

**Sacramento
City Unified
School District**

Office of the Superintendent
5735 47th Avenue • Sacramento, CA
95824 916.643.9000 Phone • 916.643.9480 Fax

M. Magdalena Carrillo Mejia, Superintendent

September 28, 2004

Honorable Michael G. Virga, Presiding Judge
Sacramento County Superior Court
720 9th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-1398

**RE: Response of Sacramento City Unified School District to the
Sacramento County Grand Jury Final Report 2003-2004**

Dear Judge Virga:

The Board of Education of the Sacramento City Unified School District, at a regular meeting held on September 23, 2004, adopted the enclosed as the District's response to the Grand Jury's final report. The District's response is hereby submitted in compliance with Penal Code Sections 933 and 933.05.

I have also enclosed a copy of Resolution Number 2386, authorizing the creation of a citizen advisory council on unrepresented administrator's compensation.

If the Grand Jury has questions regarding how its recommendations have been implemented they should not hesitate to contact me at (916) 643-9000.

Sincerely,

M. Magdalena Carrillo Mejia, Ph.D.
Superintendent

MMCM: smo

cc: Board of Education

Enclosures: Response to the Final Grand Jury Report 2003-04
Resolution Number 2386

SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Office of the Superintendent

Sacramento

City Unified

School District

Response to the Sacramento County

Grand Jury Final Report

of June 30, 2004

September 28, 2004

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 28, 2004
TO: Board of Education
FROM: M. Magdalena Carrillo Mejia, Ph.D.
Superintendent

**SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO THE SACRAMENTO COUNTY GRAND JURY
FINAL REPORT**

INTRODUCTION:

The 2003-2004 Sacramento County Grand Jury has concluded its term and issued its Final Report. A portion of the Final Report analyzes issues related to the District's participation in the joint powers authority known as the California Administrative Services Authority ("CASA"). The Final Report makes certain findings and recommendations to the Board of Education and District administrative staff. State law requires the Governing Board to respond to each finding and recommendation by September 30, 2004. (Penal Code ' 933(c).) This memorandum sets forth a proposed response for consideration and possible adoption by the Board of Education.

REQUIRED FORMAT FOR RESPONSE TO THE GRAND JURY REPORT:

California Penal Code Section 933.05 requires that for each grand jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:

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

Further, with regard to each grand jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions:

- (1) The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action.
- (2) The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation.
- (3) The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.
- (4) The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefor.

RESPONSE TO FINDINGS FOR THE BOARD OF EDUCATION:

Finding 1. The Sacramento City Unified School District Board of Education did not fully explore, question nor understand the joint powers proposal presented by the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and supported by the Superintendent.

Response to Finding 1: Partially Disagree with Finding. The Board did explore the proposal presented by the CFO and supported by the Superintendent. Several staff memoranda and presentations were prepared on the subject of the proposed JPA and its alternative pension plan. Throughout this process, the Board was continually reassured by its outside independent legal counsel and consultants that the proposed system was legal, that another public school district had already implemented a similar system and that the entire concept was cost and revenue neutral to the District because the District would only be redirecting money that it was otherwise already obligated to pay.

On March 6, 2000, before the Board approved the formation of CASA, it held a public meeting where the subject of the formation of a JPA was placed on the agenda as a discussion item. The District's outside legal counsel and CFO publicly presented the concept of CASA and discussion ensued. When presenting the features of the proposed JPA, David Girard, then outside counsel for the District, represented to the Board that "We would make sure that it is legally valid, fiscally sound, . . . and cost neutral to the District at least."

Although the Board did explore and question the proposal for creation of a joint powers authority, in hindsight it is now apparent that the Board was presented misleading and inaccurate information (see Finding 5 below), causing the Board not to fully understand the risks and financial exposure to the District.

Finding 2. In approving the JPA, the Board authorized transfer of district classified employees to CASA.

Response to Finding 2: Agree with Finding - With Clarification. The joint powers agreement was an agreement between the District and Yolo County Office of Education and did not authorize the transfer of employees to CASA. After the JPA was formed, the District approved an operating agreement between the District and CASA. The operating agreement authorized an unpaid leave of absence for certain classified employees who wanted to become CASA employees. The individual employees were not "transferred" but were instead empowered to choose whether to remain in their existing status or take a leave of absence to join CASA.

Finding 3. The SCUSD Board, once CASA was established, paid little attention to issues of oversight and management of the JPA. For example:

- a. The Board did not appoint representatives to the CASA board but delegated the selection to the Superintendent.
- b. The Board did not require periodic reports or yearly audits of CASA.
- c. The Board allowed CASA bylaws to be amended without approval.
- d. The Board allowed the CFO to assume the position of Executive Director of CASA while serving concurrently as the District CFO.

Response to Finding 3: Partially Disagree With Finding. The Board believed that it was exercising oversight and management of CASA through its trusted administrative staff. As the grand jury recognized in its Final Report, "[i]nasmuch as Board members make decisions in complex areas, they depend on district administrative staff for advice and recommendations" The District's senior administrative staff, including its Deputy Superintendent and Chief Financial Officer, Laura Bruno, and the District's outside counsel, Girard & Vinson, were heavily involved in the creation and operation of CASA. The Board trusted that these professionals would faithfully perform their duties and disclose to the Board any problems or risks associated with CASA or management of the JPA.

Response to Finding 3(a): Agree with Finding. Selection of the original representatives was delegated to the former Superintendent. However, once the Board became aware of problems with CASA it became directly involved in the selection process and remains so to this day.

Response to Finding 3(b): Disagree with Finding. During the open session of the March 6, 2000 District Board meeting, the District's counsel, David Girard, presented the conceptual framework of CASA to the Board, seeking direction on whether to proceed with finalizing the formative documents. During this presentation the Board specifically requested an annual audit requirement and periodic reporting to the District Board.

The Board's request was carried out as reflected in both the District's operating agreement with CASA and CASA's Bylaws. The operating agreement between the District and CASA requires that CASA conduct an audit of itself and its pension plan. (Operating Agreement & 2.C.(1).) CASA's Bylaws require CASA to "Provide within one hundred twenty (120) days after the close of each fiscal year, a complete written report of all financial activities for such fiscal year for each Program to each Member of the [CASA] Board of Directors and to the Chief Administrative Officer of each Member of the Authority." (Bylaws & K.2.G.)

CASA's Bylaws further provide that CASA must retain a certified public accountant to conduct an independent annual audit of the accounts, records and financial affairs of the Authority and that a report of the audit be submitted to each Member of the Authority. (Bylaws & K.2.H.) These independent audits were in fact performed by an outside CPA for the fiscal years ending in 2001 and 2002 and indicated that CASA was a financially stable agency. The audit for fiscal year ending June 2003 has been initiated but has not been completed.

Response to Finding 3(c): Agree in Principle with Finding. It is true that the Board did not formally ratify or approve changes to CASA's Bylaws. According to the provisions of the Bylaws, the Bylaws could be amended by a two-thirds vote of the CASA Board of Directors. The District's governing Board trusted that its appointees to the CASA Board and the District's administrative staff working with CASA would review any proposed changes to the Bylaws and would not approve changes that were adverse to the District's interests. Once the Board became aware of problems with CASA, it became directly involved in the selection process for District appointees to the CASA Board and remains so to this day.

Response to Finding 3(d): Agree with Finding. It is common for employees of public agencies to also serve as officers or administrative staff of a JPA of which the agency is a member. This practice is cost efficient for financially strained local public agencies.

Finding 4. The Board opted to reward its three contract employees (Superintendent, Chief Financial Officer, Legal Counsel) by giving them inflated retirement benefits. For example:

- a. Granting 10 additional years of service credit which was excessive and unprecedented for public service positions.

- b. Granting mileage allowances, travel expenses, and vacation pay to be included in the final compensation calculation for retirement was inappropriate.

Response to Finding 4: Agree in Principle with Finding. The Board did agree to provide the former Superintendent (in recognition that there had been a pay differential with other superintendents), CFO and General Counsel with increased retirement benefits and alignment of their contract termination dates, but only with the express understanding that there would be no additional cost to the District. This was done as part of the normal process for reviewing and updating an employment contract.

Response to Finding 4(a): Agree with Finding - With Clarification. The Board was never informed of the magnitude of the compensation increases granted and in fact was misled to believe that the compensation packages granted to these former employees were within the norm for similar public school districts. Also, current information indicates that the compensation increases would not be cost neutral to the District and this automatically nullifies the provision of the enhanced benefits. The Board has directed its attorneys to void or otherwise extinguish the ten years of service credit granted to these former employees and is working with CalPERS to ensure that elements of reported compensation comply with applicable statutes and regulations.

Response to Finding 4(b): Partially Disagree with Finding. Under the terms of the contracts for the employees at issue, they receive a base salary, a portion of which is deferred through a Flex 125 plan for the employee to allocate between various health benefits, and an allowance for expenses that is part of compensation and retirement creditable. Prior to the creation of CASA and throughout the CASA years, CalPERS and CASA retirement contributions (depending on which year is at issue) from both the District and the contracted employees were paid on the total amount of compensation, including the amount deferred through the Flex 125 plan and the expense allowance. This is also true for all certificated and classified management who have part of their compensation deferred through the Flex 125 plan. The issue of whether the compensation deferred through the Flex 125 plan could be pension creditable arose with CalPERS a number of years prior to formation of CASA. CalPERS audited the District and approved these funds being included in retirement creditable salary. Including the deferred compensation and the expense stipend in pension creditable salary was intended to be a continuation of past practice.

Although the former Superintendent initially sought to convert vacation pay into final salary, this was ultimately not accomplished and vacation compensation was not included in the final compensation reported to CASA upon retirement. The District's General Counsel never sought a conversion of vacation pay to final salary. Only one employee, the former CFO, was allowed to include vacation pay in final compensation. The District is working with CalPERS to correct this issue.

Finding 5. The CFO and the outside consultants she selected appeared to mislead the Board with incomplete information and strong assurances of cost neutrality of the CASA plan.

Response to Finding 5: Agree with Finding. The former CFO has retired and the District has severed its relationship with the numerous consultants who advised the District on the formation and operation of CASA, except that former outside counsel is completing a few totally unrelated litigation matters, where substitution at this point would be uneconomic.

Finding 6. The Board authorized the issuance of an unnecessary \$6.5 million pension obligation bond and incurred financial liability with little or no discussion or understanding of the possible financial impact to the District. The \$420,709 cost to issue the bond could have been applied to educational purposes.

Response to Finding 6: Disagree with Finding. The District relied upon its trusted staff and its independent consultants to properly analyze this very complicated financial transaction. The District's financial advisors, Northcross, Hill and Ach, were serving as financial advisors and underwriter for the CASA bond issuance. The District's bond counsel, Jones Hall, were serving as CASA's bond counsel. The District's outside counsel, Girard & Vinson, were advising both CASA and the District. None of these professionals ever told the Board that their loyalties ran exclusively to CASA with respect to the bond transaction. None of these professionals ever indicated that representations by District staff regarding cost and revenue neutrality were false or incorrect. Rather, the Board was assured that the District's financial responsibility under both the bonds and the loan agreement was no greater than what the District would already owe in the absence of the bonds.

In a November 27, 2001 memorandum from the Deputy Superintendent/CFO to the Board, regarding the proposed bond issuance and loan agreement, the CFO discussed the District's obligations and concluded that "the district's obligations under the bonds are no greater than they would be without the bonds." The same memorandum, when discussing the financial impact on the District of issuing the bonds, concluded that: "The issuance of the bonds will cause no increase in the employer contributions required from the district to fund the pension program. Debt service will be paid from the current level of contribution (about \$1.5 million per year) to fund the program." Thus, the Board was led to believe that all costs associated with the bonds and the loan agreement would be paid by CASA out of the District's existing contribution of 19.22% of covered payroll.

Additionally, the December 3, 2001 staff memorandum presented to the Board in support of the proposed resolution authorizing borrowing of the funds and execution of the loan agreement assured the Board that there would be no financial effect on the District. The memorandum stated: "This borrowing will not increase the district's costs because the loan repayments will be made out of funds that the district is currently paying to the Retirement Plan on an annual basis." Staff memoranda in support of Board resolutions were required to follow a specific format that included a discussion and explanation of any financial considerations to the District. This section of the December 3, 2001 memorandum clearly

indicated that approval of the loan agreement had no financial implications for the District. "**Financial Considerations:** None."

Finding 7. The Board of Education and top administrators were dismissive of community concerns regarding the JPA and CASA.

Response to Finding 7: Partially Disagree with Finding. While certain administrators may have appeared dismissive of community concerns regarding CASA, the Board took those concerns very seriously. On November 18, 2002 the Board held a public meeting to respond to questions about CASA. The District's administration, with the assistance of its consultants, made a detailed presentation on the operation of CASA and the CASA bond issuance. Presentations were made by the District's legal counsel, Girard & Vinson, Arnold Bray from School Services of California, CASA's actuary, Robert Dezube, the District's underwriter and financial advisor, Mark Northcross, and CASA's pension expert, Ralph Amadio.

At the November 18, 2002 meeting, the presentations by both the District's outside consultants and CASA's outside consultants were very convincing and reassured the Board that CASA was a legal and viable entity. For example, the District's legal counsel, David Girard, stated that: "Everything that CASA is, or CASA will do, was presented to the court and the court ruled that these proceedings were valid and those activities which CASA intended to take were proper." Thus, the Board and all the members of the public in attendance at that meeting were told that the court had already reviewed the issues and determined CASA's operations to be proper.

Less than a year after the November 18, 2002 meeting, concerns were again raised about the operation of CASA. When these concerns were raised with the new Interim Superintendent in July, 2002, he promptly began a diligent search for a qualified external auditor. After FCMAT declined to provide such assistance, the new Interim Superintendent eventually found and recommended MGT of America, and the Board retained MGT, to perform an independent fiscal and programmatic review of CASA. The Board also retained the law firm of Lozano Smith to perform an independent review of certain legal issues raised by the public and MGT.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION:

Recommendation 1. The Board needs to fully investigate and research all proposals that incur financial obligations and have fiscal ramifications. A discussion of the pros and cons should be publicly presented with adequate provision for public input.

Response to Recommendation 1: Already Implemented. Every agenda item that comes before the Board for action has an accompanying staff memorandum that follows a mandatory format. One of the subjects that must be addressed in the memorandum is any "financial considerations" the proposed action may have on the District. As recognized by the grand jury, members of the Board must rely upon the expertise of staff to advise them in complex

areas such as school finance and accounting. When District staff does not possess the required expertise, outside consultants are retained.

Except for those circumstances where laws regarding confidentiality require action to be taken in closed session, the Board conducts all of its business in public. Staff recommendations and supporting memoranda for all agenda items are available for public inspection and review. Accordingly, the public has access to the District's documents discussing the financial considerations of actions proposed by the District.

A corrective action has been taken that provides Board members more in-depth information related to financial obligations and transactions. With Board approval, the current CFO has created an audit subcommittee, which meets throughout the school year and includes three members of the Board, along with the CFO, Chief Business Officer, independent external auditor, and the internal auditor. The audit subcommittee has established a procedure whereby, on a quarterly basis, all financial activity that exceeded \$300,000 is reported to the subcommittee for review. All financial activity includes transfers of funds, contracts for services, and purchase orders. Also, Board members are given the opportunity to interact personally with both the internal and external auditors and to request that financial reports and/or data of any nature be provided to them. The internal auditor now reports directly to the Board, which also receives the report of the external auditors. If desired by the Board members on the subcommittee, all district staff will leave the meeting in order for the Board members to interact privately with the external and internal auditors.

Recommendation 2. Future attempts of the Board to compensate district individuals for outstanding service should be within the limits of what is generally given to people in education.

Response to Recommendation 2: Already Implemented. This recommendation matches existing Board Policy and therefore has effectively already been implemented. The Board was never informed of the magnitude of the compensation increases granted to the former Superintendent, CFO and General Counsel and, in fact, was misled to believe that the compensation packages granted to these former employees were within the norm for similar public school districts and did not have the financial impact that later proved to be the case. The Board has directed its attorneys to void or otherwise extinguish the ten years of service credit granted to these former employees and is working with CalPERS to ensure that elements of reported compensation comply with applicable statutes and regulations.

Recommendation 3. The Board should monitor and control all agencies or entities that the school district creates and for which it assumes liability. The Board should not delegate its oversight responsibilities to others. The Board should demand timely reports and audits.

Response to Recommendation 3: Implementation Under Way with Qualification. As the grand jury recognized in its Final Report, "[i]nasmuch as Board members make decisions in complex areas, they depend on district administrative staff for advice and recommendations" To function properly, the Board must be able to delegate technical or

specialized tasks to individuals with the expertise to perform them. Additionally, the Board did demand timely reports and audits of CASA and its pension plan. (See response to Finding 3(b) above.)

The Board of Education believed that since it had the majority of the voting members on the CASA Board, the interests of the Board of Education and the District were being protected. Neither the prior CFO nor the prior Superintendent reported to the Board of Education that, until 2003, the District's representatives to the CASA Board had been hand selected by the CFO, allowing the CFO to select the very people who would be overseeing her in her role as CASA's Executive Director. In effect, the prior CFO was in complete control of CASA, without the knowledge of the Board of Education.

The problem does not appear to be the delegation of responsibilities commonly delegated to district administrative staff as much as ensuring that the person performing the delegated responsibility has appropriate checks and balances on their authority, no conflicts of interest, and their reports or findings are actually presented to the Board.

Corrective action has already been taken by the Board to implement appropriate checks and balances: (1.) the formation of an audit subcommittee discussed under Response to Recommendation #1 above; (2.) the formation of the budget subcommittee; (3.) the separation of duties so that the current CFO does not control budget, accounting, payroll, and personnel departments; and (4.) the creation of a new job description for the Internal Audit Manager so that the position no longer reports to the CFO, but to the Superintendent and the Board.

Recommendation 4. The Board of Education must guard against appearances of potential conflict of interest whether ethical or legal.

Response to Recommendation 4: Already Implemented. Board Bylaw 9270 sets forth a comprehensive policy regarding conflicts of interest, covering incompatible activities, prohibited financial interests, gifts and honoraria. Board Bylaw adopts the Fair Political Practices Commission model conflict of interest code and designates those positions that are subject to the code's disclosure requirements as well as the level of disclosure. The Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent/CFO and General Counsel are all designated positions, along with the rest of the District's Associate Superintendent and Director positions.

In addition to the existing Board policies prohibiting conflicts of interest, the District has taken steps to protect against potential or perceived ethical conflicts by implementing the audit and budget subcommittees and other actions outlined above under Response to Recommendation #3 and has terminated CASA's ability to advise agencies chartered by the District.

Recommendation 5. The Board should establish a process to assure that community and constituent concerns are heard and addressed.

Response to Recommendation 5: Already Implemented. The current Superintendent has implemented a practice whereby all public questions and/or concerns are recorded by her staff and subsequently assigned to the appropriate administrative staff for follow-up, which is promptly provided to the member of the public by phone call or in writing.

RESPONSE TO FINDINGS FOR THE DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION:

Finding 1. The Superintendent allowed the CFO to control the central office without necessary checks and balances. For example:

- a. The Internal Auditor reported directly to the CFO rather than to the Superintendent and the Board.
- b. The transfer of funds between the District and CASA went unsupervised by the Superintendent and the Board.

Response to Finding 1: Agree with Finding.

Response to Finding 1(a): Agree with Finding. Corrective action has already been implemented whereby the job description for the Internal Audit Manager has been changed so that the position reports directly to the Superintendent and the Board. In addition, through the formation of an audit subcommittee, three Board members are able to meet on a regular basis with both the external and internal auditors.

Response to Finding 1(b): Partially Disagree with Finding. While it appears true that the former Superintendent was not adequately supervising the District's relationship with CASA or the transfer of funds between the District and CASA, the Board thought that it was supervising this relationship through its trusted administrative staff.

In addition, State and County standard accounting rules have always prohibited the transfer of monies between funds without the approval of the Board of Education. In the case of the former CFO, transfers were accomplished without notification to or approval from the Board of Education.

In hindsight, the problem appears to be that the top administrative staff that the Board was relying upon were all beneficiaries from CASA. In part to correct this problem, the Board has terminated its operating agreement with CASA and required all employees to return to District employment.

Finding 2. The centralization of power in the hands of the CFO created a climate of intimidation and coercion within the administrative offices. For example, employees were discouraged from questioning the CASA plan and some stated they felt pressured into joining.

Response to Finding 2: Partially Agree with Finding. The many positive achievements of the former CFO provided the Board with confidence in her judgment and leadership. However, it has become apparent that this confidence was abused. According to staff members, staff simply did not share their concerns and/or knowledge with the Board of Education due to the climate of intimidation created by the former CFO. It wasn't until the former CFO left the District that key employees began to come forward and express their concerns about the formation and operation of CASA as well as some of the financial transactions that had taken place.

Finding 3. The proposed retirement program and the enhanced retirement package put forward by the CFO for herself, the Superintendent and the Legal Counsel were self-serving.

Response to Finding 3: Agree with Finding.

Finding 4. The appearance of a conflict of interest occurred when the CFO of the District served as the unpaid Executive Director of CASA.

Response to Finding 4: Agree with Finding. The District has taken steps to ensure that persons who may have benefited from CASA's programs are not managing CASA's assets and do not have unilateral decision making authority over transactions with CASA.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION:

Recommendation 1. Community concerns regarding district administration actions or policies need to be fairly and openly addressed. A community oversight committee could be established to directly monitor the response to these concerns.

Response to Recommendation 1: Already Implemented. The Superintendent has implemented a practice whereby all community questions and/or concerns are recorded by her staff who assign prompt follow up to the appropriate administrator.

In addition, community members are included on all district committees, such as the District-wide budget committee. Also, Community Forums are held in order to obtain community input related to education and budget proposals. Community members will be invited to participate in periodic meetings of the budget and audit subcommittees.

The Board and the District are implementing a number of measures to provide transparent information regarding resolution of the various issues involving CASA, including communication during Board meetings, meetings with CASA's former employees and a regular weekly e-mail update.

Recommendation 2. The Superintendent must actively oversee the business administration of the school district, as well as the educational program.

Response to Recommendation 2: Already Implemented. The District has hired a new Superintendent and new CFO who have implemented changes in the organizational structure of the District and how it is managed: (1.) the CFO no longer controls all the departments which implement budget, accounting, personnel and payroll; (2.) the Internal Audit Manager now reports directly to the Superintendent/Board; (3.) the Superintendent has proposed a new top administrative organizational structure; and (4.) the Superintendent has implemented regular one-on-one meetings with top administrative staff.

Recommendation 3. It is one of the responsibilities of the Superintendent to establish and maintain a positive climate within the district office. Communication lines should be structured in such a way as to encourage and permit employee access to the Superintendent, enabling all opinions to be heard.

Response to Recommendation 3: Already Implemented. The Superintendent has established regular meetings with employee groups, community groups, and parent organizations in order to provide access to her office. The Superintendent is regularly out in the community, meeting with individuals and groups, and has been successful in changing the climate to one that is much more positive and open.

Recommendation 4. The Superintendent is responsible for assuring that a system of checks and balances is maintained so no one person or a group can bring undue or unfair influence on decisions.

Response to Recommendation 4: Already Implemented. The District has hired a new Superintendent and new CFO who have implemented changes in the organizational structure of the District and how it is managed: (1.) the establishment of new top administrative organizational and reporting structure; (2.) the CFO no longer controls and is able to exert undue influence on a disproportionate number of departments; (3.) the Internal Audit Manager's job description has been changed so that the position reports to the Superintendent/Board, not the CFO; (4.) a budget subcommittee has been formed; (5.) an audit subcommittee has been formed; and (6.) the Superintendent has established regular meetings with employee groups, community groups, and parent organizations.

Recommendation 5. The internal auditor should be autonomous and responsible and accountable to the Superintendent and report directly to the Board on a quarterly or bi-annual basis.

Response to Recommendation 5: Already Implemented. The Board has approved a new job description for the Internal Audit Manager whereby this position reports directly to the Superintendent/Board and not to the CFO. The Internal Audit Department meets regularly with three Board members who sit on the audit subcommittee.

SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Resolution No. 2386

**RESOLUTION TO CREATE A CITIZENS ADVISORY COUNCIL
ON UNREPRESENTED ADMINISTRATOR'S COMPENSATION**

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of the Sacramento City Unified School District and the District Administration endeavor to provide complete and transparent information to the public; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of the Sacramento City Unified School District should establish a process to assure that community concerns are heard and addressed; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of the Sacramento City Unified School District has no staff independent of the District Administration; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of the Sacramento City Unified School District and the District Administration put a premium on the advice of citizens; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of the Sacramento City Unified School District and the District Administration seek to attract, retain and fairly compensate the finest administrators possible; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of the Sacramento City Unified School District and the District Administration believe in public accountability;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Governing Board of the Sacramento City Unified School District approves the creation of a Citizens Advisory Council on Unrepresented Administrator's Compensation with the purpose of annually providing advice to the board on fair and just compensation, including but not limited to salaries, benefits, and retirement matters, for unrepresented contracted administrators.

BE IT FUTHER RESOLVED that the Superintendent shall provide to the Governing Board an implementation and support plan for this Advisory Council within three months of the adoption of this resolution.

PASSED AND ADOPTED on September 23, 2004 by the Governing Board of the Sacramento City Unified School District by the following vote:

AYES	7
NOES	0
ABSTAIN	0
ABSENT	0

Jay Schenirer, President
Board of Education

ATTEST:

M. Magdalena Carrillo Mejia, Ph.D.
Secretary to the Board of Education