






Miller Creek School District 2024-25 GOALS

	<p>Focus Area: Ensure Fiscally Responsible Allocation of Resources</p> <p><i>Purpose Statement: The Miller Creek School District's primary mission of education shall be the driving force behind all decisions allocating resources and optimizing infrastructure to support students and staff.</i></p> <p>Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prioritize and align district resources with student improvement and identified focus areas ● Provide clean and safe facilities and support internal operations conducive to varied and effective learning opportunities and internal operational efficiencies
--	--

	<p>Focus Area: Rigorous Student Learning</p> <p><i>Purpose Statement: The Miller Creek School District students will receive a broad challenging and relevant academic foundation, will develop an appreciation of the arts, will practice respect for and tolerance and understanding of the importance of individual and cultural differences in order to gain the skills, knowledge and attitudes to be prepared for the challenges of high school.</i></p> <p>Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Increase student academic achievement and success by providing appropriate levels of challenge and differentiation ● Accelerate growth of students not yet meeting standards ● Ensure student access to broad, culturally responsive, engaging curricula and programs
---	---

	<p>Focus Area: Attract, Retain, and Support an Outstanding Diverse Staff</p> <p><i>Purpose Statement: The Miller Creek School District staff will be dedicated to the education of all district children. We will celebrate the individual talents of the staff and encourage opportunities for on-going professional growth, teamwork and collaboration to both model and foster a love of learning.</i></p> <p>Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Support continuous professional growth by providing timely and relevant feedback and professional learning opportunities ● Support a culture that fosters a shared vision, a system-wide culture of learning, respect, and effective communication at the individual school sites and across the district. ● Provide the resources necessary to support thoughtful, intentional and effective learning experiences for students
---	--

	<p>Focus Area: Strengthen Student Connectedness</p> <p><i>Purpose Statement: The Miller Creek School District will be a community where all members encourage, respect, and acknowledge each other as valued individuals and ongoing learners and will foster healthy, inclusive, respectful and safe learning environments.</i></p> <p>Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Increase student engagement in and connectedness to school and trusted adults ● Support and strengthen student relationships ● Support a safe, secure, healthy and inclusive environment for students and families
---	--

	<p>Focus Area: Cultivate Community Engagement to Advance and Enrich Student Learning</p> <p><i>Purpose Statement: The Miller Creek School District will work in partnership with caregivers and the community at large, to include input from stakeholders in decision making processes. Varied personal and professional knowledge, experience and expertise shall be sought and respected in order to foster a greater sense of inclusion and ownership.</i></p> <p>Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Amplify and strengthen communication and articulation between schools and staff and families to ensure shared goals, optimize talent and resources and share best practices ● Facilitate opportunities for meaningful collaboration with community partners, including: CanDo!, Home and School Clubs, the San Rafael City Schools, City of San Rafael, and County of Marin ● Celebrate successes and a shared sense of community
--	---

Local Control and Accountability Plan ❖ Miller Creek School District 2023-24

LCFF: Local Control Funding Formula

-The state funding structure for school districts.

LCAP: Local Control Accountability Plan

-The plan submitted to the state on how LCFF funds are spent.

\$ 21,124,392 LCFF Sources

\$ 485.853 Federal Funds

\$ 2,443,657 State Funds

\$ 4,669,082 Local Sources

\$ 628,300 from CAN DO! Foundation

Source: 23/24 Budget MYP, June 2023

\$30,651,284

Unduplicated Percentage of Students:

(English learners, homeless or foster children, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students)

22.52%

Source: Ed-Data (CDE/EdSource/FCMAT)

Enrollment Summary



**1,825
Students**

LVE: 354

MES: 433

VAL: 420

MCMS: 608

African American: 1.2%

American Indian: 0.1%

Asian: 6.5%

Filipino: 1.0%

Hispanic: 23.7%

Pacific Islander: 0.3%

White: 56.8%

Two or More Races: 10.0%

Source: 2022-23 Dataquest

LCAP BUDGET: \$26,436,024 support for Actions and Services in 3 GOAL Areas

GOAL 1

Build the necessary infrastructure that supports access to programs for all students, especially our most vulnerable students.

Budget for Goal 1:
\$ 23,647,328

- Instructional Materials and Testing Coordination
- Recruit and Retain Staff
- Broad course of Study, including PE, Electives, Music Education, Modern Languages and Library Studies
- Technology Hardware and Software and WiFi Connectivity
- Teacher Support
- Transportation
- Facilities Support

GOAL 2

Increase academic achievement in mathematics and English language arts for all students with a focus on narrowing the achievement gap for English learners, students receiving special education, Hispanic/Latinx, and socioeconomically disadvantaged through best-practices in personalized learning and a multi-tiered system of support.

Budget for Goal 2:
\$ 1,301,437

- Professional Development
- Instructional Coach
- Standards Aligned Curriculum and Assessment
- Intervention Teachers
- Services for Multilingual Students
- 6-8 Academic Support
- Math Intervention
- 6-8 Math Acceleration
- Extended School Year, Afterschool & Summer Tutorial
- Transitional Kindergarten Expansion

GOAL 3

To increase connectedness for students through social emotional learning, campus inclusion, and wellness.

Budget for the Goal:
\$ 1,487,259.00

- Counseling and Mental Health/Wellness Support
- Health Staff
- Sexual Health Education
- Suicide Prevention
- Drug/Alcohol/Nicotien Prevention Education
- Restorative Practices
- Communication System, Local Partnerships, Translation and Interpretation
- Anti-racist Training
- MTSS, PBIS and Tiered Academic and Behavioral Support
- Parent Education and Community Engagement

LCAP
Personnel
costs:
\$25,376.453
(95.99%)

LCAP
Non-personnel
costs:
\$1,059,571
(4.00%)

Source: 23/24 LCAP Projections



LCAP State Priorities Reflected Above:

1. Conditions of Learning: Basic Conditions, Standards Implementation, Course Access
2. Pupil Outcomes: Pupil Achievement, Other Pupil Outcomes
3. Engagement: Parent Involvement, Pupil Engagement, School Climate



The Miller Creek School District believes diversity is an asset, values every student, and is committed to building communities where students thrive. In order to do so, we must recognize systemic disparities in opportunities and outcomes and dedicate resources to address those disparities.

Essential Questions

- How can we raise the equity consciousness of staff, students, parents, and community members so that we examine biases and eliminate inequitable practices?
- What equity-minded pedagogy and assessments will we use to ensure individual student growth and to accelerate the growth of students who have been historically underserved through commitment of resources?
- What are the equity-minded practices we will use when making decisions, approving policy, hiring personnel, and developing and evaluating programs?

Power	Did the process appropriately respond to community priorities and concerns?
Process	What will engagement with identified groups to make decisions and guide successful implementation look like? How does this issue, policy, or program improve current equity conditions and how will the outcomes be measured?
People	Who are the groups of people that will be affected by the issue, policy, or program and how will it serve each group? (Consider in particular underserved populations.)

Tools for Discourse

<p style="text-align: center;">Courageous Conversations Compass <small>from <i>Courageous Conversations about Race</i> by Glenn E. Singleton and Curtis Linton, Corwin Press, 2006</small></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>The Agreements</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Stay engaged. Don't check out.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Experience discomfort. Connect with your feelings.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Speak your truth. Share your perspective.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Expect and accept non-closure. Agree to disagree.</p>
--	---

We can see the impact of this inconsistent and inadequate funding history in the district.

- In the fall of 1987, the average daily ridership for the district was 550 students and a deficit of \$76,000 required a contribution to transportation from the General Fund. This was the first year bus fees were collected in the District in an effort to control costs.
- In 1991, the program's cost was projected to be \$280,109, with an expected deficit of \$99,109.
- In 1992, in the September opening of schools report, the transportation expenditures were expected to be \$242,976, with \$139,769 expected in State Aid, leaving a deficit of \$103,207, which was partially offset by another fee increase and bus pass revenue of \$61,034 and still requiring a contribution of \$46,741. At this time, most districts in the county were operating transportation programs, with three that had already opted out-Kentfield, Ross, and Sausalito.

When passed in June, the projected contribution for transportation for Miller Creek was:

2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
\$232,920	\$379,961	\$403,970

Staffing Challenges: Persistent and Beyond the District

The driver shortage is not a new condition, nor one that is experienced only by Miller Creek. In a Transportation report by Superintendent Yamashiro in October 2017, he wrote:

“The department has been challenged with the bus driver shortage. For the majority of the 2016-17 school year the Transportation Department was short one to two bus drivers with our attempts to recruit and train new bus drivers proving futile. Similar to last year with one driver down we have our Transportation Supervisor driving a route but with two or more drivers down we are forced to contract for bus drivers through an outside company. For 2017-18, we are still not fully staffed which creates many challenges including a lack of flexibility for covering routes.”

Driver Shortages in the Recent Local and National News

- **San Diego Tribune, 4/6/22:**
Latest Challenge Facing Public Transit: Bus Driver Shortage
- **EdSource, 3/4/22:**
Severe Driver Shortage Leaves Some California Kids Waiting at the School Bus Stop
- **CBS News, 8/13/23:**
Schools’ Starting, But Many Districts Don’t Have Enough Bus Drivers for their Students
- **NYTimes 8/17/23:**
The Shortage in School Bus Drivers is Getting Worse

The Age and State of The Fleet

Bus #	Year	# of Passengers
26	2005	25
18	1995	71
7	1991	71
24	2005	15
25	2005	25
29	2008	23
20	2002	72
19	2000	84
22	2002	72
21	2012	72
30	2012	16
28	2008	23
31	2015	16

The District has 13 buses, six large buses with air brake buses and smaller buses. All require diesel fuel. The average age of our buses is over 18 years, with five vehicles past their prime and over 20 years old.

Governor Newsom signed legislation in October that joins California to efforts in other states in mandating that new purchases be for fully zero-emissions fleets, which are those powered by electric batteries. Beginning on Jan. 1, 2035, districts in California may only purchase zero emission buses and chargers. A fiscal summary created by the California Department of Finance estimates the average cost differential between an electric school bus and a diesel bus is \$200,000. It assumes average electric charging infrastructure costs of roughly \$50,000.

This would require approximately \$2.2 million to replace the six large 70-80 passenger buses and almost the same amount to replace the seven smaller 15-25 passenger buses.



**MCSD Budget-LCAP
Advisory Committee**

Committee Resource: TRANSPORTATION REPORT

The MCSD Budget-LCAP Advisory Committee's purpose is to make recommendations to the board that works to align program priorities and spending by understanding the board's goals and the programs and services in place that support the goals, understanding the District's budget and expectations for solvency and to discuss, deliberate, and use consensus protocols to make recommendations.

Miller Creek School District Transportation Program: An Imperfect Funding History

In 1954, there were 50 students enrolled in the district, with nearly half of them attending class in the Old Schoolhouse. By 1955, the number had increased to 381. Ten years later, there were 4,108 students enrolled for the 1965-66 school year, and in 1968-69, the year Miller Creek Middle School opened, enrollment was at 4,896, the district's highest historical level. Transportation services were offered to students across the district and at that time, the district received funding under the state's home-to-school transportation program (HTST). Districts were reimbursed transportation costs on a sliding scale, covering 50%-90% of the costs, with additional funding for districts with lower property values.



The Transportation Report found:

- In 2007-08, the District's HST encroachment was **55%** of the total cost to provide school transportation.
- In the 2008-09 it was **52.88%**
- In 2007-08, the special ed transportation encroachment was **59.61%**
- In 2008-09, it was **41.79%**.

Beginning in the 1951-52 school year, the state created the Special Education Transportation Program (SETP), which reimbursed 100% of the costs associated with transporting students with significant disabilities. However, in 1984-85, the state consolidated General HTST and SEPT funding and froze the combined allocation at the 1983-84 level. In 2009, the School Board approved a viability study on the District's Bus program, based on the continuing challenges, including inadequate and unstable state funding, decreases in ridership, and increases in ongoing costs, that required higher and higher contributions from the General Fund to sustain the program.

In 2013-14, the state established a new funding system for schools that retained an HTST program as a separate funding stream and froze allocations at 2012-13 levels. In 2022, the state budget included provisions for reimbursement funding for school districts and county offices of education (COEs) based on the prior year's eligible transportation expenditures and prior year Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) transportation related add-on funding.

California does not require school districts to provide funding for home-to-school transportation and it is up to local districts to address the issue. When funds were cut, reduced, and frozen, districts across California had to cut back on bus routes or make the decision to discontinue services, no longer able to sustain the increased costs to their general funds, which were increasing each year due to inflation, rising fuel prices, employee costs and the increasing required to maintain a bus fleet and have a plan replacing aging buses.