been identified, the information
23 identifying them must be recorded, and the Commission therefore found that school districts
24 are implicitly required to adopt cost effective methods of assembling and maintaining this
25 information as specified in Education Code section 49079, subdivision (d).

1 The Commission observed that Education Code section 49079, subdivision (a), requires school
2 districts to provide the specified information to teachers, but does not explicitly state time
3 frames for providing such information.

4
5 The Commission recognized that the Legislature had the opportunity to set explicit time frames
6 and chose to not do so, and further noted that subdivision (a) provides that the information
7 provided be based on records the district “maintains in its ordinary course of business”.

8
9 The Commission recognized that the phrase “maintains in its ordinary course of business”
10 implies a routine report, as opposed to one which is specially produced or prepared. Since this
11 information has some degree of time sensitivity, and the untimely providing of information
12 would defeat the purpose of the statute, the Commission also determined that the information
13 must be provided on a timely basis.

14
15 The Commission therefore recognized that the phrase “routine and timely basis”, as alleged by
16 the claimaint, accurately reflects the direction of the Legislature in enacting and amending this
17 subdivision.

18
19 The Commission found that providing, on a routine and timely basis, the information specified
20 in Education Code section 49079, subdivision (a), implicitly requires the school districts to
21 adopt cost effective methods of assembling and disseminating this information to teachers.

22
23 The Commission found that the activities required in Education Code section 49079,
24 subdivisions (a) and (d), were not required under prior law.

1 APPLICABLE LAW RELEVANT TO THE DETERMINATION
2 OF A REIMBURSABLE STATE MANDATED PROGRAM

3 Government Code section 17500 and following, and section 6, article XIII B of the California
4 Constitution and related case law.

6 CONCLUSION

7 The Commission determines that it has the authority to decide this claim under the provisions
8 of Government Code sections 17500 and 1755 1, subdivision (a).

9
10 In view of all of the foregoing, the Commission concludes that the provisions of Education
11 Code section 49079, subdivisions (b), (c), (e), and (f), of Chapter 1306/89 and Chapter
12 1257/93, do not impose a new program or higher level of service in an existing program
13 within the meaning of section 6 of article XIII B of the California Constitution and Government
14 Code section 17514.

15
16 In view of all of the foregoing, the Commission concludes that the provisions of Education
17 Code section 49079, subdivisions (a) and (d), of Chapter 1306/89 and Chapter 1257/93, do
18 impose a new program or higher level of service in an existing program within the meaning of
19 section 6 of article XIII B of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514
20 by requiring school districts to, from records maintained in the ordinary course of business or
21 received from law enforcement agencies, identify pupils who have, during the previous three
22 years, engaged in, or are reasonably suspected to have engaged in, any of the acts described in
23 any of the subdivisions, except subdivision (h), of section 48900; to maintain this
24 information for a period of three years, commencing with the 1992-93 school year and
25 continuing for each school year thereafter; to adopt cost effective methods of assembling and
26 maintaining this information; to provide the specified information to teachers on a routine and
27 timely basis; and to adopt cost effective methods of assembling and disseminating this
28 information to teachers.

1 Accordingly, costs incurred related to the aforementioned reimbursable state mandated
 2 programs contained in Education Code section 49079, subdivisions (a) and (d), are costs
 3 mandated by the state and are subject to reimbursement within the meaning of section 6,
 4 article XIII B of the California Constitution. Therefore, the claimant is directed to submit
 5 parameters and guidelines, pursuant to Government Code section 17557 and Title 2, California
 6 Code of Regulations, section 1183.1, to the Commission for its consideration.

7
 8 The foregoing conclusions pertaining to the requirements contained in Education Code section
 9 49079, subdivisions (a) and (d), are subject to the following conditions:

10 The determination of a reimbursable state mandated program does not mean that
 11 all increased costs claimed will be reimbursed. Reimbursement, if any, is
 12 subject to Commission approval of parameters and guidelines for reimbursement
 13 of the mandated program; approval of a statewide cost estimate; a specific
 legislative appropriation for such purpose; a timely-filed claim for
 reimbursement; and subsequent review of the claim by the State Controller's
 Office.

14 As provided in Chapter 1306/89, if the statewide cost estimate for this mandate does
 15 not exceed one million dollars (\$1,000,000) during the first twelve (12) month period
 16 following the operative date of the mandate, the Commission shall certify such
 17 estimated amount to the State Controller's Office, and the State Controller shall
 18 receive, review, and pay claims from the State Mandates Claims Fund as claims are
 19 received. (Government Code section 17610).

20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25 g:\sfz\notifica\stmtdec.wpd
 26
 27
 28